

Proposed Restricted Roads (20mph Limit) (Scotland) Bill

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

an individual

Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic, but not in a subject relevant to the consultation, please choose "Member of the public".)

Member of the public

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

No Response

Please choose one of the following; if you choose the first option, please provide your name or the name of your organisation as you wish it to be published.

I would like this response to be anonymous (the response may be published, but no name)

Please insert your name or the name of your organisation. If you choose the first option above, this should be the name as you wish it to be published. If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Please provide details of a way in which we can contact you if there are queries regarding your response. Email is preferred but you can also provide a postal address or phone number. We will not publish these details.

Page 7: Your views on the proposal

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal to replace the current 30mph default speed limit on restricted roads with a 20mph limit.

Fully opposed

Q1. Which of the following best expresses your view of the proposal to replace the current 30mph default speed limit on restricted roads with a 20mph limit.

Please explain the reasons for your response

Following on from years of non investment in the roads network the current administration is indeed upgrading the network, but right now traffic has to move through the areas you propose. Lowering the speed limit will impact on traffic, increasing it during rush hour times and increasing the cost of doing business. The 30mph speed limit is sufficient for safety if it is properly enforced. Lowering it to 20 will do nothing to tackle those that already flaunt the 30 limit. Rural areas in particular do not have sufficient Bike or walking facilities, and for commuting the idea of walking or cycling to work each day in our dispersed rural settlements and Scottish Weather is a pipe dream. The reduced car journeys you seem to think will happen, just wont. Forcing more people onto bikes in turn increases the likelihood of accidents as these tend to be an obstruction to road traffic causing sharp braking and manoeuvres to get past them by many. This is not only dangerous for the Cyclists, but the car involved and oncoming traffic. The queues that form after such 'blockers' can lead to impatience and people making poor choices. In many areas, particularly rural, the roads are unsuitable for cyclists with blind corners, single track, or by population centres separated by Dual Carriageways (a far greater danger to their health than the difference in emissions from 20 to 30 mph). While you may think 'what has the impact of cyclists on country and dual carriageway roads got to do with reducing from 30 to 20?' the answer is simple... If you think lowering from 30 to 20 will force more people onto bikes then it will also force them onto these other roads when they get out of the 'built up' area. They wont be cycling to the end of the 20 zone then getting in their car to go down the dual carriageway. In summary, the proposed change will not tackle the main cause of traffic accidents (people flaunting existing rules), nor will it benefit commuters or the economy. The road networks are for all commuters, and not just busses, cyclists and pedestrians. The main user of them is cars, vans and lorries. These need to be prioritised given that the current 30mph system is safe if adhered to. The £4-5 million you intend to spend on this would be better spent on road awareness campaigning, cycle lanes, improved public transport and enforcement of the existing rules if these are the goals you want to achieve.

Q2. Could the aims of this proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

Yes (if so, please explain below)

Please explain the reasons for your response

Give police more funding to enforce the existing laws.

Q3. What do you think would be the main advantages, if any, of the proposal?

None

Q4. What do you think would be the main disadvantages, if any, of the proposal?

Increased traffic
More cyclists means more chances of accidents, both for the cyclist and the cars forced to brake and manoeuvre out their way
Increased costs economically on transportation intense industries

Q5. What other measures do you think would be needed to maximise compliance with the new national 20mph speed limit on restricted roads, for example in relation to advertising signage and police enforcement.

Far more than you have budgeted for. The current limit is difficult enough to enforce and this should be pursued before nonsensical reductions are piled on top

Page 12: Financial implications

Q6. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have?

	Significant increase in cost	Some increase in cost	Broadly cost-neutral	Some reduction in cost	Significant reduction in cost	Unsure
Scottish Government		X				
Local Authorities		X				
Motorists		X				
Other		X				
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

Government will set limit and pay cost for legal change Local Authority will get signs and install them Commuters will be delayed and businesses that are transport intensive see increases in delivery times and associated costs Other people - The public will end up paying through the reduced funds for other issues that are a better use of funding

Q7. Do you believe there will be any other benefits to reducing the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph?

No

Page 14: Equalities

Q8. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on the following protected groups (under the Equality Act 2010): race, disability, sex, gender re-assignment, age, religion and belief, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity?

Negative

Please explain the reasons for your response

Lowering the speed limit will not change your race, sex, sexual orientation nor religion. It is conceivable that going slower will allow more time for drive by romances leading to marriage, civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity... but if thats the intention, its a long shot. Is this question boilerplate that is legally needed because its a total nonsense question to ask when you are talking about speed limits.

Q9. Could any negative impact of the proposed Bill on any of these protected groups be minimised or avoided?

What impact?

Page 16: Sustainability of the proposal

Q10. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impact?

No

Please explain the reasons for your response:

Based on every answer given so far

Page 17: General

Q11. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal to establish a 20mph default speed limit on restricted roads?

Rip it up and start again.