

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 am content for this response to be attributed to me or my organisation

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Kenny Millar

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.

Partially supportive

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

I am in support of the proposal in broad terms, so long as the following are considered: 1. Where the existing 30 MPH limit is already deemed unnecessarily low (for example roads which have now been by-passed, wide and straight, but with very little traffic, no adjoining properties etc, but which USED to be busy, but not any more) are not included. There should be a review of the limit on these roads. 2. Where lowering the limit actually causes an INCREASE in accidents (ie commuter routes where the lower limit causes impatience and dangerous overtaking) that the limit be reviewed again. 3. Some checks and balances to ensure that the proposed bill actually results in the expected outcome. With a mandate to reverse the bill if the expected outcome is not realised.

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

No

Please explain the reasons for your response

The alternatives, of making it "good practice" or encouraging local councils to do so themselves, would result in the same end-game but at a much higher cost.

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

I think it will be two-fold

1. A reduction in fatalities and major accidents.
2. A mellowing of the drivers attitudes, resulting in more courteous driver behaviour.

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

Some limits, where due diligence has not been applied, along with a large dollop of common-sense will result in an increase in accidents due to driver impatience and frustration. (Ie driving along a wide, quiet, carriageway at 20 mph)

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.

Strong benefit messages should be used, rather than high-and-mighty law and punishment messages. Social media and young people groups should be used to get the message out.

Campaigns should be launched in advance of the change, saying how much groups are looking forward to the new limits.

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

Presumably the Scottish government will bear the costs of replacing signage, advertising and enforcement. However it will be small compared to the overall roads budget. Local authorities will save from having less repairs to carry out. Motorists should be most cost neutral.

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

Yes - lower repair bills for the carriageways, and barriers.
Less damage to buildings and infrastructure.
An overall mellowing of driver attitudes.

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?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

Please explain the reasons for your response

The only one I can think of would be possibly pregnant people. Driving at 20 MPH may be frustrating and seem positively pedestrian when you are in labour and anxious to get to a hospital.

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

Yes, for pregnant persons, some discretion by law enforcement should be used.

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?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response:

I don't see why it shouldn't have a positive impact, going forward.

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?

I am broadly in support of this Bill, however common sense must be enshrined in it, and checks and balances must be built in to make sure it delivers the proposed outcomes, with a mandate to reverse it either wholly or in part if the proposed outcome is not delivered.