

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Please explain the reasons for your response

While there may be locations where a 20mph is warranted, eg near schools, there are many roads where 30mph will remain appropriate. A better solution to any perceived mass disregard of current urban speed limits must surely be the raising of awareness supported by judicious enforcement and appropriate penalties.

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

See my previous answer - awareness, education, and enforcement.

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

I cannot see any advantages to the proposal.

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

The principal disadvantage is surely likely to be widespread disregard of a restriction perceived as inappropriate, pointless, and unenforceable.

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.

Without speed cameras on every street, compliance is going to be patchy because a blanket 20mph limit is simply ridiculous for the majority of locations.

From personal daily experience of the Edinburgh 20mph scheme, compliance will be patchy in terms of both location (places where 30mph is regarded as reasonable by a majority of motorists) and individual behaviour (where some motorists will adhere to the lower limit in places where a majority regard the lower limit as inappropriate).

The effect in many (not all) locations is uncertainty, confusion, and frustration. These are not emotions conducive to safe behaviour in any aspect of life, never mind at the wheel of a ton of metal in an urban environment.

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

I understand that Scottish Government will pick up the additional costs of policing and penalising. Local authorities will pick up costs of road signage changes and see little financial return. Again from experience of Edinburgh, budgets would be better allocated to road repairs; the wearing surfaces are in truly shocking condition.

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

None whatsoever.

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

Up to this point I had thought this was a reasonable consultation about the proposal, to be responded to with thought and care even though I believe the proposal to be deeply misguided. This question is irrelevant and inappropriate to this consultation, and completely undermines what little credibility it may have had as a serious dialogue with the tax-paying public.

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

This is an irrelevant follow-up question to the inappropriate previous question and not worthy of consideration.

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:

It is my understanding that the question of whether vehicle emissions per square kilometre per hour are significantly reduced by lowering speed limits below the current 30mph is not resolved. It is not therefore possible to confirm that any benefits will accrue at all.

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 regard this proposal as ill-advised and unnecessary, and one which looks likely to introduce a statute which will be held in contempt by many motorists. This will not help public acceptance that laws are made for the greater good of society. Again, this proposal is ill-advised and unnecessary, and it should not have been given the budget and resources to progress this far.