

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Donald Edwards

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

The 20 mph roll out in Edinburgh has been a disaster. I am a regular pedestrian, keen cyclist and car user. In all these situations the 20 mph limit is problematic. As a pedestrian it is now harder to cross a road as the time it takes for a car to approach is so much longer. In cases where there is traffic, it is difficult to tell when a space is available. As a result I have seen many more people crossing roads having to stop, or the car having to break hard in order to avoid an accident. As a cyclist I feel the 20 mph makes life significantly more dangerous. Whereas at 30 mph the speed differential means that a car passes quickly and effectively, at 20 mph an overtaking car completes the pass more slowly, making it more dangerous for the cyclist. If the cyclist is capable of keeping close to 20 mph this just means there is no need to the car to pass, but relatively few cyclists on the road can maintain this pace. As a car driver there is currently confusion in Edinburgh. Also, as a driver I find it much easier to become distracted at 20 mph than when driving at 30 mph. In addition to this, the car is incapable of driving in higher gears, 2nd or occasionally 3rd, rather than 4th or 5th. This means that the car is less fuel efficient, leading to higher pollution. The final point I wish to object to is the assumption that the fatalities and injuries are the car and car drivers fault. I firmly object to the way in which this data is collected. There is an inherent assumption within the data that if a death occurs in a car related accident, it is due to the car. There is no metric being taken which takes into account the other party; was it an unattended child, someone who stepped onto the road without looking, for example. This type of biased data collection can only ever show half the picture, and therefore can only ever have one outcome. In my experience driving through the city, road craft of pedestrians has become significantly worse over the years. Pedestrians take chances, or pay no attention before stepping onto the road (often buried in their smartphones, listening to music or talking to friends). At what point are we going to take data that shows this side of the story, require people to take some responsibility.

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

Perform a more comprehensive, less biased study first would be helpful.

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

No doubt you will have more road penalties, therefore more income from fines. Your own data states that the average speed in 30 mph is 31 mph, but that in 20 mph it is 25 mph. This makes it more likely that speeding offences will occur.

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

I actually believe that the constant attack on car drivers makes things worse for all concerned. As a cyclist I have seen more bad behaviour against cyclists over recent years, which all feel coincides with more and more measures against car drivers.

These measures and constant restrictions need to stop. We need to provide an traffic infrastructure that works for everyone. At the moment it does feel that there is a constant attack on car drivers.

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.

Have no idea. I don't believe it is workable. It hasn't worked in Edinburgh. Other cities in the UK have returned to 30 mph.

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

It cost Edinburgh millions to implement, and it hasn't yet been implemented fully or successfully. As a car driver my fuel economy has dropped by about 20%, thus more fuel.

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?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

Please explain the reasons for your response

Why would it impact any of these groups, it has no relevance.

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

Not relevant.

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:

Lower speed, lower gear, more fuel use, more pollution. It's quite simple.

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?

Dont do this. Edinburgh has shown that it does not work. It is a disaster. At the very least you need to wait a few years, measure the effectiveness of the Edinburgh project before diving into it.