

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

This proposal would actually increase air pollution as vehicles would be forced to travel in a lower gear, they would travel more slowly adding to congestion and their emissions in any area would increase due to their travelling more slowly. In addition, their slow progress would encourage the build-up of "hot spots" currently experienced mainly at locations such as traffic lights. The "evidence" quoted in the document is largely politically motivated propaganda promoted by the Greens whose objective is to drive cars off the road by making driving as slow and inconvenient and therefore unpleasant as possible, totally ignoring the main cause of pollution such as buses and heavy commercial vehicles (17%), itself a much smaller cause than industrial emissions and even from wood-burning stoves (18%), much favoured by the Greens. The speed cause of accident fatalities ignores the fact that only 12% of accidents are speed related, a much more frequent cause being poor judgment and inadequate attention to road conditions (which is actually exacerbated by speed limits posted lower than a natural speed for the conditions).

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 aims should not be delivered in any form as they are purely politically motivated and have no bearing on road safety.

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

Purely an act of self-indulgence by the Green Party, which would actually make roads less safe and more polluted. Oxford removed its 20 limits because air quality was worsened after their introduction.

Air quality in Princes Street, Edinburgh deteriorated when it was made bus and taxi only and pedestrian accidents increased as it became a race track for buses.

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

Poorer road safety and worse air quality together with a reduced effectiveness of the working day as more time would be spent travelling to and from work and between jobs in the course of the day.

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.

I can see no benefit in compliance with a politically motivated and artificially low speed limit. Police have confirmed that they will not enforce Edinburgh's 20 limit areas except at schools and accident reduction sites so why would they enforce these limits across the country?

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

Passing an Act would incur the Scottish Government in substantial cost in trying to "sell" the public the spurious benefits, local authorities would incur costs by being obliged to promote the blanket limit and in trying to identify areas which should be exempted from it, motorists would have increased fuel consumption and more emissions would be caused by the increased burning of fossil fuels.

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

The Greens' drive to force everyone on to public transport would make it more difficult for rural communities to travel for the disabled to move around and for people with respiratory conditions vulnerable to poor air quality to survive.

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

Of course not as no consideration is being given to anything other than the Greens' obsession with an anti-car agenda.

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:

The increased emissions, lengthened journeys and increased congestion are fundamental results of the proposals.

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?

Yes, scrap the proposal. It is not worthy of any serious consideration.