

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Mr John McGarrachan

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 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 use a bicycle regularly and find drivers travelling at 30+MPH cannot judge distance to or speed of cyclists. On several occasions I have been forced to "crash" into the kerb, and on a few occasions have sustained minor injury through coming off the bike. These incidents have been the result of errors in driver judgement. Having said that I find drivers pay scant attention to anything smaller than their vehicle or that could seriously damage their paintwork. Drivers will turn into your path at junctions and open car doors irrespective of what is behind. I think that if drivers were to travel at a slower pace then they might notice more of the road and other road users.

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

Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response

Motorists seem to think that they are the only "entitled" road users and that every other user is simply an annoyance. There are good drivers to whom this does not apply, but in the main (unless you are a Police horse, when protest is under the breath) drivers resent non motorised road users. This is contrary to the highway code and so I would suggest that not only the ability to parrot the code be included in the driving test, but also a comprehension test. It should also be mandatory that drivers paying the vehicle excise duty are made aware that this is not a "Road Tax" but a tax on the emissions that lead to the early death of 40 to 60 thousand UK citizens per annum and cause misery to those developing respiratory illness due to traffic pollution. While the sociopathic view that a nice car and aggressive driving manner makes you a better person is current then I don't think anything will alter drivers attitude to safety or give them the ability to drive at 20MPH. It seems to me that in order to avoid the, carbon increasing, slow down and then speed up of traffic calming measures, all roads would have to be traffic calmed over their entire length or the traffic will ignore the speed limit. I live in the high rise flats beside the Pollokshaws Road roundabout at the beginning of Barrhead Road and the scream of engines at all hours as the Audi/BMW and boy racer set put the pedal to the floor to use the dual carriageway is testament to the respect given to limits. Drivers should be made aware that they are using a means of transport that puts the efforts of the IRA, ISIS and the Luftwaffe in the shade. they are destroying our countryside and wildlife and the adverts showing the freedom implied in new car on a country road are one of the most misleading things that they will ever buy into.

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

That drivers would at least have to think about reducing speed if they thought there was some form of enforcement in place.

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

Drivers will oppose this leading to loss of votes for those putting decent and sensible ideas forward.

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.

Fit limiting devices to engines or there is no chance of the law being obeyed.

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

Changes to infrastructure always have a cost and although savings from injuries, property damage and roads themselves might be substantial, the cost of signage, enforcement and "traffic furniture" can be high in the short term

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

Carbon reduction, hotter engines belch more carbon.

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?

Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response

I have had drivers scream at me for cycling a more than a foot from the kerb, in my experience if they are upset this spills over into other areas. A driver arriving at the office after a "bad" commute can be awkward for hours despite other office staff not having anything to do with their problem.

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

Educate drivers. Simply because they are using the legal method of killing an incapacitating fellow citizens, they should not also be allowed to come down on those less able to defend themselves (although that is one of the reasons for driving in the first place).

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:

The negative aspect of the proposal comes down to driver attitude, if people are made aware of the fact that they will have to push for alternatives to motorised transport in order to have a decent environment and way of life then I think they will carry any costs. At present even segregated cycle paths are frowned upon, traffic calming is frowned upon and the pedestrian zones are considered by many as a disaster for traffic (contrary to evidence).

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?

Restricted roads if implemented too narrowly will lead to "rat runs" elsewhere. Restricted areas with enforcement of speed limits on the roads surrounding the areas would be a better option in my opinion. Establishing safe walking/cycling/running routes. to encourage less car use would help.