

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Michael G Cockburn

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

The blanket (one fit all) imposing 20mph is completely wrong as I have already detailed to my local councilor. A case can be made outside schools, health centres or very busy shopping districts (like Stockbridge or morningside) but in the rest of the city it achieves nothing. Slower traffic does not encourage walking or cycling and reduction in road deaths/injuries is not proved by reliable data pure estimate by your lobby & you. Again teaching road sense is a parent responsibility and can be enhanced via education in schools and your bill helps neither. 20mph increases congestion and air quality will get worse as many cars/vans on the road do not run well at lower speed. The policy is mis-guided and there is no data I am aware of that proves it is worthwhile. To get more to walk and cycling in the city place the funds for these stupid 20 signs into dedicated paths & cycle lanes (that cars cannot enter-solid white lines) away from traffic. That action will tick all the boxes and help improve health and deliver the travelling benefits you say your bill will do. Lastly your bill and concept is totally impossible to enforce as Police Scotland do not have the resource-the Scottish government has seen to that.

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

Allow local authorities to decide where they feel 20mph is justified (Schools, health centres & busy shopping streets etc) and place any funds from central government into schemes with Sustrans and the like to increase cycle routes off road and better protected cycle lanes in cities.

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

This proposal is un-workable in practice and cannot succeed in its aims. It will cause more pollution in the air and will not encourage walking or cycling as claimed.

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

Repeat cannot be enforced, increases pollution and will fail to meet any of its aims re increasing people walking more and cycling.

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.

If you recruit another 10,000 police officers that might help but the police have more serious issues to address than this. House breaking and motor bike crime need resource to improve arrests/convictions. Serious work on improving safe cycle routes in towns and off road out of town would be money better spent.

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

Police will demand more resource and the signage and road markings need maintenance (30 mph is cheaper as you do not need road paint remainders). Slower speeds means more fuel being used unless you have a hybrid car (are you going to force everyone to buy one or have a government scrapping scheme) so motorists again take a hit. Kids going to school will walk through air quality reductions and will see increase in GP/hospital visits as health suffer (NHS will have a cost rise in cases of breathing issues in the young and old).

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

NONE WHAT SO EVER.

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

It is not just above that will see negative side-all of the public will suffer. No-one wins in this proposal as it cannot deliver what it claims are the aims. There is no data available to prove a reduction in child injury/death.

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

NO

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:

Again it cannot achieve its aims and there is no evidence to support it-it is pure speculation that it can.

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?

Leave it to local authorities to decide which roads need a perm reduction. Avoid the concept one size fits all.