

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".)

Professional with experience in a relevant subject

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Oliver Bassi

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

Less efficient speed for vehicles which increases pollution. Longer journey times which increases pollution. More vehicle time on the roads which increases congestion. More conflict between cars and bicycles forced to travel together at similar speeds. Encouragement of cyclists to under take other traffic. Some vehicles will suffer damage with sustained 20mph as this is below clutch engagement speed in the lowest gear. Below the natural speed for safe observations so drivers more easily distracted (some studies suggest increasing accident rates). Some vehicles are less stable hitting potholes at this speed for example large motorcycles. Difficulty for pedestrians in judging vehicle speed, often thought to be stopping. Reduced vehicle road noise so pedestrians less aware of approaching traffic. Other cities such as Manchester have tried this as reversed the changes due to lack of support and compliance. Unlikely to be widely supported and adhered to, devaluing the principle of a speed limit and its importance in really critical locations such as outside school gates. If the current 20mph limits are already not generally observed it can not justify the expense of extending the experiment.

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

Tougher driving tests could increase the quality of driving on our roads, reducing accident rates while a reduced pass rate would reduce the number of vehicles, pollution and congestion. Entitlement to drive would be based more on ability and less on ability to pay. The same could also be achieved by removing financial penalties for traffic offences in place of bans or licence cancellation. This is a simpler and more economic way to reduce accident rates, fatalities, congestion, pollution and parking issues and encourage walking, cycling and public transport.

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

Reduced fatality RATE though this may need to be considered in the context of an increased number of actual accidents resulting from reduced driver attention, cycle/car conflict from traveling together, reduced traffic awareness of pedestrians, and increased illness resulting from congestion and pollution increases.

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

Please see reasons for opposition in earlier question.

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.

Focused use of the 20mph limit on critical locations rather than a blanket approach that dilutes respect for the extra low speed.

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

Please see reasons for opposition in earlier question.

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

They will be effected in the same negative manner as other citizens.

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

Keeping 20mph limits for critical locations, increasing the chance of observance by a public seeing the value.

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:

Increased journey times will cost individuals and businesses with vehicles spending more time on the road with engines running, increasing the numbers of commercial vehicles required by businesses.

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?

There has been no consideration to other limits given, a 25, 15 or even 10 mph limit. With out these being explored there can be no confirmation 20mph is the correct speed for best effect.

The Edinburgh Council survey has been generally criticised for having 'loaded questions' designed to result in a favorable result for localised limits and has then been extrapolated, the general question of support for a city wide 20 was never asked. Suggesting general public support without asking this makes no sense yet the proposal does. In fact it is hard to find members of the public in favour, reflected by the general lack of observance since the existing 20 roll out.

Urban drive cycles have been found time and again to be far removed from reality, particularly in the light of current diesel emissions scandals. Yet the proposal makes claims of reduced emissions for diesels involved in this scandal and says it out weighs increased petrol emissions that would result from a new 20 limit. This is fundamentally flawed, only the petrol emissions should be considered or better still a study on the streets of Edinburgh conducted.