

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Altering the speed limit will be ineffectual, as those who ignore the current 30mph limit will continue to speed. If the current speed limit was policed better, those who are causing the problem would be better targeted, and educated. Additionally, we are no longer educating people, particularly children, to have the correct attitude towards traffic and other general hazards which occur in day to day living, preferring to install such prohibitive measures as this unrealistically low speed limit. The money would be better spent on hazard education, and (old fashioned as it may be) lessons in how to cross a road safely.

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

Better policing of speed limits - using police not cameras, which can be dodged by locally slowing down. Only contact with the police will properly educate those who speed. The Speed Awareness course which is available in England should be introduced. I have personally taken this course and it has altered my driving and attitude to speed dramatically.

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

Other than the debatable hope for a reduction in accidents, I see no advantage in this measure. It will lead to clogged up roads and driver frustration, and possibly lead to more dangerous driving, as those who will continue to ignore speed limits try to get past anyone who is conscientiously following the rules.

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

Unnecessary slow speeds will clog up roads, and tempt those in a hurry, and who will ignore the speed limits no matter what they are, to try to get past slow traffic. This will introduce a risk of accidents, where travelling at 30mph through a town would be more likely to be accepted without passing.

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.

Some main A-roads would have to be maintained at 30 and 40mph to ensure sensible distribution of people and goods. Travelling at 20mph outside of housing areas is unrealistic.

Significant policing will be necessary, but this is already the case, and if introduced with the current 30mph limit, would have virtually the same effect as reducing the limit in most areas.

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

Alteration to and additional signage. Additional policing. Additional speed control measures. Administration of education and application of tickets and fines.

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 should driving limits affect these groups??

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

Not applicable, there should be no effect on general society or the listed protected groups.

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:

Widespread limit of speed to 20mph outwith housing areas will have an economic effect on goods distribution and people going about there daily lives.

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?

Our speed limits are already lower (generally) than those who measure in kph, due to the conversion (i.e. general limit of 50kph in Europe converts to 32mph), and speed and safety education would be a far better way forward.