

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Partially 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

A blanket 20mph limit is not necessary and would actually lead to greater pollution, greater frustration and less attention to driving (more accidents). I fully support 20mph limit in areas of high risk (schools, hospitals, parks, residential side streets etc) and areas proven to be accident spots (history or injury or death to padestrian/cyclist caused by car driver driving within the speed limit). Educating younger drivers to the effects of speeding in restricted areas would be far more effective and lower cost than replacing all signposts.

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

Educate younger drivers to the effects of speeding in 30 limits. Cheaper and more effective than blanket reduction.

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

No advantage to the wider population unless you own a speed limit sign company.

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

Increased pollution, journey times, congestion, frustration and no significant benefit.

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.

Why waste even more money, just spend a little on education of younger drivers and raise the penalty for exceeding current limits. Also educate the pedestrian and cyclists to take more care as they are a significant contribution to the accident rates.

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					

Q6. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have?

Local Authorities	X					
Motorists	X					
Other	X					
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

It is a counter productive measure and high cost at that. Educate road users better, stop being draconian, think outside your box and do something that may actually work long terms.

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

No, it is actually the opposite, no benefits, just more demonisation of the motorist. Education is better than this blanket reduction.

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

All will feel a negative effect of a blanket reduction. It will not stop those same idiots that are already exceeding the current limits.

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

Yes, don't implement the bill. It is ill conceived.

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

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?

Please explain the reasons for your response:

Too draconian, too costly with no improvement in real safety. Educate all road users more. Bring back Tufty and the geeencross code man!

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?

It is a bad idea, just trying to justify more demonisation of road users and selling it as a safety benefit. Why not 10mph or 5mph? It makes no sense. Education is far better.