

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

I am a driver, cyclist and pedestrian and can honestly say that it is not speed that causes injuries but human beings, some of whom should not be allowed outside without a carer. I like to think I am a good driver and pay attention when there are speed limits imposed, whether 70 or 20 mph. Other drivers, and cyclists do not adhere to acknowledging speed limits and put undue pressure and stress on drivers who do. Reducing speed limits as part of a default speed does not get near to reeducating such drivers who refuse to pay attention to what is indicated, they are only concerned on getting from A to B by the quickest method. The argument that it would make it safer for other road users is entirely fabricated, and can and will be seen as another means of taxing the hard pressed motorist. Only this week we discover the following :- Chelmsford rake in nearly £300,000 in 4 weeks just by installing bus lane cameras and telling no one, the M1 crash driver who killed 8 people had no licence and had been asleep for 12 miles of his journey, (no doubt these deaths will be blamed on speed rather than utter incompetence/stupidity of the driver, bearing out my previous indication that its the drivers who are to blame). In the 45 years I have been driving and cycling and walking I can assure Mr Ruskell that people will not get fitter and healthier under such a default speed, the majority of kids and adults can barely walk 1km without assistance. I live rurally and need a car to do shopping, has he ever tried carrying 4 bags of shopping onto the inadequate bus service which serves my village. I cycle over 60 miles per week to maintain fitness and walk my 10000 steps per day, does Mr Ruskell have similar numbers we can compare. While cycling I do obtain speeds in excess of 40 mph at times, usually on the downhill, but if I am to adhere to a default speed in towns and villages of 20mph, I'm not sure what the road cyclist clubs are to do when pedalling through our village each Tuesday and Sunday in their peloton. Far better to install sleeping policemen or build speed reducing measures in towns and villages, our own village could do with just a similar measure given the speeds that drivers are maintaining through our village. Its not the speed its the DRIVERS that need to be changed/reeducated, there is no one size fits all solution of decreasing default speed in the hope that drivers will adhere to such measures.

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

detailed previously that speed reducing measures will be required, educate the drivers who need to be educated, not everyone is a maniac on the road.

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

None, as drivers would ignore without penalties being introduced. There are insufficient police officers available so it would be cameras that would impact upon not only the hostile drivers but also the errant good driver who has been driving unblemished for 40 + years in the belief that the default speed was 30.

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

Certain positive points used to justify the bill are spurious in the extreme, particularly the health benefits. Given that in my small village 68% of the children at school are brought there by their parents I don't see that changing by virtue of a 20mph limit, people will not cycle any more as they would feel just as exposed and liable to injury once out of a 20mph zone, assuming that every driver in the zone adhered to the limit. Journey times for all would be extended, when you rely on bus timetabling this would diminish an already sparse bus service and make journeys for the elderly even more inadequate.

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.

Speed reducing measures would be the only solution if reeducating drivers could not be done. We have had advertising signage and have not noted any reduction in speed of drivers through our village, there are insufficient police to enforce this across the nation on an equitable basis.

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

Only Hospitals would see a reduction in cost as fewer incidents would happen with the correct speed reducing measures in place

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

NONE

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

Speedy drivers cut across all Protected groups

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

We are on dodgy ground if there are to be exclusion due to protected groups, what next . Will cyclists always be not at fault in accidents.

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:

The bill will inevitably have an economic impact, its going to cost people in terms of infrastructure build and economic loss in terms of travelling times.

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?

People drive nowadays using cruise control, even in towns and cities and any attempts to have them switch from 70 to 40 to 30 to 20 can only create confusion and likely accidents are people speed up and slow down as they move through the various speed limits, it already happens now especially in these days of SAT NAV.