

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

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**

Vehicle safety has increased enormously since the original speed limits were set. Not only by way of massively reduced stopping capability and vehicle design impact safety entirely moving the opposite way of the suggestion being made in this case. Blanket speed restrictions aid nobody and remain in place even when roads are quiet, at night and outside all times where people are even out on the streets. They enormously disadvantage the populace as a whole for little or no real benefit. Close study of the Transport and Research Laboratory study (TRL 323) clearly shows that an American style jaywalking law would be far better targeted and no doubt have far greater benefits.

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**

The aim being to reduce casualties could be tackled many other ways. The removal of ALL sign posts from the edge of roads and junctions with posts being sited where they do not obstruct views of pedestrians and other traffic. Schemes making pedestrians aware that THEY also play a critical role in accident safety.

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

I see no advantages whatsoever, quite the opposite.

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

24Hr inconvenience to road users of all types, more accidents as concentration levels have been proved to drop with lower speeds...

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.

All of the mentioned elements will require costly input and policing. This would have a huge cost overall and the margins involved at such a low speed limit will end up with more court appearances for drivers for what in real terms are likely to be safe speeds which are outside the percentage margins used before prosecution is pursued.

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**

All players within the implementing of such broad blanket changes will incur notable manpower and equipment costs at government and LA level. Motorists will all have longer times in ongoing journeys which will increase costs both directly and to employers and subsequently consumers. The likelihood of a big jump in speeding offences/prosecutions is also very likely, with knock on effects of totting up, licenses being lost increased insurance costs Etc

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

I can't see ANY benefits, only disadvantages.

## 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**

It would disadvantage everybody and would not be race disability or sex related.

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

Yes, avoided by not following through on such a backward and damaging changes.

## 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:**

It can only be of detriment to everybody, not only people who live and drive through such areas, but also any business dealing with anybody or company who is directly impacted by the changes.

## 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?

Yes, A National review of all speed limits with a view to bringing them in line with current vehicle capabilities and safety standards overall.