

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

David O'Donnell

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 supportive

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

Supportive of enforced 20 mph limits around schools and narrow residential streets. A possibility would be to adopt the US system for all traffic to be halted when school buses drop off or pick up pupils

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

Make this very targeted. A blanket approach serves no one. Pollution increases as vehicles are not as efficient and stay in the area longer. Congestion increases as vehicle flow is slower. Individuals become more frustrated possibly leading to more not fewer accidents and productivity is lost as more time is spent commuting. Bill serves no purpose in taking cars off the road as public service vehicles will have to travel at the same speed so there is no overall improvement.

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

There are none. A blanket approach serves no one. Pollution increases as vehicles are not as efficient and stay in the area longer. Congestion increases as vehicle flow is slower. Individuals become more frustrated possibly leading to more not fewer accidents and productivity is lost as more time is spent commuting. Bill serves no purpose in taking cars off the road as public service vehicles will have to travel at the same speed so there is no overall improvement.

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

See response to previous question. It doesn't take an Einstein to work out that traffic congestion would increase.

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.

This question presents survey bias in that there is an assumption that the 20mph limit should be implemented and therefore the survey is of questionable validity. The implication of police enforcement is that the exercise becomes one of revenue generation rather than safety. If safety is the primary aim then the 20 mph limit should be targeted to ensure that key roads and environments are covered and these should be schools and narrow roads around housing estates where children are more likely to be playing and could run into the road.

It is my contention that there is too much signage on all roads at present and consideration should be given to reducing signage not increasing it.

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						
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

There will be costs to both Scottish and local governments in implementation. There will also be additional costs in greater pollution through vehicles being less efficient and being remaining in an area for longer as traffic flows are reduced. Productivity will be impacted as travel times will be increased. This will be both for motorists and for public service vehicles. Deliveries will take longer and travel times will be longer and it may be that delivery companies and bus operators will require more vehicles rather than fewer to ensure that delivery targets are made and timetables are met. This potentially increases employment but further increases vehicle numbers and pollution

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

I'm glad that we are considering everyone equally. It warms my heart

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

No Response

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:

Please see the response to the other questions. This is a sledgehammer to crack a nut. The proposal is essentially grandstanding so that the current government can show what it has achieved but at great cost to everyone. There are similarities with the air rifle laws. There is no evidence that the air rifle law as passed will create the protections for citizens that the Government sought. Air rifle incidents were and still are rare but occasionally happen however a large number of people were/are inconvenienced so that the Government could be seen to be doing something. Law abiding citizens are inconvenienced and fleeced but individuals likely to be involved in incidents ill ignore the law anyway so nothing is achieved.

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?

No Response