

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Studies in the past have proved that when a 30mph speed limit was seen as too low for a road the average speed was 42mph and when made a 40mph it was 38mph. This will be the case for much of the 20mph zones if implemented. There are many roads within the urban area which 20mph would be frustratingly slow without increasing safety in any way and could lead to more congestion. Frustration I have noticed is the cause of many accidents on the road so to increase it will lead to more of the same risk taking actions that lead to RTI's elsewhere. The problem here looks like bureaucracy, so where a community or safety case is made for a 20mph zone for an area it is far too complex and expensive to implement. Simplifying this process and the strictures associated with applying for and implementing a 20mph zone is all that is needed.

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

See previous response on reducing bureaucracy and simplifying the procedures and strictures for introducing a 20mph where a community or a safety case is made for a 20mph zone

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

None.

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

Increased risk taking by frustrated drivers

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.

Lots and lots of money that we don't have. More police, more cameras. more traffic calming measures required when we cannot even afford to maintain the roads as they are, big advertising campaign.

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

As per the previous comment the investment required to implement it and police it would be significant. Some money would be pulled back for central government in speeding fines but there would be other costs as folk would be losing their licences more easily and with it in some cases their livelihoods.

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

No, although this is being sold as a safety bill the real agenda here is the Greens general anti car agenda. I do use alternative transport means when practical but often it is not.

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

Everybody will have to put up with the same frustration.

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

Yes, don't do it.

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:

Lots of infrastructure will have to be put in place which will increase our carbon footprint. At the speeds being talked about emmissions saved will be minimal.

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