

Proposed Restricted Roads (20mph Limit) (Scotland) Bill

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

on behalf of an organisation

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".)

No Response

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

Commercial organisation (company, business)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

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.

mike@mwbradiocomms.co.uk

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

Please explain the reasons for your response

Increased pollution. Despite the carefully manipulated pollution surveys trying to prove otherwise the actual pollution levels will increase significantly. Firstly to travel at 20mph for most vehicles means driving in a lower gear which results in an increase of engine revs. by about 300 rpm which obviously burns more fuel added to the fact that the journey time has increased by a staggering 50%. More fuel burnt for a longer time = MORE POLLUTION. This should be simple enough even for a politician to grasp. Some years ago Government figures showed that the most economical speed was 54mph so unless the laws of physics have changed I assume that to be still true. Other reasons. Fifty per cent longer journey times are damaging for businesses and customers. Other English cities have abandoned the 20mph schemes because of pollution and unpopularity. The vast majority of Edinburgh motorists ignore the current 20 mph schemes. Increased frustration of drivers. To make up for lost time drivers will tend to travel much faster when outside the restricted areas.

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

Scrap the whole idea.

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

None whatsoever - Scrap the proposal.

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

Increased Pollution
Increased driver frustration
Damaging for business
Bad for customers
Waste of public money

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.

Signage is a waste of public money and it will quite rightly be ignored.
Police should not waste their valuable time trying to enforce this. They are paid to stop crime. Not to pander to some politician's misguided thoughts

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

The costs of signage, increased congestion, increased pollution, lost business, delayed business, increased fuel costs passed on to customers has to be paid by someone so I expect all tax payers would foot the bill as usual.

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?

Negative

Please explain the reasons for your response

I can see a serious risk if a woman who is in labour has got to get to hospital urgently as was the case with my two sons. A 50% increase in journey time would be unacceptable and could potentially be life threatening.

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

Yes - scrap the proposal completely.

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:

As already explained, this Bill is unnecessary, unwanted, and too costly in pollution levels.

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?

This proposal should be scrapped completely. Some of the information used to promote this has been exaggerated, corrupted, is irrelevant and in some cases pure lies all designed to peddle the dogma of a "Green" politician. This is a solution looking for a problem.