

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Ken Cochran

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

The premises of the proposal are deeply flawed. Environmentally even the consultation document acknowledges an increase in CO2 emissions when cars are driven at 20MPH vs 30MPH. The Automobile Association also highlights this at http://www.theaa.com/public_affairs/news/20mph-roads-emissions.html Cars are not designed to be at their most efficient at 20 MPH. From a Safety perspective the consultation document research cannot distinguish between safety benefits caused by reduced speed, versus better designs of cars, street lighting, safety education for pedestrians, tougher driving tests etc. The consultation document makes no mention of increased travel times of up to 50% and the corresponding waste of people's lives in slow moving traffic. Cumulatively many "person-lives" will be lost each year to unproductive increases in travel times. We could of course reduce fatalities to zero by having a person walk in front of every car with a red flag. Reducing all 30MPH speeds limits to 20MPH will adversely affect law-abiding motorists who drive carefully, but do little to reduce inappropriate speed by drivers who habitually ignore speed limits. The approach we should take is to punish the latter type of drivers with stiffer penalties including banning.

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

As mentioned above the main problem is people driving at inappropriate speeds. Tougher penalties for exceeding current speed limits should be introduced including earlier banning.

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

None, other than giving people a false sense of security.

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

I have outlined these above namely ...
INCREASED pollution
INCREASED journey times up to 50% with corresponding cumulative loss of "life" time for motorists
Questionable attribution of reduction in injury to lower speeds when other factors also contribute
Disproportionate impact on law abiding motorists who will drive more slowly versus those who don't observe limits but drive as fast as thin fit regardless.

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.

Increased penalties for inappropriate speed.

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

Motorists would have significant costs in reduced fuel efficiency and most significantly in increased journey times with reduction in other productivity. Councils would have some one-off signage costs.

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

All groups will be adversely affected to the extent that they are motorists regardless of other protected characteristics.

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

Yes, by dropping the idea all the negative impacts could be avoided for all groups.

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 have ongoing effects on productivity of motorists by increasing journey times making less time available for productive work. An obvious example is that delivery firms will have to put more vans on the road to deliver the same number of packages per day.

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 is an example of government interference which looks, and is presented as having only benefits, when in fact is detrimental to society and does not stand up to scrutiny.