

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Totally unnecessary. Many reasons: If the concern is about people being knocked down, then punishing car drivers is the wrong knee jerk reaction. The money should be spent on educating children and the wider population about road safety. Cars are significantly less efficient at 20mph than 30mph, so this would have a massive impact on pollution levels. Journey times would be longer and driver concentration would be significantly lower - there are plenty of drivers who are completely distracted when driving at what feels like a walking pace. The policy is totally unenforceable as a 20mph limit is supposed to be self-enforcing, meaning that a speeding ticket issued to a driver exceeding 20, but below 30 actually invalidates the 20mph limit in the first place rendering both the limit and the ticket unlawful. 30mph might be the limit at the moment, but that doesn't mean that 30mph is always a safe speed. Dangerous or wreckless driving is still an offence even when below the speed limit, so there is no restriction to prosecuting dangerous drivers who obey the speed limit. In fact, the current focus on purely speed, actually detracts from the real problem of poor driving standards. This policy would compound that misdirected offensive.

Q2. Could the aims of this proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

No

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

Improving road safety is a target that nobody should argue against. However, the aim of the proposal is misguided as it focuses purely on vehicle speed and implies this is the only factor in accidents. Reducing the speed of vehicles simply masks the problem of poor driving standards and poor public road safety.

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

Due to the poor state of the roads, the only advantage would be less damage to vehicles when they hit a pothole. The proposal might reduce severity or number of incidents, but not by addressing a problem, but by masking it.

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

Higher pollution levels.  
Frustrated and irrational drivers.  
MORE accidents due to lack of concentration.  
Longer journey times.  
More congestion - if 33% less traffic can pass along a certain road, then the queues will be longer.  
Reduced pedestrian traffic awareness as the traffic will be slower, so they don't even need to look. This policy will mask the problem that it is trying to address, thereby actually compounding the problem. Also when pedestrians are then in an area where traffic moves faster, they are more likely to step out without looking.  
The policy ducks the need to educate kids on road safety - this can only be a bad thing.  
20mph limits are not enforceable by law, so there is not point trying. The implication is that policing speed becomes pointless and stops happening, so driving standards drop even further than they already are.

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.

You would need to install so many signs and traffic slowing (not calming!) measures that the roads would become undriveable, frustrating and therefore more dangerous as people rush to get past an obstacle before they are stopped by oncoming cars with priority. The cost of all these extra things would be astronomical.

Also, why even consider compliance with 20mph limits as they are not legally enforceable anyway?

## Page 12: Financial implications

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**

Government would have to spend on advertising and promoting the new policy. Local authorities would have to install lots of new signs and 'street furniture' (bollards, stupid one-way kerbs etc). Motorists would have increased fuel costs due to the less efficient speed. Other - police would have to spend less on traffic speed monitoring as 20mph is not a legal speed limit anyway.

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

As an INDIRECT result of \*masking\* the problem of people walking in front of cars, pedestrian injuries would be reduced.

## 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?

Unsure

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

I cant answer this question with 1 checkbox for all those groups! Most would be totally unaffected.

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?

Disabled people would both gain and lose. They might benefit when they are a pedestrian as crossing the road \*could\* be easier for them. On the other hand reducing the speed of the traffic would result in less cars able to get along a road in a set time, so the flow of cars over time would actually increase, making it harder to cross. If the disabled person is a driver, then it would negatively impact them as its going to take them 33% longer to get anywhere.

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

Don't see how.

## 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:**

Its a change of speed limit, it is equally as sustainable as the current speed limit. If anything, it is less sustainable due to the increased pollution it will cause.

## 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?

Please don't subject the vast majority of drivers who are diligent and sensible to more punishment rather than tackling the real problem of poor driving standards and poor public education on road safety.