

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

While I fully support the 20mph limit around schools and areas with a naturally high density of young and of people general, such as Parks and the main shopping streets of town centres. I believe the main element in many road accidents and fatalities is frustration, caused by in-necessarily slowing up and delaying people in a world where we are all increasingly busy. I think the introduction of a blanket 20 mph limit will see a vast increase in these levels of frustrations and potentially increase accidents rather than decrease them. We need to be careful not to assume that because frustration can not easily be measured as a cause of accidents, that it is not ruled out. What this bill would do is create a blanket 20mph everywhere, and while the ability to make roads 30mph is provided for, this then becomes the expensive option for councils with ever increasing budgetary pressures, in essence creating very little incentive for the 30 mph limit to be applied, even where it is logical to do so.

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

Remove the red tape and pass a bill allowing the councils to introduce 20MPH limits in any areas deemed necessary without having to go through all the red tape. If this is not done, all built up areas will become 20 mph, making roads 30 mph will become the costly option for councils strapped for cash and there will be little incentive to do so, even where appropriate. This will increase motorist frustrations, and result in higher incidences of rash driving and overtaking by idiots in built up areas where the 30 mph limit is not necessary but will inevitably be implemented.

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

I don't, I think a sensible approach to changing the current legislation to allow councils to decide for themselves on a common sense basis where it is appropriate to install a 20 mph limit, (Parks, Retail areas of town centres, housing estates with narrow roads or high traffic volumes) without the cost of having to jump through hoops to do so. A blanket 30 mph limit will increase frustration and rash driving from people in a hurry who will end up overtaking in a built up area where they would have previously waited behind a car doing 30 mph. Making it illegal, doesn't stop people driving like idiots, the further you frustrate their progress the more people will do it, and this risks increasing accidents and fatalities, not reducing them. What then happens is that another accident is attributed to speed, when frustration is the actual cause and further speed restrictions are implemented because speed is easy to measure. But that increases the root cause, not decreases it. It is a flawed plan.

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

I think it is a terrible idea, it's using a sledgehammer to crack a walnut. People speed because they are in a hurry or frustrated because we all have increasingly busy, and stressful lives. Reducing speed limits in a blanket way like this makes journey times longer, which increases frustration, and stress, not reduces it. So I believe, through this policy, you will get a dramatic increase in normally sensible drivers, as well as the existing idiots driving recklessly, over taking 20mph vehicles in town centres where they'd previously have waited behind the car doing 30mph.

I think a much more sensible policy is to put forward a bill allowing local councils to use a common sense local knowledge approach to deciding where 20 mph limits are necessary and desirable (around schools, parks, busy housing estates, estates with narrow roads, leisure centres etc.) without the need for a costly drawn out process to implement them. I.E. if the public ask for one, someone trained in these matters goes out and assesses the site and either approves or rejects the application and the roads people go in to change the signage.

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.

I don't think the policy should be implemented. 20 mph limits are appropriate in some areas. there is no need for them to be implemented in a blanket way like this. Easing peoples journeys through towns and built up areas is the way to reduce accidents, not by further inhibiting it.

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

The government will have the cost of implementing the bill when legislation simplifying a common sense implementation of 20 mph zones is what is required, not a blanket 20 mph limit. There will be increased driver frustration, resulting in more accidents, higher policing costs for monitoring and accident investigations, motorists will inevitably inadvertently slip over the limits occasionally and receive increased fines. Local authorities, rather than only having to add some new signage to appropriate zones will need to replace all existing 30 mph signage with 20mph signage. But more importantly than financially it is the wrong decision, it will increase driver frustration and therefore accidents and fatalities. Look to roads like the A9 to support this, where there were no passing opportunities, people ended up taking stupid risks to overtake. The areas which were then dualled, removed this frustration and accident numbers fell dramatically on those stretches. Frustration is the root cause, ease traffic flow, rather than hinder it to reduce accidents.

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

No, It will result in increased driver frustration, more accidents and more deaths in built up areas. A common sense 20 mph where appropriate, removing the barriers to implement these is the best solution rather than a blanket 20mph limit which will slow drivers progress, increase their frustration and encourage further reckless driving, accidents, and fatalities.

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

More of them will be involved in more accidents as driver frustration increases and more people take reckless risks where they would have adhered to a 30 mph limit. A 20 where appropriate policy with ease of implementing these increased is the most sensible option.

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

Yes, do not implement the policy, it is flawed to its core. Ease traffic flow to reduce driver frustration, do not hinder it, this increases accidents not reduces them.

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:

More accidents and fatalities will occur, which will have a substantial social impact.

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 do not implement this, it will only cause more accidents and fatalities. The current 20 mph limits work so well because they are small zones which heighten driver awareness that they are in an area of greater risk. A blanket 20mph limit de-sensitizes drivers to that heightened risk around schools, parks, retail streets with high volumes of people etc. It's the fact they are so limited that makes them work so well.

A blanket urban 20 mph limit will also greatly frustrate drivers progress, will cause some to take reckless risks where they would have waited in a 30 mph scenario and cause more accidents and fatalities. Instead remove the barriers to local councils installing 20 mph limits where necessary and desirable, so that this can be done with less cost. The bill allowing for 30 mph zones to be added will mean it is just as expensive for them to do so as it currently is to install a 20mph zone and with squeezed budgets and increased speed camera incomes from these blanket 20 mph limits there would be little incentive for councils to implement these.