

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

A reduction in speed limit is entirely unnecessary, and would have a negligible effect on public safety - if any effect at all. It would serve only to frustrate motorists and hinder the flow of traffic, resulting in increasing congestion and air pollution. I also feel reducing speed limits is an unfair denial of the advancement of automotive technology, particularly in terms of road-holding and safety. Highway code stopping distances may have been reasonable for cars in the sixties, but are no longer representative of vehicles on the road.

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

A better route to delivering safer roads would be to invest in and incentivise further driver training - through initiatives such as the IAMs young driver schemes.

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

None. At all.

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

Large scale disruption to the road network while signage and roadmarkings are changed. Increased congestion as traffic flow speeds are reduced, and cars become unable to legally overtake slow moving vehicles such as tractors or bicycles. Increased emissions due to cars being forced to drive at less efficient operating points.

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.

Introducing registration plating and road taxes for cyclists. As modern road bikes and hybrid bikes are easily capable of exceeding 20mph in good conditions - and these are also road users - they must be held accountable and punished equally to motorists for breaking the law. If anything, cyclists are more likely to be a danger to pedestrians and other road users due to the physical exhaustion inherent in such a means of transport.

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

Changing road infrastructure is a hugely expensive task, and must be shouldered by government and local authorities. The best route towards covering this cost would be to increase road tax rates for motorists - which would just as likely encourage a move away from cars, and reducing road tax income. This cost wouldn't realistically be offset by an imagined improvement in fuel efficiency for motorists - low speeds are in fact a less efficient operating point for modern cars in terms of miles per gallon. Cars are generally more efficient by this metric at around 40-50mph. Furthermore, if the government or local authorities are to effectively enforce the new proposed speed limits, they must commit more resources to police forces to do the job of enforcing.

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

None.

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 imagine pregnant women or the disabled struggling to cycle or walk from place to place when travelling by car is made even less attractive because of the increased time taken and increased vehicle running costs. This won't be offset by an improvement in safety, because such a drop in road speeds will not result in a reduction in accidents or road fatalities.

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

none.

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:

I have outlined in previous questions why this will be environmentally damaging, while there will be no social improvement as safety will be entirely unimproved.

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?

I feel politician's time could be more effectively spent handling other issues which will have a real noticeable impact on the public, such as tackling the plight of Scotland's dire future for farming and rural enterprise, or maybe committing policing resources to dealing with serious rural crime. Alternatively, if the aim is to improve road safety and infrastructure, then I would recommend investing in improving road surfaces and existing signage. I feel one of the biggest dangers I encounter on the roads is poor surfaces which are detrimental to vehicle grip and stability, or potholes which damage vehicles and make them less road worthy.