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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Q1.۱	Which	of the	followir	ig best	expres	ses y	our/	view	of the	proposal	to	replace	the o	current	30mph	default
spee	d limit	on res	stricted	roads	with a 2	0mp	h lim	it.								

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 proposal is seeking to amend exceptionally old legislation. The fact is that the technology of vehicles has in fact improved meaning they are more efficient in their ability to accelerate, brake and use fuel. As a result vehicles are in fact more able than ever before to travel faster with greater safety than when this legislation came in to being. Congestion and pollution is flagged as being an issue with vehicles traveling faster. The issue here though is perhaps more one of town and road planning. Due to our current roads system being geared to faster moving traffic there is clearly an issue. It is often seen that pollution is particularly apparent with stop start traffic conditions. This is not removed by speed restrictions, but by efficiency such as removal of crossings and introduction of 'jay walking' laws. The gearing of cars is also not designed for these speeds and so due to town planning is leading to people using second far more often than they need to even given best intentions and so in effect is increasing pollution. The health living and cycling lobbyists would likely wish to see such introductions, however this is short sighted and likely does not consider the aging population. The aging population is unlikely to want to be cycling around and will likely wish to use vehicles due to infirmity. Further such speed restrictions have led to cyclists causing congestion as cars cannot overtake due to the speed restrictions in place. It seems also that the cycling lobby believes no road law apply to them and can be often seen saying that the speed restriction to them are not applicable. The notion of a 20mph limit is a fix all is quite simply ill conceived. There are many factors that need to be considered not least, town/city planning, the likely way our roads will adapt over time, the increased answer-ability of cyclists and how to accommodate commuters who cannot afford exorbitant rail fairs. 20mph in certain circumstances my provide benefit, but blanket or over zealous approaches are quite simply counter productive.

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

The aims of the proposal is a lazy approach to a problem and does not really in fact address the problems at all.

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

I can see no advantage to the proposal.

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

Increased frustration on the roads.

Pollution increases due to drivers remaining in second gear.

Increase in congestion due to slower speeds and unable to overtake cyclists.

Increased disregard for speed limits over all as 20mph limits are not taken seriously so knock on psychological effect.

Potential for increased accidents due to monotonous driving mixed with gun-ho pedestrians and cyclists. Discouragement of vehicle use by vulnerable members of society due to congestion and stress leading these people to isolation.

Impedance of emergency vehicles leading to loss of life.

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.

Do not introduce it in the first place

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	Х					
Local Authorities	Х					
Motorists	Х					
Other	Х					
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

The costs are high as a number of changes need to be made to our roads in order to accommodate this scheme. There would be policing costs for this scheme and this would be to our already over stretched force. There are far more important tasks for our police than entertaining a whim. Motorist will be using more fuel due to how gear systems work. Due to congestion caused this will cost more time and thus money. I commute and due to 20mph introduction spend an increased 15% time in the car going to from work. As people are reliant on their goods to be delivered by vehicle they will suffer increase in costs due to employees spending longer to get the stuff there, but also through the extra amount of fuel they shall consume.

Q7.	Do١	you believe	there will I	be anv c	other be	enefits to	reducina	the sr	peed limi	t from 30m	ob da	20mpl	n?

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

This legislation is really only going to serve benefit to a few interest groups and lobbyists. People need to be able to get around efficiently especially to avoid isolation such as older people and people with

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?

disabilities. The overall effect of these limits might appear to create a benefit in some areas, but more often than not the problem has simply moved from one place to another. The congestion affect of such measure also will impact on health and this could affect directly a person who is pregnant or going to maternity. Generally, the proposal affects us all and would potentially drive up the prices of things such as food which given austerity and food banks seems somewhat unwise.

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

Yes, by the bill being thrown out and time spent looking at more coherent methods of addressing the issues that it presumes to solve.

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 does not take account of the changing and aging population. The approach given proposes a blanket approach which the impact of is largely unknown. The fact is that the study for Edinburgh will not be known for years so to look at this as legislation now is complete and utter folly. There is likely to be impacts due to slow moving traffic of congestion, pollution and increased cost as a knock on effect to all in society.

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?

No Response