

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".)

Academic with expertise in a relevant subject

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Dr Morris Bradley

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 Supportive

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 20mph speed limit covering the whole urban area of Edinburgh (except for some main routes designated) is easier to understand by motorists and other road users compared with a patchwork of streets with different speed limits. This means safer conditions for all responsible road users: they know what is required and what to expect. At 20 mph, buses and cars flow at a smoother pace, allowing vehicles and other users to cross the flow with less risk and less disruption than that caused by impatient and aggressive drivers. Drivers who habitually break the existing 30 mph speed limits will now be easier to identify and will tend to reduce their speeds from well above 30mph to below 30mph where a speeding offence now applies. Anyone caught speeding at or above 40mph in a 20mph zone must be committing a deliberate and reckless action and should be penalized accordingly. The net result should be a safer, calmer city with far fewer instances of aggressive reckless driving. Essential road users may find the discouragement of speeding drivers results in less traffic flowing more evenly and with fewer disruptions through accidents and vehicle conflicts: so there may be an improvement in average journey times and of course a reduction in air pollution. Above all, calmer traffic conditions will improve the quality of life in Edinburgh, with immediate benefits for citizens and visitors and with long-term benefits by attracting people and investment in the city.

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

Unsure

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

See my previous replies.

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

None. Driving faster gives people of little confidence a spurious sense of achievement. Real achievement comes from thoughtful and considered actions.

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 think the method of speed enforcement whereby a police officer has to flag down a speeding driver is inefficient in an age of digital technology. If the law needs to be changed, it should be made possible to use fixed or temporary mounted cameras (no officers required) which would record speeding offences and pass the data to a central control centre where a statement of the details of the offence and the penalties applicable would be automatically sent to the owner of the vehicle (who should be responsible whoever was actually driving). Businesses using drivers would establish work contracts to recover fines caused by their drivers.

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						
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

It depends of course on how the system is implemented but there would certainly be cost benefits from reduced disruption to traffic flows, reduced accidents and costly court cases, health benefits to the public, profound benefits in Edinburgh becomes a more attractive and successful location to live and work in or to visit.

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

Yes. If this is sustained and the traffic flow is calmed effectively, people's perception of Edinburgh will become more positive.
 Of course there are other more significant changes that should be considered. The priority given to motorists who expect to drive (usually alone) through city centre streets should be reconsidered, allowing better pedestrian, bus, tram and cycle use of the road space.
 Best practice in other European cities offers plenty of examples of what can be achieved and it benefits. Such changes are of course consistent with reducing air pollution which is damaging our children's health and reducing carbon dioxide emissions which are damaging our children's future.

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?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

Please explain the reasons for your response

Self-evident.

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

There is no reason to expect an effect due to such factors.

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?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response:

The impact of the Bill should be positive regarding sustainability.

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.