

Name

Publication consent

Publish response only (without name)

Q1) Do you agree or disagree with the Council's approach to the distinction between a 'principle' and a 'purpose' of sentencing?

Agree

Please provide any reasons for your response.

Q2) Should there be an overarching principle of "fairness and proportionality"?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your response.

Q3) Are the supporting principles which underlie the overarching principle of fairness and proportionality (as listed at paragraph 2(i)-(vi)) appropriate?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your response.

2 l) "impact on the victim"

This is what has been missing in the sentencing of drivers who speed and kill or maim cyclists. Community Service or a Suspended Sentence is **never** a suitable sentence in these circumstances. The impact on the victim's family could not be greater: they have lost an active family member, often the main breadwinner.

Q4) Are the supporting principles expressed clearly and accurately?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your response.

Q5) Are there any other supporting principles which should be included at paragraph 2?

Q6) Do you agree or disagree with the approach to the purposes of sentencing as set out at paragraph 4 of the draft guideline?

Disagree

Please provide any reasons for your response.

If we are going to use the word "proportionality", we need to define it very clearly. Proportional to what?

Q7) Are the purposes as listed at paragraph 5(a)-(d) appropriate?

No

Please provide any reasons for your response.

The document must recognise that for some types of crime, a deterrent sentence is more relevant than for others. Very few of us will ever consider murdering someone, very many of us will speed in a motor car. Sentencing needs to recognise this: the weighting given to the deterrent should not always be the same, in the case of motoring offences where a vulnerable road user's life is lost or changed through the actions of a motorist, the deterrent element becomes more important.

Q8) Are the purposes expressed clearly and accurately?

No

Please provide any reasons for your response.

If "similarity" is defined, "proportionality" should be too.

Q9) Are there any other purposes which should be included?

Q10) Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out at paragraph 6 of the draft guideline in relation to the efficient use of public resources?

Agree

Please provide any reasons for your response.

Q11) Is it appropriate to consider efficient use of public resources during the sentencing process?

Yes

Please provide any reasons for your response.

There is a heavy cost to custodial sentences.

Q12) Do you agree or disagree that the guideline would lead to an increase in public understanding of how sentencing decisions are made?

Agree

Please provide any reasons for your response.

Q13) Do you agree or disagree that the guideline would lead to an increase in public confidence in sentencing?

Disagree

Please provide any reasons for your response.

Which members of the public? To those who want our roads to be safer, I see little there to convince me that the necessary factors have been considered in drawing this up.

Q14) What costs (financial or otherwise) do you see arising from the introduction of this guideline, if any?

Q15) What benefits do you see arising from the introduction of this guideline, if any?

Q16) Would you like to make any other comments in relation to any matter arising from this consultation?