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The Scottish Parliament has made lasting changes to our lives since devolution. Measures such as the ban on smoking in enclosed public places were initially seen by some as questionable but have become an accepted and valued part of how we protect public health and our living environment. With newly devolved powers over speed limits coming to the Parliament we have a clear opportunity to act in a similar way and effect a national change that will have a lasting benefit for generations to come.

For over a decade communities across Scotland have been making the case that ‘twenty is plenty’ where we live. Dropping the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph in residential areas delivers many benefits from making it easier to cross the road to cutting air pollution. The bottom line is that 20mph speed limits have been shown conclusively to reduce vehicle speed and that reducing speed saves lives.

However, while some local authorities have taken action, the roll out of 20mph areas in Scotland has been limited and piecemeal so far. The process for creating them within the current 30mph urban areas is complex and expensive for councils to administer. When they are established they are often restricted to areas around school gates, while the wider residential community is left with the higher limit.

The national 30mph speed limit for urban areas was set back in the 1930s, at a time when our understanding of road safety was very different, and has never been changed. It’s time to bring the urban limit into the 21st Century by moving the default to 20mph.

I recognise that such a change has to take account of a number of realities. Firstly, that communities across Scotland are diverse and that the way we use roads across urban and rural areas will vary. Local authorities, working with communities, are best placed to make judgements about which roads may need to be exempted from a 20mph default limit. Secondly, that such a change in itself needs to be part of a comprehensive approach to enforcement and investment in speed reduction in problematic areas. My intention is to bring forward a Member’s Bill to begin to give effect to that change by reducing the 30mph default speed limit to 20mph, whilst allowing local authorities to increase the limit back up to 30mph in areas where they and the local community consider it appropriate.

I welcome views from all stakeholders on this proposed Member’s Bill and hope we can work constructively together on designing ground-breaking legislation that will be effective in delivering the benefits of speed reduction in residential areas across Scotland.
HOW THE CONSULTATION PROCESS WORKS

This consultation relates to a draft proposal I have lodged as the first stage in the process of introducing a Member’s Bill in the Scottish Parliament. The process is governed by Chapter 9, Rule 9.14, of the Parliament’s Standing Orders which can be found on the Parliament’s website at:
http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/17797.aspx

At the end of the consultation period, all the responses will be analysed. I then expect to lodge a final proposal in the Parliament along with a summary of those responses. If that final proposal secures the support of at least 18 other MSPs from at least half of the political parties or groups represented in the Parliamentary Bureau, and the Scottish Government does not indicate that it intends to legislate in the area in question, I will then have the right to introduce a Member’s Bill. A number of months may be required to finalise the Bill and related documentation. Once introduced, a Member’s Bill follows a 3-stage scrutiny process, during which it may be amended or rejected outright. If it is passed at the end of the process, it becomes an Act.

At this stage, therefore, there is no Bill, only a draft proposal for the legislation.

The purpose of this consultation is to provide a range of views on the subject matter of the proposed Bill, highlighting potential problems, suggesting improvements, and generally refining and developing the policy. Consultation, when done well, can play an important part in ensuring that legislation is fit for purpose.

The consultation process is being supported by the Scottish Parliament’s NonGovernment Bills Unit (NGBU) and will therefore comply with the Unit’s good practice criteria. NGBU will also analyse and provide an impartial summary of the responses received.

Details on how to respond to this consultation are provided at the end of the document.

Additional copies of this paper can be requested by contacting me at:

Mark Ruskell MSP
MG.17
The Scottish Parliament
EH99 1SP

0131 348 6468

Mark.ruskell.msp@parliament.scot
Enquiries about obtaining the consultation document in any language other than English or in alternative formats should also be sent to me.

An on-line copy is available on the Scottish Parliament’s website (www.parliament.scot) under Parliamentary Business/Bills/Proposals for Members’ Bills/Session 5 Proposals.

**CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND**

**Road safety and speed**

In June 2009 the Scottish Government set out its framework for road safety to 2020 in *Go Safe on Scotland’s Roads – It’s Everyone’s Responsibility.* In the framework it sets out its vision as being:

“A steady reduction in the numbers of those killed and those seriously injured, with the ultimate vision of a future where no-one is killed on Scotland’s roads, and the injury rate is much reduced.”

This framework was reviewed in 2015-16 with speed, age and vulnerable road users identified as key priority areas of action.

In October 2016 Transport Scotland published its annual statistical report *Reported Road Traffic Casualties Scotland 2015.* Table A of the report shows that in 2015 there were 5,398 accidents on built up roads, where the speed limit can be up to 40mph, and 877 of these accidents were categorised as fatal and serious. Paragraph 2.3 of Article 2 goes on to say that “travelling too fast for the conditions” or “exceeding the speed limit” were reported as contributory factors in 11% of all reported accidents and in 19% of all fatal accidents.

According to the Scottish Government’s *Recorded Crime in Scotland, 2015-16* statistics, speeding offences accounted for 32% of all motor vehicle offences in 2015-16, and a total of 54,419 speeding offences were recorded in Scotland.

A Department for Transport fact sheet from 2016 states that the average speed of cars and light commercial vehicles (LCVs) in a 30mph area is 31mph while the average speed of cars and LCVs in a 20mph area is 25mph. Therefore, as a result of this proposal, we could expect to see a reduction in speed of around 6mph.

---


4 Scottish Government, 2016. *Recorded Crime in Scotland 2015-16.* Available at:
Transport Research Laboratory study found that the number of accidents could be expected to fall by between 4% and 6% for each 1mph reduction in average speed.\(^6\)

The Scottish Government supports 20mph speed limits in residential areas and in January 2015 published its *Good Practice Guide on 20mph Speed Restriction*,\(^7\) where it states that 20mph is the ideal speed limit for residential and built up areas in Scotland. Furthermore the document states that “The Scottish Government is committed to encourage initiatives that cut speed, particularly near schools, in residential areas and in other areas of our towns and cities where there is a significant volume of pedestrian or cyclist activity.”\(^4\) The *Good Practice Guide* sets out that the Scottish Government’s policy is to “encourage the creation of shared spaces and social streets to encourage active travel and create places that people can enjoy and that for residential streets, a maximum design speed of 20mph should normally be an objective.”\(^8\)

This Bill intends to make it easier for local authorities to pursue and implement that 20mph policy for the benefit and safety of us all.

**Link between road traffic injuries and speed**

The Scottish Government’s *Good Practice Guide* highlights a Department for Transport report which found “that the risk of fatal injury to pedestrians rose from under 1% at an impact speed of 20mph to 5.5%, or 1 in 20, at 30mph.”\(^9\)

In its *Road Safety Framework Mid-Term Review* of March 2016, Transport Scotland committed to Vision Zero, which involves reducing road casualties until Scotland becomes a nation with zero road deaths.\(^10\) The *Mid-Term Review* also identified the introduction of 20mph zones or limits as a ‘Priority One’. Similarly, it identified speed as a national priority to tackle.


\(^10\) Transport Scotland, 2016. *Road Safety Framework Mid-term Review*. Available at:
The World Health Organisation’s (WHO) factsheet on road traffic injuries identifies speed as one of the key risk factors that can be addressed to help prevent road traffic injuries.¹ The factsheet states that an increase in average speed is directly related to both the likelihood of a crash occurring and to the severity of the consequences of the crash. WHO provides statistics showing that an adult pedestrian’s risk of dying is less than 20% if struck by a car at 50 km/h (31mph) and goes on to say that 30km/h (18.6mph) speed zones can reduce the risk of a crash occurring and recommends them in areas where vulnerable road users are common, such as residential and school areas.

WHO also states that worldwide around 1.25 million people die each year as a result of road traffic crashes. The factsheet further states that road traffic injuries are the leading cause of death among young people aged 15-19 years old. It goes on to say that half of those dying on the world’s roads are “vulnerable road users” such as pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists.

In Great Britain grouped by cause of death, the biggest killer in Britain of children aged 11 – 16 and of anyone aged 5 – 25 is road traffic crashes.²

In Scotland there were 162 people killed on the roads in 2015 with 1,597 people seriously injured in road accidents. The average number of children killed on the roads was seven per year between 2013 and 2015 with 140 children seriously injured in 2015.³

Current law and practice

Under current legislation the speed limit on restricted roads is 30mph. Restricted roads are defined as roads which are lit by street lights that are no more than 185m apart. Local authorities can then use Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to set speed limits to 20mph or to create 20mph zones where they feel 20mph is an appropriate limit for that particular section of road. 20mph limits are defined as streets or areas where the 20mph speed limit is enforced through street signs and 20mph zones are defined as streets or areas where a 20mph speed limit is supplemented by physical traffic calming measures.

Local authorities can also use the TRO process to set speed limits of 20mph in streets or areas of their choosing for a variety of traffic regulations such as road closures, introduction or varying of speed limits, prohibition of turns (such as right turns and u-turns) and introduction of waiting or loading restrictions.

While the creation of 20mph speed limits is achievable through TROs this is a very time consuming and expensive process for local authorities to take forward to cover all the relevant streets and areas, as set out later in this consultation. In practice some local authorities have taken this forward more than others and this has led to a patchwork collection of 20mph streets across Scotland which is potentially confusing for all road users.

**BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED BILL**

The proposal set out in this consultation is to change the default speed limit from 30mph to 20mph on restricted roads (covering the vast majority of residential and built-up areas). By doing so, Scotland’s communities can be made safer, healthier, and more climate-friendly for a fraction of the cost of sticking with the current piecemeal approach. Further, a consistent approach should result in better compliance as all road users would be aware of the law.

The arguments for 20mph speed limits can be considered in the broad categories of safety, health and reduced emissions and are discussed below.

**Safety**

As set out above evidence shows that road users, especially those that are vulnerable, are significantly more likely to suffer from serious or fatal injuries from cars travelling at 30mph as opposed to 20mph. As established earlier reductions of speed even if they do not lower by the full 10mph will still see significant safety increases. We already put 20mph limits around schools for children’s safety but our roads are used by many vulnerable users who deserve the same protections, such as elderly and disabled individuals, cyclists and motorcyclists.

Also, imposing 20mph limits only in the immediate vicinity of schools ignores the fact that many children walk to school from much further away. 20mph limits will help make all vulnerable road users safer. The mean radius of school safety zones is just 300m. However, the mean distance travelled to school is 1.8km. Therefore, school safety zones typically protect a child for only one-sixth of the child’s journey to school.

In Calderdale, a Metropolitan Borough of West Yorkshire, they found that average speeds reduced by 2.2mph and road casualties fell by 22% following the introduction

---

4 [http://www.20splentyforus.org.uk/BriefingSheets/How_school_safety_zones_are_not_a_priority.pdf](http://www.20splentyforus.org.uk/BriefingSheets/How_school_safety_zones_are_not_a_priority.pdf)

of 20mph limits. When compared to national and regional data the fall in Calderdale was faster than other areas.

A 2003 study of 20mph zones in Hull found pedestrian casualties dropped by 54% and child pedestrian casualties dropped by 74% within 20mph zones over 7 years, compared with a 1.5% rise in casualty rates across the rest of Yorkshire and Humberside as a whole. A 2007 review of 20mph zones in London found a 42% reduction in injury accidents and a 53% reduction in fatal or serious accidents.

A reduced speed limit will not only reduce the likelihood of accidents occurring but if they do occur it will reduce the severity of the accident and will lower the chances of those involved being killed.

**Health**

Lowering speed limits will help encourage ‘active travel’ where people choose to travel by foot, bicycle etc. An increase in mobility and active travel will have clear health benefits for all involved.

There are clear health benefits associated with an increase in active travel. Even moderate exercise, such as that associated with walking or casual cycling, has numerous health benefits which are set out below.

*Maintaining a healthy weight.*

Regular exercise can help people maintain a healthy weight. Cycling raises your metabolic rate, which can help to keep weight off. Moderate pedal-pushing burns up to 500 calories per hour, which is more than walking or swimming. A 20-minute bike ride to work could use the same amount of calories as a cappuccino, a bar of chocolate or a 175ml glass of wine.

Regular exercise also helps prevent a number of potentially serious illnesses. For example:

- Heart disease: which is the number one cause of death in the UK. Inactive and unfit people have almost double the risk of dying from heart disease compared to more active and fit people.

---


18 Sustrans, 2017. *Health benefits of cycling and walking (online)*. Available at: [http://www.sustrans.org.uk/what-you-can-do/use-your-car-less/health-benefits-walking-and-cycling](http://www.sustrans.org.uk/what-you-can-do/use-your-car-less/health-benefits-walking-and-cycling)
• Asthma: has seen a significant increase amongst young people and adults in recent decades. There is strong evidence that this is linked to traffic pollution. Sustainable transport and active travel will assist in creating cleaner air for all.\(^{19}\)

• Diabetes: according to WHO Europe, physically inactive people have a significantly higher risk of developing type II diabetes compared to inactive people.\(^{20}\)

• Cancer: by being physically active, individuals can reduce the risk of breast, bowel and womb cancer. Cancer Research UK suggests that keeping active could help to prevent over 3,000 cases of cancer in the UK every year.\(^{21}\)

Furthermore, keeping active has benefits for mental health and wellbeing. According to SUSTRANS physical activity can be used to overcome, and even prevent, depression and anxiety. According to the Mental Health Foundation, physical activity can be incredibly beneficial to mental health and self-confidence.\(^{22}\)

**Reduced emissions**

When cars are running they produce harmful Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), particulates (PM\(_{10}\)) and Carbon Dioxide (CO\(_2\)) emissions. Petrol and diesel cars produce these emissions in different quantities – with diesel cars typically producing more NOx and PM\(_{10}\) than petrol cars. Both petrol and diesel cars produce significantly less PM\(_{10}\) in 20mph limits than when in 30mph limits. Diesel cars will also see a reduction in both NOx and CO\(_2\), while petrol cars would see a slight increase in NOx and CO\(_2\) as shown in the table below.\(^{23}\)

However, given the much larger quantities of dangerous emissions from diesels and the current distribution of diesel / petrol cars this would still result in lower levels of NOx and PM\(_{10}\) overall.

\(^{19}\) SUSTRANS, *Health Benefits of Cycling and Walking*. Available at: http://www.sustrans.org.uk/whatyou-can-do/use-your-car-less/health-benefits-walking-and-cycling


\(^{22}\) Mental Health Foundation, 2016. *How to look after your mental health using exercise*. Available at: https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/publications/how-to-using-exercise

\(^{23}\) Research by Imperial College London for the City of London Corporation, cited by 20's Plenty at http://www.20splenty.org/emission_reductions. The original report is available at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Drive Cycle(^7)</th>
<th>NOx (g/km)</th>
<th>PM(_{10}) (g/km)</th>
<th>CO(^2) (g/km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petrol 1.4 – 2.0 litre, EURO IV</td>
<td>20mph</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>0.00218</td>
<td>271.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30mph</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
<td>0.00237</td>
<td>266.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of 20mph drive cycle</td>
<td>+7.9%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>+2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel 1.4 – 2.0 litre, EURO IV</td>
<td>20mph</td>
<td>0.7437</td>
<td>0.01758</td>
<td>201.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30mph</td>
<td>0.8104</td>
<td>0.01917</td>
<td>201.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of 20mph drive cycle</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, 39.6\% of cars on UK roads were diesels. Where a 20mph limit is implemented the reduction in total NOx and PM\(_{10}\) emissions is large enough to be the equivalent of taking nearly half of the 63\% of petrol cars off the roads.\(^{25}\)

It is worth noting that despite the above evidence there are a number of other issues that affect emissions including traffic flow, road works, energy spent speeding up/slowing down, the style of driving and the vehicle itself including its specifications and condition. However, 20mph may see a decrease in wear and tear on vehicles and an improvement in traffic flow.

**Tackling inequality**

A report by Fife Council reviewing their rollout of 20mph areas highlighted the fact that SIMD (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation) areas show a greater reduction in casualties when compared to non-SIMD areas (34\% vs 20\%).

Furthermore car availability is closely linked to income and deprivation, as highlighted by the Scottish Households Survey:

> “in households with a net annual household income of over £40,000, almost all households (97 percent) have access to at least one car compared to 51 percent of households with net incomes of less than £6,001 and 37 percent of households with net incomes between £6,001 and £10,000.”\(^9\)

---

\(^7\) A “drive cycle” is a specific speed trace used for testing vehicle performance. Sixteen drive cycles were generated for this research, eight for 20mph limit roads and eight for 30mph limit roads. All were approximately 3.2km in length but had different speed and acceleration characteristics. The research was based on data gathered using various routes across central London in 2013.

\(^8\) “s Plenty for Us, 2015. 20mph limits offer a toxic diesel fume reduction equivalent to taking half of all petrol cars away. Available at: [http://www.20splenty.org/emission_reductions](http://www.20splenty.org/emission_reductions).

People in lower incomes are less likely to drive to work or for leisure activities. As such creating roads that are safer, cleaner and healthier will have a greater positive impact on those on lower incomes.

**Longer term benefits**

Although it is hard to evidence, we believe the introduction of 20mph speed limits as default in Scotland will effect a cultural change which will provide a significant long term benefit.

The introduction of compulsory seat belt use and the ban on smoking in enclosed public places were both met with significant criticism, and many argued that they would be unenforceable and pointless. However nowadays smoking is on a serious decline\(^\text{10}\) and no bar or restaurant allows smoking on the premises. Similarly a 2014 study found that 98.2 percent of those in cars observed seat belt laws.\(^\text{11}\)

Although the law defines speed limits (including the current default limit of 30mph on restricted roads) as the maximum, they are generally treated by drivers as the target speed – i.e. drivers generally aim to drive at the limit, and expect others to do the same (with drivers choosing to drive more slowly often treated as if they are being antisocial or obstructive).

Drivers develop these behaviours when learning to drive and continue with these attitudes throughout their adult lives. By reducing speed limits to 20mph we can help create a new norm that understands that 20mph is safer, and suitable for the majority of urban roads in Scotland. This will help create long-term cultural changes that will make roads safer and more accessible for everyone.

**RESEARCH**

Campaign groups and charities such as 20’s Plenty and Living Streets Scotland,\(^\text{12}\) to name just a few, support the implementation of 20mph speed limits in built-up areas across Scotland. There is also a significant amount of research already done to support this proposal. Overleaf is just a small sample of the research already undertaken.


\(^{12}\) [https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/what-we-do/key-issues/20mph](https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/what-we-do/key-issues/20mph)
Department for Transport (2010)

A 2010 Department for Transport (DfT) publication\textsuperscript{13} which looked at the relationship between speed and risk of fatal injury found that the risk of fatal injury to pedestrians rose from under 1\% at an impact speed of 20mph to 5.5\%, or 1 in 20, at 30mph. Above 30mph risk increased very substantially, to over 30\% at an impact speed of 40mph.

Transport Research Laboratory

A study by Taylor, M. C., Lynam, D. A. and Baruya, A. (2000) \textit{The effects of drivers' speed on the frequency of road accidents} which looked at the effect of speeds on overall accident numbers found a clear relationship between the two.\textsuperscript{14}\textsuperscript{15} On the types of urban road likely to be considered for a 20mph speed limit the study found that the number of accidents could be expected to fall by between 4\% and 6\% for each 1mph reduction in average speed. As highlighted above we could expect reductions of around 6mph on roads with 20mph speed limits. The greatest reductions were achievable on “busy main roads in towns with high levels of pedestrian activity.” The same study also highlights EURO model that estimates that reducing speed limits by 10mph reduces mean speed by 8\% and increases the proportion of people exceeding the speed limit by a factor of 2.4.

Manchester City Council

Manchester City Council recently announced that they are planning a review of their 20mph zones as average speeds on roads within the initial roll-out were reduced by less than 1mph. They commissioned and presented a report to the Council Executive.


\textsuperscript{14} Transport Research Laboratory, 2000. \textit{The effect of drivers’ speed on the frequency of road accidents}. Available at: http://www.20splentyforus.co.uk/UsefulReports/TRLREports/trl421SpeedAccidents.pdf

\textsuperscript{15} Manchester City Council, 2017. \textit{Report for Resolution: Evaluation of phase 1 nd 2 of 20mph programme}. Available at: https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/20'splentyforus/pages/215/attachments/original/1489236106/1_20mph_Spedlimits.pdf?1489236106
There are however a number of issues with the way Manchester City Council has handled this decision.\(^\text{32}\)

1. The report itself acknowledged that the Council would need to evaluate data over a long period of time to get statistically relevant data. Furthermore, the report compares numbers in the tens in some areas to the hundreds in other areas. It is not statistically valid to compare numbers in single figures with numbers in the hundreds.

2. The campaign group 20’s Plenty argue that roads included in the Phase One rollout in Manchester did not accurately represent its roads and their accident rates. They comprise of 20% of roads in Manchester yet before introduction of the 20mph limit they accounted for only 7% of vulnerable road user casualties in the city. Furthermore, some of the roads in Phase One may have included previous 20mph schemes. Any comparison needs to take these differences into account.\(^\text{33}\)

**Public Health England**

A Public Health England briefing ‘Working Together to Promote Active Travel’\(^\text{34}\) states that:

“There is also a growing evidence base on the benefits of 20mph speed limits … and repeated national surveys show strong public support for 20mph in residential streets. Many towns and cities in England have either implemented or are committed to 20mph speed limits across much of their road networks.”

**Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health**

A recent study by Dr Sarah J. Jones, ‘Twenty miles per hour speed limits: a sustainable solution to public health problems in Wales’\(^\text{35}\) argued that “if all current 20mph limit roads in Wales became 20 mph limits, it is estimated that 610 lives would be saved and 1200-2000 causalities avoided each year, at a value of prevention of £58M-94M” The evidence review suggests benefits in terms of road traffic casualties, air quality, active travel, noise pollution, greater social inclusion, greater community cohesion and local business viability.

**Current 20mph results**

Fife council has been introducing 20mph since 2003. A recent report by Fife Council stated that the initiative “is substantially complete.”\(^\text{36}\)

The report highlighted a number of positive benefits of 20mph speed limits. The report states that “the risk and severity of pedestrian injury has been significantly reduced”. A study comparing road accidents 3 years prior and 3 years after the introduction of 20mph speed limits found significant reductions in casualties. A 20.8% reduction of slight casualties, 14% reduction of serious casualties and a 100% reduction of fatal casualties. Amongst child casualties there was a 31.5% reduction in slight casualties, 9.5% in serious casualties and 100% reduction in fatal casualties.

The report also highlighted a 2% increase in cycling and stated that “the rise in cycling generally can be attributed to a range of infrastructure improvements including the introduction of 20mph zones.”

Further the report states that:

“the surveys show significant success; before the introduction of lower speed limits only 50% of traffic on residential streets travelled below 25mph whereas, in the after surveys, 83% are travelling below 25mph.”

Results from Fife Councils Schools Hands Up Survey showed that between 2008 and 2014:

“the percentage of young people walking to school has been largely preserved, together with a re-invigoration of the trend in cycling. Increases are also highlighted in both Scooter/Skating and park and stride … Walking and cycling are higher than that of the national trend. The declining percentage in those being driven to school should also be noted.”

This suggests that Fife’s 20mph mandatory speed limits – which have been phased in since 2003 – have been successful in support active travel amongst school children.

In Bristol, 20mph pilots saw a 12% increase in walking and cycling.
Public Polls

The City of Edinburgh Council’s south Edinburgh public pilot saw increases in walking and cycling amongst school children and an increase in support for the project after implementation.\(^\text{16}\)

The City of Edinburgh Council’s annual Edinburgh People Survey showed that 59.3% of people support 20mph speed limits with only 19.8% opposing.\(^\text{17}\)

In the report presented to Fife Council the results state that:

> “71% of respondents agree that streets in 20mph zones are safer for children, 65% agreed that a safer environment for walking and cycling had been created, 60% agreed a more pleasant environment for walking and cycling had been created”.

Public polling shows almost 8 in 10 people think 20mph should be the norm around schools, on residential streets and in village, town and city centres.\(^\text{18-19}\) 20mph would reduce noise for communities, make it safer for children to play outside and help people view speeding as antisocial behaviour.

Polling commissioned by Scottish Green MSPs in April 2017 found that, once the ‘don’t knows’ were removed, 55% of people said they support the introduction of 20mph default speed limits with only 29% of people opposing. Furthermore a quarter of people said they would be more likely to walk or cycle if 20mph speed limits were introduced.\(^\text{44}\)


\(^{19}\) mph Polling Results. Available at: https://greens.scot/saferstreets/20mph-polling-results
DIFFICULTIES WITH THE CURRENT LAW

While local authorities have the power to introduce 20mph speed limits using the TRO process it can be a time consuming and costly process. Transform Scotland was commissioned by Green MSPs to interview local authorities about their experiences implementing 20mph limits and zones. Feedback from these interviews found that TROs can take on average 6 to 12 months to complete. Estimates of the cost of a TRO were typically in the £1,500 to £3,000 range.

Local authorities also stated that the costs of signage were a significant concern under the current system. The current TRO system leads to a piecemeal approach to 20mph across Scotland. A series of Freedom of Information (FOI) requests revealed that the number of streets varied from near total coverage in some local authorities to one or two streets in others.

Research found from FOI requests made by Scottish Green MSPs found a patchwork of 20mph coverage around Scotland. This can be seen here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Number of streets where 20mph limit applies*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City Council</td>
<td>639 - does not specify permanent / part time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire Council</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Council</td>
<td>118 permanent/31 schools part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute Council</td>
<td>105 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh Council</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire Council</td>
<td>All residential streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway Council</td>
<td>Information not held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td>44 permanent (our estimate). 207 total but mostly around schools (e.g. part time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>Information not held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>10 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian Council</td>
<td>69 streets - does not specify permanent/part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire Council</td>
<td>Not Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk Council</td>
<td>0 permanent Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife Council</td>
<td>4,804 streets - does not specify permanent/part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>74 areas (205.75km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td>64 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde Council</td>
<td>24 streets permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian Council</td>
<td>Not received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray Council</td>
<td>40 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DETAIL OF THE PROPOSED BILL**

**What this Bill will do**

This Bill will reset the current default national speed limit from 30mph to 20mph for restricted roads. Roads that are close to housing, walkways or busy public spaces will automatically have the current 30mph speed limit replaced with a 20mph limit. This change will replace the current complex and time consuming TRO process local authorities have to follow to create 20mph roads.

As a result, the coverage of 20mph roads will be greatly increased across Scotland, allowing communities to benefit from improved road safety, fewer severe and fatal traffic accidents, more active travel opportunities, reduced air pollution and more welcoming streets for vulnerable road users. Local authorities will still be able to use their discretion to designate some roads in built-up areas as suitable for a 30mph (or higher) limit where considered appropriate, for example to maintain a network of faster “through routes” and to ensure a smooth flow of traffic. Designation of 30mph roads will follow the existing or, potentially, a simplified TRO process.

Local authorities will also continue to have the option to put in place additional traffic calming features to newly designated 20mph roads, particularly to tackle blackspots where they judge there is a high risk to pedestrians. Roads currently forming 20mph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Number of streets where 20mph limit applies*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comhairle nan Eilean Siar</td>
<td>26 20mph speed limit areas. 25 of which are part time. These affect 29 streets/roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>4 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>206 Streets - does not specify permanent/part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Islands Council</td>
<td>24 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Council</td>
<td>43 Areas: 59 speed limits in place, 11 permanent, 48 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire Council</td>
<td>Not received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders Council</td>
<td>79 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Islands Council</td>
<td>90 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>344 streets - does not specify permanent/part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>370 permanent streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council</td>
<td>725 does not specify permanent/part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>41 zones (approx. 120 roads) – permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Not received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We were not provided with information relating to the number of streets each local authority has in total.*
zones will be unaffected by this Bill and their traffic calming features will remain in place.

**Impact on current legislation and guidance**

This Bill will replace the current 30mph national speed limit with a 20mph default limit.

Section 81(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 sets the current 30mph default speed limit. This provision states: “It shall not be lawful for a person to drive a motor vehicle on a restricted road at a speed exceeding 30 miles per hour.” Powers over the national speed limit were devolved to the Scottish Parliament under the Scotland Act 2016. Under this Bill all restricted roads currently designated 30mph by default will be lowered to 20mph.

Local authorities must refer to a range of guidance, regulations and directions regarding speed limits. These will require updating to reflect a new 20mph national speed limit, including the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 and the local authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1999 which set out the process for TROs. These revisions would generally take a straightforward approach, replacing references to a 30mph default speed limit with a reference to a new 20mph default limit. However new guidance may be needed to advise local authorities considering raising the speed of a default 20mph road through a TRO.

**Who this Bill will affect**

*Local authorities*

Research for the Scottish Green MSPs suggests the current timescale for a TRO to set a 20mph speed limit on a single road to be between 6 and 12 months\(^20\). A national 20mph default may enable local authorities to roll out 20mph areas on shorter timescales than is currently the case as TROs would not be needed on a street-by-street basis.

It will also help local authorities meet the Scottish Government’s aims of increasing active travel as set out in the *National Walking Strategy 2014*\(^21\) and *A Long Term Vision for Active Travel in Scotland 2030*.\(^47\)

*Pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists*

Those walking and cycling in 20mph areas will be less likely to be involved in a serious accident with a car. Research for the DfT suggests that for every 1mph reduction in average speed there will be a 2-7% corresponding reduction in accident frequency.

---


across urban roads. While we acknowledge decreasing the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph is unlikely to reduce average speeds by the full 10mph – the DfT suggests the average speed on 20mph roads is currently 25mph – even a small decrease in average speed will help to reduce the frequency of road accidents.

Lower speeds will also reduce the likelihood of those accidents being fatal. Transport Scotland research indicates that a pedestrian hit by a car at 20mph has only a 1% chance of dying compared to a 5.5% chance for a pedestrian hit at 30mph.

The perceived dangers of cycling on the road or letting children walk to school will be reduced and more people should feel able to make walking and cycling a daily part of their lives. People will feel more confident in exploring their local services and greenspaces on foot or by bike, and reduced air pollution will reduce the risks of heart and lung disease.

Vulnerable road users will also feel safer as cars will be passing at lower speeds. At 20mph, motorists will be able to spot children as well as older and disabled people earlier and have more time to react to their presence on the road.

Motorists

Motorists will be less likely to be involved in collisions, and therefore less likely either to sustain an injury themselves or cause serious injury to a pedestrian or cyclist.

Drivers travelling in a 20mph limit are more likely to have a smoother journey with less sharp braking and re-acceleration as traffic flow is improved and drivers have longer to respond to hazards. In Germany, the introduction of 30kph (18.6mph) reduced stopping, cutting fuel use by 12%. A reduction in fuel use will save drivers money. Similarly, smoother journeys mean less vehicle wear and tear which will save drivers money in vehicle repairs.

One common concern about the introduction of 20mph limits is the impact of increased journey times and potentially higher economic costs for drivers commuting or making deliveries. Evidence from 20mph areas across the UK suggests that increases in journey times are minimal. Researchers at Stear Davies Gleave conducted a review

22 Transport Research Laboratory, 2000. The effect of drivers’ speed on the frequency of road accidents. Available at: [http://www.20splentyforus.co.uk/UsefulReports/TRLREports/trl421SpeedAccidents.pdf](http://www.20splentyforus.co.uk/UsefulReports/TRLREports/trl421SpeedAccidents.pdf)


of 20mph schemes across the UK and concluded that “whilst concerns are sometimes raised regarding increased journey times there have generally been no noticeable impacts (on either general traffic or buses) once a scheme has been implemented.”\textsuperscript{52} The City of Edinburgh Council suggests a 25 second per mile increase in journey times as a result of their 20mph rollout, though no long-term study has yet been conducted.\textsuperscript{24}

A review of European case studies where 30km/h schemes have been rolled out further indicates that there will be “smoother traffic flow” at lower speeds. A 20mph default limit can make journeys smoother, as when vehicles travel slower it becomes easier for traffic to merge at junctions and fewer cars are left idling.\textsuperscript{54} Lower speeds also improve conditions for buses, making it easier for them to pull out from stops and accelerate to the maximum speed of the road.\textsuperscript{55} This can make bus journey times more equal to that of cars, increasing the competitiveness of buses and encouraging more people to make trips by bus.\textsuperscript{56} This in turn could lead to fewer cars on the road and smoother traffic flows as a result.

However, it has also been suggested that misconceptions about 20mph limits increasing journey times leads to higher levels of non-compliance by motorists.\textsuperscript{57} Effective social marketing and engagement with motorists is essential to ensure 20mph limits are successful.

**Enforcement of 20mph limit and penalties**

The Bill will not make any changes to enforcement or the penalties for speeding. The range of sanctions for breach of the new 20mph limit will remain the same as currently provided for breaching the 30mph limit. Enforcement will continue to remain a matter of operational discretion for the police. The report produced by Fife Council stated that “Police Scotland are able to enforce these mandatory speed limits”.\textsuperscript{58}

We would recommend that a national 20mph awareness campaign is rolled out by the Scottish Government to coincide with the transition to a default 20mph limit, as police enforcement will likely remain at current levels. As mentioned above, noncompliance with 20mph limits is a recognised problem in schemes already underway across the UK. In 2015, 20mph roads had the lowest level of speed limit compliance in the UK, across all vehicle types – for example, 84% of cars exceeded the limit

\textsuperscript{24} The City of Edinburgh Council, 2015. *Busting the myths around Edinburgh’s 20mph roll-out.* Available at:

\textsuperscript{54} 20’s Plenty for Us, 2012. *20’s Plenty for the Environment.* Available at:
In Bristol, 9 out of 10 drivers were caught breaking the new 20mph speed limit. Enforcement of new 20mph limits will be dependent on effective education and awareness campaigns to effect a cultural change where 20mph becomes the new norm.

A 2012 study into the effectiveness of social marketing campaigns for 20mph limits noted “If there is to be a culture shift towards 20mph as the normal limit in built-up areas then the introduction of legal limits need to be accompanied by a high profile and sustained programme of soft measures to win over people’s hearts and minds.”

The same study highlighted that successful awareness-raising campaigns were those linked with schools, bus companies and, in particular, the police and fire and rescue services. Engagement with communities was highest when the benefits of 20mph were fully and clearly articulated over a sustained period of time.

A national campaign should highlight the benefits of 20mph outlined above and help to bring about a cultural shift where 20mph becomes the new norm.

**Alternative approaches**

As part of this process some alternative ideas for a Bill to reduce traffic speeds in residential areas were considered. These included:

- Promoting existing guidance recommending 20mph rollouts.
- Removing the requirement for TROs for 20mph roads in new housing developments.
- Reviewing smarter street design in new housing developments to encourage slower driving, including angling kerb corners to require sharper turns.

---


of these measures would be included as part of the development’s design and construction costs and so would not form an additional cost.

These alternatives have not been taken forward as recommending existing guidance on 20mph would not reduce the complexity, expense and time-consuming nature of the current TRO process. Local authorities would still face significant time and cost barriers when rolling out 20mph on a street-by-street basis.

Measures to remove TRO requirements in new housing developments and smarter street design are smaller in scope and would apply to only a small proportion of restricted roads. The approach taken by this Bill will see 20mph rolled out over the great majority of restricted roads, meaning more communities will benefit from improved safety and reduction in air pollution, not just those in new housing developments.

**Financial implications**

Evidence from the rollout of previous schemes suggests that it is significantly cheaper to have a national 20mph limit rollout as opposed to each local authority implementing their own scheme and public awareness campaign.

If local authorities were each to implement their own individual 20mph schemes in urban areas, following a rollout similar to Edinburgh’s 20mph scheme, it is estimated to cost £17.2m. The City of Edinburgh Council's 20mph rollout cost £2.2m or £4.46 per head of population. This covered 80% of Edinburgh’s roads which were newly signed as 20mph. By extrapolating these figures, 20's Plenty estimate that a scheme to cover the rest of Scotland's urban population (3.85m people) would cost £17.2m to place 20mph signs in 80% of urban roads.

By contrast, a national 20mph limit would require signage only for those roads that would be designated as 30mph through a TRO – roughly 20% of roads in an urban area. Based on a cost per head of population calculation for this measure the total would be £4.3m.

Based on these calculations, a national 20mph speed limit is significantly cheaper than every local authority implementing their own Edinburgh-style roll out (£4.3m vs. £17.2m). 20’s Plenty also suggest that this could be between 5 and 8 times cheaper for local authorities to implement.

These figures also include the costs of an accompanying awareness raising campaign. Of the total £2.2m the Scottish Government and City of Edinburgh Council spent on the city’s 20mph rollout, 8.6% is to be spent on awareness raising.

20's Plenty for Us, 2016. Scottish National Default 20mph Limit Estimated Cost £2m: Eight Times (£15m) Cheaper than Authority by Authority. Available at: https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/20'splentyforus/pages/173/attachments/original/1469788812/scots_default_20mph.pdf?1469788812

£4.46 x 3,850,000 = £17.22m

If 80% of roads will cost £17.2m, 20% of roads = £17.2m/4 = £4.3m

20’s Plenty for Us, 2016. National 20mph limit for Scotland is 8 times cheaper than authority by authority. Available at: http://www.20splenty.org/scots_default_20mph.

from 2015-16 to 2017-18. For a £4.3m national rollout, an awareness campaign could therefore be in the region of £370,000.

With local authorities facing cuts to their budgets it is clear that a national roll out of 20mph will be easier, cheaper and more effective than the current TRO process.

In addition, a 2001 Scottish Executive study into 20mph limits across 75 projects found the public sector saved £177,060 due to fewer accidents taking place. The cost of the 75 schemes was lower than the cost of one fatal accident, three serious accidents or 30 slight accidents.

Accidents – from slight to fatal – place a financial burden on public services. These costs are calculated by accounting for the human and direct economic costs. Direct economic cost includes covers lost output due to injury, medical costs, damage to vehicle and property and administrative costs for the police and insurance providers. Human costs relate to the impact of suffering from an accident on an individual and the associated impacts on their family and friends which can impact their ability to work and spend money on goods and services. In 2015 the total estimated accident costs in Scotland (£million) at 2015 prices were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Cost (£million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>332.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>351.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>172.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1,130.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The campaign group 20's Plenty argue that a 20mph default speed limit in Scotland could save 940 casualties and £56m per annum.

---

64 £4.46 x 3,850,000 = £17.22m
65 If 80% of roads will cost £17.2m, 20% of roads = £17.2m/4 = £4.3m
66 20’s Plenty for Us, 2016. National 20mph limit for Scotland is 8 times cheaper than authority by authority. Available at: http://www.20splenty.org/scots_default_20mph.

67 These figures have been shared by the City of Edinburgh Council. Total cost of 20mph roll out = £2.22m. Awareness raising cost = £0.19m.
68 Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, 2001.
69 20mph Speed Reduction Initiative. Available at:
The 75 schemes cost £369,315 which is lower than the cost of: a) one fatal accident (£1,182,910); b) three serious accidents (£415,470); c) 30 slight accidents (£410,700). Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, 2001. 20mph Speed Reduction Initiative. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/156487/0042012.pdf


http://www.20splenty.org/20scotland

QUESTIONS

SECTION 1 - ABOUT YOU

1. Are you responding as:
   • an individual – in which case go to Q2A
   • on behalf of an organisation? – in which case go to Q2B

2A. Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic whose experience or expertise is not relevant to the proposal, please choose “Member of the public”)
   • Politician (MSP/MP/Peer/MEP/Councillor)
   • Professional with experience in a relevant subject
   • Academic with expertise in a relevant subject
   • Member of the public

2B. Please select the category which best describes your organisation:
   • Public sector body (Scottish/UK Government/Government agency, local authority, NDPB)
   • Commercial organisation (company, business)
   • Representative organisation (trade union, professional association)
   • Third sector (charitable, campaigning, social enterprise, voluntary, non-profit)
   • Other (e.g. club, local group, group of individuals, etc.)

3. 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
   • I would like this response to be anonymous (the response may be published, but no name)
   • I would like this response to be confidential (no part of the response to be published)

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.

Name/organisation:

4. 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.)

Contact details:

SECTION 2 - YOUR VIEWS ON THE PROPOSAL

Aim and approach

1. 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
   • Partially supportive
   • Neutral (neither support nor oppose)
   • Partially opposed
   • Fully opposed
   • Unsure

   Please explain the reasons for your response.

2. 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)
   • No
   • Unsure

   Please explain the reasons for your response.

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

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

5. What measures do you think would be needed to maximise compliance with the new national 20mph speed limit on restricted roads? (Examples might include advertising, signage or police enforcement.)
Financial implications

6. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have on:

(a) the Scottish Government
- Significant increase in cost
- Some increase in cost
- Broadly cost-neutral
- Some reduction in cost
- Significant reduction in cost
- Unsure

(b) Local authorities
- Significant increase in cost
- Some increase in cost
- Broadly cost-neutral
- Some reduction in cost
- Significant reduction in cost
- Unsure

(c) Motorists
- Significant increase in cost
- Some increase in cost
- Broadly cost-neutral
- Some reduction in cost
- Significant reduction in cost
- Unsure

(d) Other road users and members of the public
- Significant increase in cost
- Some increase in cost
- Broadly cost-neutral
- Some reduction in cost
- Significant reduction in cost
- Unsure

(e) Other public services (e.g. NHS, Fire and Rescue Services etc)
- Significant increase in cost
- Some increase in cost
- Broadly cost-neutral
- Some reduction in cost
- Significant reduction in cost
• Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

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

**Equalities**

8. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation?

• Positive
• Slightly positive
• Neutral (neither positive nor negative)
• Slightly negative
• Negative
• Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

9. Could any negative impact of the Bill on equality be minimised or avoided?

**Sustainability of the proposal**

10. Do you consider that the proposed bill can be delivered sustainably, i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impacts?

• Yes
• No
• Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

**General**

11. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal to establish a 20mph default speed limit on restricted roads?
HOW TO RESPOND TO THIS CONSULTATION

You are invited to respond to this consultation by answering the questions in the consultation and by adding any other comments that you consider appropriate.

Format of responses

You are encouraged to submit your response via an online survey (Smart Survey) if possible, as this is quicker and more efficient both for you and the Parliament. However, if you do not have online access, or prefer not to use Smart Survey, you may also respond by e-mail or in hard copy.

Online survey
To respond via Smart Survey, please follow this link:

http://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/20mphSpeedLimits/

The platform for the online survey is Smart Survey, a third party online survey system enabling the SPCB to collect responses to MSP consultations. Smart Survey is based in the UK and is subject to the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. Any information you send in response to this consultation (including personal data and sensitive personal data) will be seen by the MSP progressing the Bill and by specified staff in NGBU, and may be added manually to Smart Survey.

Further information on the handling of your data can be found in the Privacy Notice, which is available either via the Smart Survey link above, or directly from this link:

Smart Survey’s privacy policy is available here:

https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/privacy-policy

Electronic or hard copy submissions

If possible, please submit your response electronically – preferably in MS Word document. Please keep formatting of this document to a minimum, and avoid including any personal data other than your name (or the name of the group or organisation on whose behalf you are responding).

Any additional personal data (e.g. contact details) should be provided in the covering e-mail (or a covering letter).

Please make clear whether you are responding as an individual (in a personal capacity) or on behalf of a group or organisation. If you are responding as an individual, you may wish to explain briefly what relevant expertise or experience you have. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, you may wish to explain the role of that organisation and how the view expressed in the response was arrived at (for example, whether it reflects an established policy or was voted on by members).
Where to send responses

Responses prepared electronically should be sent by e-mail to:

mark.ruskell.msp@scottish.parliament.uk.

Responses prepared in hard copy should be sent by post to:

Mark Ruskell MSP
Room MG.17
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh EH99 1SP

You may also contact Mark’s office by telephone on (0131) 348 6468.

Deadline for responses

All responses should be received no later than 15/09/17.

How responses are handled

To help inform debate on the matters covered by this consultation and in the interests of openness, please be aware that I would normally expect to publish all responses received on my website www.greens.scot/saferstreets. As published, responses will normally include the name of the respondent, but other personal data (signatures, addresses and contact details) will not be included.

Copies of all responses will be provided to the Scottish Parliament’s NonGovernment Bills Unit (NGBU), so it can prepare a summary that I may then lodge with a final proposal (the next stage in the process of securing the right to introduce a Member’s Bill). NGBU will treat responses in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The summary may cite, or quote from, your response and may name you as a respondent to the consultation – unless your response is to be anonymous or confidential (see below).

I am also obliged to provide copies of all responses to the Scottish Parliament’s Information Centre (SPICe). SPICe may make responses (other than confidential responses) available to MSPs or staff on request.

Requests for anonymity or confidentiality

If you wish your response, or any part of it, to be treated as anonymous, please state this clearly. You still need to supply your name, but any response treated as anonymous will be published without the name (attributed only to “Anonymous”), and only the anonymised version will be provided to SPICe. If you request anonymity, it is
your responsibility to ensure that the content of your response does not allow you to be identified.

If you wish your response, or any part of it, to be treated as confidential, please state this clearly. If the response is treated as confidential (in whole or in part), it (or the relevant part) will not be published. However, I would still be obliged to provide a complete copy of the response to NGBU, and a copy of any non-confidential parts (i.e. a redacted copy) to SPICe when lodging my final proposal. As the Scottish Parliament is subject to the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA), it is possible that requests may be made to see your response (or the confidential parts of it) and the Scottish Parliament may be legally obliged to release that information. Further details of the FOISA are provided below.

In summarising the results of this consultation, NGBU will aim to reflect the general content of any confidential response in that summary, but in such a way as to preserve the confidentiality involved. You should also note that members of the committee which considers the proposal and subsequent Bill may have access to the full text of your response even if it has not been published (or published only in part).

**Other exceptions to publication**

Where a large number of submissions is received, particularly if they are in very similar terms, it may not be practical or appropriate to publish them all individually. One option may be to publish the text only once, together with a list of the names of those making that response.

There may also be legal reasons for not publishing some or all of a response – for example, if it contains irrelevant, offensive or defamatory statements or material. If I think your response contains such material, it may be returned to you with an invitation to provide a justification for the comments or remove them. If the issue is not resolved to my satisfaction, I may then disregard the response and destroy it.

**Data Protection Act 1998**

As an MSP, I must comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 which places certain obligations on me when I process personal data. As stated above, I will normally publish your response in full, together with your name, unless you request anonymity or confidentiality. I will not publish your signature or personal contact information, or any other information which could identify you and be defined as personal data.

I may also edit any part of your response which I think could identify a third party, unless that person has provided consent for me to publish it. If you specifically wish me to publish information involving third parties you must obtain their consent first and this should be included in writing with your submission.
If you consider that your response may raise any other issues concerning the Data Protection Act and wish to discuss this further, please contact me before you submit your response.

Further information about the Data Protection Act can be found at: www.ico.gov.uk.

**Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002**

As indicated above, once your response is received by NGBU or is placed in the Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe) or is made available to committees, it is considered to be held by the Parliament and is subject to the requirements of the FOISA. So if the information you send me is requested by third parties the Scottish Parliament is obliged to consider the request and provide the information unless the information falls within one of the exemptions set out in the Act, potentially even if I have agreed to treat all or part of the information in confidence or to publish it anonymously. I cannot therefore guarantee that any other information you send me will not be made public should it be requested under FOI.

Further information about Freedom of Information can be found at:

www.itstpublicknowledge.info.