

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

I have young children, and an elderly mother, and I and my husband cycle as our main mode of travel. It is scary at times, particularly thinking about the kids getting older and walking and cycling without our supervision. A slower national restricted area speed limit would make it safer, more pleasant, healthier, and would prioritise active travel which would hopefully help change attitudes about the priority of pedestrian and cyclists, their rights and safety.

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

No

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

Safer to navigate residential and city/town centre streets. Which would encourage walking and cycling, which may lead to less car use in built up areas in time. But mainly safety in the short term.

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

If it wasn't enforced it could lead to a false sense of security.

Possibly resentment, but this could be negated by good public information campaigns.

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.

Wide spread poster/leaflet/TV public info campaign.

Mobile Cameras. Cycle police Patrols. Getting neighbourhood watch groups involved.

Good clear signage.

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			X			

Q6. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have?

Local Authorities		X				
Motorists				X		
Other						
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

Health savings nationally would mean cost neutral, possibly even savings. Need for signage etc would increase costs to councils? Unless grants were provided by ScotGov. Motorists should see fuel efficiency savings? Plus personally better health on average over whole population, which might not be noticed on an individual level.

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

More active travel.

People thinking more about pedestrians and cyclists. (Could we have presumed liability too!)

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?

Positive

Please explain the reasons for your response

Lower income group, mothers, carers (who tend to be female) the elderly and those with disabilities tend to use active travel more. They will be safer.

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

I don't see any negative impact on those groups from travel speed being slower in built up areas.

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

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?

Please explain the reasons for your response:

Costs will be offset by health benefits from less emissions, less accidents, and people being more confident to use active travel methods due to slower speeds.

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?

It is a great proposal. It could make a huge difference to many people's lives.

When the original limit was introduced there was so much less traffic, it needs a reassessment now.