

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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'm convinced of the benefits of 20mph default limits as a means to improve the liveability of our villages, towns and cities. As well as making these areas more pleasant, it will reduce the consequences of road traffic collisions (financial and human), and should contribute to improving health and wellbeing by reducing the significant disincentive to active travel - fast moving motorised traffic.

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

Piecemeal implementation of 20mph on a per-case basis would be significantly slower and more expensive, yet realise only the same benefits (if not fewer).

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

Cost effective simplicity - Scotland wide, the urban limit would be provided, and exceptions can then be made on a case by case basis for those roads that require a higher limit.

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

There would be an initial burden of TROs on local authorities to exempt certain roads from the legislation.

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.

Advertising will only go so far, it will take enforcement and time to establish compliance (cf seatbelt legislation, anti-smoking legislation, etc) until society acclimatises to the slower speeds.

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			
Local Authorities				X		

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

Motorists				X		
Other					X	
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

The cost to the Scottish Government should be offset by savings made in terms of NHS expenditure (due to reduced injuries and improved health and wellbeing). The cost to local authorities should be reduced, where they are convinced of the benefits of wide scale 20mph. If they aren't, then their costs will rise by having to exempt most of their roads. They should see some reduction in the cost of road maintenance due to vehicles having reduced kinetic energy (e.g. braking forces transferred to the road surface will be reduced). Motorists should, eventually, see some reduction in cost due to lower insurance premiums (reduced cost of collisions), however this may be hidden by annual premium rises. Society as a whole should see a significant reduction in the cost of road traffic collisions which are currently externalised. Similarly, the hostile nature of many roads discourage active travel which is a societal benefit (environmental, health, wellbeing, security, local economy, etc). There is also the less well quantified quality of life cost of road noise, which will be reduced alongside road speeds (regardless of the power source of the vehicles).

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

See before - primarily surrounding quality of life, removing a barrier to active travel (thus offering health, wellbeing, environmental, security and local economic benefits).

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

Reducing speed limits improves road conditions for expectant mothers and those with disabilities, whenever they engage in active travel. These groups are unlikely to be able to cycle according to currently UK government guidelines (Cyclecraft), which recommends developing a "cadence" of 80, and a sprint speed of 20 mph. Realistically these groups are (self-)excluded from cycling under current road conditions as they are unable to produce the necessary levels of performance required.

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

I see no negative impact on these protected groups.

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:

Given the economic, societal and environment benefits presented by reducing road speeds (and the anticipated increase in active travel), the sustainability of the proposed Bill seems likely.

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