

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Christopher Pearson

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**

This will make the process of reducing urban speed limits much simpler and cheaper. Lower urban speeds mean fewer and less serious accidents, fewer people killed and injured, and probably lower fuel consumption and pollution.

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**

There are other ways - Edinburgh is going through this now - but they are longer and more expensive. This bill would cut through all that.

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

Reduction in injuries and deaths to pedestrians and cyclists.  
Giving a lead to the nation that 20mph should be considered the norm in urban areas. That the well-being of pedestrians and cyclists has a higher priority than trivial increases in journey times for motor vehicles.  
Possibly reductions in fuel consumption and pollution.

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

Slightly increased journey times in some cases.  
Motorists may disregard it. Enforcement will be needed until it becomes the new normal.

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.

A lot of publicity needed but that won't be a problem as the anti-20mph forces will shout loud enough to ensure that it's made into a major controversy.  
Extra enforcement will be need at the start until it becomes the new normal.

## 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?

<b>Local Authorities</b>				X		
<b>Motorists</b>			X			
<b>Other</b>				X		
<b>Police Scotland</b>						

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

Only affects roads within urban areas, so no costs to central government. Local authorities will only incur extra costs for residential roads they want to keep at 30mph. Hopefully very few. They will have to think hard about whether it's so important that they want to incur the extra costs of opting out of 20mph. Accidents and injuries are expensive - a reduction in their number and severity will reduce costs for everyone. There will be an initial extra enforcement cost, but this will be short-lived. Motorists may find they use slightly less fuel through not accelerating and braking so much. Pretty small difference probably.

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

Benefits described in previous responses.

## 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?

Slightly positive

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

It would benefit everyone by making people less likely to be killed or injured. The benefits perhaps apply slightly more to people with disabilities or age-related problems who struggle to safely cross roads.

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

N/A

## 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:**

It will reduce overall costs, as described in previous responses.

## 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*