

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Steve Rowan

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

It is an elegant solution to the current patchy system of changing urban speed limits from 30mph to 20 mph.

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

I think the arguments speak for themselves and do not need re-stated.

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

Reduction in injuries to road users, reduction in air & noise pollution, reduction in fuel consumption, reduction in wear & tear to road surfaces & markings, reduction in subsequent costs - particularly road maintenance & public health. Increase in sustainable transport use - by foot & by cycle.

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

People would need to adjust lifestyles to allow for longer journey times & alternative travel methods.

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.

Consider use of ANPR/SPECS "grids" & use of Average Speed Prosecutions when drivers pass through urban areas inside of times that must have meant their speeds exceeded those in force in that area. The technology to calculate average speeds from multiple passing points is surely feasible rather than only be restricted to sections of roads, e.g. A9 Inverness-Stirling. Equally, the technology exists to calculate, for example, the average speed between Inverness & the Skye Bridge by comparing ANPR data.

This would probably be seen as "big brother" and argued against on cost grounds plus privacy infringement but is perhaps the only way to effectively manage "Shared Space" in mixed urban/retail zones such as town centres. The same principle could apply when creating a "ring" of interconnected SPECS around a town or city.

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				
Motorists				X		
Other				X		
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

The cost of legislation, signage, public awareness, & enforcement would likely be borne by central and local government particularly in the short-term but the potential savings in reduced wear & tear to roads, reduced health costs and reduced fuel consumption could help offset the costs in the long-term.

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

No, I think these have already been identified.

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

There should hopefully be a reduction in the number and severity of road casualties which is particularly beneficial to children, cyclists, and people with impaired mobility due to health/disability/age.

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

I could not identify any negative impacts from the proposed Bill.

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:

The fewer the number of casualties and the lesser their injuries, the lower the health care, emergency & statutory service costs. I wonder if there is evidence of lower general offending behaviour in 20 mph zones. There may actually be longer-term improvements in economic, social & environmental measures.

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?

Sooner the better!