

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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 am fully supportive of this because I think it will make roads safer and encourage cycling which is enjoyable, environmentally friendly and healthy. I am a cyclist and although I experience a lot of the benefits of cycling such a better health and fitness and a resultant increased sense of mental well-being in my 9-5 office job as well as saving money, I find that it is extremely stressful cycling on the roads and I think that both motorists and very confident cyclists can be guilty of having a sense of entitlement that everyone should keep up with their speed or get out of their way. For example, it can be particularly difficult for cyclists to turn off main roads because it means that they have to cycle into the centre/right of the lane in front of other cars and stick their right arm out to demonstrate that they are indicating. They have to do all this whilst cycling at a speed relative to the cars speed and then stand and wait in the middle of the road until traffic on the other side chooses to give way to them, which they might not want to do because of the pressure of the traffic behind them. Then cyclists physically have to start cycling again whilst holding their arms out and turning right at the same time. It takes quite a confident cyclists to do this properly and to be seen by all the cars at the same time as travelling quickly enough not to annoy them. If a motorist is annoyed by this cyclists risk cars driving very quickly past them and close to them, which is quite scary and not particularly safe. This type of competitive road environment means that lots of people are intimidated to cycle and a lot of my work colleagues have spoken to me about how they would like to cycle to work but they just feel that they would be taking their life in their hands to do so because it is so dangerous for cyclists and motorists to share the same road. However the risks are reduced to cyclists and pedestrians when cars drive slower and that helps to make the road a more equal space for different types of road users. It can also reduce the anxiety that motorists feel when they are worried about seeing a cyclist in time or reacting to someone who steps out onto the road without looking. I think that this is a forward looking proposal because it is looking at tackling long-term physical health concerns and environmental concerns as well as trying to create a cultural shift which will make our roads safer and friendlier places to be. I think the cultural aspect is quite important because at the moment roads are not inclusive places to be and just to get around town can cost quite a bit of money, particularly for someone on a low income. I think that promoting 'active travel' and possible making the roads more efficient for public transport as well will come with a lot of benefits for people whose movement around the city is limited, partially by poor transport links, or financial limitations. I also think that concrete steps need to be taken to tackle the sheer amount of pollution and waste produced by cars. They are no longer an efficient form of transport in the way that they are used and lots of people waste money and time and get stressed sitting in traffic jams on the way to work. Anything that seeks to reduce this kind of scenario is good in my book. I hope that this legislation will also encourage all road users to be more responsive and aware of the needs of the others around them. It is very easy as a cyclist not to let a pedestrian cross, or as a car not to give way to a cyclist, but hopefully with a bit more time to make those decisions and without so much pressure to travel as quickly everyone will have more respect for one another on the road.

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 that people will only drive slower when they actually have to by law. For example, until drinking whilst driving was completely banned many drivers would just have a beer whereas now many of my colleagues say that they cannot take their car to work if they want to come for a drink afterwards. Everyone always pushes the boundary of what they can do so introducing a nationwide law is probably the most efficient and straightforward way to those aims. The 20mph zone sounds OK but extremely bureaucracy heavy.

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

Increased cycling.
Reduced mortality on the roads.

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

A more peaceful atmosphere in cities.
 Less pollution.
 More social inclusion in terms of transport access for people of differing financial backgrounds.
 Better traffic flow.

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

Drivers may feel targeted by it. They may feel victimised if penalties are too harsh. The fact that police use discretion when policing speeding means that lots of people will still travel over the speed limit - hopefully their speed will still be reduced however.

Another disadvantage is that in terms of reducing emissions it probably does not go far enough. However that can be a benefit because it is a slow introduction of a big change which is often more effective.

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 huge public campaign around the benefits of reduced speeds and to make sure that everyone is informed of when the change is going to come about. On big roads such as Pollokshaws Road in Glasgow where cars can travel quite quickly it might be good to introduce those signs which tell you your speed to make people more aware of how quickly they are driving.

Police will have to actively enforce the policy for at least two years after it's introduction. People have to know that it is a serious change.

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		
Motorists			X			
Other					X	
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

Scottish Government saves money in terms of overall health benefits of active travel and reduced pollution and reduction in the costs of dealing with car accidents. Local Authorities are spending their money better in terms of furthering the aims of the 20mph zones scheme. Motorists are going to save a little in fuel costs

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

and car maintenance although they will pay a little in terms of their time. Other people will save money if they opt for walking or cycling because it is cheaper than driving a car or catching public transport.

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

I think the atmosphere will be better generally because there will be reduced noise pollution and the streets will feel safer.

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?

Unsure

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

No Response

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:

I think that people will still be able to use their cars and drive to places in reasonable amounts of time if they need to. However it will open up the option for other road users to be safer so the option not to drive will be far better supported.

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?

I think that it is great.

