

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

1) 30mph zones were introduced to slow traffic down and reduce the appalling number of, and impacts of traffic collisions with other vehicles and with people. With vastly increasing numbers of vehicles on the road, the risks of collisions are increased and consequent injuries to people are increased. As numbers increase, noise levels and pollution also increase. 30mph as a standard urban speed limit is no longer fit for purpose and needs to be reviewed and revised downwards, for this and the following reasons. 2) Scientific/Medical knowledge about the impacts of vehicles on humans increasingly shows us that the lower the speed of collision, the lesser are the short-term and permanent injuries. Therefore, lower speed means less damage to people (with consequent savings for emergency/health services and less trauma for victims, families and communities). 3) The lower the speeds (especially in very congested roads) mean there is more time for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (and animals) to avoid collisions. Therefore lower speeds mean fewer collisions. 4) With increasing size, power and number of commercial vehicles in urban areas, the risks of collisions are greater; and the impacts of collisions between commercial vehicles and people are greater, especially of being dragged under vehicles. 5) With more urban roadways being used for a wider variety of and larger numbers of road users (commercial vehicles, cars, buses, cyclists, pedestrians (children, adults and the elderly each have particular issues), it becomes increasingly difficult to be alert and aware of all that's happening. Therefore slower speeds make it easier for ALL road users to minimise the risk of impacts and collisions. 6) With increasing congestion and road use, average speeds in urban areas have reduced, while road users (especially drivers) expect to make speeds up to or averaging 30mph; thus encouraging risky driving behaviour and irritation at 'obstacles' in the driver's path. Therefore lower speed limits mean a more realistic expectation of the pace of progress achievable in urban areas. 7) Increasing awareness (and acceptance) of the impacts of climate change means that more people are aware of the need to reduce dependence on cars and vans; and instead to prioritise active travel (walking, cycling) and public transport (buses, trams etc). However, the domination of private and some commercial vehicles makes it very difficult to encourage people to walk, cycle or bus more - because they are slower, sometimes more expensive and can be more dangerous or unpleasant (air pollution). Lower speed limits will a) equalise the time of travel by car and bus/cycling b) make walking/cycling/bus more attractive and safe c) discourage drivers to use cars in urban areas, so reducing numbers and thus increasing speed, reliability, safety & attractiveness of public transport and active travel. Therefore lower speeds means reduced climate change impacts. 8) Measures which encourage less use of cars in urban areas reduce air pollution and also encourage more use of streets for non-car activities. Therefore lower speeds means healthier people and more active streets. 9) Road use is socially-unequal. More people are killed and injured in areas of deprivation than in more well-off areas. Partly this is to do with access to cars and public transport, partly to do with the amount of care that drivers take in different areas. Therefore lower speeds address social inequality.

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**

Local Authorities can create 20mph zones, but this is patchy and confusing, as well as being expensive to create traffic orders, signage etc each time; rather than a national traffic order.

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

Please see answers to Q1 for more detail.

Lower speeds and lower speed limits mean:

- 1) less damage to people
- 2) Savings for emergency/health services and less trauma for victims, families and communities).
- 3) fewer collisions.
- 4) It becomes easier for ALL road users to minimise the risk of impacts and collisions.

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

- 5) A more realistic expectation of the speed of travel achievable in urban areas.
- 6) Equalised the time of travel by car and bus/cycling
- 7) Walking/cycling/bus use becomes more attractive and safe
- 8) Reduced climate change impacts.
- 9) Healthier people and more active streets.
- 10) Less social inequality.

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

Some vehicle (internal combustion) engines may not operate at best efficiency at/below 20mph; but this might encourage greater use of electric vehicles for urban use.

Some aspects of road haulage/delivery may need to change in order to work alongside other road users (rather than dominating in some areas). But again, this could encourage smarter business practices and the acceptance that large trucks are not part of the urban environment, except perhaps within defined routes and/or times.

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.

Some locations where 20 mph zones have been created have installed chicanes and/or directional priorities. These reduce the speed and require drivers to give and take.

Speed bumps perhaps do more harm than good.

The whole approach to road, pavement, access and housing design needs to be revised, so that vehicles, people, bikes and all road users feel safe and accepted by other users. Currently cyclists and pedestrians are actively segregated from cars and larger vehicles; but perhaps it makes more sense to segregate larger vehicles from other road users; and for road/pavement surfaces and signage to be redesigned so that powered vehicles are required to actively give way to other road users. Examples from England, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark etc are available.

## 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**

Transport Scotland and LAs would need to redesign routes and signage, but this would be a one-off cost,

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

with costs thereafter being the normal upgrading and replacements. There could be savings if fewer signs are required (due to fewer different speed limit zones) Motorists should see little difference overall - fuel costs could increase slightly (if engines work less efficiently) but collision costs would reduce (with consequent lower insurance premiums, you'd expect). Over time, motorists driving mainly in urban areas would tend to buy vehicles that are lower-powered or more efficient at lower speeds. Some will use their cars less and less. "Other" is very broad, and includes all the other costs and benefits to business and society. \* Haulage/Delivery companies may see costs increase due to more time being needed for journeys, but savings could be found by varying business models. \* Health costs will reduce greatly, with fewer/less damaging injuries meaning less call on emergency services, A&E facilities, recovery and treatment. Less air pollution means less acute/ongoing/chronic health issues. More active travel and public transport use means physically and mentally healthier individuals. \* Fewer collisions means the economic impacts (work time lost by victims and families/carers, road closures, disruptions to traffic etc) of injuries to people will also reduce. \* Social costs will reduce as slower speeds, fewer accidents and perhaps fewer large vehicles on the road mean less social inequality (which also stunts economic activity). \* Businesses in urban areas should see increases in amounts of 'passing trade', as traffic speeds slow down, more people use buses, bikes and walking; making shops, cafes etc easier to get to and pleasanter places to be. \* Bus companies and bike sellers will see more business.

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

I think I've covered it in previous answers!

But the country will gain a reputation for putting people first, caring for the urban environment, being proactive in tackling congestion, air pollution and the dominance of the car & van. People in towns and cities may begin to breathe again - in reality and metaphorically - with cleaner air and 'something being done' about the seemingly-untouchable increasing unpleasantness of urban life.

## 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?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

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:**

There are very many economic, social and environmental benefits from this change.

## 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?

nope - go for it!