

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".)

Professional with experience in a relevant subject

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Paul Williams

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

As road user as a pedestrian, a driver, and a cyclist I feel this proposed change would benefit all of society. The impact on drivers would be minimal, but the benefits to other road users would be hugely beneficial. As a pedestrian, the increased rate of survival if involved in an accident with a car travelling at 20mph is greatly increased. As a both a commuting and recreational cyclist, I feel extremely vulnerable on Glasgow's roads. I am happy to share roads with motorists, but the number of 'close passes' I receive from motor vehicles travelling at 30mph is alarmingly common. When on a bicycle, the difference between a car travelling at 20mph and 30mph is hugely significant in regards to how safe I feel, not to mention improved outcomes if involved in an accident. I feel all traffic moving at 20mph would make everyone more tolerant of other road users, especially the more vulnerable.

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

If set in law, this removes any ambiguity for local authorities and creates a level playing field across Scotland.

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

As road user as a pedestrian, a driver, and a cyclist I feel this proposed change would benefit all of society. The impact on drivers would be minimal, but the benefits to other road users would be hugely beneficial. As a pedestrian, the increased rate of survival if involved in an accident with a car travelling at 20mph is greatly increased. As a both a commuting and recreational cyclist, I feel extremely vulnerable on Glasgow's roads. I am happy to share roads with motorists, but the number of 'close passes' I receive from motor vehicles travelling at 30mph is alarmingly common. When on a bicycle, the difference between a car travelling at 20mph and 30mph is hugely significant in regards to how safe I feel, not to mention improved outcomes if involved in an accident. I feel all traffic moving at 20mph would make everyone more tolerant of other road users, especially the more vulnerable.

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

Motorists initially adapting to the new proposal will take time and I'm sure will cause some frustration. However I believe this would be short lived. There would also be an initial financial implication of changing road signs. However neither of these disadvantages are of any real significance in comparison to the potential benefits.

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 and education would need to be put in place during the roll out of the proposal. Additional speed cameras/ police presence would probably be needed initially in order to enforce the new policy.

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

While initially some outlay in cost regarding signage, police presence and advertising, in the long-term however there would be cost savings. Less wear on roads therefore requiring less maintenance, decrease in carbon emissions helping meet targets, hopefully less accidents requiring less court time. Long term cost savings for NHS due to improved health of society due to increased physical activity due to active travel.

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

I feel this would help encourage active travel, helping improve health, helping people meet the government recommended physical activity targets, and decrease numerous health conditions which are placing an increasing burden on the NHS.

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

The positive impact of reduced speed limits and therefore encouraging active travel are beneficial to all of society regardless of all of the above.

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

I am unaware of any negative impact on any of the above 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:

Initial outlay costs will be recouped within the medium to long term. Once this becomes a cultural norm, the benefits will only be positive and cost-saving.

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