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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Q1.۱	Which	of the	followir	ig best	expres	ses y	our/	view	of the	proposal	to	replace	the o	current	30mph	default
spee	d limit	on res	stricted	roads	with a 2	0mp	h lim	it.								

Partially opposed

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

On small side roads, fine, but some of the bigger main roads are not appropriate, it will cause delays and congestion - and angry drivers. I have had many an angry driver behind me while observing the lower limit already.

Q2. Could the aims of this proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response

Not sure how it could be done, or if it should be.

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

Safe roads for walkers, especially in residential and school areas.

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

Slower, and on larger roads that will cause congestion.

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.

No Response

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	Х					
Local Authorities	x					
Motorists		Х				
Other						

Police				
Scotland				
Please explain the re Changing signs, road overstretched (e.g. po	markings and policir		rting resources from are	eas already
Q7. Do you believe the	ere will be any other	benefits to reducing the	e speed limit from 30mp	h to 20mph?
No Response				
ıge 14: Equali	ties			
igo i 4. Equaii				
	ce, disability, sex, ge	ender re-assignment, ag	following protected grouge, religion and belief, so	
Neutral (neither positiv	ve nor negative)			
Q9. Could any negativavoided?	e impact of the prop	osed Bill on any of thes	se protected groups be i	minimised or
No Response				
•				
ana 46. Suatai	nability of th	- nveneed		
age 16: Sustai	nability of th	e proposal		
	that the proposed B	sill can be delivered sus	tainably i.e. without hav	ing likely future
Q10. Do you consider disproportionate econo	that the proposed B	sill can be delivered sus	tainably i.e. without hav	ing likely future
Q10. Do you consider	that the proposed B	sill can be delivered sus	tainably i.e. without hav	ing likely future
Q10. Do you consider disproportionate econd	that the proposed B	sill can be delivered sus	tainably i.e. without hav	ing likely future
Q10. Do you consider disproportionate econd No	that the proposed B omic, social and/or e	sill can be delivered sus	tainably i.e. without hav	ing likely future
Q10. Do you consider disproportionate econd No	that the proposed B omic, social and/or e	sill can be delivered sus	tainably i.e. without hav	ing likely future
No age 17: Genera	that the proposed Bomic, social and/or e	bill can be delivered sus environmental impact?	tainably i.e. without hav	

No Response