

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Fiona Gibson

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 live in a small town which is spread out around a unique town centre. There is a lot of green space around central buildings resulting in the main attractions drawing people into the town centre being spread over a large area. Although our population is low, the town is physically broad. Therefore a lot of people find it easier and quicker to drive around within the town. We are also a bottle neck for a main trunk road from North Ayrshire to Glasgow and the rest of Central Scotland. So we have a combination of commuter traffic and internal traffic. This results in huge congestion at key times, meaning any speed limit is largely irrelevant as no one is moving quickly! However, as a mother who has tried to walk to school with my children, I have been appalled at the dangerous manoeuvres and speeds which people attempt in our narrow streets. I've asked for more restrictions on key roads in the past and in lieu of those I would wholeheartedly welcome any reduction in speed limits.

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

Councils have so many challenges facing them across towns of varying shapes and sizes. Trying to find solutions from council region to region would be a mammoth task. My understanding of this bill is that it would be a blanket reduction in urban areas which could then be altered in cases where it was felt appropriate to use the higher limit. This provides safety first and practicalities second, which is my personal preference: one casualty is too many.

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

Forcing people to slow down in towns and populated areas, making people safer. Also making it safer and easier to walk around town centres without speeding traffic, allowing healthier lifestyles.

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

As a driver, it would be a mild inconvenience to factor in more journey time. But the safety benefits outweigh the practical objections.

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.

Signage and police enforcement are two very different ways to tackle the issue. Signage makes people aware of the rules, but is no guarantee of enforcement. Police enforcement is effective but impractical in a Scotland-wide roll-out. Gradually adding physical obstacles (e.g. speed bumps, protruding pavements) is effective and would continue to be effective after the initial outlays. An example where this works (I believe) is Minishant in South Ayrshire - a small town on a major trunk road, which has controlled speeds by physically blocking the road with extra pavements etc.

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

Motorists should be able to save money from lowering their speed and therefore fuel consumption. The government will have an initial expense but should see more benefits over time, not having to deal with road accidents. I would imagine local authorities would also have some increased maintenance costs for new pavement areas, speed bumps etc, but should also reduce costs in crossing patrols and repairing damage done by speeding motorists.

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

I think I have fully detailed a large number of benefits.

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

Some of the categories listed would be largely unaffected (e.g. sexual orientation and race) but the majority are vulnerable to any risks on the road, for example disabled people needing longer to cross at pedestrian crossings, pregnant women having dimmed awareness (I can attest to "baby brain" being a real thing!), younger and older people who have less awareness of their surroundings, especially teenagers on mobile phones, listening to music etc.

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

I can't think what negative impact these proposals would have on any of those protected 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:

After the initial roll-out, the ongoing costs would be very minimal (as I've mentioned, marginally more ground to maintain where pavements have been inverted, etc) but the areas could be used as eco-friendly additions to towns: e.g. green areas in built up spaces

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 fully support this.