

# 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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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 have been responsible for getting trialling in areas in East Lothian. I have taken my information from 20's Plenty for Us and worked via email with Rod King and Anna Semlyen. I totally in support of 20 mph limits due to the extensive information on 20's Plenty for Us website .. all evidence based. I work with East Lothian Council and East Lothian Tenants and Residents Panel. I also work with Cockenzie and Port Seton Community Council and we are presently consulting on 20 mph limits throughout Cockenzie and Port Seton. (All voluntary work)

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**

It is taking too long to implement through Councils. It is a long process to trial different areas. However, I am concerned how long it would take for the Scottish Government to roll out 20 throughout Scotland. I have written to Alison Johnstone, MSP and Keith Brown several years ago asking that Scottish Gov takes over 20 in Scotland. I think it is best way forward for Scottish Government to introduce 20mph Limits throughout Scotland as it would be more cost effective and it could be done in a more joined up way. I am concerned that in the meantime some Local Authorities will stop the trialling - I have been advised that this is the case in East Lothian. This would be detrimental for many communities which would then have to wait longer for 20mph limits in their areas. I take it that it would be a significant length of time for the Scottish Government to finish this consultation and the next then start to set up each Local Authority. Once it was up and running it would result in getting done quicker than at present but it is important that Local Authorities keep listening to communities wanting 20 in their areas.

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

Most importantly is the fact that death or severe injury is less likely to happen when someone is hit by a car going at 20mph.

There are many other advantages:

Environment (cars use less fuel at 20)

More people would be confident to cycle or walk as 20 is safer - health benefits come with walking and cycling

Less noise and pollution when a vehicle travels at 20 mph .. thus health benefits

Children cannot correctly judge speed and 20 lessens the danger of a child being killed or severely injured.

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

Many people would continue to drive over the limit and there is not enough police to manage "speeding" .. we need more road police/community police.

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.

Ads, signage and police enforcement would indeed help maximise compliance.

Information leaflets, severe penalties for drivers who do not comply, more police (currently local police are too busy dealing with Youth ASB to be able to give the manpower needed to deal with speeding!).

## 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 and LAs would benefit as costs for health, well-being, accidents and deaths would reduce. Motorists - Driving at 20 uses less fuel and it is less likely that a driver will have an accident. Others - Pedestrians would be less exposed to pollution, accidents and death. Healthier, happier communities would develop due to better sense of well-being, less noise, more cycling and walking.

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

Environment - global warming: using less fuel and walking and cycling would help this.  
Savings for SG and LAs - money could be used for benefit of communities, education, jobs etc.

## 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**

Creating more equality and protection can mean happier, healthier people. Disabled, elderly, parents and their children would benefit most.

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

I don't see what negative impact can occur from more equality and protection.

## 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:

Evidence:

- 1 <https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution> Every breath we take
- 2 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/556396/rrcgb2015-01.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/556396/rrcgb2015-01.pdf) 1730 fatalities 2015
- 3 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/420385/veh0203.xls](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/420385/veh0203.xls)
- 4 [http://www.20splenty.org/emission\\_reductions](http://www.20splenty.org/emission_reductions)
- 5 <http://tinyurl.com/NoiseReductionDesarnaulds>
- 6 [http://www.clientearth.org/major-victory-health-uk-high-court-government-inaction-air-pollution/COSTS AND BENEFITS FOR 3 OPTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING 20MPH LIMITS IN SCOTLAND](http://www.clientearth.org/major-victory-health-uk-high-court-government-inaction-air-pollution/COSTS_AND_BENEFITS_FOR_3_OPTIONS_FOR_IMPLEMENTING_20MPH_LIMITS_IN_SCOTLAND)

Summary of Costs and Benefits of 3 Options for Scottish Road Speeds – The Impact of the 20mph National Default Limit

We give our best estimates of the options for rolling out 20mph limits across Scotland. The country will have the benefit of learning from the success of other country 20mph/30kmh implementations, especially England where 25% of the population lives in local authorities who are or have already implemented 20mph limits for most roads. But Scotland can follow the "English" way by implementing authority by authority subject to local political support and funding, or take a more radical and cost effective route by making a national plan for country-wide implementation.

This allows the avoidance of the need for repeater signs on 20mph roads and simplifies the whole implementation process. Local authorities will still be able to nominate roads which will remain at 30mph as exceptions.

Here we present our best estimates of the cost and benefits for each. Transport Scotland will be well placed with its access to street and road detail to produce a more accurate costing and we would be pleased to work with them on such an exercise.

Impact

Option Zero. Do Nothing. Keep 30mph limits

Option A: Scottish National Default 20mph limit for Urban Roads (assumes 15% fewer casualties)  
Reduction in casualties vs Option Zero

Option B: Local Authority by Authority 20mph localism (assumes 50% of councils at 20mph & 15% fewer casualties)  
Reduction in casualties/costs vs Option Zero

Casualties pa on 30mph roads (base is 2011-2015 ave)

49 deaths, 823 serious, 5,410 slight 6,282 total

Casualties saved 7 deaths, 123 serious, 812 slight, 942 total

Casualties saved 4 deaths, 62 serious, 406 slight, 471 total

Casualty £ pa

£267M cost

£56M saving

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?

£28M saving

5 year casualty £ Saving vs Option Zero

£0

£280M saving

£140M saving

Implementation Comment

Default sets majority of urban roads to 20mph with LAs able to raise limits on selected roads to 30mph where warranted.

Patchy risk and casualty reduction effects for 'lucky few in a postcode lottery' based on the history of local political support & funding for 20mph in each LA.

Inactivity Cost/ Benefits

Health costs of inactivity. This is currently estimated at £1,153M pa based on Public Health England stats for the Scottish population

Assuming a very conservative effect of reducing this by 1% over the whole population the saving is £11M pa or £55M over 5 years

Assuming a very conservative effect of reducing this by 1% over half the population the saving is £5.5M pa or £27.5M over 5 years

5 year casualty and inactivity saving

NA

£335M

£167.5M

Direct Costs to Local Authorities (LAs) / Gov't

£0

Approx. £4.5M from Gov't. Replace 30mph with 20mph signs on entrances to communities and 20/30 signs for any roads left at 30mph. No requirement for repeaters. Plus National engagement and ads £0.5M. In total approx. £1 per head of Scottish population. We ask Transport Scotland to provide accurate costing.

£8.6M for 50% of urban Scottish population outside Edinburgh (1.925M people). Implemented slowly, as funds become available, funded by LAs. (Estimated costs are based on Edinburgh where it cost £2.2M (£4.46 per head) to sign 80% of Edinburgh's roads at 20mph).

FYRR and 5 year Benefit to cost ratio

NA

1,100% FYRR on casualty reduction and 67:1 benefit to cost ratio over 5 years on casualty and inactivity reduction.

325% FYRR on casualty reduction and 19:1 benefit to cost ratio over 5 years on casualty and inactivity reduction.

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?

Comment

Litigation risks from poor air quality and spiralling social care costs. Vulnerable are unprotected. This option also creates the greatest transport and health inequality.

Consistency improves compliance and casualties saved. Potentially hundreds of life years saved due to more physical activity and improved air quality. Dominant option for active travel (heart disease and obesity), lower noise levels, greater social inclusion, greater community cohesion and local business viability.

Benefits of reducing avoidable risks in selected places. Higher levels of activity and exercise & better quality of life, improved air quality vs Option Zero. Lower total benefits and higher total costs than Option A. Takes longer to implement than Option A.

5 yr Summary

Not recommended

Net £330M saved vs Option Zero – The dominant and recommended option

Net £159M saved vs Option Zero, but not as cost effective as Option A.

## 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?

Welcome the proposal - long overdue.  
Concerned about the length of time it will take.