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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Pedestrians are much less likely to be killed when hit at 20 instead of 30 mph. Drivers will be able to stop in half the distance, making it easier for them to respond to unexpected events. This should make the roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists. Making 20 mph the default speed limit in towns makes it easier for drivers to know what the speed limit is, as the rule is consistent. It will also be cheaper to implement 20 mph as the default than have each town that chooses 20 mph make a case for it, and have to put in many repeater signs.

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

No

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

Safer and quieter streets for residents, pedestrians and cyclists. Hopefully leading to an increase in active travel

Introducing the 20 mph speed limit across the whole of Scotland is efficient in implementation and consistent for drivers.

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

None really, just some complaints from drivers who would put their convenience over other people's safety.

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.

Replacing the current 30 mph signs with 20 mph signs should be sufficient. The police will have to enforce the speed limit strongly and consistently.

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						х

Q6.	Taking	account	of both	costs an	d potential	savings,	what financial	impact	would	you exp	ect the
pro	oosed B	ill to hav	e?								

Motorists			Х
Other			Х
Police Scotland			

Please explain the reasons for your response

I'm not sure about the financial impact, but please remember to factor in a reduction in road injuries and increase in active travel as benefits to the health service.

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

I hope it will lead to a shift from diving to walking and cycling short journies. It sends a signal that as a society we prioritise pedestrians, when for a long time cars have had top priority in town. It is a step towards making our town centres places for people instead of cars.

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

It's harder for children, elderly and disabled people to negotiate fast moving traffic. Slowing down will help keep them safe. Low income households are less likely to have access to a car. Prioritising cars disadvantages them. Children can only travel independently by walking, cycling, public transport. If the roads are so dangerous that their parents have to take them places, we remove their freedom.

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

No Response

Page 16: Sustainability of the proposal

Q10. Do you consider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely fut	ure
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:

The amount of energy required to drive in town is proportional to speed because so much is used accelerating and braking. A lower speed limit will mean less energy is needed to get to the speed limit, and less braking needed too. Less fuel should be needed to drive at 20 mph through town than 30 mph.

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