

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

It has been proven that casualties are much less severe when hit by vehicles at 20mph rather than 30mph. Stopping distances are shorter, thus vulnerable road users are less likely to be hit. Walking and cycling should be encouraged in built-up areas for health, environmental and social reasons and people are more likely to choose these modes of transport if the environment is more pleasant. In many urban areas, av. speed is below 20mph anyway, therefore traffic flow is also likely to be better with the lower limit.

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

Unsure

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

See answer to Q1

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

None.

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.

Clear signage.
Signs flashing your speed if you exceed the limit.
Enforcement through fines.
Priority given to vulnerable road users in the road layout, meaning it is difficult to drive above the limit.
Publication of statistics on casualties at different speeds.

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	

Q6. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have?

Other					X	
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

I do not know what the cost implications are for the authorities. I would expect costs to be lower for motorists due to lower fuel consumption and less accidents and, hopefully, a switch to other forms of transport. For non-motorised transport costs should be lower due to decreased accident risk.

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

Most are detailed in Q1

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

Positive - we're all human beings affected by the environment we live in. Even if members of any of the above groups are reliant on a car for transport, it is still the case that on urban roads you're unlikely to average above 20mph. It would be more salient to divide groups economically. If you create an environment where sustainable transport (walking/cycling/public transport) can thrive, the less well-off are more likely to be able to get around easily and cheaply, especially if you also provide cheap cycle hire.

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

I can't really envisage any negative impact.

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:

Absolutely. Most of my reasons have already been detailed above: cheaper and easier sustainable

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?

transport, greener forms of transport, less pollution. Better urban environment meaning people are more likely to meet and speak to each other on the streets.

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