

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Partially 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 is a meaningless gesture if this is not ever enforced. There are areas of Edinburgh which already have a 20 mph speed limit and on which cars drive at far higher speeds. This is mentioned in the consultation, as is the intention to not take any action to improve enforcement. I can envisage this proposal making a meaningful contribution to increasing road safety and reducing the (justifiable) public perception of cycling in traffic as very dangerous if actually effective and enforced and linking with protected cycle lanes on busier urban thoroughfares. Otherwise I see it as an empty gesture.

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

I think a blanket reduction of traffic speeds from 30 mph to 20 mph is unlikely to be appropriate.

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

The possibility of a minimal decrease in traffic speeds may minimally decrease the lethality of traffic accidents occurring at these speeds, although it strikes me as unlikely to actually decrease the rate at which such accidents occur.

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

It may be an ineffectual sop that politicians could hide behind when pressed on the painfully slow and often ineffectual or counterproductive development of cycling or other active transport infrastructure in Scottish cities.

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.

Actual visible police enforcement would be required. While I assume it occurs, I have never seen police enforcing speed limits in urban Scotland.

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

There would be a capital cost required to local authorities with respect to new road signage. I imagine road maintenance costs would decrease in line with traffic speeds and a hypothetical decrease in traffic volume. Driving at a slower speed may be slightly less fuel efficient, but arguably most urban driving is already quite fuel inefficient so this additional factor may be negligible.

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

It may reduce traffic noise in built up areas.

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?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

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 future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impact?

Yes

Please explain the reasons for your response:

It's a very minor change in traffic speeds that is unlikely to actually be enforced. It's hard to envision a likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impact.

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