

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

As someone who lives on a busy (residential) road on Glasgow's south side, I am very conscious of the detrimental effect fast-moving traffic has on the quality of life of people who live in our neighbourhood. On the street where I live, traffic is heavy, and many drivers ignore the existing city speed limit of 30mph. Fast-moving traffic speeding past our front door is noisy, feels aggressive and makes this an unpleasant place to live. This is true not just of my own street, but of many surrounding streets including those circling the local park (Queen's Park). Even walking to or from the bus stop in order to get to work can be a stressful business, as negotiating the fast-moving traffic - by which I mean simply crossing the road - is very difficult. I often watch elderly people and parents with young children standing marooned on the kerbside or on traffic islands, awaiting a break in the traffic simply to get to the park or to get home. I am a fairly fit individual in my 50s, and would love to cycle to work (it's only three miles away, and perfectly commutable by bike). However, the speed of traffic on the local roads makes me far too nervous to attempt this. What a pity. I have long been bewildered by the fact that as a society, we repeatedly prioritise the needs of motorists who are passing through people's neighbourhoods above the needs of those who actually live there. It is galling to know that many of those speeding past my front door probably live in quiet 20mph streets themselves. Slowing the traffic down on all residential streets would hugely enhance quality of life in my neighbourhood, making this a happier place to be. It would make walking along the streets a more pleasant experience and encourage people to use the streets. It seems likely that it would have a minimal impact on the journey times motorists. I understand research suggests that 20mph zones in cities does not significantly increase journey times. However, even if it does, the extra minutes on people's journey times are a price worth paying for safer, happier, healthier communities - and if more people are encouraged to swap their daily drive for walking or cycling on our safer, quieter, cleaner, happier streets, then so much the better for all of us. Incidentally, if this bill is successful (as I hope it is) I am sure that discussion will ensue as to what does and what does not constitute a residential street. In my view, the answer is quite simple - it means any street where people live, and that must include many of the main arterial routes, which are often lined with houses and tenements. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this consultation.

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**

Perhaps local authorities could themselves decide to move to default 20mph zones, but so far, this doesn't seem to be happening. I suspect that legislation is the best way to bring about this change.

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

Safer streets, healthier happier neighbourhoods. They would result in more people (by which I mean pedestrians and cyclists) actually using their local streets. Parents would be happier about allowing their children to walk or perhaps even cycle to school. More people would be encouraged to commute on foot or by bicycle. Noise levels would be reduced and neighbourhoods would simply feel more pleasant, without the blight of fast-moving traffic.

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

I can't think of any disadvantages. Doubtless, some motorists would at first feel annoyed at not being able to drive at the speeds they are used to, and perhaps their journey times would be slightly increased. Even so, I am sure that most would quickly realise they, too, have much to gain from urban and village environments that are quieter, safer and happier. Most motorists are, after all, also pedestrians and some are cyclists too.

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.

Public information and education campaigns would be necessary to enhance the understanding that this new national 20mph speed limit is in everyone's interests, including people who drive. A change in attitudes similar to those brought about for drink-driving and smoking in public space should be achievable. Changed street layouts would probably also be necessary, for example, chicanes, speed bumps, more zebra crossings and speed monitors. Police enforcement would of course be necessary, particularly in the beginning. There is no point in introducing a new speed limit unless we are prepared as a society to ensure that it is adhered to. However, as people begin to understand the benefits and the importance of safer streets, social attitudes and public disapprobation towards those who break the speed limit and put others at risk would be an influential factor.

## 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**

I think there would inevitably be initial costs in terms of public education, changing street layouts and policing. However, these would be short-term and would in the longer term be offset by improved public health, decreased accidents and so on. Once we all get used to the new default speed limit, policing and remedial streetscaping should cease to be necessary. For motorists, I can't see that there would be any change - and for the rest of us, well, feeling safe enough to cycle or walk instead of driving would cut down on commuting costs.

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

I think I have already detailed most of these: enhanced safety, quieter, pleasanter communities, a more active population as people are encouraged to walk and cycle on their safer streets.

I am convinced there would also be enhanced feelings of wellbeing among communities, as their neighbourhoods cease to be blighted by aggressive, fast moving traffic.

I do feel that those of us who live on busy roads can be made to feel like lesser citizens, and this must have an impact on people's confidence and mental wellbeing. Those of us whose neighbourhoods are blighted by fast-moving traffic can feel like we don't matter; our needs and happiness are of lesser importance to our local authority and our government than the supposed needs of those who commute by

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

car through the places where we live. Therefore, changing the default speed limit to put the needs of communities first would, I believe, have a significant impact on mental wellbeing. And of course, slower traffic is quieter and feels less aggressive, therefore anxiety levels would be reduced. On my street, the traffic is often so noisy you often have to shout to be heard by someone standing a few feet away.

## 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 would certainly enhance the wellbeing of people with physical disabilities who currently struggle to cross busy roads because they are wheelchair users or are frail or have impaired mobility. I am sure it would also be beneficial to people suffering from anxiety-related health problems, for reasons I have already cited. And in terms of pregnancy, maternity (and paternity) it would make all parents feel happier and more confident about the environments in which they are raising their children.

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

I can't think of any negative impacts on any of these 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:**

Any initial costs of materials required would in the long run be reversed.

## 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 think I have already explained my view. I wholly support this measure, which would make Scotland a safer, healthier and happier place to live, and help to transform our urban environments and enhance the quality of life of everyone who lives here. I do hope that the bill is successful.