

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".)

Academic with expertise in a relevant subject

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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 agree with the case made in favour of the speed restriction 20mph.

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

Decisions that impact on people in a way that they have to change existing practice without seeing immediate benefits for themselves require political will and determination. Recommendations, mutual stakeholder agreements, or legislation that is not enforced will only move a minority to change their practice, the majority will chance carrying on as usual.

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

The advantages of the proposal would be manifold and include:

- safer roads for all
- better traffic flow
- greater incentives for people to use active transport as road space becomes less dangerous with the added benefits for population health
- improvements in population health
- public transport will become more attractive creating opportunities for modal transport.
- children and young people will be safer on their ways to school and leisure, encouraging them to be more active
- population carbon footprint will be reduced
- open spaces in areas where this is implemented will become more attractive for shops who rely on people looking, stopping and walking into the shop.
- tourism will flourish in places where it is safe to move around

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

- I can only see one disadvantage: there will be a minority of people who will insist that this is an infringement of their personal freedom and who will use any argument, e.g. access, disabled access, being old, being young, having children, not having children, having always driven 30mph without a problem, having little time, loosing out on business etc. to resist the change. These people will disregard evidence of any kind and will not want to engage in discussion as they are set in their way and like to think that this is a battle they can win.

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.

My expectation is that the level of additional intervention to implement and achieve compliance will vary greatly across the country. In many places people will respect the restriction without additional measures, in some places where people will think they are getting away with not complying additional measures such as speed cameras and occasional police enforcement might be necessary.

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

As the benefits of the reduced speed limit such as safer roads, more (multi-)modal travel (and transport) resulting in better population health will require different timeframes to produce discernible impact on population-health (I would expect this to take between 1 on 5 years in the first instance), it will be difficult to offset savings against initial additional investment. The evidence from places where this change has been implemented already, and was flanked by additional initiatives to improve public spaces, however is compelling.

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

Where the speed limit is reduced to 20mph, roads become significantly safer for people using active transport modes. In the short term the new speed limit will therefore result in an increase in active travel without additional investment in creating i.e. separated routes for cyclists and pedestrians. In the medium term a reduction in speed can only be a first step towards an integrated policy that promotes multi modal travel and transport.

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

Over time, virtually everybody will gain. If the speed limit is flanked by additional developments to make public spaces safer, protected groups and children will gain disproportionately since they are the most vulnerable under the current circumstances.

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

I can't discern any negative impact other potential impact in isolated places during the implementation period. These should be identified by creating a channel for feedback that is accessible and can demonstrate the ability to launch mitigative action.

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:

The proposed bill is a step in the direction of more sustainability in terms of environment, built environment and public space, population health, health and social care services.

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?

Be brave, there is a large group of people (including children, adolescents, parents, older people who don't drive, women who find going out on a bike too dangerous, shops who will benefit from people stepping off their bikes and walking in etc.) who will love you for doing this once they experience the benefits.