

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

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**

While I do not disagree with the obvious headline statistics of reduction in fatal/serious accidents and the overall benefit to the environment, it seems that a blanket 20mph zone application is not the most sympathetic or impactful approach to solving the problem of high speeds on our public roads. As a cyclist and car driver, I see the problem from both sides and find some of the roads chosen to become 20mph slightly bizarre, and equally am surprised about some roads being 30mph - the road near Forrester's high school being a good example - the main vote-winning approach for this scheme would surely be children first. As a cyclist I now feel less safe on the city's roads, as the speed of cars becomes closer to the speed of the average cyclist - drivers become more hesitant to overtake and behave more erratically, sometimes slowing mid-overtake much to the concern of someone on a bike. I think the scheme should have a focus on retaining some higher speed arteries and give some consideration for the second order effects of lowering average vehicle speeds.

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

Yes (if so, please explain below)

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

I think the approach of various street furniture and pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle segregation should be given more focus, especially in Edinburgh. The city is relatively small with most roads being narrow, so the problem is not an easy one to solve - this I understand. However this would surely give the most benefit by designing away the problem, rather than relying on a lower speed to hopefully alleviate and reduce the effects of an impact when it does happen. Many other European (and non-European!) cities have different approaches to the problem - with a small rollout along these lines taking place on a few (quieter) roads in Edinburgh such as the Pleasance and near Buccleuch St - learning from these schemes and extending the idea, if not the exact same implementation would be a great step forward.

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

I am hopeful of the ~8% reduction in pollution as mentioned in the bill proposal being achievable, and am hopeful (but doubtful) of an increase in traffic flow, as I have not seen any obvious additional effort going into streamlining traffic flow. A secondary benefit would be a reduction in car use in the city centre as more vehicle users grow frustrated with car travel and the bus times become more aligned to a car journey time. However increases in bus ticket fares to fund the tram will likely stick in many's craw.

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

The main disadvantages would be an increase in journey time (despite the best wishes of the bill documentation- there is nothing to alleviate this concern), and a lower than expected decrease in serious accidents. Mandating behaviour such as slower travel, rather than taking an approach where going too fast for the given scenario is impossible through use of street furniture and street design will leave many paying less attention on the road. The confusing roll-out of the scheme in Edinburgh has also left many baffled by which streets are which speed (the 20mph signs are tiny and infrequent) and crossing the road with one car thinking the zone is a 20mph, with another doing 30mph is confusing and dangerous.

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.

As mentioned in previous answers, better street design - simply relying on a limit will not work very well.

## 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						

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

Other than the aforementioned safety and pollution, no.

## 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?

Unsure

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

## 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?

No

**Please explain the reasons for your response:**

I believe the blanket change will have a cost saving for local authorities in the short term, but would not be required were changes to the traffic segregation and road design to be tackled first. In addition the condition of the roads is of higher priority, as this would surely reduce wear and tear on vehicles and ensure that the tarmac provides sufficient traction in the event of an incident, reducing incident rates. The condition of roads would also entice more cyclists onto the roads, reducing the number of vehicles on the roads and thus alleviating these problems. The last point I'd make is will this even be measurable in ~5 years time with the advent of self-driving cars, meaning the traffic flow is controlled centrally and reliably - the most dangerous part of a car is the driver.

## 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*