

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

I live in Edinburgh and have experienced 20mph speed limits as the default on non-trunk routes for more than a year. I am variously a car driver, cyclist, pedestrian and public transport user. Among the direct benefits I have experienced is safer walking and cycling, smoother traffic flow and faster journey times when driving, more courteous motorists (whether in car, as pedestrian or cyclist), and less traffic noise. Based on the published evidence, I'm also led to believe that where there are lower speed limits, there are fewer accidents and that they are less severe, and there is an environmental benefit of lower emissions. In addition, where road safety is perceived to be increased, more people choose to walk or cycle, further reducing emissions and traffic, and with obvious health benefits.

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**

Effecting change on traffic regulation on a piecemeal basis council by council is a recipe for inaction and confusion. Progressive local authorities will push for the measure. Less progressive ones will oppose it. Some will support but lack the political authority to achieve it. The result will be a confusing patchwork of speed limits, so that drivers crossing from Edinburgh to Musselburgh, for example, encounter different traffic regulations, and that motorists from non-20mph areas will claim not to be aware of the rules. A uniform national policy implemented on a tight timeframe ensures everyone knows the rules, and that all areas benefit equally.

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

Safer roads for cyclists and pedestrians, but also for motorists. Lower emissions and reduced journey times, as traffic moves more smoothly. More courteous motoring. Less stressful driving. More people choosing to walk or cycle.

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

There aren't any. There may be debate about exactly which roads should be designated 20mph or 30mph zones, but the basic principle of lower limits on non-trunk roads to enhance safety and reduce emissions has no disadvantages.

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 road speed signage would be required for 20mph zones, as it is for 30mph, 40mph or other speed zones. With national adoption of the measure, the new limit would rapidly become a default for motorists unless they have seen signposting indicating the limit to be higher, as it is for the current 30mph limit in built up, street-lit areas.

Police and camera enforcement would be required, as it is for other speed limits. The lower limit itself does not necessitate an increase in enforcement, but as the lower limit is implemented in the areas where pedestrians and cyclists are most likely to be present, that infractions would be treated at least as seriously as those in higher speed zones.

## 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

Any short term increase in cost for local authorities as they plan and implement 20mph limits, and update road signage. This will be cancelled out by reductions in road maintenance costs due to the lower impact on road surfaces of lower traffic speeds. National government will see reductions in health care costs due to fewer, and less severe road traffic accidents. The court system will save money as there will be fewer cases to prosecute for severe accidents. Police Scotland will save money in having fewer serious accidents to attend. This saving could be reinvested into increased focus on tackling speeding and dangerous (in all speed limit zones). Motorists will save on fuel costs, and car insurance costs in general will reduce as the number and severity of car accidents reduces; they will also save time with shorter journey times.

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

*No Response*

## 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:**

The net result of this bill will be cost reductions for individuals, local authorities, and national government. It will have a positive impact on health, safety and the environment. There would be no negative impact on the economy, and probably a benefit as fuel costs and journey times are likely to be reduced, increasing profitability.

## 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*