

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

The scientific evidence supports the reduction, not least through changed injury and fatality rates. Moreover - although more subjectively - I have experienced reduced speed limits as a pedestrian, cyclist, and car-driver in German cities and towns, and also in Edinburgh, and I find such settlements to be more pleasant, and less stressful and threatening to walk and cycle around.

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

I agree with the logic for a national change, but with local-authority discretion to increase selected streets to 30mph if appropriate. The clearer messaging associated with a national posture on this, and associated reduced costs for local authorities, are compelling reasons supporting national change.

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

Safer roads, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists (hence - hopefully - increased numbers of walkers and cyclists with associated low-carbon and health benefits).
Reduced costs for councils as a national campaign will build awareness of changed laws rather than local campaigns.

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

No Response

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.

An advertising campaign, certainly.
At least in the early stages, increased police enforcement seems essential.
Also electronic speed warnings (eg flashing signs alerting drivers that to their speed)

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

Gvt: overall, I'd speculate reduced health care costs (through increased active travel and reduced accidents) LAs: reduced costs as national awareness campaign remove burden from councils. Motorists: speculate cost-neutral but I am ignorant of possible implications for fuel consumption. Other: increased active travel could mean reduction in costs for travel by private car or public transport.

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?

Unsure

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

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