

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Across the UK we have had a Carcentric planning approach for 50 years. Cars/motor vehicles - however powered - are well suited to a lot of journey purposes on our network, but not all as is the current ingrained habit. One of the significant factors that will help to ease our chronic problems of Congestion, Pollution, poorer physical and mental health and Social inequality/Isolation is a Modal shift to more people oriented travel options in urban or people concentrated areas. Currently one of the most significant factors that prevents people even considering such a shift to say walking, or particularly cycling, is the fear caused by vehicles travelling through the public spaces (roads) around local facilities, workplaces and housing. Lower speeds will allow people to revise that view, consider healthier travel options, and improve the quality of our environment.

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

Unsure

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

Across the UK we have had a Carcentric planning approach for 50 years. Cars/motor vehicles - however powered - are well suited to a lot of journey purposes on our network, but not all as is the current ingrained habit.

One of the significant factors that will help to ease our chronic problems of Congestion, Pollution, poorer physical and mental health and Social inequality/Isolation is a Modal shift to more people oriented travel options in urban or people concentrated areas.

Currently one of the most significant factors that prevents people even considering such a shift to say walking, or particularly cycling, is the fear caused by vehicles travelling through the public spaces (roads) around local facilities, workplaces and housing.

Lower speeds will allow people to revise that view, consider healthier travel options, and improve the quality of our environment.

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

none

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.

Engagement with the community to explain the rationale of the proposals.(see previous ans)
Present facts that clearly refute the oft rolled out myths about modern cars not being capable of low speeds/dramatically longer journey times/more pollution etc.
Local authorities/forces pool budgets and resources to promote limits and compliance, especially at point of implementation.

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

Slower speeds potentially = more people choosing healthy travel options, also fewer collisions+costs, less particulate and particle pollution due to steadier speeds. People get out and socialize more,= better mental and physical health, = lower Health service costs. Parents confident to let more children walk/cycle to school - less school running, healthier, more socialized kids. People on foot or cycle spend more in local economies/shops.

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

Slower speeds potentially = more people choosing healthy travel options, also fewer collisions+costs, less particulate and particle pollution due to steadier speeds.
 People get out and socialize more,= better mental and physical health, = lower Health service costs.
 Parents confident to let more children walk/cycle to school - less school running, healthier, more socialized kids.
 People on foot or cycle spend more in local economies/shops.

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

As previous answers: lower speeds = more people choosing healthy travel options and socializing

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

?

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:

Lower speeds in people intensive areas increase prosperity/reduce health bills.

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?

Yes - the current approach of implementing 20mph areas piecemeal is not as effective in reducing speeds as a default approach.
Drivers are currently dipping in and out of 20 areas and zones, and simply either fail to notice them or are fatigued by having to try and decipher which speed area they are currently in.
A default 20 will engender a less confused and more compliant culture in the same way as the current 30 does (mostly)