

Proposed Restricted Roads (20mph Limit) (Scotland) Bill

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

on behalf of an organisation

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".)

No Response

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

Other (e.g. clubs, local groups, groups of individuals, etc.)

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 am content for this response to be attributed to me or my organisation

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Cycle Stirling

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

Cycle Stirling is a network of representatives from statutory, voluntary, private organisations and individuals involved in promoting active travel, particularly cycling. We are aware in our work that traffic speed is an important barrier for most people, for cycling, for walking, and trying to cross roads safely. Reducing speed is so important to developing peoples' confidence to cycle on roads. We believe that the proposal will make Scotland's communities safer, healthier, and more climate-friendly for a fraction of the cost of sticking with the current piecemeal approach to introducing 20 mph speed limits.

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

Although local authorities have the power to introduce 20mph speed limits using the TRO process it can be a time consuming and costly process, resulting in a confusing patch work of different limits. There also needs to be legislation to enable consistency of approach and enforcement across all Scotland.

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

Fewer road traffic collisions, and intimidating near misses.
Reduced impact of those road traffic collisions that do take place
Reduced costs to health service, fire & rescue services, police collision investigation teams, victims and society.
Reduced harmful vehicle emissions leading to better air quality and reduced climate change
Less discriminatory for those without access to cars.
More attractive for business and tourists.

Speed of traffic is often given as a barrier to people walking and cycling:-

1. In the Transport Scotland publication "Transport & Travel in Scotland 2015" (<https://www.transport.gov.scot/media/20138/j450918.pdf>) it is reported on page 7 & table 26 that 12% of those who do not cycle to work reported that the barrier to them cycling to work was traffic moving too fast.

2. In Stirling the St Nininas Primary School Travel plan survey in 2006 recorded a major reason for parents not allowing children to walk or & cycle was speed of traffic.

In reducing urban speed limits this proposed bill helps remove the barrier (of motor vehicles travelling fast) to people cycling to work or school and helps make an environment more conducive to increased levels of walking and cycling, independent mobility for all ages and abilities, and enabling social connections in neighbourhoods.

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

There are no disadvantages, to vehicles either since;

The proposed bill expects 30/40 mph exceptions to be made for distributor roads.
The evidence shows that slower speed limits make little difference to journey times and often improve traffic flow, and reduce accidents and related holdups.

Slower speeds are an important part of creating the environment to encourage mainstream active travel.

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

Local journeys are often more efficient by active travel.
 If more people travelled by active travel, the reduced peak school and commuter traffic congestion would improve vehicle traffic flows; for private car, bus and commercial vehicles.

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.

Public awareness media campaign to make everybody aware of change
 Repeater signs on the urban road that remain 30 mph so it's clear which have remained 30 mph
 Speed feedback signs
 Average speed cameras
 Education needs to be backed up with enforcement to get compliance and good habits established.

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

a) Scottish Government - It is broadly cost neutral as there will be no need for staffing increases. b) Local Government - Some reduction in costs: Particularly in relation to costs of implementing 20 mph speed limits piecemeal via existing TSO procedures. c) Motorists - Some reduction in costs: In relation to smoother driving in urban areas – less time spent stationary at junctions waiting in a queue. Fewer collisions and reduced impact of those that take place, which also leads to reduced car insurance premiums as fewer collisions result in fewer pay outs by the insurance companies across the market. d) Other road users and members of the public - Significant reduction in costs: Especially for vulnerable road users as a result of fewer collisions and reduced impact from the collisions that do take place. More people walking and cycling as a result of the lower traffic speeds reducing the fear of walking and cycling. e) Other Public services (eg NHS, Fire & rescue) - Significant savings in costs: Especially to NHS (reduction in cost of treatment for collision injuries and reduction to disease related to air quality and inactivity) & to Police & fire & rescue services (in managing collisions). Expect these to significantly outweigh one off cost of implementing legislation Also increased physical activity through walking and cycling – incentivised through a reduction in the speed Limit - would have positive benefits for overall health and wellbeing statistics and consequently cost savings to the public purse; E.g. <http://www.sustrans.org.uk/what-you-can-do/use-your-car-less/health-benefits-walking-and-cycling>

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

Elderly drivers may feel more confident driving in urban areas where traffic is moving slower.
Elderly people may feel confident about walking and cycling in urban areas where traffic is moving slower, and make social connections in their neighbourhoods.
A more attractive environment for residents and tourists.

Increases in active travel among young people may help them meet minimum levels of activity (recommended weekly targets for physical activity are 2 hours and 30 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity such as cycling or fast walking every week) and arrive at school in a better physical & mental state to learn (As per the Daily Mile initiative in primary schools)

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

Reducing speed to enable easier road crossings and less intimidating streets will particularly benefit the children, the elderly and pedestrians with disabilities. Slower speeds would also enable elderly drivers and cyclists to continue driving or cycling. Safer streets and reduced pollution will benefit all.

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

There are none.

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:

This bill would have positive impacts on economic, social and environment. It is one part of a more sustainable approach to transport.

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?

This bill is an important well evidenced initiative which should be supported.