

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

Third sector (charitable, campaigning, social enterprise, voluntary, non-profit)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Paths for All

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

We welcome the proposals as an important way of encouraging walking and cycling. We agree that 20mph limits have road safety benefits that encourage sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling. We agree that a 20mph limit will improve the local environment making for safer and better places to live and work in. We agree that making the streets safer and more pleasant to use will encourage more cycling and walking, especially for local trips. This will not only bring road safety benefits, but will also help to improve overall health and wellbeing, reduce congestion, improve air quality and have positive local economic benefits. We recommend that this should be introduced alongside work to enhance and promote the walking environment and promote walking in support of the National Walking Strategy.

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

We believe that the Bill will support the delivery of measures to improve walking and cycling environments – and the delivery of the Scottish Government’s Active Scotland Outcomes Framework, National Walking Strategy, The Cycling Action Plan for Scotland and the Long-term Vision for Active Travel in Scotland,

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

Clarity from a common approach across the country - creating a new norm and removing a confusing patchwork of 20 or 30mph zones

Safer streets that encourage more active travel

Cleaner air - NICE recommends urban speed reduction for better air quality. NICE guidance says 20mph limits without physical measures in urban areas help "avoid unnecessary acceleration and deceleration".

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

There will be initial upfront costs – e.g. for signage – but in the long run there will be savings from this approach

20mph may be seen by drivers as a target, not a maximum, when speeds less than 20mph are more appropriate.

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.

There will be a need for enforcement and social marketing to show the benefits and enable a culture shift to a new norm where 20mph is the default in restricted streets

Encouraging behaviour change through locally-based initiatives such as those demonstrated by the Paths for All Smarter Choices Smarter Places Programme funded by Transport Scotland

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						
Local Authorities						
Motorists						
Other						
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

We believe that there would be potential financial benefits from: Improved local environments in towns – making them more attractive and places to spend more time - increasing spend by visitors Increasing physical activity through active travel has the potential to reduce burdens on health and social care for the NHS / Local Authorities Reduced casualties - saving money in health care / social costs – reducing speed reduces serious or fatal injuries Improving health through improved air quality and the consequential savings to health budgets

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

It sends a clear signal that walking and cycling are valid modes of travel and reduces the assumption that vehicles should dominate our public spaces

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

Lower income groups are less likely to be drivers and so will benefit more from the Bill. Children and young people, and older people are the most likely to be injured as a result of cars in built-up areas. Reducing accident rates will positively impact these groups

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

There will be perceived costs – e.g. to motorists and parts of the road transport industry – it will be vital to have well evidenced information to show the benefits overall

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:

It is likely to be less costly than piecemeal development of 20mph zones and the associated high levels of consultation as is occurring at the moment. Introduction of 20mph zones will improve air quality; reduce CO2 emissions; reduce the amount of oil, brake fluid and rubber spread in our urban areas; save households money, and improve health. There is no negative impact on sustainability.

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?

There are relatively high levels of public support for 20mph limits and the benefits they bring – and this tends to increase after implementation (e.g. in Fife and Edinburgh)

The proposals are likely to attract negative attention from parts of the media and individuals and this will need to be carefully managed