

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Guide Dogs Scotland

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**

It is important for safety and wellbeing of blind and partially sighted people that they are able to walk along obstacle free pavements and be able to make safe and efficient road crossings. Using our streets and roads can be very stressful for people who cannot see and people therefore learn and practice various strategies for undertaking road crossings. Blind and partially sighted people are required to find the kerb edge, position themselves to try and make a straight crossing and then listen to evaluate traffic volume, speed, and direction in deciding when it is safe to then step out onto the road. A national restriction on traffic speed from 30 mph to 20 mph on restricted roads would go some way to making streets and roads more user friendly and less stressful for blind and partially sighted people. That is why we support this proposed Restricted Roads (20mph Limit) (Scotland) Bill. We acknowledge that there has to be some flexibility for local authorities to apply a 30 mph limit on certain roads.

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**

Local authorities can introduce 20 mph speed limits in certain areas using the Traffic Regulation Order process. We believe that this fragmented approach would be too costly on the public purse.

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

As outlined in question one, we believe that reducing speed limits would be safer for blind and partially sighted people in using streets and roads. Reducing speed limits we believe potentially increases safety for all people who use streets and roads; can make for more pleasant environments to be in therefore potentially increasing peoples activities; reinforces intentions of Scottish design policy on placing pedestrians as the key users of space. We also believe that reducing speed limit would reduce severity of injury.

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

We are not convinced that there are substantial disadvantages to introducing this proposed Bill. There will be initial costs in changing road signs.

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.

We believe that a national public information campaign would be required to explain the benefits and rationale for change. We believe enforcement will be key to the effectiveness of implementing a reduced speed limit and suggest that along with Police Scotland other methods of enforcement, such as, cameras, are explored.

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**

There will be initial cost for a national information campaign and at a local level for replacement of road signs. At a local level there will be costs associated with going through a TRO process for 30 mph roads where they are desired. Currently there are costs associated with TRO processes for creating 20 mph areas so these will be saved if a national restriction were in place. We believe in the medium to long term there will be no additional cost both at national and local levels in having a 20 mph instead of a 30 mph restriction.

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

Reducing speed limits to 20 mph could improve the air quality of some streets and makes for a far more pleasant environment to walk in.

## 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**

We believe that reducing the speed limit to 20 mph would have a positive impact on disabled, older and young people, as well as creating healthier environments for pregnant woman.

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

We are unaware of any.

## 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:**

We believe that after initial costs there will be no additional funding other than ongoing maintenance as is the case now with a 30 mph restriction. We envisage a positive effect on society and the environment.

## 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*