

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign

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

Many excellent reasons are given in the Bill, but we would highlight that the Bill would reduce speeds and consequently danger; would save lives and reduce casualties; would cut air pollution; and would encourage more people to walk and cycle in our towns and cities. To elaborate on this latter a little: currently our roads are dominated by moving vehicles; non-motorised users are intimidated, even though most motorists would not be aware of this. The dominant attitude is, 'might is right'. In our civilised society, we are already doing much to prove that might is NOT right (e.g. to ensure equal rights for women; to stop racism; the whole 'equality' agenda). Making the roads fairer for all can be seen as part of this agenda. It's time for a re-think of our relationship with the car. All road users should feel comfortable with their daily travel. Vehicles already impose very high costs on society and the majority of these are externalised, i.e. the motorist does not pay for them - examples include climate change, air pollution, sedentary (unhealthy) life-style, land take (whether moving or stationary), the costs of crashes and casualties. The current intimidation and dominance of the road network, mainly because of speed, is one of these externalised costs.

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

The Bill explains why. It is easier and cheaper to have a default speed limit nationally for towns and cities. Local Authorities can always make exceptions. If done piecemeal, TROs are time-consuming and expensive; extra signage is expensive; some authorities will do it, others won't.

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

As outlined in the Bill, and as noted in answer to (1) above.

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

The Bill would have to be supported by education (especially of motorists) and enforcement (ditto). The 3 'E's of transport are, education and enforcement. Engineering might be needed in some cases - speed engineering humps and the like - where compliance is not forthcoming. Indeed it should perhaps be made clear that the Government will be prepared to introduce such measures if motorists don't co-operate.

Education, both before the measures are introduced, and after, is essential, and a substantial budget should be set aside for this.

Our experience of 20mph in Edinburgh is that by and large the widespread introduction of 20mph has made very little impact on traffic speeds, though this is from observation - no evidence is yet available (the trial showed some reduction). There has been very little by way of education, which helps explain why so little change is observed. Motorists just don't 'get' it; they don't understand the impacts of their speeds on vulnerable road users.

Enforcement is also essential. Police Scotland must be 'on board', and must be given resources to carry it out. The Edinburgh experience indicates there has been too little enforcement. Enforcement will only be necessary until motorists get the message; it must be immediate after the introduction, and it must be visible.

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 education campaign including TV advertising and use of social media. Enforcement must be immediate and widespread and visible, as noted in (4) above.

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

The Bill has some useful material here. Likely costs/benefits are difficult to assess, and some will be in departments other than transport, e.g. Health. Government: start-up costs will be off-set by gains from fewer casualties, better health both for motorists (calmer lifestyle) and non-motorised road users - more walking and cycling; better health for all through less air pollution. Overall the benefits will outweigh the costs, possibly by significant amounts depending on how effective the education/enforcement aspects are. Local Authorities: ditto. One might add less wear-and-tear on the roads from slower speeds, fewer air particles from smoother driving, gentler braking etc Motorists: similar. Better health, better lifestyle, less fuel consumption, less air pollution Other: mindful of earlier remarks about road speed being an equalities issue, our whole society would benefit from slower speeds - a fairer Scotland. One might mention tourists and visitors - more would be attracted to a calmer, less car-dominated, less noisy environment - "I came to Scotland and it was a real tonic!"

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

As mentioned in (6), a calmer road network in towns and cities will attract more tourists; will result in a fairer Scotland; could result in a healthier Scotland, as more switch to active travel. And we have an ageing population, who will find it harder to stay active unless speeds are reduced. That has huge implications for the health and care services; we have to do everything possible to enable the old to remain independent.

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

Very positive for disability, age (the young and the old), the pregnant and the maternal. Crossing the road is a nightmare for these groups, and it's all to do with speed and dominance/intimidation by the motorist.

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

We foresee no negative impacts - they are all positive

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:

The economic, social and environmental benefits, as outlined above and in the Bill itself, all heavily outweigh any costs, such as the start-up costs.

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?

Use the Edinburgh experience to do it better