

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Please explain the reasons for your response

It is my view that safety must come first. Today's roads are very busy and many cars are large and powerful. I think it is important to reduce speed on all roads in built up areas not just residential streets. If it is safer and more pleasant to walk - or cycle - more people will do so and we would see vast improvements to our health, well-being and environment. It is very important that people, particularly children are encouraged to walk more, especially to school, but the environment must be right. Cutting the speed of traffic makes this more likely. It should also reduce accidents and 'near misses'. There has always been too much emphasis by local authorities on the rights of the motorist. They are also far too concerned about upsetting business people and the economy which may be affected by slightly longer journey times. This should not be the primary concern. I totally support a reduction in the speed limit and any measures which help implement that.

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

I have been involved in a road safety campaign which had the support of the local council, police, local school, politicians etc but the real stumbling block was that we couldn't change the law which made some of the things we wanted to do impossible. The Council could only make the road outside my house a temporary 20mph zone at the start and end of the school day because it was judged to be a main road despite the fact there are many houses all along it and it is the main walking route to one of the biggest primary schools in Fife. I am slightly concerned that the use of 'residential' in the wording of the proposed Bill will be open to interpretation by local authorities. It took months of meetings with council officials before they recognised that concerns voiced by residents of this street should be taken on board at all despite all the evidence gathered by police showing that many cars were speeding and that the volume of traffic including HGVs and heavy agricultural vehicles was way beyond council estimates. I welcome any efforts to change both the law and the mindset of many councils and their officials.

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

Improved safety for both pedestrians and motorists, greater likelihood of people walking or cycling, better for the 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.

In my experience flashing signs showing the speed the driver is doing (green when under the limit, red when over) are the most effective at getting the message across. Police enforcement is good but only effective when officers are present. Police Scotland Fife Division (North East Fife) have been using 'Pop Up Bob' cardboard cut out police officers at various locations and they seem to be very effective.

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						
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

Legislation, signage and promotion of new speed limits will cost both the Scottish Government and local authorities some money initially but savings should be made elsewhere, hopefully via a reduction in road accidents and damage to the road infrastructure. Courts should also save money if accidents are cut and therefore prosecution rates for speeding fall. Motorists may not save time but driving more slowly is more fuel efficient. The economy may be impacted on very slightly with increases in journey times but there could be some incentive for businesses who act responsibly.

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

Yes, people may realise that slowing down and not rushing helps their general health and stress levels.

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?

Slightly positive

Please explain the reasons for your response

I would think a reduction in vehicle speeds would be beneficial to some members of protected groups including disabled people, the elderly and even some pregnant women or those with small children/buggies as slower traffic makes it easier and safer to walk beside roads and to cross over.

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

I don't think there would be any negative impact on any groups protected or otherwise

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:

Just like the introduction of seat belts and no-smoking in certain places, the main issue is getting the message out there that safety must come first. Signage will cost but can be offset by a future reduction in accidents and damage. Getting the message across that driving over this speed limit is not socially acceptable is key and this comes down to clever promotion which need not be costly eg children can learn in school and educate their parents and grandparents, community involvement could see local businesses sponsoring signs promoting their support for the scheme giving local areas pride in their decision to put safety first.

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?

I would like this proposal to get cross party support so it can be taken forward and avoid any potential for political point scoring