

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Andrew Winter

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

The death and serious injury toll in urban areas with a 30 mph limit is unacceptable. The evidence is overwhelming that slower speeds (20mph vs 30mph) hugely reduce deaths and serious injury for pedestrians and cyclists hit by cars We need to reclaim our urban spaces and allow all road users including those using footway, cycling and crossing the road to be safer and improve the environment. Having a completely consistent new 'normal' with exceptional variation to 30mph is a far better position than having mostly 30mph with occasional 20 mph areas.

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 think this needs political leadership and a cross-party universal response. We have managed to tackle indoor smoking and reduced the drink driving limit in a similar way with strong leadership and the public largely acquiesced in the common good.

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

A completely consistent, pan-Scotland limit presents a 'new normal' and embeds 20mph, not 30mph, as the maximum speed to drive at unless there are clear signs it can be exceeded. It would reduce the considerable extra bureaucracy that currently is required to introduce a 20mph zone. To derestrict the road to a higher limit would require a clear argument as to why that is necessary, whereas at the moment the onus is on campaigners to prove why 20mph zone should be imposed

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

This would require consistent enforcement with likely increased resources for traffic policing. this has been in any case cut far too much.

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.

As well as enforcement as for other major public health campaigns a good social media campaign and normalisation of the new speed, helping people see that it is fine and expected to keep to third gear if that is required, emphasise that overall journey times would hardly be affected. we need to liberalise the speed camera regime - as in Australia where there are far more random speed checks, a no-argument points system and the limit means the limit. this is a cultural change to accept that speed is dangerous and socially unacceptable and to drive is a privilege afforded by society not a right. there is already huge concern about the drop in roads policing and this needs to be reversed to reduce mortality and injury average speed camera technology cost is dropping all the time and could be exploited

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

Overall i would expect death and serious injury rates to reduce which will ultimately reduce cost both for councils (in supporting social care for serious injuries) and NHS in treating those injured. it is likely congestion will reduce. pollution will reduce as speeds will be more steady and this too will improve health. eventually with less serious accidents motorists car insurance costs will reduce.

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

reduction in pollution due to less 'racing' for the lights ; reduced spend on managing care of those injured; a modal shift to cycling and reclamation of key arterial routes in towns which now will feel less intimidating

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?

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

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

No Response

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 case is very strong for reduction in future injuries and modal shift in transport and reduction in pollution

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 think a brave step needs to be taken and this can be done.