

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

From your own report, there is compelling evidence in terms of accident risk to pedestrians and cyclists. Experiments suggest that impacts on average motorised journey times will be small. The government has been failing in its ambitions for greater numbers of "green" (pedestrian/bicycle) journeys — and in its economic commitment to same; this policy should at least make pedestrians and cyclists feel safer, so may encourage more desirable transport choices. Such a hope is supported by the evidence in your own report.

Q2. Could the aims of this proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

Unsure

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

It seems to me that parliament is the appropriate venue to bring this forward. Not obvious what alternatives there are, beyond a chaotic per-council-area approach, which seems likely to be confusing and dangerous.

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

As identified earlier, and in your own report: more active travel, fewer traffic accident fatalities, calmer traffic.

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

Inevitably there is a negative impact on motorised journey times, but your report and others suggest this impact will be minor.

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 interesting idea I read about today is state subsidy for roadside memorials for victims of accidents. The article suggested that memorials had a much more significant impact on drivers than serious or "humorous" signage.

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**

A national policy will be far cheaper (as evidenced by your own research) than a piecemeal per-local-authority one. It appears that substantial savings will be realised in terms of health costs of accident victims. With journey times barely increased, motorists shouldn't expect significant impacts.

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

If it's enforced and actually takes effect, our country's roads should become calmer, safer, happier places to be.

## 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**

I think it'll have a positive effect on everyone, including the protected groups. Broadly I wouldn't expect it to be group specific in terms of the above, though I could see it having more of a positive effect on those with lower incomes, due to its making lower-cost transport options more widely available.

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

As I said, largely I think this is a group-neutral proposal.

## 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:**

In the sense that it's a step in the right direction, yes. More needs to be done to improve our sustainability though.

## 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?

Go for it.