

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

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

I am concerned about my grandchildren's vulnerability to traffic danger as they walk, scoot or cycle to school and feel that they would be a lot safer if traffic went more slowly. I am fed up with the 'entitlement' which many motorists seem to think they have to drive as fast as they (legally) can, paying no attention to other road users who are not in cars. I would like to be able to cross the road without having to wait for a stream of cars. It seems to me that a default limit of 20mph in built-up areas would help to cause a change in attitude so that those of us who do not drive everywhere stop being perceived as a bit odd, but become more normal. We cannot go on with the constant gridlock in our cities and anything which makes cycling, walking or the use of public transport easier and more popular must, I think, be a good thing.

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

I cannot think of a better way, but as I am not an expert, a bill seems the best way to me.

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

Please see my answer to question 1. I do not live in a city, but some of my grandchildren live in or near Glasgow. On every visit to Glasgow I am struck by just how car-dependent the city is. We need a better way of living, and anything which improves the bus service (as suggested in the consultation paper) and makes cycling and walking safer will help.

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

There is bound to be a lot of resistance (see reference to motorists' 'entitlement' which i mentioned in answer to question 1) but that, as you point out, was also true for seat-belt and anti-smoking legislation, and so can be countered.

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.

A good public education campaign, including in schools to get the children interested and putting pressure on their parents, as it is the children who will be major beneficiaries. Enforcement will, of course, be necessary, but then it is necessary now for 30mph limits.

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

Agin, I am not an expert, but although initially there will be costs for new signs and road markings, it seems to me that in the longer term there will be a reduction in costs from fewer (and less severe) accidents, and eventually a decrease in the costs to the NHS from pollution-related illness and from illness caused by lack of exercise. If we could become like the Netherlands with a decent infrastructure for cycling, these benefits would be increased. As far as motorists are concerned, slower speeds result in less fuel use, and for other road users such as buses, that would also apply. People like me would benefit in finding walking around more pleasant, which is worth a lot to me!

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

Think I've covered all I can think of already. Go for it!

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

Not applicable to all, I think, but it should make it easier for disabled and elderly people to get around if traffic is going more slowly and buses are able to spend less time in traffic jams. Pregnant women and their babies (and the rest of us) will benefit from being subjected to less pollution.

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

What negative impact?

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:

I cannot see why there should be any bad economic, social or environmental impact. We do not have a divinely-given right to drive at all, particularly in a way which brings such danger, pollution and annoyance caused by constant gridlock to our surroundings.

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. I wish you the best of luck with it.