

# 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".)

Professional with experience in a relevant subject

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

The administrative and financial advantages of achieving this "step change" in policy are overwhelming and the benefits in terms of health are incontrovertible. The disadvantages - if there are any - will be trivial.

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**

A piecemeal system for change is clumsy, slow, expensive, and confusing.

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

A definite reduction in serious and fatal road traffic injuries. This in itself is clearly a highly desirable outcome but the associated reduction on health care costs would also be extremely beneficial  
A probable improvement in health by encouraging more active travel, with again reduced health care costs.

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

Not much. A small increase in journey times is a small price to pay for the undoubted large benefits.

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.

Awareness campaigns, national campaign when introduced, and encouraging bus companies and emergency services to display rear adverts and observe the limits exactly.

## 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		

Q6. Taking account of both costs and potential savings, what financial impact would you expect the proposed Bill to have?

<b>Other</b>						
<b>Police Scotland</b>						

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

Health care and other costs associated with accidents would substantially be reduced, this is a government burden. Local TRO costs would be substantially reduced, this is a Local Authority burden. Motorists would have less accidents, but as most motorists don't have accidents, this would not be a substantial saving. A small improvement on fuel use is likely if they drive more smoothly.

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

It's likely that air pollution would be reduced.  
There is an inherent inequality in the distribution of road accidents, in relation to deprived areas, and deprived areas have already benefited more from 20 mph limits. A step change in the public attitude to road accidents, from inevitable to unacceptable, would be a great possible benefit.

## 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**

People with disability are more likely to suffer road traffic accidents, and any reduction would thus probably be more advantageous to such people.

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

I can see no 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:**

Road accidents already have excess social and economic impact. The reduction in these costs would have an enormous advantage. Money and time would be saved in the legislation, and a small reduction in

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?

fuel use would be environmentally helpful. Even more, would be the encouraging of a shift to active transport, to reduce the over-use of vehicles.

## 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?

The logic of this proposal is inescapable. It could be the first step in a change of attitude to consider that any road accident is one too many; and the previous acceptance of random injury as a part of life should be consigned to history.