

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

As a cyclist and pedestrian, I have had far too many scary experiences, from close passes at speed to sudden accelerations by car drivers. As a father to two young children, this has become even more of a concern - there are certain roads nearby (eg Auchterarder High Street) I would never take my children along, and large sections of Perth, our nearest city, are no-go areas. To calm the whole experience requires calming motorised vehicles. Nothing else will do.

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

Theoretically, yes, through local authorities, but take-up is likely to be low in some areas. For instance, my local authority has a new administration made up of councillors who campaigned to make it easier for car drivers to "keep moving", and made no mention of cyclist or pedestrian needs in their campaign materials. I fear things are going to get worse here, without adequate central government and/or parliament support for improvements.

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

Making built-up areas calmer - they will be quieter, less stressful environments, which will benefit everyone (including the drivers of motorised vehicles).

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.

Education, primarily - for example through driving instructors and public information campaigns. However, speed limiting measures may be necessary, although we have a tradition in Scotland and the UK of using speed limiting measures which also negatively impact upon road users who do not travel at speed (speed bumps are a nightmare for cyclists, for instance).

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

I expect a reduction in cost for many road users as non-motorised travel increases. For local authorities, that means less impact on roads, meaning that road maintenance savings cancel out the cost of new speed-limiting infrastructure. For central government, there should be significant savings for the NHS - fewer accidents, and those that do occur will cause far fewer deaths or serious injuries.

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

Public health will be dramatically improved - fewer accidents, and more journeys by cycle or foot improving health.

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)

Please explain the reasons for your response

It will benefit everyone, equally.

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

n/a

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, social and environmental impacts of the proposals will be positive.

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 Response