SECTION 1 - ABOUT YOU

1. Are you responding as:

 an individual – in which case go to Q2A

2A. Which of the following best describes you? (If you are a professional or academic whose experience or expertise is not relevant to the proposal, please choose “Member of the public”)

 Member of the public

2B. Please select the category which best describes your organisation:

 Public sector body (Scottish/UK Government/Government agency, local authority, NDPB)

 Commercial organisation (company, business)

 Representative organisation (trade union, professional association)

 Third sector (charitable, campaigning, social enterprise, voluntary, non-profit)

 Other (e.g. club, local group, group of individuals, etc.)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Name/organisation:

4. 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.)

Contact details:

SECTION 2 - YOUR VIEWS ON THE PROPOSAL

Aim and approach

1. 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

 Partially supportive

 Neutral (neither support nor oppose)

 Partially opposed

Fully opposed

 Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

Cars are now far safer and built to higher safety specifications than in the 1930s. Those higher safety specifications apply to drivers, passengers and other road users.

It will cost councils a lot of money to implement this change, far more than continuing with the existing scheme. If particular areas are identified as being a problem, these should be prioritised under the existing scheme for a change to 20mph.

If you are expecting an average speed reduction of 6mph, this would mean that drivers would still be speeding and, if caught, criminalised for driving at 24mph. The current average speed of 31mph would not result in a driver being prosecuted. Therefore, drivers would be unfairly penalised and disadvantaged. The flip side of that argument is that the cost of policing the change to a universal 20mph would be huge and, if the scheme can’t be effectively policed, then it is destined to fail. You acknowledge in your proposal that non-compliance with 20mph areas is already a problem.

The current scheme is not confusing as drivers should be paying attention to all road signs, including speed limit signs.

The facts you present regarding the 20mph limits imposed in Calderdale, Hull and London are misleading as you do not state whether or not the 20mph areas are across the whole of these areas or just within residential areas or other specific areas.

Lowering the speed limit may increase the use of “active travel” but only for those who live within cycling or walking distance to work. For other workers who have no option but to commute, you will be penalising them (especially those who live in rural communities) and causing them longer journey times because you are assuming that local workers WILL choose to walk or cycle. If they don’t, the volume of traffic on the roads remains the same but the flow will be slower.

Many drivers now use dash cams which encourage safer driving.

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

Yes (if so, please explain below)

 No

 Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

The existing scheme should be continued. The 20mph radius around schools could be widened in problem areas. In accident prone areas, speed cameras, speed bumps or speed indicator signs could be introduced.

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

None

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

Drivers will be penalised, disadvantaged and discriminated against. If a driver thinks that driving at 40mph in a 30mph zone is acceptable, how are you going to convince them not to drive at 40mph in 20mph zone? See also response at Section 2.1

5. What measures do you think would be needed to maximise compliance with the new national 20mph speed limit on restricted roads? (Examples might include advertising, signage or police enforcement.)

I believe the definition of “restricted roads” should be re-examined as a measure. Some rural roads are “restricted” but the introduction of a 20mph limit on them would be extreme. There will be a need for police enforcement. Drivers will need re-educating on the supposed dangers of driving at 30mph. This would need to be done on a very wide scale, from tv adverts, to road shows, drop in events and should be extended to any workplace where workers have to drive as part of their employment (councils, NHS etc). This re-education would also need to be extended to England, Wales and Northern Ireland as limits there would remain at 30mph and drivers from those areas should not be disadvantaged. All signage would need to be renewed. Markings on roads would need renewing which could cause disruption.

Financial implications

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

(a) the Scottish Government

 Significant increase in cost

Some increase in cost

 Broadly cost-neutral

 Some reduction in cost

 Significant reduction in cost

 Unsure

(b) Local authorities

 Significant increase in cost

 Some increase in cost

 Broadly cost-neutral

 Some reduction in cost

 Significant reduction in cost

 Unsure

(c) Motorists

 Significant increase in cost

 Some increase in cost

 Broadly cost-neutral

 Some reduction in cost

 Significant reduction in cost

 Unsure

(d) Other road users and members of the public

 Significant increase in cost

 Some increase in cost

 Broadly cost-neutral

 Some reduction in cost

 Significant reduction in cost

 Unsure

(e) Other public services (e.g. NHS, Fire and Rescue Services etc)

 Significant increase in cost

 Some increase in cost

 Broadly cost-neutral

 Some reduction in cost

 Significant reduction in cost

 Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

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

No

Equalities

8. What overall impact is the proposed Bill likely to have on equality, taking account of the following protected characteristics (under the Equality Act 2010): age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, sexual orientation?

 Positive

 Slightly positive

Neutral (neither positive nor negative)

 Slightly negative

 Negative

 Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

9. Could any negative impact of the Bill on equality be minimised or avoided?

By rethinking the proposal to be more realistic and have less impact on drivers. By re-examining the definition of “restricted roads”. By ensuring that only roads in built up, residential areas where there is a genuine road safety issue are changed to 20mph. By making the existing scheme quicker, cheaper and easier for councils to introduce.

Sustainability of the proposal

10. Do you consider that the proposed bill can be delivered sustainably, i.e. without having likely future disproportionate economic, social and/or environmental impacts?

 Yes

 No

 Unsure

Please explain the reasons for your response.

General

11. Do you have any other comments or suggestions on the proposal to establish a 20mph default speed limit on restricted roads?

I think that there are better ways to deal with the supposed issue, for instance by improving the existing schemes for councils, by re-examining the definition of “restricted roads” (and, if the ability to do redefine the roads is not something that has been devolved, it should be). The Scottish Government should work with car manufacturers to ensure that the highest possibility safety features are built in as standard.