

Proposed Restricted Roads (20mph Limit) (Scotland) Bill

Page 2: About you

Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

on behalf of an organisation

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".)

No Response

Please select the category which best describes your organisation

Commercial organisation (company, business)

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 am content for this response to be attributed to me or my organisation

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Phil Jones Associates Ltd

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 a transport planner and traffic engineer, and the principal of a consultancy which advises both public and private sector clients on the design of streets in new and existing places. I have been involved in the preparation of national-level guidance on the design of urban streets for many years, including 'Designing Streets', the current policy statement of the Scottish Government, and its predecessor PAN 76. These documents have stressed the importance of achieving traffic speeds of 20 mph or less in built-up areas to reduce the number and severity of road casualties, make walking and cycling more attractive and improve liveability. While it is possible to achieve such speeds through the careful design of new streets and introducing traffic calming in existing streets, the use of a 20 mph limit, together with its enforcement by the Police, means that speeds can be reduced over wide areas relatively simply. At the moment though the fact that 20 mph limits are the exception rather than the rule means that the case for them must be made on each occasion, which can cause delay; and significant expenditure is required on signs and road markings, to the detriment of the street scene. Adopting a default 20 mph limit, with 30 mph as the exception to be justified, would achieve a reduction in traffic speeds across large parts of urban areas without delay and with minimal cost. Any impact on journey times would be minimal, since most traffic delays occur at junctions; moreover, the increase in cycle and walk trips would lead to fewer short car trips which would in turn reduce congestion. I therefore strongly support the proposals.

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

No

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

See comments earlier

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

Studies, including extensive consultation, would be required to identify any routes which should remain at 30 mph, and this would take some time.

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 well-designed public information campaign would be needed to inform people of the change. Such campaigns have been successfully mounted before - for example on seat belt wearing and drink driving - and there is no reason to think it would not be possible in this instance. Although it would need to focus on Scotland, it would also be necessary to consider how the core message would be delivered in the rest of the UK, with the support of the Department for Transport and the other devolved administrations.

Enforcement would be essential, but a number of police forces are already committed to enforcing 20 mph limits so there should be no difficulty with this in principle, although clearly additional resources would be required.

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

Scottish Government - slight expenditure in making the legislation and in funding additional enforcement, but cost reductions on balance due to lower health expenditure on treating road casualties. Local authorities - cost reduction from designing and promoting 20 mph speed limits Motorists - lower insurance premiums due to fewer traffic collisions

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

See above

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

Road safety benefits will accrue to people who are disproportionately involved in traffic collisions (by exposure rate) - children, the elderly and disabled people.

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

NA

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 consider that there would be economic, social and environmental benefits.

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