

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Goff Cantley

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**

20 mph restrictions will make travelling a more equitable undertaking between walking, cycling and driving. Faster driving speeds are unpleasant and scary to cyclists and pedestrians in any given roadway with pavements. The more people feel safer walking and cycling to work or for pleasure, the better the health of the nation.

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**

Leaving the scheme to individual local authorities would be cumbersome and implementation would be inconsistent and to an uncertain timetable.

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

Fewer deaths and serious injuries around towns and cities. Cycling would become more attractive to lots of people as they would feel safer in traffic. This would have consequent health benefits across the country with reduced health service spending.

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

The noise generated by the selfish car driving lobby who would squeal about deprivation of their freedom to drive fast.

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.

Ultimately, individual vehicle tracking would be necessary, saving a lot of police time. More automatic speed cameras would be desirable again to save police time.

## 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		

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

<b>Local Authorities</b>			X			
<b>Motorists</b>				X		
<b>Other</b>			X			
<b>Police Scotland</b>						

**Please explain the reasons for your response**

There is likely to be reduced wear and tear on urban/suburban roads benefitting all parties to a small extent. Motorists could well experience improved fuel consumption and fewer accidents.

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

It would make cycling and walking more attractive for many people, particularly for short distances as the speed differential would be less and there would be a welcome feeling of there being less risk to cyclists.

## 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**

Older and female cyclists say that the main reason they don't cycle is that they don't feel safe on the roads. A 20 mph limit could reduce this fear significantly leading to increased cycle use by these groups with consequent improvement in health and mobility.

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

Not applicable, as far as I can see.

## 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

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?

**Please explain the reasons for your response:**

Traffic in towns rarely manages to average much more than 20 mph. Therefore the impact of the limit would not significant adverse effects. Fewer accidents would mean improved 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?

Don't listen to the petrol-head motoring lobby who forget that the majority of the population do not have a car and thus suffer the adverse effects of congestion, pollution and general nuisance that car drivers cause across the country.