

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Graham Banks

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

to make the built environment more attractive and safer for walking, cycling, scooting, playing and living, with little overall impact on progress of motorised road users.

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

without a S.P. Bill local authorities resort to traffic calming measures, which are expensive to install and maintain and can be a hazard to cyclists. In the future it may be possible to electronically restrict cars to 20mph in built up areas, which would achieve an additional benefit of preventing speeding and also possibly preventing terrorist use of vehicles as a weapon.

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

1. reduction in death and serious injury and all the associated financial and social costs.
2. reclaim the streets for a more just and considerate society.
3. help persuade more people to walk and cycle, and make the space safer for all, especially children.

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

Perhaps some initial frustration for some vehicle drivers during the settling-in period.

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.

20 mph signage and speed enforcement by normal means, preceded by advertising/information campaign.

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?

Local Authorities					X	
Motorists			X			
Other						
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

Reduction in deaths and injuries and the huge Police/NHS/legal/insurance/job/social costs of each accident. Local Authorities will no longer need to use traffic slowing/calming road design.

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

Possible smoother flow of traffic and less brake dust.

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

It should make the 20mph areas better places to be for all.

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

I don't see any 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:

Yes, it would be similar to making seatbelts compulsory and the benefits of restricting smoking. More people would be encouraged to travel more sustainably, which is likely to reduce healthcare costs, and

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?

work absences, along with obesity, heart disease, pollution, climate change.....I believe the economic, social and environmental impact would 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?

Cyclists should be legally allowed to cycle 'the wrong way' down one way streets.
Pavements should be shared use if wide enough and where there is insufficient space for cycle lanes/segregated routes.