

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Graeme Stuart

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

There are many reasons but this is the main one. I live on a narrow residential street in Musselburgh that carries almost 6,000 vehicles a day. The road runs beside a large secondary school and a primary school. The pavements are narrow and slope steeply towards the road. On bin days parts of the pavement are effectively reduced to a width of 40cm. It is neither a safe nor pleasant road to walk along. Residents, including myself have been trying to get safety features introduced but to no avail. The reason why East Lothian Council is unwilling to provide safety features is that this narrow residential street is essential for their traffic management plan. Any safety features will considerably slow down the commuters from Gullane, Dunbar, Prestonpans etc. who see this as a convenient alternative route into Edinburgh. 70% of all traffic in Musselburgh goes in one end and out the other, yet the road system has been designed to suit them and not residents, cyclists, children etc. There is significant political pressure on the council from commuting voters and councillors from the above mentioned towns to keep the cars flowing despite the obvious pollution and health and safety concerns from the residents. An imposed speed limit that bypasses the intransigence (and cynical negligence) of the council would be considered a huge victory for the residents against the tide of cars that sweeps through every day. Taking the decision to have 20mph speed limits out of the hands of this council is necessary for political reasons as well as all those of social, health, and wellbeing.

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

20mph zones in residential areas should be a mandatory imposition on councils. They cannot be trusted any other way.

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

As I wrote in a previous page, councils can be subject to many pressures to prevent the introduction of safe street policies.
This bill would cut through their intransigence, inertia and innate reluctance to offend the motoring lobby.

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.

Car pacification measures such as raised road surfaces (not speed bumps), chicanes and more pedestrian crossings.
Signage will be ignored. Cars will continue to speed unless physically prevented from doing so.
The police are overstretched and will only respond with enough complaints.

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

Road budgets will take a hit with traffic calming measures.

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

Lower pollution levels from vehicles (noise, particulates,etc.), fewer deadly accidents with pedestrians. The inclination to speed from red light to red light will be disincentivised. Greater pedestrian usage of adjoining pavements.

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?

Positive

Please explain the reasons for your response

Mobility scooter users do not like our pavements as they slope too steeply and the road is too fast. They avoid the street if they can even if it means adding to their journey time. This bill will be a boost for those with a disability that requires a mobility scooter.

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

Can't say.

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:

Taken into the context of the health (mental and physical) of people living next to these roads their will be a net benefit. Taken into the context of how much was spent in turning our towns into car friendly zones the cost is insignificant.

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?

Councils will naturally try to reimpose 30mph limits along many routes in urban areas.
20mph limits should be mandatory and immutable if:

- a) along a school route
- b) the pavements are less than 1.5m wide
- c) the road is less than 6.5m wide
- d) if there are double yellow lines along route

etc.

These would be obstacles to any council wishing to reinstate 30mph in urban areas.