

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

Other (e.g. clubs, local groups, groups of individuals, etc.)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Blairhall Primary School Parent Council

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

We would support this bill because it would make the road environment for our kids going to and from school much safer, part of the daily route for some of our pupils is up the main road in our village which generally has cars parked on both sides, this makes crossing the road quite hazardous, with a lower speed limit this would give drivers more time to react to children stepping out from between parked cars while trying to cross the road.

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 the compulsion to do so drivers would not reduce their speed voluntarily as everyone seems to be in a hurry these days. The bill would allow local authorities to implement the change quickly, with a minimum of effort, and at a reduced cost when compared with the existing system as detailed in the consultation document. In addition because this would be easily implemented local authorities are more likely to do so, also given that local authority budgets are being squeezed year on year this would also represent a cost effective solution for both the local authorities and the taxpayer.

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

The main advantage is that a greater proportion of the routes taken by our children to and from school will be made safer, this would no longer mean a small area around the school was the only part of their route covered.

Generally it would mean the roads within our village would be safer for those less able and/or less mobile, or those with disabilities (eg. poor eyesight and/or hearing). As our population demographic changes as more of us live longer then it stands to reason that the proportion of the population falling into the aforementioned categories will increase, this by default means that there would be more potential hazards for motorists, this bill would give motorists more time to react.

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

The main disadvantage may be that if local authorities have to apply for TRO's to increase speed limits where necessary, given the time and cost implications as detailed in the consultation document, they will be less likely to go through the process for areas where such changes are required leading to increased congestion in certain areas, some alteration to the TRO system or indeed a simpler more cost and time effective process would be required in tandem with the proposed bill.

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 national advertising campaign would be required, flashing signs showing motorists speeds, warning them if they are going too fast, and regular if not prolonged enforcement by the police.
The provision of information leaflets from local organisations like Community Councils, School Parent Councils, Scouts, Guides, Old Folks groups etc.

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					
Local Authorities		X				
Motorists			X			
Other			X			
Police Scotland						

Please explain the reasons for your response

There would be a significant increase in cost to the Scottish Government as a national advertising campaign would have to be undertaken including printing of leaflets and TV advertising, also local authorities would probably ask for additional funding to implement the changes. There would be some increase in cost to the Local Authorities with the need for additional signage and possible complimentary traffic calming measures. The cost implication for motorists and other road users would be minimal if any.

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

Hopefully this may encourage people to walk for shorter journeys within built up areas rather than taking the car as it may be just as quick, this would generally improve health if less cars were on certain roads, and help cut pollution levels within our built up areas.

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

The bill would have a greater positive impact on people with disabilities and those with pregnancy and maternity requirements, the main one being greater safety, with respect to the other groups mentioned above, there would be little or no impact either way .

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

No Response

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:

If done correctly, this bill would slide into the public consciousness much as the smoking ban did, the public would adopt it as the norm, there would be little or no impact economically, it would become more socially acceptable, and possibly have a positive effect on our environment.

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?

As previously mentioned some alteration or replacement to the current TRO system for changing limits up to 30mph or above would necessary, firstly to make this process easy and cost effective for both local authorities and the taxpayer, and secondly to avoid unwanted congestion in our restricted areas.

If as a result of this bill the traffic management in restricted areas was compromised this would cause anger amongst motorists and cause increased pollution, both of which would cause the public to disengage from the whole process.