

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

Public sector body (Scottish/UK Government/Government agency, local authority, NDPB)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Killlearn Community 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 already have some 20 mph speed limits in Killearn, a village in South West Stirlingshire, on roads leading to the Primary School, and these have helped to modify drivers' behaviour. Even if not fully observed, with some drivers travelling at 25 mph, this is a big improvement on previous speeds of 45 mph in a 30 mph area. Like drink driving, we expect that speeding in 20 mph areas will become much less socially acceptable. We have serious problems with speeding on main roads through the village and would support 20 mph limits on through routes as well as residential areas. One of the through routes is an A road and the other a B road - would they be covered by the default 20 mph proposal? We would argue that they should. The proposal was discussed at the meeting of Killearn Community Council held on 21 June, and attracted unanimous support from Community Councillors and around 20 members of the public present. The road safety argument is compelling, and we support any efforts to reduce pollution.

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

In our experience, some people have to be forced to behave responsibly. Non mandatory signs such as '20's plenty' would be no use. It needs legislation.

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

Simpler process for local authorities to achieve speed limit reductions than they have to follow at present. 20 mph would become the norm instead of the exception, leading to peer pressure for motorists to conform and strong disapproval of those who didn't.
Improved road safety.
Cleaner environment.
More pleasant experience for those walking and cycling around the village.

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

Publicising new speed limit effectively to main offenders, who include delivery drivers (always in a hurry) and tradesmen.
Cost to local authorities for new road signs and markings.
Difficulty in enforcing new limit - Police have so many other duties to carry out.

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.

National advertising campaign in press, on billboards, TV and social media would reach maximum number of people.
Endorsement by motoring organisations such as AA and RAC.
Local advertising as above.
Enforceable penalties for non-compliance.

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 should bear cost of national advertising campaign. Local authorities would have cost of road signs and markings, unless costs met by Scottish Government. Can't see any savings as a result of the proposal.

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

Perhaps a reduction in drivers' stress levels.
Generally slower traffic will mean a more pleasant environment for all.

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

Roads will be much safer especially for pregnant women, families and children walking, cycling and playing. Greater safety for other drivers too.

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

Don't believe there will be any negative impact on these protected groups or anyone else.

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:

Once initial costs of change in policy are met there should be no greater impact economically than is the case at present. Social and environmental impact will be beneficial to population.

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?

Hope the proposal is accepted across political parties and becomes law.