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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.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

Partially opposed

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

The community council consider that the Scottish Government should not impose unnecessary restrictions on local authorities. That the current system speed restrictions on roads should be left in place whereby a local authority can set in place the speed limit appropriate to local conditions after consultation with local residents.

Q2. Could the aims of this proposal be better delivered in another way (without a Bill in the Scottish Parliament)?

No

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

none

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

The proposal appears to take away control from local authorities and thereby local people. If this proposal were to be implemented who will police it? The Police are already stretched and will not be on hand to police all rural roads. The government would better serve the people by placing speed restrictions on those major roads which are seen as dangerous by local people rather than this blanket ban.

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.

An increase in the numbers of traffic Police!

### 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	Х					
Motorists			Х			
Other						

Police Scotland	
27. Do you believ	e there will be any other benefits to reducing the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph?
Perhaps on some	e rural roads, but let local residents decide.
ige 14: Equ	alities
Q8. What overall	mpact is the proposed Bill likely to have on the following protected groups (under the
	): race, disability, sex, gender re-assignment, age, religion and belief, sexual orientation partnership, pregnancy and maternity?
Neutral (neither p	ositive nor negative)
Q9. Could any ne	gative impact of the proposed Bill on any of these protected groups be minimised or
avoided?	2
No Response	
No Response	
	tainability of the proposal
age 16: Sus	tainability of the proposal  sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future economic, social and/or environmental impact?
age 16: Sus	sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future
age 16: Sus Q10. Do you cons disproportionate e	sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future
age 16: Sus Q10. Do you cons disproportionate e	sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future
Q10. Do you cons disproportionate e	sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future economic, social and/or environmental impact?
age 16: Sus Q10. Do you cons disproportionate e No	sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future economic, social and/or environmental impact?
age 16: Sus Q10. Do you cons disproportionate e No	sider that the proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future economic, social and/or environmental impact?  The proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future economic, social and/or environmental impact?  The proposed Bill can be delivered sustainably i.e. without having likely future economic, social and/or environmental impact?