

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

Representative organisation (trade union, professional association)

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Muckhart 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

Clackmannanshire Council piloted a 20MPH speed limit through our village some years ago. Whilst there was a mixed response from the community in our area - some supportive, others not – it was clear that this speed limit was not being adhered to by drivers travelling through the village. Whilst it did slow traffic down, somewhat, it also led to ‘driver frustration’ which resulted in unsafe overtaking manoeuvres, in particular, at the west end of the village. Frustrated drivers were speeding up to pass those cars driving close to the 20MPH limit, and overtaking, on the wrong side of a road traffic island located close to a pedestrian crossing at our local play park. The 20MPH limit was not enforced, to any great extent, by the Police and, eventually, the Police themselves requested that the speed limit trial be halted, in the interests of driver, cyclist and pedestrian safety.

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

Yes (if so, please explain below)

Please explain the reasons for your response

We do not believe that a blanket policy is appropriate in all circumstances. Other ways to deliver the aims could be introduced, for example: proper Police enforcement and the use of ANPR systems and speed cameras to enforce existing 30MPH speed limits; improved availability of public transport, in particular, in rural areas; improved provision of Park & Ride services; Government to encourage the uptake of ULEVs.

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

Other road users, e.g. cyclist and pedestrians may feel more secure.

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

Increased driver frustration and driver inattention, possibly leading to more accidents; the time and costs associated with Police enforcement.

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.

Others, like us, are unlikely to agree with the blanket introduction of this proposal, therefore, a massive advertising and awareness campaign would need to be delivered - and repeated - at the introduction of this initiative; massive, costly, enforcement efforts, from the Police, would need to be supported; average speed cameras would need to be introduced everywhere; additional road signage and traffic calming / speed reduction measures (e.g. rumble strips, sleeping policemen, additional street furniture and/or street re-design; etc.) would also need to be introduced.

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

Government: increased consultation / study, legislative / policy and advertising / campaign costs, possibly, offset by reduced NHS costs. LAs: increased costs of installing ANPR and/or speed cameras, street design / traffic calming / speed reduction measures plus vast amounts of increased signage, possibly, offset by receipts from fines. Motorists: possibly, reduced insurance premiums and reduced petrol / diesel costs. Other Services: increased Police / enforcement costs, possibly, offset by reduced emergency services costs.

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

Possibly, reduced noise from traffic and reduced damage to buildings infrastructure.

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?

Unsure

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

Unknown

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?

No

Please explain the reasons for your response:

Funding would be better targeted at enforcing current measures.

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?

We believe that the supporting documentation provided for this proposal is slightly imbalanced, in particular, by exaggerating the likely cost and savings benefits.

We believe proper / stricter LA or Police enforcement of the speed limits we already have will be a less costly, more beneficial solution, however, consideration could be given to the introduction of a 25MPH limit.

Where 20MPH limits are in place, evidence shows that the average speed is nearer 25MPH, so, why not make the limit 25MPH? This speed limit works in many countries in Europe and in states throughout the USA. Drivers find this a much more acceptable 'slow' speed, it's safer than 30MPH and it might also be easier to enforce compared to a 20MPH limit. A 25MPH speed limit would offer all of the benefits of a slower speed limit, with fewer of the likely driver frustrations, etc..

NOTE: below is a summary of the response, produced by a recent Community Plan questionnaire, relating to the proposed re-introduction of a 20MPH speed limit through our village in Clackmannanshire (Pool of Muckhart).

Respondents were asked to agree (score > 5) or disagree (score < 5) with the following statement: "The existing 30 MPH speed limit on the main road (A91), throughout Pool of Muckhart, requires to be replaced with a 20 MPH speed limit, to reduce speeding traffic and to improve road safety."

Commentary: a largely negative response was obtained (64.3% of scores were 5 or less) with, by far, the most frequent response being total disagreement with the statement (a score of 0).

Therefore, quite clearly, there is absolutely no support within our community for a (re-introduced) 20MPH speed limit.