

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 If you choose the second or third option, a name is still required, but it will not be published.

Dunlop and Lugton 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.

Neutral (neither support nor oppose)

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

I speak for my Community Council, but as a retired Civil Engineer who spent most of his professional life in Road planning, traffic management and especially pioneering work in road safety engineering (reducing recorded accidents in my County from 1500 to 990 from 1968 to 1975 despite traffic growth of 18%), a visiting lecturer on road safety at Tulliallan and to Town Planning students. I have a grasp of what makes road safety and sustains it. Has there been any research into CURRENT driver speeds in housing areas. The 85%-ile speed in these areas, I suspect, is already in the speed area you propose. Any proposed change without such a study is purely a political gesture, unlike banning pavement parking and as a former wheel chair pusher that's NO 1. I took strenuous efforts when working with guard rail posts etc to help that. Frustration became recognised as a factor, stupidity and ignorance also, so clarity of road layout, clear identification of speed standard and the minimum variations in speed limits a driver will encounter on a route lead to CONTINUITY and thus AWARENESS. And so safer DRIVING with concentrating on other factors more likely to be recognised, ie children near road, parked cars and what it could mean, road faults etc will result. Drivers, and lets face it their vehicles do the damage, are then not faced with "what is the speed limit now" and left to concentrate on safer driving, the factors above. The TRL also reports that driver recognition of 30's and 70's is high, but much less so with 40's and 50's even confusion, so why add 20's to the mix. Currently at schools there is a 20 mph limit when lights flash. In my experience this system seems totally ignored. Is this the way forward. (Just before my retiral with destruction of Strathclyde RC I designed a foolproof school speeding, parking, stopping pedestrian crossing layout still in place where I had it introduced, Notes photo available) Also, and I know from professional experience, reducing speed limits DOES reduce accidents, however, this was based on speed limits much higher than 30 to 20, and if I recall tended to be related to suburban routes with only some rural locations included successfully.

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

From scratch: by design layout; retrospective by throttles; greater use of crossings, (see Portugal where mere "zebra" marks at most junctions/crossing foci are respected by drivers and crossees); Bbtter maintenance of housing roads thus letting drivers concentrate on driving, not pothole spotting; some speed bumps (not a fan) All of these are POSITIVE, almost SELF ENFORCING. This is the vital element.

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

Bonanza for sign manufacturers.

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

Sign clutter, even multiple signs at strategic locations. When sign research was carried out some years ago, it was found drivers could only assimilate THREE yes THREE messages, destinations (see the signs on Edinburgh relief road, A720, they are books)
More confusion "is this 20 or 30 or even other".
There would also be a distraction from the Roads Authorities normal routine tasks. I also suspect from experience I have noted that many of the smaller ones have fairly incompetent very inexperienced traffic sections and erratic Scotland wide standards would result. Again a driver difficulty.
Parachuting in consultants with little or no local knowledge is A resented, B not successful for records C very costly by comparison.

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.

What traffic police?

Enforcement, like parking enforcement would be so patchy and inconsistent there would be considerable press, political and driver resentment. At the same time residents in the areas would expect a very high level of enforcement.

I had to deal with many Community groups, pressure groups as well as local members.

Signs are an irrelevance. I use the "Three day rule", when major roadworks are underway, I had notices placed the week before for MAJOR layout changes, first day CHAOS and bewilderment, second day CAUTIOUS approach and negotiation, third day almost normal on new pattern.

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

Govt and LA`s because of order making admin costs and signage, plus local publicity I assume. Motorists nil Other, Police costs if realistic enforcement must rise.

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

No

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?

Please explain the reasons for your response

Irrelevant, we are all drivers, pedestrians, pram pushers, bus passengers, cyclists and in time, old age pensioners.

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

Hard to see bearing in mind points mentioned earlier re enforcement.
Only negative.

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:

Social impact most likely, cannot comment on economic impact unless and doubtful, it reduces casualties as well as accidents.

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?

If present routes that is for example, local connectors, bus routes, with 30 mph were restricted any time advantage over minor roads would be lost thus HIGHLY probable housing road rat runs would emerge. Whilst they can in time and money be partially alleviated this is not the way forward in isolation. Better that an area be restricted overall than a blanket concept as suggested.