

RURAL ECONOMY AND CONNECTIVITY COMMITTEE

RESTRICTED ROADS (20 MPH SPEED LIMIT) (SCOTLAND) BILL

SUBMISSION FROM [SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL]

Finance and Constitution Committee Questionnaire

This questionnaire is being sent to those organisations that have an interest in, or which may be affected by the [Restricted Roads \(20 mph speed limit\) \(Scotland\) Bill FM](#).

In addition to the questions below, please add any other comments you may have which would assist the Committee's scrutiny of the FM.

Consultation

1. Did you take part in any consultation exercise preceding the Bill and, if so, did you comment on the financial assumptions made? **YES and YES in general terms.**
2. If applicable, do you believe your comments on the financial assumptions have been accurately reflected in the FM? **YES It is good to see that an effort has been made to capture the potential costs associated with the Bill. I remain concerned however that a number of assumptions have been made that are not accurate (at least for some authorities) and the likely costs associated with the Bill are still potentially significantly under estimated.**
3. Did you have sufficient time to contribute to the consultation exercise? **YES, but not in terms of being able to make an accurate assessment of costs.**

Costs

4. If the Bill has any financial implications for your organisation, do you believe that they have been accurately reflected in the FM? If not, please provide details. **NO, Fundamental error at Section 40 in assuming that all authorities would, in the absence of the Bill, be introducing area-wide 20 mphs. A number of authorities have previously made it clear that this was not their intention. As such any costs associated with this would be new costs. Similarly, contrary to Section 43, many authorities no longer have the resource to undertake regular monitoring of speeds and only do so on request or not at all. Before and after surveys would be a significant and costly exercise that many authorities would need to externalise at considerable cost.**
5. Do you consider that the estimated costs and savings set out in the FM are reasonable and accurate? **NO These appear to be significantly under estimated and require further work. In particular the savings assumptions which, for the reasons outlined above, are erroneous.**
6. If applicable, are you content that your organisation can meet any financial costs that it might incur as a result of the Bill? If not, how do you think these costs

should be met? **NO** Not confident at all that this authority would be in any position to absorb the costs associated with this Bill. This is a new significant pressure for Councils at a time when they are already being asked to make drastic cuts and savings on a regular basis and any costs associated with implementing the Bill should be met centrally.

7. Does the FM accurately reflect the margins of uncertainty associated with the Bill's estimated costs and with the timescales over which they would be expected to arise? **NO** For the reasons previously outlined.

Wider Issues

8. Do you believe that the FM reasonably captures any costs associated with the Bill? If not, which other costs might be incurred and by whom? **NO** In addition to the previous comments, staff resource is likely to be a significant issue for smaller authorities; the majority of which are likely to need to employ consultants to design, consult and implement proposed changes.

9. Do you believe that there may be future costs associated with the Bill, for example through subordinate legislation? If so, is it possible to quantify these costs? **Not clear at this stage.**