

**What is your Community Council -
Community Council**

ABBEY ST BATHANS / BONKYL /
PRESTON

ANCRUM

AYTON

BOWDEN VILLAGE COMMITTEE

BURNFOOT

BURNMOUTH

CARLOPS

CHIRNSIDE

CLOVENFORDS & DISTRICT

COCKBURNSPATH & COVE

COLDINGHAM

CRAILING, ECKFORD & NISBET

DENHOLM & DISTRICT

DUNS

EARLSTON

EDDLESTON & DISTRICT

EDNAM & STICHILL

EYEMOUTH

FLOORS, MAKERSTOUN, NENTHORN
& SMAILHOLM

FOULDEN, MORDINGTON and
LAMBERTON

GAVINTON, FOGO & POLWARTH

GRANTSHOUSE

GREENLAW AND HUME

HAWICK

HEITON & ROXBURGH

HERIOT

HOBKIRK

INNERLEITHEN & DISTRICT (including
CARDRONA)

JEDBURGH

KALEWATER / MOREBATTLE

LAMANCHA, NEWLANDS AND
KIRKURD

LANTON

LAUDERDALE

LEITHOLM, ECCLES & BIRGHAM

NEWCASTLETON

NEWTOWN & EILDON

OXNAM WATER

OXTON & CHANNELKIRK

RESTON & AUCHENCROW

ROYAL BURGH OF SELKIRK &
DISTRICT

SOUTHDEAN

SPROUSTON

ST ABBS

STOW & FOUNTAINHALL

SWINTON AND LADYKIRK

TWEEDSMUIR

UPPER TWEED

WALKERBURN & DISTRICT

WEST LINTON

Any further comments about the 20 mph trial? - Comments

Preston residents are disappointed at the general lack of compliance. Covid19 restrictions should have reduced traffic volumes, it would be good to see how these 20mph work with normal volumes in the summer season.

We surveyed residents and the response was universally very positive from all age groups, but with further work required to encourage driver adherence.

Although at the beginning of the trial most motorists appeared to be adhering to the 20 mph limit, there appears to have been some complacency lately. Generally we feel 20 mph is a good thing for Bowden and should remain. Some concerns were raised about other areas where there is clear road and no pedestrian usage. Remaining at 20mph increases fuel consumption and can cause congestion. Member experienced dangerous tail-gating by delivery drivers possibly trying to stick to a schedule. Increased congestion in towns even when traffic levels are lower due to Covid.

a bike lane and pot holes repaired would be more beneficial to cyclists as they tend to cycle on pathways and can be a danger to walkers. Many drivers do not keep to the 20 mph limit so there is little difference in traffic through Burnmouth.

As a Community we have submitted a series of plans which highlight the opportunities where signage options and double white lines have been identified.

We would propose the following;

1. East End.

a. Traffic calming (chicane/road narrowing/give way) at the 20 mph between the junction and Mabons Place (the first residential road joining after the 20).

b. An electronic speed measuring/warning after Mabons Place in the Old Smiddy area.

2. A6105 at Henderson's Yard.

a. An electronic speed measurer as above, as a reminder when approaching the Waterloo crossroads and onto the school area.

3. Change the 'slow down' at the school approach from the east to a speed measurer as above.

4. Despite knowing the criteria for siting of speed surveys, we still disagree that better consultation with our community over sites, would have resulted in more meaningful results. Our only speed survey point was just before a severe speed bump at a 'school crossing' where traffic is already slow!

The general approach is welcome. We feel the trial itself has not increased walking/cycling directly but has made people feel safer. It is more a result of the Covid lockdown.

In addition we would like to address the problem in the 20 of the undefined footway on the A6105 from Henderson's yard to the ambulance station road. It is frequently parked on by commercial vehicles but is a very important link in local walking routes, users are forced to move into the path of main road traffic, including HGV's.

Those that oppose it tend to strongly do so, but in reality, it is hard to travel over 20mph in much of the area (other than the C130 mentioned above) safely, due to the narrowness of roads. Commercial vehicles, in particular tractors, continually break the speed limit of 20mph on Hoprig Road. Those that are in favour are strongly so.

We regard it a great pity that some people still exceed this, although they were most likely the ones who ignored the 30mph previously.

Overall, the response from our villages has been very positive

We would like the 20 mph zones to be made PERMANENT.

No further comments

The trial and current reduction to 20 mph on the A68 coming into Earlston from the south ignores the often repeated CC request for the limit to be moved south of the bridge over the Leader. Cycling opportunity and safety for users would be made possible by completion of the third and final of multi use path to Leaderfoot begun approx 3 years ago.

Eddleston CC is delighted with the 20mph trial and we can confirm it has improved walking and cycling rates around the village. It has also had a positive impact on the independence of our young people when moving around the settlement and for those residents who require time to cross the road. Across all generations, pedestrians and cyclists are feeling safer as well as car drivers turning out onto the A703. We're very happy with the communication and responsiveness from council officers throughout the trial period. We feel our feedback was always taken on board and views listened to. Compliance with the 20mph and 40mph zones is still an issue and we would like to see more deployment of mobile speed cameras and other deterrents. The speed indicators do have a positive impact. We would very much like to maintain the current arrangements permanently.

Most of the comments I here are about the many drivers who just ignore the 20mph speed limit. This has become more frequent the longer the trial has gone on. During School run times the roads and pavements are busy and this has made it safer. Many motorists have complained however these are usually complaints from people who think 30 was too slow. The overall feeling in the town is the area is safer for everyone and it should stay 20mph.

There is a surprisingly high level of support for the 20mph limits, such that people would be disappointed if they were withdrawn.

Any reduction of speeds and enforcement is helpful.

As a pedestrian, -

the A 6105 is nonetheless a very busy, fast and dangerous road to walk on, with vehicles not adhering to the speed limits (whatever they are) and without any form of footpath at the east end. The absence of the lack of footpath at the west end (where many more people walk) was so dangerous that the community council and a local landowner have donated and constructed a new path off their own bat.

As a cyclist -

the same above applies - the road is dangerous, and any reduction in speed will help cyclists. The 6105 is dangerous for cyclists whatever the speed, as large and wide vehicles commonly use the road, and often exceeding the speed limits.

As a driver -

Any effective improved safety measure helps, however it remains a very busy road, being the spine road into the Borders north of the Tweed.

Much of the money allocated to Spaces for People would have been better being quietly spent on Footpaths.

Although the speed limit in Gavinton is generally popular we believe it has had only a marginal effect on pedestrian and cyclist activity.

More generally some members of the community council have certain misgivings concerning the 20mph speed limits throughout the area. Specifically the extent and design of the 20mph restrictions in Duns and on the A68 in Earlston received criticism.

I would like to explore electronic warning signs

The Community Council feel for those who regularly walk and cycle they will continue to do so regardless of the 20mph, however, 20 mph encourages more families to walk and cycle together.

HCC would like to see all streets within our town revert back to 30mph as soon as possible, except streets with schools located on them.

The part of Heriot around the Heriot Primary School school MUST be reduced to 20mph. We cannot understand why this area was omitted from the trial. It makes absolutely no sense, for example, to limit the speed to 20mph on a safe, wide, trunk road with footpaths through Stow, whilst retaining a national speed limit past a primary school with no footpaths, poor visibility where primary school age children are regularly present

Highly successful and well worth continuing

Because traffic is slowed down and obviously much quieter it does make pedestrians less observant when crossing a road.

It is however appropriate in areas where younger children might be out playing unattended

In Morebattle, this speed limit has been very well received , as the School is at one end of the village, and there is a narrow winding road, with poor visibility at the other end. Also, there is a blind summit in the midst of the village, where the road narrows.

The trial is really important to encouraging people to walk, cycle and ride. It also gives people time to avoid some of the potholes on the road.

We were pleased to see 20mph in Lanton as we have single track roads with steep, soft verges and no pavements for pedestrians to take cover

I cant think of anything negative to say about it, its quieter, safer and hopefully will make people think about chosing to jump in the car especially for short jurnies.

Maybe a consultation before it was introduced might have been wiser than simply taking the government's money for a hair brained scheme that wasn't thought through. Implementing decisions WITHOUT proper consultation means we have been accused of making decisions without community engagement. This 'delayed' consultation is not helpful.

More speed bumps in the new streets in Newtown st boswells would be a huge benefit for the speeding drivers currently using this street as a racetrack

The introduction of the 20 mph trial has made a big impact , with a lot of delivery vans being a bit more aware of the speed they normally come into the village, with a visible reduction in speed.

With the expectation of a vast increase in traffic coming through Reston due to the New railway station, we welcome the new speed limit as well as look forward to the new speed sign soon to be in place. Already with the construction traffic for the station, with an excess of 40 lorries per day at present, the new speed limit has been encouraging.

The main concerns we hear about the 20mph limit are to do with enforcement, a sure-fire way of ensuring compliance would be to start prosecuting speeders

In Chesters it has been ineffective as a measure to slow down traffic, and will remain ineffective unless there is enforcement. (The same applies to the previous 30mph limit). The Community Council accepts that there are guidelines as to where the traffic sensors are placed for the surveys, however the guidelines lead to the sensors being sited 10 metres from a right angle bend in the road where traffic has right down slowed to take the bend. The surveys therefore do not reflect the overall speed of traffic through the village. The reality is that through traffic in general approaches the bend at excessive speed, brakes to take the bend at low speed, then accelerates to leave the village at excessive speed.

We fully support the reduction from 40 mph to 30 mph on the B6350 through Sprouston village and for this to become permanent along with any electronic speed indicator signs.

Likewise the internal roads & streets within the village ie to be permanently reduced from 30 mph to 20 mph (although most of these were covered previously by the 20's Plenty - due to being close to the primary school).

We had considered possibly allowing Station Road to revert back to 30 mph however there are two housing developments (with planning permission for 16 and 18 houses respectively), with access roads coming off Station Road near Calvin Cottage, that we consider that it should remain as 20 mph as per the current trial.

Under the present trial a number of motorists on Station Road are travelling at excessively high speeds (even way beyond the previous 30 mph). What we need is some enforcement of the speed limit and also some more repeater signs (there is only one at the moment).

Our Community area also covers Lempitlaw where a trial 20 mph has been introduced. We have consulted with a few residents there to find out their views and it seems that most are in favour of retaining it as 20 mph.

Given the nature of the roads around St Abbs and the amount of on street parking especially at visitor peak times, the appropriateness of the 20mph limit seems self-evident.

The Parish of Stow Community Council and Stow Community Trust's joint response to the SBC consultation on the 20mph speed reduction trials

The community of Stow has long recognised the harm from traffic on the local community, particularly the impact on young children and their families and their ability to walk or cycle to school. The pandemic and reduced traffic levels heightened the community's awareness of the environmental impact of speeding traffic in the village. It has helped us to appreciate our local environment, the benefits of walking and cycling, the quality of life that we want to enjoy and our aspirations for our local community.

The implementation of the reduced speed limits has been widely supported by local drivers who are aware of its importance and have changed their driving habits accordingly. These developments have certainly resulted in reductions in the speed that vehicles travel through the village and our ability to enjoy our natural heritage and enjoy walking and cycling around the village. The groups who have benefitted most are children, older people and people with disabilities. The groups who are seldom heard in the social media frenzy and speed and driving.

"When vehicles drive at 20mph it is fantastic. Crossing the road is a lot less scary, no horrible wind drag that pulls you into the truck, much reduced noise pollution. All together a better experience as resident, driver and pedestrian".

Stow Community Trust and the Community Council have supported Scottish Borders Council's communication and media events in the village as well as contributing to national media discussions on speed reducing measures and cycling e.g. BBC Scotland's Call Kay The local windfarm community funds in partnership with the community council has funded two speed indicators that have now been erected in Stow.

When the trial started most vehicles respected it but know most would appear to be ignoring it.

We have noticed that a lot of vehicles, including HGV do not adhere to speed limits in local villages.

It is not working in Broughton. It does NOT help cyclists who have to either cycle along the footpath or in the middle of the road due to the appalling state of the A701 through Broughton.

Most drivers drive slower, although some still ignore it completely. In general, it is a success and motorists are driving slower and safer.

Anecdotally, the trial has reduced the speed on the A702 (speed surveys will determine this empirically), however there are a relatively large minority of drivers that still travel in excess of 30mph, overtake in the 20mph area or tail-gate drivers in front of them.

To the extent it has reduced the average speed we consider lower limit to be a success. Enabling it across (almost) all roads in the Borders makes it easier to follow as it is a blanket speed, unlike Edinburgh where one does not know what the speed limit is!

Are there any locations where you'd like to see a 'buffer' speed limit introduced? - Please be specific about which streets.

Preston currently has a 20mph limit which appears to be largely ignored. There is an electronic slow down sign at one end of the village and we have today been informed that a further sign will be placed at the village end. A 30mph buffer from the Dund side of the Cumledge Mill junction might go some way to reducing speed from that direction.

We have three entrances to the village; all have a 60mph speed limit, dropping to 20.

Some drivers take a few minutes to adjust to the change, so don't brake fast enough and are still traveling too quickly as they enter the village. Our lack of pavements can mean that this puts children and adult pedestrians alike at risk.

Residents have requested additional measures to slow cars down at all three entrances.

1) A68 junction with B6400 over Ancrum Bridge. Although the sharp corner after the 20mph sign does slow traffic on the B6400 down, traffic travelling towards Denholm along South Myrescroft can continue quite quickly. This is also the most frequently used entrance to the village. Residents have requested speed limit reductions from the bridge. This part of the road is used frequently by pedestrians and cyclists.

2) The B6400 entering the village from the west (Lilliesleaf); the road is straight and motorists are not responding fast enough to the drop in speed limit, so they are travelling quickly into the village, and past the Glebe entrance where children often play

3) Entering the village from Denholm on South Myrescroft. This is a straight section of road and only short, so motorists don't seem to be adhering as much to the 20mph signs as in other areas of the village.

None

Yes on Newhall straight travelling South from Amazondean junction to gateway.

Yes on between Rutherford Castle Junction to Gateway heading north

1. We considered the A6105 at the west end of Chirnside. Should there be a 30 leading into the 20 area around the Waterloo crossroads? Or a 40 before the 30/20 On the approach to the junction. See comments on reversion. This area despite not having houses on the west/south side is crossed frequently by pedestrians accessing footpaths into the farmland, including the 'Philosophers Paths'. We have had comments that even at a theoretical 30, crossing if elderly/with young or dogs can be hazardous.
2. We have been considering a 40 on the approach to the east end of the village. Currently the 20 is entered directly from a national speed limit (60). We propose a 40 at the east end around the A6105/B6437. See further comments below.

Yes, a buffer on old A1 (now C130) southern entrance to village of Cockburnspath. Currently the speed limit goes from 60mph to 20mph (not uncommon) but a buffer of 40mph from the Abbey St Bathans road end to The Mount, after which the 20mph begins would be greatly appreciated, to slow traffic as they enter the village. At present, the traffic travelling along the C130 doesn't slow going through the 20mph area, and as it is so short at this point, speed limit is virtually unenforceable.

A1107 currently has a buffer of 40mph from Lawfield to just past East Law cottages. We would (as would the residents who have made repeated representation) like to see this 40mph reduced to 20mph also. If this is deemed not possible, 30mph would be more acceptable than the 40mph at present.

There is some support for this on the approaches to Nisbet.

It would be advantageous to have 30 mph Buffer Zones on the A698 at east and west entries to Denholm, by EXTENDING the existing limited zones - this would give drivers a better opportunity to decelerate PRIOR to entering the 20 mph zones.

Countdown markers approaching Duns from Preston on the A6112.

All three main routes A68 x 2 and A6105 require sensible buffer zones with clear signage to reduce from 60 to 20 with clearly identified steps between.

A68 signs coming from the north are immediate after the final bend but difficult to see.

We would like to keep our 40mph buffer zone to the north and south of the village.

No

It was discussed and agreed the buffer signs are confusing on the way into Coldingham and it would be good to avoid excess signage.

Already introduced in Smailholm and much appreciated by residents.

We have a 40mph buffer speed limit at the east end of Foulden on the A6105.

We would like this to be reduced to 30mph with 3/2/1 countdown signs on the approach.

We would also like an active speed indicator situated on the approach from the east to the Kerrigan way junction, where pedestrian activity and numbers of turning vehicles ramp up considerably.

The west end improvements will help greatly, the east end is still lacking reminder and enforcement.

We would like you to extend the 30mph buffer zone on the A6105 approach to Duns from Gavinton, westward to the point of the original 40mph sign.

None

Wester Row , Edinburgh Road, Coldstream Road and Duns Road.

Buffer zones have already been established within Hawick

B709 from A7 to Sandyknowe junction would be more sensibly reduced to 40mph in order to reduce driver confusion and the amount of signage at Sandyknowe.

20mph would be OK in the Burrows.

I think the flashing lights with the "smiley face" should be at the edge of town signifying that you are coming to a 30mph restriction

Definitely. We are speaking to Scottish Borders Council about introducing a 40MPH trial at Blyth Bridge on the A701. Vehicles coming from the south at 60MPH are using the gradient to slow down as they enter the village at the Old Mill end and are sometimes passing the entrance to the children's playpark at speeds in excess of 40MPH. The pavement and the road are one!

I think the Stow Road into Lauder Would benefit as was discussed at the last meeting. Between the town limit and the first junction

On both entrances to the village north and south prior to the old 30MPH zone starting.

No roads to have buffer speed limit leading into the village,

Reston

Unnamed road alongside school past 'Braehead Cottages' - road is a national speed limit i.e. 60 mph speed limit. Road was never changed or speed limit never reduced when road was changed as a link to the A1-during the Houndwood bypass dual carriageway. This road serves over 10 properties and a busy working farm, numerous complaints reported to the Police and SBC over speeding vehicles, as this is a 60 mph zone no enforcement can be carried out. We require this to be changed to either a 20mph zone or 30 mph zone.

Auchencrow

Although not part of the study, 20 mph restrictions have been put in place. Auchencrow is served by a narrow road B6438 which is a 60 mph area coming down into Auchencrow via the road locally named as 'Mickie's Brae', several unrecorded accidents have taken place due to speeding vehicles coming down the hill into a narrowing of the road at the entrance to the village. We would like the 20mph zone increased to cover the properties, to provide safe ingress and egress from the properties and to prevent further accidents.

We would welcome buffer zones on the approaches to Chesters before the 20mph limits are reached – on Chesters Brae and on the A6088 approaching Chesters from the West and also from the South. However we believe these buffer zones should be in addition to the existing 20mph limit, and should not be used to reduce the extent of the 20mph zone. The entirety of Chesters should be 20mph.

In Stow we would like a 40mph buffer outside of the current 20mph limit. It is unacceptable that residents at the extremities, who still have to cross and walk along the road, are not considered equally to those in the centre. The residents at the extremities of Stow feel it is very necessary to have the whole settlement at 20mph. We have regularly asked SBC to consider buffer limits beyond the existing 20mph limit and would like to request this again.

No locations.

Please can the Junction from the A701 to Tweedsmuir be considered for speed reduction. Either pedestrian signage, reduction in speed or reviewed as a new case.

A72 approaching Peebles Road from Innerleithen. Partially hidden awkward turning from High Cottages and busy garage workshop are located at the start of the 20 mph limit and vehicles are leaving a long straight stretch of road before having to brake suddenly to slow to 20 mph.

Bogsbank Road and Deanfoot Road ("Moor Road" section)

walking change	cycling change	- view - A Pedestrian	view - A Cyclist	- view - A Driver
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Great Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Undecided	Good Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Undecided	Good Idea	Not the Best
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------	------------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Good Idea	Good Idea	Undecided
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------	------------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------	-----------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------	------------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------	-----------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Undecided
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Not the Best
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Good Idea	Good Idea	Undecided
No difference to walking	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Not the Best	Not the Best	Terrible

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Undecided	Undecided	Great Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Not the Best	Not the Best	Terrible
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Not the Best	Not the Best	Terrible
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
No difference to walking	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Terrible	Terrible	Terrible
People are more likely to walk	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Good Idea	Undecided
No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Not the Best
People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Good Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	-----------	------------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	------------	------------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	------------	-----------

No difference to walking	People are more likely to cycle	Good Idea	Good Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	------------	------------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Good Idea	Not the Best
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------	-----------	--------------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------	------------	-----------

No difference to walking	No difference to cycling	Good Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------	------------	------------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Great Idea
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	------------	------------

People are more likely to walk	People are more likely to cycle	Great Idea	Great Idea	Good Idea
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	------------	-----------