

Jamie.Greene.msp@parliament.scot,
"Smyth C (Colin), MSP" <Colin.Smyth.msp@parliament.scot>,
to: "Finnie J (John), MSP" <john.finnie.msp@parliament.scot>,
mike.rumbles.msp@parliament.scot
date: 4 Oct 2019, 22:02
subject: Transport Scotland Bill, amendments 174 and 175

To: party Transport spokespersons in the Scottish Parliament

Jamie.Greene.msp@parliament.scot
Smyth C (Colin), MSP
Finnie J (John), MSP
mike.rumbles.msp@parliament.scot

Dear MSP

I am emailing from Spokes, to urge you to support amendments 174 and 175 (particularly 174) to the Transport Bill, regarding the simplification of Traffic Regulation and Redetermination Orders (TRO/RSOs)

<https://www.parliament.scot/parliamentarybusiness/Bills/108683.aspx>

The reasons why this issue so concerns us were laid out in our letter to the Cabinet Secretary on 22 July 2019...

<http://www.spokes.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/1907-Traffic-Orders-letter-to-Minister-FINAL.pdf>

As you can see, our concerns are based on experience in Edinburgh which even now is severely delaying (by well over a year) various major active travel projects, despite these projects already having undergone several rounds of consultation and amendment. As mentioned in the letter, the Transport Conveners of both Edinburgh and Glasgow also support change.

As you will be aware, a proposal to amend the Bill so as to change the rules on TRO/RSOs was discussed and rejected at the RECC on 26 June. Although we were very disappointed, we were pleased to see the sensitive debate and the clear appreciation by most Committee members that there was an issue - but the Committee felt the details and complexities needed more extensive discussion and consultation. We understand that Transport Scotland is indeed now in the process of consultations on these details, with relevant bodies such as local authorities.

However, the new amendment 174 now proposed merely amends the Transport Bill such that these detailed matters on the treatment of TRO/RSOs could be handled under Secondary legislation rather than requiring a new Act. This makes a great deal of sense and we very much hope that your party will be able to support it.

With thanks
Dave du Feu
for Spokes