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**Foreword**

The government’s own figures show that traffic on our roads is increasing at an alarming rate. Because of this, the impact that road traffic has on our society is worsening. I am greatly concerned that we need to take active steps to reduce road traffic and reduce its negative impacts.

At the same time, the contents of my mail bag suggest that our transport system is not working as well as it could be. From congested cities to remote rural communities, whether a pedestrian, passenger, cyclist or a motorist, most people agree our transport system could be a lot better.

I’m proposing a relatively simple Bill that I believe will spur Ministers to promote alternatives to road traffic. I have held meetings with transport organisations and other stakeholders, and have had very encouraging feedback with many messages of support from those involved in providing and using transport in Scotland.

The Scottish Executive believes that road traffic growth cannot continue, and has committed itself to a target of reducing road traffic levels to 2001 levels by 2021. But this long-term target is meaningless without short-term strategies and goals. Today’s Ministers are unlikely to be in place in 17 years’ time. To be effective, we need Ministers to set targets for which they can be held accountable. This Bill proposal ultimately, is about accountability.

This consultation paper will help decide how this legislation will work in detail, so I’d like to encourage responses from as wide a range of individuals, and organisations with an interest in transport, as possible.

The responses to this consultation will shape the legislation that is put before Parliament to improve our transport system – it is your chance to have a say.

I would warmly welcome your response, and will give it full consideration.

Yours

Chris Ballance MSP
South of Scotland
Moving On - A Green Transport Bill for Scotland
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Executive Summary

Road traffic levels are predicted to rise by almost one third over the next two decades, while overall public transport use has plummeted over the last 20 years. Road traffic congestion and pollution cause a wide range of social and environmental impacts and these problems will get significantly worse if road traffic continues to rise.

Experts agree there are a range of measures that could be used to reduce levels of road traffic if there is the political will to put such measures in place.

The Scottish Executive agrees with this outlook on road traffic and has committed itself to a long-term target of reducing road traffic levels to 2001 levels by 2021.

However, Chris Ballance, MSP for South of Scotland Region, believes this target may not be achieved unless successive Executive administrations are required to set interim targets between now and 2021 and be obliged to take action to meet those targets.

Chris is lodging a Green Transport Bill that will require Scottish Executive Ministers to set interim targets between now and 2021, to make public their plans for achieving them, and to report on their progress.

The consequence of having to reduce the amount of people and goods moved by road will be a more socially and environmentally friendly transport system.

Chris is seeking the views of those with an interest in transport to respond to this Bill proposal. Details of how to respond are given at the end of this consultation document.
Introduction

Transport is an important area of Scottish Executive responsibility. The way people and goods are moved around has an impact on jobs and the economy, on communities and social inclusion, and on the environment that we live in.

Over the past 40 years our transport system has been revolutionised, with a motorway building programme, the closure of railway stations and lines, cutbacks in bus services and the privatisation of public transport.

Awareness of the problems caused by too much traffic is not new. In 1963, a groundbreaking report on the problems of congestion and traffic growth, “Traffic in Towns: A study of the long-term problems of traffic in urban areas” was published. Since then, road traffic has grown by leaps and bounds, and increasingly short trips that once would have been made on foot or cycle are now made by car.

Over the years regular transport acts have been passed in both Westminster and in Holyrood. The Scottish Executive itself believes that road traffic growth is not sustainable and must now be halted. The Executive has set a target of bringing road traffic back to the levels they were in 2001 by the year 2021. However there is concern that those Ministers who have set this target are unaccountable for reaching this target because they are unlikely to be in office in 2021. Thus, declaration of an intention to meet this target may not result in any action unless current Ministers are made responsible for making some progress towards the 2021 target.

Chris Ballance MSP has lodged a proposal in Parliament for a Green Transport Bill to address this issue.

This Bill sets interim targets to reduce traffic levels.

The proposal reads: “a Bill to require Ministers to provide transport targets and plans aimed at stabilising road traffic at 2001 levels and which reduce climate change emissions and promote socially and environmentally sustainable transport alternatives.”

Chris believes that the imposition of interim targets for road traffic reduction will oblige Ministers to change the direction of transport policy in Scotland away from road traffic towards more socially and environmentally sustainable alternatives.
Outline of the Problem: Impacts of Road Traffic

Road traffic can cause a wide range of social and environmental problems. Some of these impacts of road traffic are described below. It is the intention of the Green Transport Bill that by reducing the amount of road traffic the extent of these negative impacts will be reduced.

Health

Traffic fumes continue to harm public health and make life a misery for people with respiratory conditions like asthma. Over 2,000 deaths a year in Scotland are now attributed to health-damaging particulates from vehicle emissions. The Scottish Executive’s walking strategy consultation document notes that “Studies have also shown that levels of pollutants can actually be higher inside the car than walking in the street. Road users travel in a ‘tunnel’ of pollution with those at the centre of the tunnel tending to be exposed to higher levels of pollutants than those on the road side. For this reason exposure levels tend to be highest for those travelling in cars and lower for pedestrians and cyclists.”

A research team for the Calor gas company recently devised a “cigarette equivalent” ranking for emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) from road traffic. According to a September 2004 press release, emission levels for George Square in Glasgow equate to smoking nearly 15 cigarettes over a 24-hour period, with Aberdeen coming in a close Scottish second at just over 13 cigarettes. Public awareness of the health impacts of passive smoking is at an unprecedented high, yet there seems to be unquestioning acceptance of road traffic pollution, where according to the Calor material “The [UK] Government’s stated target for average NOx levels is 21 parts per billion – the equivalent of 12 cigarettes a day.”

A further health impact is the increasing incidence of obesity in schoolchildren, sometimes leading to early onset diabetes, as walking and cycling decline and parents switch to the car for the journey to school. Dr Stuart Biddle of the British Heart Foundation and National Centre for Physical Health and Activity, in an interview for the World Service, was asked what single measure he would introduce to improve the cardiac health of the nation, if he were given unlimited funds, and the power to implement any scheme. He replied that his scheme wouldn’t cost anything – the single thing most likely to improve heart health would be for every child to walk to school.

The Economy

Traffic is also strangling the economy. The CBI has estimated that congestion costs the British economy £20 billion each year. In the city of Edinburgh alone, congestion accounts for some 15,000 ‘lost hours’ wasted per day – £173,000 per day at the Scottish average wage, £47 million per annum and forecast to nearly double by 2021.

Some local authorities have been reluctant to develop road traffic reduction targets as encouraged by the Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997 on the basis that there is a direct link between traffic growth and economic growth. Historically the two have undeniably been linked, and of course transport is fundamental to much economic activity. But, as the Transport Planning Society has observed, “As the transport intensity of an economy increases it becomes less efficient. The transport intensity of the UK is increasing. This is highlighted by the difference of 24% between traffic growth and economic growth 1970–1995.”

The European Federation for Transport and the Environment puts the case succinctly: “We should view transport like other inputs to our growing economy by ensuring we use as little as possible for as great a benefit as possible, rather than simply trying to use ever more and more transport without regard to how efficient it is. We need to be as efficient with its use as we are with resource consumption, energy use or labour productivity.”
Social Exclusion

Many people are excluded from carrying out activities that depend on having a car. The gravity of this social exclusion is recognised by the government, and various studies have been commissioned by both Westminster and the Scottish Executive, most recently the Department for Transport’s report on “Social exclusion and the provision of public transport” published in June 2004.

The report concluded “it is now necessary to travel ever-increasing distances to access almost everything (shopping, work, education, leisure, health etc), even in some parts of the inner city”

The Scottish Executive’s 2001 paper on ‘The Role of Transport in Social Exclusion in Scotland’ found that women, the unemployed, elderly, people with health problems and those in low income groups are more likely to experience transport related social exclusion.

For example major supermarkets are planned and sited for car users, out of town. Those without cars who cannot readily access them are left only with local shopping whose viability has been damaged by the large supermarkets. This can mean that the people least able to pay are faced with higher prices and a poorer selection of stock – particularly fresh fruit and vegetables and healthy cuts of meat.

Children of the poorest families in society are more likely to be killed in road traffic accidents than those from the richest portion of society (see below: ‘Accidents and Injuries’).

Environment

The environmental impact of road traffic is well documented. The Department for Transport’s paper on “The Future of Transport – Protecting the Environment” notes that “the negative impacts of transport on the environment affect all of us. These include emissions of greenhouse gases, air pollutants, noise, and damage to both the natural and built environments.”

Climate change

Climate change or global warming is recognised as the greatest environmental crisis facing humanity. UK Prime Minister Tony Blair recently called climate change “the world’s greatest environmental challenge ... a challenge so far-reaching in its impact and irreversible in its destructive power, that it alters radically human existence.” The UK Government’s own chief scientific adviser says climate change is a more serious threat to the world than international terrorism, and without serious action, millions more people around the world may in future be exposed to the risk of hunger, drought, flooding and debilitating diseases such as malaria.

Pollution from our reliance on private cars and heavy lorries is making climate change worse. Transport is currently responsible for about a quarter of total UK CO₂ emissions. In the short term, emissions of carbon from road transport are expected to rise by about 10 per cent from 2000 levels by 2010.

Transport is also the source of emissions of some of the other gases that contribute to climate change. These include methane and nitrous oxide, present in exhaust emissions, and also gaseous emissions from refrigerants used in air conditioning systems in cars. These gases all have high capacities to increase global warming.

Climate change cannot now be prevented but we can take steps to stop making it worse. Reducing the level of road traffic would reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that are being emitted into the atmosphere.

Technological progress means that cars can and should be less polluting – indeed, in the speech referred to above, Tony Blair himself said that “we must develop far cleaner and more efficient aircraft and cars.” However, placing reliance on less polluting vehicles is not in itself the answer and would do nothing to combat the other negative impacts of excessive road traffic such as congestion and social exclusion. Indeed, the current popularity of “Sports Utility Vehicles” displays a trend towards less rather than more efficient vehicles, and the Department for Transport has observed that, “A significant improvement in vehicle fuel
efficiency is essential for delivery of the UK’s climate change targets” and that, “The increase in carbon dioxide emissions from traffic growth has been compounded by the limited improvements in car vehicle fuel efficiency since mid 1980s.” Alternative fuels such as biofuels offer some scope for reducing climate change emissions, while hybrid cars and fuel cells offer further possibilities, but once again, the important thing is to have fewer cars overall as well as less polluting cars.

Air quality
Road traffic also has an impact on air quality. Over the last decade air quality has improved significantly and projections to 2015 suggest that these trends will continue. However, the downward trend in emissions of two pollutants, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulates (PM10), is likely to level off and could start rising again after 2015 unless further action is taken.

The SEPA Air Quality Report 2000 observes that “Motor traffic emissions are now posing the principal threat to air quality in urban areas. Petrol and diesel engine motor vehicles emit a wide range of pollutants, principally carbon monoxide, nitrous oxide, volatile organic compounds and particulates, which have an increasing impact on urban air quality. Whilst improvements in motor exhaust emission controls and fuel technology have resulted in an improvement in air quality (e.g. lead-in-air), concerns still persist about the elevated levels of air pollution occurring in urban areas; including photochemical smogs or hazes.”

Accidents and Injuries
Unacceptably high numbers of people are also killed and injured on Scottish roads every year. In 2002, over 500 children were killed or seriously injured, contributing to a total of 19,248 casualties including 305 deaths.

Although Scotland’s road safety record is improving, and measures such as the Safer Routes to School programme represent welcome and positive steps, car usage is creeping up. Safer Routes to School’s own publications acknowledge that part of the reason for the decline in children walking or cycling to school is the perception that this is too dangerous.

The Scottish Executive’s report on “Road Accidents And Children Living In Disadvantaged Areas” notes that “The risk of death for child pedestrians is highly class related. The decline in children’s death rates from injury over time has been less for children from the manual social classes than for children from the non-manual social classes, and as a result the socio-economic mortality differentials have increased. Injuries to children from socio-economically disadvantaged families tend to be of greater severity.”
Road Traffic on the Increase

In Scotland, traffic levels are predicted to rise by almost a third over the next 20 years. This is an average figure – for certain areas an even greater increase in traffic is predicted. This is particularly the case in urban areas, where 80% of the 27% overall growth has been forecast in the Executive’s 2002 Transport Delivery Report.17

According to “Scottish Transport Statistics 2004”, “The UK Department for Transport or DfT estimates that the total volume of traffic on Scotland’s roads in 2003 was about 42.0 billion (thousand million) vehicle kilometres, 1% more than in the previous year, and 18% more than the figure for 1993 (the first year for which DfT has estimated the total volume of traffic on all roads in Scotland). It is estimated that the volume of car traffic on major roads has more than doubled, from an estimated 9,300 million vehicle kilometres in 1975 to over 21,900 million vehicle kilometres in 2003. The number of motor vehicles licensed in Scotland in 2003 was nearly 2.4 million, 2% more than the previous year, and 27% higher than the number in 1993.” 18

In the ten years from 1993, the cost of local bus fares has gone up by 19% in real terms19, while motoring costs have remained stable in real terms. This is helping to drive the increase in road traffic.

The problem is therefore that increasing road traffic means increasing the negative impacts of road traffic.
Existing Legislation on Road Traffic

The Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997\textsuperscript{20} placed an obligation on local authorities to assess local traffic levels and forecast growth, and to specify targets for reductions in traffic levels and in the rate of growth of traffic levels. A weakness of the Act is that authorities are not obliged to set targets if they consider it inappropriate, provided that they state their reasons.

Subsequently, The Road Traffic Reduction (National Targets) Act 1998\textsuperscript{21} placed an onus on Scottish Ministers to set and report to the Scottish Parliament, targets for road traffic reduction or “other targets or measures that they consider to be more appropriate for reducing the adverse impacts of road traffic.” These adverse impacts are listed as (a) emission of gases which contribute to climate change; (b) effects on air quality; (c) effects on health; (d) traffic congestion; (e) effects on land and biodiversity; (f) danger to other road users; and (g) social impacts. As with the 1997 Act, there is a flaw in that Ministers can publish whatever targets or measures they deem appropriate, and also in that they do not actually have to make progress in tackling the seven impacts listed.

The Transport (Scotland) Act 2001 provides some tools to enable delivery of the 1997 and 1998 Acts in that it allows local authorities to implement local road user charges, better know as “congestion charging”. It also gave authorities a statutory basis on which to establish bus quality partnership and quality contract schemes, in addition to containing sections on local transport strategies and on home zones. Three years on, the public consultation on congestion charging has only just begun and no bus quality contract schemes are in operation, even though the Executive’s own commissioned research has concluded from a study of best practice in other countries that “In no region or city that can be considered to be delivering better or exemplary practice in transport policy implementation is the local roads-based public transport system deregulated; the most successful systems are run on a franchised (quality contract-type) basis.”\textsuperscript{22}

The Scottish Executive’s Review of Local Transport Strategies and Road Traffic Reduction Act Reports\textsuperscript{23} (October 2001) observed that 12 of the 32 authorities did not set any targets and that “Many authorities have made a direct link between economic growth and traffic growth and therefore see restrictions on traffic growth as impeding economic growth”, and that despite guidance from the Executive seeking consistency in methodologies there has been considerable variation between local authorities in the methodologies and rationales adopted.\textsuperscript{24} While the review cites multiple instances of good practice, the bottom line remains the same: road traffic continues to increase.

The common flaw linking these pieces of legislation is that while they allow for setting of targets and plans or mechanisms to implement them, they feature no obligation to do so; what is lacking is an obligation to publish a clear strategy for implementing transport policies, an obligation to set targets for road transport levels and a requirement for these to be debated by Parliament.
Scottish Executive Policy on Road Traffic

The Scottish Executive has expressed concern about the growth in road traffic, and has accepted the need to halt this growth.

In 2002 the Scottish Executive said:
“We will therefore strive to stabilise road traffic at 2001 levels (in vehicle kilometres) by 2021, through investing in an integrated package of measures – modernising and improving public transport, promoting alternative modes of transport to the private car, and targeted motorway and trunk road improvements.”

In 2003, “A Partnership for a Better Scotland” stated that “By the end of 2006, Scottish Executive spending on transport will reach £1 billion per year, of which 70% will be targeted on public transport.”

The Scottish Executive’s Transport White Paper was published in June 2004 and is the Executive’s most recent statement of transport policy. This document reiterates the stabilisation pledge made in 2002, although again the commitment is to strive rather than to accomplish.

The Scottish Executive has promised to address the problem, but with 17 years before the due date of their target, it is impossible to hold the Executive accountable for reaching that target. Such a long-term target is meaningless if there is no short and medium-term implementation plan to achieve it, no interim targets against which to monitor progress, no legislative requirement to set targets (interim or long-term) and no requirement to report on them.
Measures to Reduce Road Traffic

Road traffic growth and its associated impacts are not inevitable and there are a wide range of policies and packages available to Scottish Executive Ministers that they could introduce to reduce the growth of road traffic.

A report for the Executive by the Transport Research Institute at Napier University concluded that “Scotland now needs a range of targeted policies and packages of measures that, in particular, will offer practical help to those currently unable to shift, and coerce or persuade those presently unwilling to do so.”

So what sort of policies and packages are available to the Executive?
The most recent paper on the subject, aptly named “Smarter Choices – Changing the Way We Travel” was published by the Department for Transport outlined some of these including:

- workplace travel plans;
- school travel plans;
- personalised travel planning;
- public transport information and marketing;
- travel awareness campaigns;
- car clubs;
- car sharing schemes;
- teleworking;
- teleconferencing, and
- home shopping.

Learning from elsewhere

The city of Copenhagen in Denmark has adopted an overall travel management policy to improve the quality of transport, the urban environment and city life in general. The policy involves computerised traffic management, the development of public transportation, a cycle network and a parking policy. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that environmental criteria are taken into account in the development of the travel management policy. The success of Copenhagen’s travel management policy may be judged against the scale of its road infrastructure network which is no larger now than it was in 1970. Traffic volume has reduced by some 10% below the 1970 level.

The London congestion charging scheme is reducing congestion and pollution while at the same time creating a more pleasant urban environment without hindering the economy. Indications from the first year of operation are that the scheme has led to a reduction in traffic levels of 10–15% and that congestion is down by 30%. Bus use – a London double decker bus carrying up to 80 people and thus replacing a maximum of 80 cars – is up by 38% and bus provision is up by 23%, while service disruption due to traffic delays is down by 60%.

Further examples of good practice across the UK may be seen in the Case Study Report accompanying the “Smarter Choices” report cited in the section above on measures to reduce road traffic. These include workplace and school travel planning in Birmingham, Bristol, Buckinghamshire and Cambridge; car clubs and car sharing plans, which provide mobility for a greater number of people for the same amount of cars and parking spaces, in Bristol, Edinburgh and Milton Keynes; public transport information and marketing in Brighton, Nottingham and South Yorkshire; and further travel awareness plans in York. It is worth noting that York has achieved a 16% journey share for cycling and 12% for walking which is very near mainland European best practice. York has a successful track record in prioritising these modes of transport at a time when other Councils have not done so. York is a UK best practice example and has been recognised as such in the “Transport Authority of the Year Award” in 2003.
The Green Transport Bill

The Green Transport Bill as proposed would oblige Ministers to announce a series of interim targets for road traffic levels between now and 2021.

Ministers would also be required to make public an implementation plan for reaching these targets.

Ministers would also be required to report periodically on progress towards meeting their targets. Parliament would then be able to assess the Executive’s progress in implementing its strategies.

The Bill does not specify what interim targets should be set or specify what action plans should be taken to reach these targets. These decisions would be entirely up to the judgment of Ministers. Consideration could be given to incorporating a requirement to address the seven adverse impacts listed in the 1998 Road Traffic Reduction (National Targets) Act (climate change emissions, air quality, health, congestion, land and biodiversity, danger to other road users, and social impacts) and views on this in responses to the consultation would be particularly welcome.

Why medium term, interim targets?

The transport Minister has refused, during questions in the Chamber, to set interim targets, and when asked in a Written Question on the implementation strategy for achieving the 2021 target, the Minister replied “The Executive is striving to stabilise road traffic volumes at 2001 levels by 2021. This is reaffirmed in paragraph 1.21 of Scotland’s Transport Future. We seek to do this through modernising and improving public transport, investing in cycling and walking and encouraging people to change their travel behaviour.” (S2W-09430, 28 July 2004).

This accountability principle has been accepted by other departments within the Executive. With renewable energy, for example, there is an interim target and a long-term target, and similarly with fuel poverty there is an interim target to reduce the number in fuel poverty by 30% by 2006 as a milestone towards the goal of ending fuel poverty in Scotland within 15 years.

Interim targets and strategy constitute the vital missing link in Scotland’s current approach to transport. We need interim targets in order to prompt action, set priorities and measure progress (or lack of it) year on year. Such targets will mean bigger shifts in spending towards environmentally and socially sustainable transport alternatives because Ministers will have to develop alternatives to road traffic.

Placing a requirement upon Ministers to report will ensure they remain committed to making genuine progress during their term of office, on the basis that they will wish to show progress against key targets for their departments.

This would ensure that real action is taken by the Executive now, rather than passed on to future administrations. There will be a need to ensure that targets are meaningful and to avoid some of the pitfalls of other pieces of legislation such as the Road Traffic Reduction Acts of 1997 and 1998 where the requirements placed upon local authorities to set targets were weakened by exemptions if they considered targets inappropriate or allowed them to set whatever targets they saw fit. Similarly, the fuel poverty targets mentioned above represent an improvement on the Home Energy Conservation Act of 1995 where local authorities were required to report on progress rather than to make progress. Interim targets would need to be linked explicitly to the Executive’s own long term target of stabilizing traffic at 2001 levels by 2021.

Enforcement

There is no intention to introduce a legal penalty to be applied to Ministers if they fail to reach a particular target or to produce an action plan, but it is believed there would be a considerable incentive for Ministers to act because of the public criticism that would accompany any failure to meet the terms of the legislation.
Scrutiny, both in the Chamber of the Scottish Parliament and in Committee, and by transport professionals, offers one of the strongest incentives for Ministers to achieve their stated goals. If targets are enshrined in legislation, Ministers will again be far more likely to act to achieve those targets than if they remain policy statements lacking the gravity of legislation.

**Financial implications of the Bill**

Although this Bill does not dictate how much money should be spent – that is a decision for Ministers – it clearly has financial implications, both in terms of Ministerial, Civil Service and Parliamentary time and of course of the cost of creating and running the programmes necessary to achieve the targets. However, even a “do nothing” or “business as usual” approach has costs, including the £20 billion per year that the CBI attached to congestion for the UK as a whole. Many of the “soft” measures proposed to take forward traffic reduction cost very little, particularly if set in the context of the spiralling costs of the M74 extension, while other measures, such as congestion charging, can actually create an income. The London congestion charging scheme is estimated to have raised £68 million in its first year of operation,\(^{30}\) to be reinvested in further transport enhancement measures, although it should be stressed that reducing congestion, not raising funding, is the primary aim of the scheme. The costs of doing nothing also include the ongoing toll of death and injury and environmental degradation, all of which carry financial as well as human and environmental costs.

The Green Transport Bill does not dictate how the Executive would meet its targets and what its strategy should be, and therefore does not specify spending requirements.

It is of course quite possible that the effect of drawing up a strategy would encourage Ministers to redirect existing transport funding, or even to argue for more funding for transport, but that is not within the Bill itself. Such decisions would be up to the relevant Minister in relation to the delivery of the strategy.
Responding to This Consultation

Chris Ballance MSP is keen to receive feedback to assist in framing the terms of the Green Transport Bill from all interested organisations and members of the public. To assist you in responding to this consultation, here is a list of questions that you may wish to answer:

- What would be the advantages and disadvantages (if any) of requiring the Executive to publish interim targets and transport strategies?

- If these proposals were adopted, with what frequency should targets be set between now and 2021, and how often should the Minister report to Parliament on strategy and progress?

- How specific should the reporting requirement be?

- Should there be an obligation to report alone, or actually to make progress toward targets?

- What should the targets and strategies address?

- What costs do you think would be incurred were this Bill to become law?

- What savings do you think would be incurred were this Bill to become law?

- Are there any other observations that you have about the Bill proposal?

Deadline for responses:
Please submit your response to this consultation exercise by Tuesday 12 April 2005.

Ways to respond:
By email to: andy.macpherson@scottish.parliament.uk

By post to: Andy Macpherson, Room MG.12, Scottish Parliament, Holyrood, Edinburgh, EH99 1SP

By fax: 0131 348 6375, marked ‘for the attention of Andy Macpherson’

Further copies of this consultation paper can be downloaded from: http://www.chrisballancemsp.org or ordered by email from the above address.

Chris Ballance MSP may wish to publish your response to this consultation document. Unless you state otherwise, we will assume that there is no objection to your response being made public. If you do not wish your views to be made public, or if you prefer to remain anonymous, please specify this in your response and we will respect your wishes. We will still count confidential responses in any statistical analysis and your views will be taken into account in the same way as for non-confidential responses.
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