PROPOSED DISABLED PERSONS PARKING (SCOTLAND) BILL

STATEMENT OF REASONS BY JACKIE BAILLIE ON WHY NO FURTHER CONSULTATION IS REQUIRED

Background to proposal
1. In line with Rule 9.14.3 of Standing Orders, my draft proposal for a Disabled Persons Parking (Scotland) Bill was lodged on 16 May 2007. The proposal is for a Bill—

   to enforce disabled persons parking bays

2. A consultation paper on introducing a straightforward method to enforce disabled persons parking spaces was published by me on 20 November 2006 and ran for 14 weeks until 26 February 2007. The main areas of consultation were: a consultation period for new disabled persons parking bays being created, enforcement in private car parks such as supermarkets, who should be responsible for enforcement and the level of fines.

   Over 120 copies of the consultation paper were sent in hard copy to various organisations and individuals with an interest in the issue; recipients were encouraged to bring the consultation to the attention of anyone else they thought might have an interest in the subject matter. In addition I answered requests for up to another 80 copies to be sent out either electronically or in hard copy and one copy was requested and supplied in audio format. The consultation document was also available for download from the Scottish Parliament website.

   A total of 173 substantive responses have been received, 22 from local authorities, 118 from individuals, 32 from organisations and 1 from an MSP. The Transport Working Group (TWG) from Fair Deal\(^1\) organised a petition in support of the principles of the proposal and collected around 1600 signatures.

   The proposal and consultation have also been widely covered by the media.

   A summary of responses and copies of all responses (excluding any made in confidence) have been placed in SPICe.

Statement of reasons
3. In relation to my draft proposal for this Bill, I do not consider that consultation is required for the following reasons:

   - Given that a consultation exercise has been undertaken and completed 3 months ago, I consider that there has been adequate and current

---

\(^1\) The TWG aims to improve transport for adults and children with disabilities in Glasgow. [Fair Deal: Transport Working Group](http://www.fair-deal.org/default.aspx?id=257&n=223&cid=0&rid=0)
opportunity for the public to comment on what is being proposed which in turn will help to test, develop and refine my proposal.

- Further consultation on the same proposal would duplicate effort, incur unnecessary cost and could create an impression of ‘over consultation’

4. I do not consider that a further consultation exercise need be conducted on my proposal for a Bill for the reasons set out above. I believe that there is ample published, current and pertinent information to help test, develop and refine my specific proposal and proceed with the development of the Bill’s policy and its eventual production.

Conclusion

5. I therefore request the Committee to which my draft proposal is referred consider this statement of reasons and confirm that it is satisfied with the reasons for not consulting further on the draft proposal.

Jackie Baillie MSP
16 May 2007