

[REDACTED]

5 March 2012



Andrew Pope
Policy Manager
Transport Scotland
Forth Replacement Crossing
Principal Contract Project Office
King Malcolm Drive
Rosyth KY11 2DY



Dear Mr Pope

**CONSULTATION – M9/A90/M90 TRUNK ROAD (KIRKLISTON TO HALBEATH)
(VARIABLE SPEED LIMITS AND ACTIVELY MANAGED HARD SHOULDER)
REGULATIONS 2012 AND THE A823 (M) TRUNK ROAD (PITREAVIE TO MASTERTON)
(VARIABLE SPEED LIMITS) REGULATIONS 2012**

I acknowledge receipt of your letter and information pack setting out the details of the proposals to make Regulations under section 17 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 and I am grateful for the opportunity to provide comment on these proposals.

The Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT) Scotland is the trade association for the bus, coach and light rail industries, with our members operating over 90% of the registered bus network in Scotland. As such we clearly welcome the proposals to use variable speed limits and the creation of an actively managed hard shoulder, which will allow specified buses and coaches to use sections of the hard shoulder as a bus lane. It is very much hoped that these initiatives will help to keep traffic moving and allowing buses and coaches to bypass congestion when it occurs.

Having reviewed the proposals I would make the following comments:

- We welcome the suggestion not to apply the lower speed limit to a vehicle if that vehicle passed below the relevant gantry within ten seconds of the lower speed limit being applied, following the course of action taken by the DfT in England.
- As this is the first scheme in Scotland to propose active use of the hard shoulder as a bus lane, we believe it is vital that the appropriate information and rules on using the hard shoulder bus lanes is issued widely to bus and coach operators. We would be happy to assist with the dissemination of information through our membership network.
- We note that the proposed bus lane will be discontinuous due to the presence of slip roads at junctions and we would suggest that it is vital that, where there are breaks in the bus lane, signage warning of the “end of the bus lane”, should be placed well in advance to allow buses and coaches to rejoin the main carriageway traffic flow.

[REDACTED]

- The provision of emergency refuge lay-bys is welcomed; however, we would seek further information on what safety measures will operate where a vehicle enters an emergency refuge lay-by.
- We note that the proposed 2012 regulation will restrict use of the hard shoulder as a traffic lane to buses and coaches which can carry more than 28 passengers. We would suggest that this should be reduced to 24, this being typically the minimum passenger capacity of a PCV. In order to provide further clarity here, the Regulations should clearly specify whether this relates to total passenger capacity, including standing passenger, in order to avoid any confusion on this matter.
- We would welcome further information on what enforcement measures will be put in place to ensure that the proposed bus lanes are not abused.
- We understood, from earlier discussions, that there was the potential for the provision of a hard shoulder bus lane on the M9 spur southbound, between Humble Rail Bridge and Newbridge Interchange, has this been dropped from these proposals, or will it be done under a different order?
- We note that it is intended that the bus lane will operate at least for the duration of the construction of the Forth Replacement Crossing project. However, we would ask that, subject to successful monitoring throughout its initial enforcement, consideration be given to the possible extension of the scheme into a permanent infrastructure improvement.

I would again thank you for allowing CPT Scotland the opportunity to comment on these proposals. Please do not hesitate to contact me direct should you require any further information or clarification on any of the points we have set out in our response.

