



GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL COMMITTEE

AGENDA

5th Meeting, 2006 (Session 2)

Monday 15 May 2006

The Committee will meet at 10.10 am in Committee Room 1.

1. **Oral evidence on the general principles of the Bill:** The Committee will take evidence from—

Panel 1

Bob Darracott, Director of Planning and Transport, Renfrewshire Council;

Gerard Malone, Deputy Chief Executive, Inverclyde Council;

Ian Johnson, Manager, Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan and Transportation Committee, South Ayrshire Council;

Panel 2

Stewart Whitehill, Transport Manager, Fairline Coaches Ltd;

Ron McAulay, Director, Scotland, Network Rail;

Bill Lynas, Commercial Schemes Sponsor, Network Rail;

John McGlynn, Chairman, Scottish Independent Airport Park and Ride Association;

Panel 3

Simon Wallwork;

Jim Harkins, Managing Director, Light Rail (UK) Ltd;

David Reid, Director, Reid Rail Ltd;

Panel 4

Andrew Shuttleworth, Assistant Chief Officer, Strategic Planning, Strathclyde Fire and Rescue;

David McCall, Assistant Chief Constable, British Transport Police;

Neil Amner, Partner, Biggart Baillie;

Johnny Gwynne, Chief Superintendent, Strathclyde Police;

Calum Murray, Chief Inspector, Strathclyde Police;

Panel 5

John Halliday, Head of Transport Planning and Integration, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;

Douglas Ferguson, Director of Operations, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;

Charles Hoskins, Manager, Projects, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;

David Keddie, Partner, Roger Tym and Partners;

Simon Temple, Director, Faber Maunsell.

Terry Shevlin
Clerk to the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill Committee
85233
Room T2.60
Scottish Parliament
EH99 1EP
terry.shevlin@scottish.parliament.uk

The following papers are attached for this meeting—

Agenda item 1

Written Evidence

[GARL/S2/06/5/1](#)

Written Evidence

[GARL/S2/06/5/1a](#)

**GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL:
WRITTEN EVIDENCE**

Background

1. The written evidence that has been provided by the organisations giving oral evidence at today's meeting is attached at annexe 1. Written evidence has been provided by the following organisations:

Organisation	Page
Renfrewshire Council	2
Fairline Coaches Ltd	12
Network Rail	13
Scottish Independent Airport Park and Ride Association	14
Simon Wallwork	15
Light Rail (UK) Ltd	25
Light Rail Solutions Ltd	28
Strathclyde Fire and Rescue	30

2. Three of these organisations have also made objections to the Bill. These objections (attached at annexe 2) may contain issues that Members wish to discuss at Monday's meeting:

Organisation	Page
Renfrewshire Council	31
Network Rail	34
British Transport Police	39

3. Visit Scotland was invited to give oral evidence but was unable to provide a witness for today's meeting. Written evidence provided by Visit Scotland is attached at annexe 3:

Organisation	Page
Visit Scotland	45

SUBMISSION FROM RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL

1. On the 15th December, 2005 the Council agreed in principle to support the GARL project due to the wider economic and social improvements it would bring to Renfrewshire. The Council's support was however conditional upon the conclusion of satisfactory legal agreements being reached with SPT regarding mitigation and pitch replacement works at St James Playing Fields, Paisley and elsewhere. (A copy of the Council paper is attached).

2. It should also be noted that the Council also agreed on the 15th December, 2005 to write to SPT stressing the need for improvement works to be undertaken at Gilmour Street Station in Paisley.

3. The above points reflect the major concerns held by the Council. The playing fields are owned by ourselves and form a valuable community asset, not just for Renfrewshire but the West of Scotland. The 22 pitches located at St James form one of the largest such grouping of grass pitches in Scotland serving the needs of thousands of amateur football players every year. The Council's stance is therefore to agree the considerable disruption that the rail link will bring (ie effectively severing the site in half) provided the same level of quality of football pitch provision can be continuously guaranteed, throughout the build process and beyond.

The Council's view as regards Gilmour Street Station reflects the fact that this facility requires to be modernised and improved. It is the only proposed stop on the GARL and as such, its general environment needs improved and passenger facilities upgraded. If not, it will reflect very poorly upon the project (when compared with the 2 stations at either end) and potentially undermine the overall investment.

4. The GARL was again considered by full Council on 16th March 2006, following submission of the Private Bill. At this time Council decided to submit a holding objection to the Bill pending conclusion of a satisfactory legal agreement with SPT regarding the playing fields. (Copy of Council paper is attached).

5. The Council's formal objection was lodged with Parliament on 31st March, 2006.

6. At this point, the Council continue to discuss these legal issues with SPT and Draft Heads of Terms are circulating. If these can be concluded to the Council's satisfaction - implying that our various agreements regarding replacement and temporary pitches, new pavilion, access and car parking etc are guaranteed to be delivered within an agreed and enforceable timetable, the Council will withdraw its objection to the Bill.

Agenda Item No

Renfrewshire Council

To: COUNCIL

On: 15TH DECEMBER, 2005

**Report by
Director of Planning & Transport/Director of Environmental Services
GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK (GARL)**

1. Summary

1.1 The report provides a further update on the Glasgow Airport Rail Link (GARL) proposal, currently being promoted by the SPT. On the basis that negotiations over the past 12 months have resolved the Council's primary concerns about the continuing role and function of the St James' Playing Fields, the report also recommends that the Council confirms in principle support for the Rail Link.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That Council note the detail in this report and:-

- a) agree to support the Glasgow Airport Rail Line on condition that a satisfactory legal agreement be reached between the Council and SPT regarding the mitigation works at St James Playing Fields (and elsewhere) as outlined in this report.
- b) write to the SPT regarding Gilmour Street Station, stressing the need for improvement works to be undertaken and funded at the same time as the GARL is being constructed.

3. Background

3.1 Renfrewshire Council considered the GARL proposal initially in April 2003. At that time the Council determined to oppose the rail link due to the impacts this would have on the St James Playing Fields.

3.2 SPT subsequently secured Scottish Executive support to further progress their Stage 1 study into the feasibility of a rail link. As a consequence SPT and lead consultants Faber Maunsell have progressed a number of option appraisals and firmed up on the required technical and financial appraisals. SPT also entered into a public consultation exercise between October 2004 and January 2005. It is important to note that, throughout this time, following SPT's Stage 1 study, the only option being assessed in detail related to a heavy rail line from Glasgow Central, through Paisley Gilmour Street and then branching off to the Airport.

3.3 As a consequence of the above and following various option appraisal exercises the preferred proposal can be described as:

- A new elevated station at Glasgow Airport located immediately to the south of the existing multi-storey car park. The station will be twin track and ultimately be capable of accommodating two trains of up to four cars in length;
- An elevated pedestrian link between the eastern end of the new station and the Airport terminal building, crossing Caledonia Way. The link will be fully enclosed and will include a passageway flanked by travelators;
- A twin track railway viaduct heading westwards from the station;
- A new bridge structure crossing the M8, which will be single span and likely to be of tied arch design;
- A twin track viaduct crossing St. James' park and the Murray Business Area. This viaduct structure will bridge a number of roads, including the A726, McFarlane Street and Clark Street.
- Existing main lines between Paisley St. James' Station and Paisley Gilmour Street Station will then be used.
- From just to the east of Paisley Gilmour Street Station, Wallneuk Junction and Arkleston Junction will then be extensively remodelled in order to accommodate the increased traffic that GARL will generate;
- Between Arkleston Junction and Shields Junction, a stretch of approximately 6km, a new third track will be built. There is sufficient room to place this new track within the existing rail corridor.
- Between Shields Junction and Glasgow Central Station, existing rail lines will be used for GARL;
- At Glasgow Central Station platform 11A will be extended into the train shed. This work will mean construction of new track, the loss of existing short stay car parking spaces within the station as well as the exit ramp from the car park.

3.4 The Council received further reports on the proposal in January and September 2005. From these it is evident that the Council required further information from the SPT regarding the economic justification for the rail line and more specifically about the impacts and consequent mitigation proposals relating to the St James Playing Fields.

3.5 It is evident following the public consultation exercise undertaken by SPT and from subsequent discussions with community and sports groups that the issue of the likely impact on the St James Playing Fields is the primary concern of the majority of Renfrewshire residents.

4. Current Position and Update on Issues Raised in previous reports to Council

4.1 Option Appraisal Issues

- The proposed rail link to Glasgow Airport has been under consideration for around 15 years. During that time 22 different route options and variants have been evaluated. This work culminated in 2003 with the publication of

the 'Rail Links to Glasgow and Edinburgh Airports' report by consultants Sinclair Knight and Merz (SKM). The report was commissioned by the Scottish Executive, BAA Scotland, Strategic Rail Authority, Department of Transport and Scottish Enterprise.

- SKM concluded that the optimum route was the heavy rail link between Glasgow Central, Paisley and the Airport, operating on a 15 minute basis.
- SPT were subsequently awarded funding to undertake the required design and engineering appraisals necessary to lodge a Private Bill before Parliament.
- Amongst the many alternative routes ruled out by SKM were lines running through the Braehead, Renfrew area and leading into the east side of the Airport Terminal. These alternatives were discounted for a number of reasons including:
 - requirement to demolish a large number of private homes, including around 60-70 in Renfrewshire.
 - journey times being greater than the Paisley-Glasgow link option.
 - reduced attraction to airport related passengers, these options being around 25% less attractive to those seeking to travel directly from City Centre to Airport.
 - significantly increased capital and revenue costs.
 - would not fit with the Airport's longer term expansion plans.
- In essence, whilst the securing of improved public transport to serve the growing Renfrew-Braehead area would be attractive, this configuration would undermine the Scottish Executive's primary objective of developing a fast rail connection between city centre and Airport. The Executive determined in 2003 its preferred route. Realistically therefore, there is little scope for the Council to influence this issue at this stage.

4.2 Economic Benefits

- The primary function of this project is to develop a fast, modern and frequent rail based public transport link between Glasgow Central and the Airport. This recognises the fact that the airport continues to grow with its recently issued Masterplan predicting the following:
 - increase in passenger numbers from the current 8.6m per annum to 13m by 2015 and 24m by 2030.
 - increase in employment from existing 5,300 to 8,200 by 2015 and 12,200 by 2030.
- It is also the case that longer term, the environmental benefits of this facility could be significant - ie in encouraging modal shift from car to train and reducing congestion on the M8. It is however recognised by the Executive and SPT that such impacts will be slow to materialise.

- The wider economic benefits suggested by the promoters include:
 - increased train service frequency between Paisley and Glasgow Central (from 8 to 12 per hour).
 - improved access to jobs in and around the airport (note, Glasgow Airport is currently the most significant economic driver in Renfrewshire).
 - improved linkages between the centre of Paisley and the Airport may help the town centre benefit from spin out investment.

SPT commissioned a specific report on this issue, prepared by consultants Rodger Tym and Partners. The “GARL - Assessment of the Wider Economic Benefits” study concluded that:

“the rail link would support continuing employment growth in the wider conurbation of at least:

- ♦ 65 jobs/annum in Glasgow and Renfrewshire - equivalent to 1,300 jobs over 20 years.
- ♦ 5 jobs/annum in Ayrshire and Inverclyde.

enabling the development of new opportunities in Paisley Town Centre of:

- ♦ up to 135,000ft² of office accommodation to accommodate 315-328 net additional jobs indirectly”.
- The rail line itself would employ 67 jobs directly.
- During construction around 270 jobs will be created.
- Whilst there are some significant potential economic benefits for the Renfrewshire economy it should also be noted that the promoters recognise there could be some economic negatives, particularly in relation to the effect the rail line will have on businesses in the Murray Street/Clark Street area. The Council's Economic Development team are currently working with several businesses in this area and the SPT in order to ensure economic disruption is minimised and alternative accommodation is secured for those businesses being displaced.

4.3 St James Playing fields

- The preferred route for the GARL runs through the middle of these playing fields, on a raised viaduct, constructed around 7m above ground. The route then bridges the M8 and runs through to the Airport. The impact of the rail line on the 22 football pitches at St James have been well publicised and widely debated over the past few years. The issue has also been the subject of very detailed discussion between the SPT and officers of the Council - discussions which aimed to assess the full extent of the project's impacts and how these could be mitigated. Without any prejudice to the Council's formal position regarding the GARL, there has been a requirement to assess the operational disruption the line would cause and

to consider how best this important facility could be improved for the longer term benefit of all users and the wider community.

- The outcome of our discussions with SPT has resulted in the following outline agreement:
 - 20 pitches will ultimately be retained at St James.
 - These pitches will benefit from new and improved drainage - designed and constructed to a specification agreed by the Council.
 - The existing changing and grounds maintenance facilities will be re-located and re-built to standards approved by SportScotland. This will provide a new changing room complex to accommodate 40 teams plus officials.
 - The existing car parking facilities will be replaced and improved with the likelihood of an improved number of spaces being provided on site.
 - Additional ball catch fencing will be provided, as required.
 - Additional hard and soft landscaping will be provided around the boundary of the site - to a specification agreed with the Council.
 - 2 new grass pitches of league standard will be provided at Ferguslie Sports Centre and the existing changing accommodation will be improved and extended accordingly.
- During the period of construction, 11 league pitches will be retained to fully operational standard at St James, in the area west of the new railway viaduct. In effect, this implies that for a period of around 18 months, temporary accommodation and pitch capacity requires to be found for the balance, elsewhere in Renfrewshire. This level of provision has been the subject of much discussion between Council and SPT staff. The Director of Environmental Services has now agreed in principle after an extensive option appraisal exercise on the following:
 - *Ferguslie Park, Paisley* - four pitches will be provided by upgrading the existing two pitches to league standard plus constructing two new league standard pitches. The two new league standard pitches will be those that are put in place as part of the permanent replacement. Improvements to the existing changing facilities will be provided and will be of a similar standard to the existing facilities.
 - *Lochend Playing Fields, Paisley* - two pitches will be upgraded to league standard plus provision of temporary changing facilities.
 - *Ralston Playing Fields, Paisley* - two pitches will be upgraded to league standard plus possible extension of existing pavilion or provision of temporary changing facilities.
 - *Seedhill Playing Fields, Paisley* - one pitch will be upgraded to league standard plus possible extension of existing pavilion or provision of temporary changing facilities.
 - *Thomas Shanks Park, Johnstone* - two pitches will be upgraded to league standard plus provision of temporary changing facilities.

All these sites will benefit from the installation of temporary changing facilities of a standard acceptable to the Council.

- During construction of the new railway, the eastern half of the playing field site will be used temporarily as a construction compound. Access will be formed from a temporary signalled junction off the A726. Access to the 11 remaining operational pitches will be maintained at all times.
- The Head of Property Services has been involved in the discussions with SPT regarding this matter and he advises that the Council should retain its statutory right of compensation, notwithstanding the outline agreements detailed in this report.

5. Conclusions/Future Issues

5.1 SPT, supported by the Scottish Executive intend to lodge the GARL Private Bill with the Scottish Parliament early in 2006. For both parties this is a priority project. There will, as the Bill is scrutinised in detail be the opportunity for the Council to comment further on the proposal. It is however the case that SPT would wish to submit the Bill with the support of both Glasgow and Renfrewshire Councils. To date, Glasgow has broadly welcomed the rail link, Renfrewshire Council's position remains the same as determined in 2003.

5.2 The extended round of negotiations with SPT staff regarding the economic benefits of the proposal and, in particular, the impacts on St James Playing Fields have been undertaken with a view to reaching agreements enabling the Council to review its opposition to the GARL. The wider economic benefits have been investigated by SPT and reported on. These are summarised in para 4.2. As regards the St James Playing Fields, a satisfactory arrangement has been negotiated which ultimately delivers an improved and modernised facility at St James whilst retaining the majority of the pitches - 20 out of 22. The remaining 2 pitches will be provided for at Ferguslie Park Sports Centre. This will represent one of the largest investments in sports facilities in Renfrewshire in recent times. In addition, arrangements during the construction period will result in 11 pitches remaining in use at St James and 11 temporary pitches and changing facilities provided at 5 locations across Renfrewshire. The most significant element of our outline agreement is however the provision of new changing room facilities and maintenance building. This constitutes a major improvement on the currently ageing facilities at St James and clearly meets one of the major demands of the various user groups.

5.3 Any agreements with the SPT will require to be formalised - ensuring that their commitments and the associated specifications (eg in terms of drainage provision, changing room design and layout etc) are delivered within agreed timescales. In essence, this report seeks to define the broad heads of terms of any legal agreement between both parties.

5.4 There is little doubt that the GARL, if ultimately approved by Parliament, will bring disruption and inconvenience, particularly to the users of the playing fields, nearby residents and to businesses in the Murray Street/Clark Street area. However, the scheme also brings some significant benefits - some of which will be clearly evident, ie improved train scheduling, improved access to the airport, creation of direct jobs and the enhanced facilities at St James Park. Others are less obvious,

such as the indirect jobs provision and the longer term impacts on traffic volumes on the M8.

5.5 It should also be noted that any physical improvements to Gilmour Street Station in Paisley will now require to be funded directly through the SPT capital programme, and not through the GARL budget. This issue is however recognised by SPT and they have agreed to fund a study from their capital budget during 2006/07 to investigate the scope for improvements to the station. The concern for Renfrewshire Council is that any improvements identified as part of this study will need to compete for budget allocation alongside many other public transport proposals across the SPT area.

Implications of this Report

1 **Financial Implications** - None.

2 **Personnel Implications** - None.

3 **Community Plan Implications**

Social inclusion - There are economic development and access to work benefits described in this report which will result from the development of the G.A.R.L., which in turn will contribute to the Council's Social Inclusion agenda.

Modernising government - None.

Sustainable development - This project represents an investment of around £160m in a major public transport initiative. One of the core objectives of the project is to improve public access to the airport and longer term achieve a modal shift, away from car based trips associated with the airport towards the railway. The objective clearly fits well with the Council's Sustainability Development priority.

4 **Legal Implications** - Formal legal agreements require to be prepared covering the broad heads of terms outlined in this paper.

5 **Property Implications** - The Council require to retain its statutory position regarding the claiming of compensation relating to any un-mitigated effects on Council property.

6 **Information Technology Implications** - None.

7 **Equal Opportunities Implications** - None.

Agenda Item No

Renfrewshire Council

To: COUNCIL

On: 16TH MARCH, 2006

**Report by
Director of Planning & Transport**

GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK

1. Summary

1.1 This report updates members on progress regarding the Glasgow Airport Rail Link (G.A.R.L.).

1.2 In particular Council will note that the G.A.R.L. Private Bill has now been lodged with the Scottish Parliament and a 60 day consultation period has commenced.

2. Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Council note the detail of this report and:

- a. Agree to the lodging of a holding objection regarding the G.A.R.L. pending the conclusion of all legal agreements associated with the mitigation works required by the Council at St James Playing Fields and elsewhere.
- b. Instruct the Director of Planning & Transport to lodge a holding objection and any relevant background information prior to the 3rd April, 2006.

3. Background and Update

3.1 A detailed report was presented to Council on the 15th December, 2005 regarding the airport rail link. This report summarised the background to this project, explained its impact upon Renfrewshire in particular the effects the proposal would have on the St James Playing Fields. At that time the Council agreed to support the rail link in principle, subject to a number of legal agreements being reached with the SPT regarding issues such as:

- the provision of temporary replacement football pitches.
- further details of site drainage.
- confirmation of the design and specification of a new changing pavilion.
- further details of access and car parking provision.
- reinstatement of St James Playing Fields following construction of the rail link to accommodate 20 pitches.
- off site provision of 2 permanent pitches at Ferguslie Park Sports Centre.

SPT have confirmed their willingness to enter into such legal agreements.

3.2 The report to Council in December, 2005 also referred to the fact that SPT intended to lodge the G.A.R.L. Private Bill with the Scottish Parliament, early in 2006. The Bill was indeed lodged with Parliament, on the 31st January, 2006. Amongst other things, the Bill will provide SPT and their successors compulsory purchase powers over Council land. A 60 day objection period began immediately thereafter, ending on the 3rd April. During this period, members of the public and stakeholders will be provided the opportunity to object to any aspect of the proposal. To this end, the Scottish Parliament Private Bills Unit organised a public meeting on the 1st February in Paisley Town Hall to coincide with the lodging of the Bill. The meeting was attended by around 30 members of the public, community representatives and local representatives and local businesses. Details regarding the procedures, timescales, access to information etc was provided.

3.3 Renfrewshire Council are a mandatory consultee, and as such has been invited to lodge a statement in relation to the proposal. In effect this provides the Council with the opportunity to bring to the attention of the Parliamentary Committee its views about the adequacy of the prior consultation and all accompanying documents. This is in addition to the Council's right to object to the Bill.

3.4 The Council and SPT have yet to conclude the formal legal agreements in connection with the mitigation works outlined in para 3.1 and agreed at the Council meeting on the 15th December, 2005. Under these circumstances it is proposed that, in responding to the Parliament's consultation, the Council submit a holding objection to the G.A.R.L. pending conclusion of the necessary legal agreements and an assurance that the Council's interests are fully protected, in terms of the work proposed by SPT (or their assignee) and the required mitigation works.

3.5 On completion of the required legal agreement, the Council can assess any residual claim for compensation, based upon the permanent affect of the works at St. James etc and taking into account additional consequential costs for the Council in both the short and longer term.

3.6 The SPT are now in the process of establishing a number of Community and Business Liaison Groups - designed to communicate with a wide range of interested parties throughout the lifetime of the project. Four groups are proposed and a number of Council Members and local MSP's will be involved. The groups are:

- St James Residents Community Liaison Group (CLG).
- St James Playing Fields CLG.
- Line of Route and Compounds CLG (this group includes representation from stakeholders along the full length of the line).
- Murray Street Business Liaison Group.

Implications of this Report

- 1 **Financial Implications** - none.
- 2 **Personnel Implications** - none.

3 **Community Plan Implications**

Social inclusion - none.

Modernising government - none.

Sustainable development - The rail link will provide sustainable transport for the Airport but the Council is ensuring that the recreational facilities at St James Park are not lost or reduced.

4 **Legal Implications** - It is considered that it is necessary to submit and maintain a formal objection to the Bill until such time as the Council's position is properly and adequately protected in respect of the undertakings made by SPTE relative to the retention of a specified number of football pitches throughout the period of the works.

5 **Property Implications** - none.

6 **Information Technology Implications** - none.

7 **Equal Opportunities Implications** - none.

SUBMISSION FROM FAIRLINE COACHES LTD

1. I am grateful that the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill Committee is seeking comments that Fairline Coaches Ltd may consider to be relevant. Although we have been aware of a proposed Glasgow Airport Rail Link this is the first occasion anyone has asked for our input (or, I believe, that of any other bus operator).

2. Fairline Coaches Ltd have been involved in the express bus service to Glasgow Airport since April 1991 and has been integral with Scottish Citylink Coaches in providing what BAA now describes as a "high-quality, high-frequency bus service". The service has never received a subsidy and has consistently offered concessions to airport staff to help BAA attain its public transport use objectives. The service also provides income to BAA at Glasgow Airport and SPT at Buchanan Bus Station by way of their stance charges.

3. As operators on the main public transport connection from the city centre to Glasgow Airport it is disappointing to have not been consulted prior to this stage in the GARL development. This is exacerbated by the dismissive comments of paragraphs 74 & 75 in the Promoter's Memorandum.

4. MVA did not consult with bus operators for its 2002 report to SPTE. Its approach was to use the preferences exhibited by passengers in the South East UK and assume that these are applicable for Glasgow rather than even consult with those who have actually transported over a million passengers to and from Glasgow Airport in the preceding ten years.

5. While MVA may have been correct in assuming that existing bus frequency (approximately every 7.5 minutes) could not be improved it was wrong to suggest that the service was operating at its optimum level. The patronage on buses is heaviest at peak times and can be very low at other times. Given that a large proportion of passenger growth in the future will come from low cost/no frills carriers who traditionally use off-peak time slots there is ample provision on buses for additional patronage.

6. Road congestion on the M8 at peak times is a major problem for the bus service. Transport Scotland has failed to meet its objectives in maintaining traffic flow on the M8 and Glasgow City Council has failed to meet its objective to reduce car use in the city centre and make public transport more reliable.

7. However, even "bus journey time at peak... in excess of 30 minutes" will be shorter than that afforded by rail travel. While the actual journey time of GARL passengers may be 16 minutes, the majority of passengers will be deposited in the periphery of a station they do not want to go to. Transferring to Queen Street or Buchanan Bus Station will entail an extra journey. At present the bus serves Glasgow Central in 16 minutes, Queen Street Station in 21 minutes and Buchanan Bus Station in 25min.

8. Terminating at Glasgow Central is clearly only a temporary measure and GARL should not be assessed independently of a Cross Rail Link. The true cost at current levels then approaches £400million and the merits of GARL should be assessed at these figures.

9. If GARL becomes operational the competition with the existing bus service will provide the Scottish Executive, Transport Scotland and the SPT with a clear conflict on interest. Can they justify and promote this highly subsidised rail link without prejudicing an existing high quality bus service which operates at no cost to the tax payer?

10. The SPT currently fail that test. They refuse to implement signage of Glasgow Central informing passengers of the existence of a bus service to Glasgow Airport. There is adequate signage at Queen Street Station but at Central the SPT would rather passengers endure the woefully inadequate current rail link rather than give them the choice of using the bus service. The bus stop in Waterloo Street is no further from the main station concourse than platform 11 and the journey time is less than half that of the rail-bus link.

11. The MVA report suggests that bus use will drop initially after the introduction of GARL but will recover as passenger numbers grow at Glasgow Airport. This will only happen if a balanced approach is adopted and conditions should be imposed to ensure that Transport Scotland do not favour GARL at the expense of other modes of transport.

SUBMISSION FROM NETWORK RAIL

Many thanks for your invitation to submit evidence to the Committee on the above bill. I hope that the following will be of interest.

Network Rail's responsibilities are to provide train operators with a robust and reliable network with sufficient paths to meet their reasonable requirements in accordance with our licence conditions and the needs of their customers.

From your letter of 14 March, I understand that the Committee are seeking views on the 'general principles' of the Bill and on the wisdom of the broad policy to establish a rail link between Glasgow Airport and the City Centre.

On this overall intention, we are happy to indicate our general support in terms of the direct integration such a link would provide between Glasgow Airport and the rail network.

The link should also offer more general integration with the wider public transport network, through the new interchange opportunities that will be presented. These benefits, we believe, are consistent with the overall objectives of economic growth, social inclusion and accessibility.

It will be known that Network Rail has lodged an objection to the Bill. We would wish it to be understood that this was necessary to protect against the risks presented to our existing business interests as operator of the national rail network.

These risks arise from the land acquisition and other powers that the Bill seeks to obtain, including acquisition powers over the current operational railway. We are presently negotiating an agreement with SPT which, when finalised, would allow our objection to the Bill to be withdrawn.

If the committee would like to discuss these matters in further detail, I will be happy to attend a committee hearing to discuss them further.

SUBMISSION FROM SCOTTISH INDEPENDENT AIRPORT PARK AND RIDE ASSOCIATION (SIAPRA) (part of the U.K. wide body IAPRA)

1. SIAPRA are an Association of Independent Park and Ride Car Park Operators serving Scottish airports on Glasgow Airport in particular. Some ten years ago one Park and Ride operation with around eight hundred spaces and serviced Glasgow Airport's needs. Now there are in excess of eight thousand spaces.
2. SIAPRA are focused on providing best service" for their customers "in terms of product and in terms of cost. Parking within Glasgow Airport currently costs in excess of ten pounds (£10.00) per day. The average daily cost to the public for those using a SIAPRA associated car park is around £3 per day.
3. SIAPRA members believe they provide a cost effective and competitive parking product and excellent service to the customers using Glasgow Airport.
4. Glasgow Airport Parking Association Ltd., part of SIAPRA, held a meeting with SPT in November 2004 seeking to cooperate with SPT and to arrange A Park and Ride facility from the SIAPRA sites, utilising transit buses to transfer passengers to/from existing SPT rail and bus stations as required or in accordance with an agreed route timetable.

- Arrange a direct access from the private car parking facilities to Paisley St. James Station and vis versa utilising transit buses.
 - To provide an airport shuttle service from other locations in Strathclyde to Paisley St. James to Glasgow Airport. The closest Park and Ride site to Glasgow Airport is approximately three minutes by coach and a regular shuttle service could be provided to/from the airport for passengers arriving from elsewhere in Scotland by rail.
 - SIAPRA consider that the benefits deriving from the foregoing proposals would be beneficial for SPT and convenient for Park and Ride commuters given the need to attract traffic to the rail link.
 - Dependant on routing, SPT were asked to consider whether a “Parking” stop on the route at an Association car park would allow passengers to embark and alight and would be in keeping with the SPT objective of the moving road traffic from the M8/B767/B761 interchange.
 - SIAPRA estimated that such a Transit Rail Stop would have the dual benefit of removing a number of shuttle buses and adding approximately one hundred thousand (100,000) passengers per annum to the rail usage on the link.
5. SIAPRA members believe that a combination of the Rail Link and Park and Ride facility would provide best service to customers.
 6. One area however in which the present Glasgow Airport Rail Link proposal has a major flaw is that the operating times are inadequate. A large proportion of passenger growth in the future will come from low cost/no frills carriers using off peak timeslots. An inability to service such passengers will detract from the usefulness of the Rail Link service and prove a disincentive to using it. It would not have the flexibility to ensure ‘joined up journeys’ where eg. flight delays and adjustments lead to passengers being stranded on their arrival at the airport.
 7. Alleviation of the traffic congestion around Glasgow Airport is an integral part of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link equation and SIAPRA are well placed to assist in the alleviation of this. An integrated solution which provides good Park and Ride connectivity from the airport to Park and Ride facilities whether within the vicinity of the airport or further afield is essential.
 8. There is no reason why the Park and Ride facility surrounding Glasgow Airport cannot act as a feeder to Glasgow Airport Rail Link for trips to the City Centre.

SUBMISSION FROM SIMON WALLWORK

Originally this document was an objection to the Private Bill promoting the GARL. However, it has been pointed out to me that as I am not directly affected in any

negative way by the Bill, any 'objection' from me will not be accepted for consideration.

Therefore, private bills unit has advised me to write to you explaining my point of view, and I have added this short header to my previous letter, which apart from a few alterations and additions was submitted as an objection.

Since I submitted my original letter I have seen in the press that the GARL will now cost c. £210m and will be about two years late. The EARL seems to be going the same way too but in a grander fashion. Frankly I suggest a review is overdue here for both schemes before it's too late. The EARL is a lovely design, but way out of scale for a regional airport. The surface diversion option will no doubt be adopted at some point although it may be a difficult pill to swallow even if only in a political sense.

At Glasgow lack of demand makes the ever rising cost of the GARL poorer and poorer value for money and the spoiling of St.James playing fields a worse idea than ever.

I work in public transport myself, at Edinburgh Airport for a well known UK airline and I have been working on my own proposal for rail access at Glasgow Airport for about five years.

I would be grateful for a chance to outline and explain to the committee why my proposal is the **best** and *cheapest* solution for Glasgow.

I object to the Bill on the grounds that it is a poor use of public money and that there are better and cheaper ways of providing rail access to Glasgow Airport.

My objection to the Bill is composed of two parts and is meant to be *constructive*.

Part One. Why the Bill promoting the GARL should fall.

Part Two. What we should build in its stead and why.

Part One. Why the Bill should fall.

Background.

The SPT claim to have understood and then rejected my proposal.

Why then in para 78 of the promoters memorandum do they state that....."This option relied upon a car based access to a park and ride site in close proximity to the airport. Passengers would travel by the LRT system into the airport"? Wrong! The car park is Solely for the use of commuters going to/from Glasgow City centre. Not for 'airport' passengers. It's not a "car based solution" as they describe it. In fact, as it's designed to get motorists OUT of their cars it is the opposite of what the SPT state.

How can they claim to have appraised the scheme when here, in their own words, is proof of their non-comprehension?

I might add that I have, on several occasions at the public meetings, tried to point this sort of thing out to them all plainly to no avail.

The process used to decide what to build was fundamentally flawed right from the start. Instead of casting about widely to identify the best possible solutions, a path of action was decided upon right at the beginning, and with very minor variations, that is the GARL as proposed. This 'back to front' approach lead directly to the 'consultation process' being such a sham.

Also, why is it that the formal assessment of GARL, which was prepared by Sinclair Knight Merz, Rail Links to Glasgow and Edinburgh Airports, at huge expense over several years, is being **ignored**? Had it come out in favour of GARL then no doubt that would be all the justification required to build it. SKM however pointed out in the bluntest terms, that the GARL is a dud.

Now the Scottish Executive and SPT seem keen to dismiss the findings of SKM as wrong.

What on earth is the point of commissioning consultants such as SKM, at huge cost, only to ignore their findings?

1. There is a lack of demand for the GARL.

While rail access to the Airport is desirable, the demand for it at Glasgow Airport is particularly low. What demand there is could easily be met by a far less costly and intrusive proposal.

Like the promoters of the Bill, I wish there was much more demand for the GARL. **There is not!**

SPT themselves, at the start of the 'consultation' process estimated demand as 500,000 in year one. If we take 4 trains per hour each way between say 0615 and 2345, (140 trains per day x 365 days) equals 51,100 trains per year. 500,000 passengers, means average passengers per train is **9.7**.

I assert that 500,000 is optimistic.

I understand it has since been revised, upward.

SKM in their report which the Scottish Executive commissioned (Rail links to Glasgow and Edinburgh Airports, final report), stated that:

(para 689) "None of the options considered for a rail link to Glasgow Airport would cater for more than about **5to 6%** of the passengers accessing the airport" (my proposal not studied here).

(para 679) "Under our base assumptions, **none** of the options at Glasgow would generate economic benefits which would exceed the cost of implementation....." (my proposal was not included here.)

(para 683) “.....the project would **not** be commercially viable let alone attractive to private sector lenders and investors.”

(para 684) “If revenues were twice our forecasts.....and the funding gap were to be covered by a public sector grant.....then, although cash flows would be improved, they would almost certainly be **unacceptable** to lenders and investors”

(para 687) “Any one of these factors could make an already **weak** case substantially **worse**”

Also please see section ‘8.5 Conclusions’ of the same report for details of how the GARL **misses two out of the three Planning Objectives** which were set out.

At this point please look up what the planning objectives *actually were* and satisfy yourselves that the GARL does miss two of them as I point out above.

What is the point of such a costly and long investigation by highly paid consultants, if the result of their work is ignored? And what is the point of specifying ‘planning objectives’ if we are content to construct something which misses them without even having a good hard look at the alternatives?

Why is this Bill still being promoted after such a damning assessment?

Could it be that the scheme was ill thought out right from the start but no one has the courage to admit that a mistake has been made?

I assert that the whole consultation process has been a sham. The only other scheme (as far as I know) that has been studied at all, is my own proposal and even in this case only **half** of the proposal was looked at and then only briefly. I do not consider this satisfactory scrutiny.

2. The GARL as proposed is environmentally unsound.

Building an intrusive electrified branch line over and through the St.James playing fields in Paisley is the sort of extreme action that would only be merited by the most obviously *valuable* and *desirable* type of scheme.

The twenty-two playing fields here are in heavy use by youth football teams and it seems a great shame to spoil the area for use by a scheme whose merits are doubtful. I realise that there are ideas to re-jig the fields to allow continued use of the majority of the pitches. This area will be spoiled badly.

Surely it’s a truism that if we can avoid building here, then we ought not to.

3. The GARL is too expensive.

Although the actual figures can not be ascertained, there seems no doubt that demand will be low. Therefore it follows that the benefits of the GARL will be low. But what about the cost?

It will be high. For clarity, we must:

(a) Clear the centre area between the existing tracks of all the existing overhead line supports and completely re-electrify 9km of railway between Shields & Wallneuk junctions.

(b) Lay 9km of new track where the old overhead supports are at present.

(c) rebuild Wallneuk junction

(d) Completely rebuild, realign and electrify platform 11a, which will mean losing the car park between platforms 11&12. So if someone drives to Central to use the GARL- nowhere to park.

(e) Build the Branch line into the Airport, crossing a large part of Paisley, the playing fields, the M8 (at its widest point) and the Airport fuel farm (to be moved!). This will be an enormous 'blot on the landscape'.

(f) Buy new rolling stock *and* subsidise operating it.

All *hugely* expensive.

And even after all this cost, the GARL leaves the airport passenger at least **130metres away from the Terminal!**

Cost estimated at circa £200 million at 2004 prices. Rail projects in general have recently demonstrated spectacular cost overruns (West coast main line re-electrification for example). What would be a likely final bill for the GARL? £300m? £400m? Possibly acceptable for a project which has demonstrated how useful and popular it is likely to be- but the GARL has showed the signs of being a 'white elephant' right from the start as SKM's report pointed out in blunt terms.

4. Therefore the GARL is a disproportionate way of solving the problem of rail access to the Airport.

Frankfurt-Maine in Germany is a *massive* airport. Three huge runways and Fifty-Two million passengers per annum. It uses a light rail link to provide rail access to a nearby electrified railway line.

Birmingham International Airport is much more like Glasgow. One runway and nine million passengers per annum. It also uses a light rail link to provide access to 'Birmingham International', a nearby mainline station.

Why should a similar scheme not suffice at Glasgow?

5. The GARL is not an 'Integrated' scheme.

Far from providing benefits to all who travel in this part of Scotland, the GARL will only appeal to those who wish to travel directly from Glasgow City Centre to the Airport. Frankly it would be easier to drive.

And most people will. The 'Airport' trains are not even to stop at intermediate stations- so much for Airport workers using it.

Anyone travelling from West of Paisley will have to change (and wait) at Paisley Gilmour St. This includes those using the ferries which dock at Gourrock and Wemyss Bay.

There is nothing in the GARL to encourage interchange between different modes of travel. Bicycle, walking, bus & taxi for example. A new purpose built interchange is required to facilitate this.

The GARL does nothing to help with the **real transport problem** in the area which is road congestion. It misses out on a rare chance to provide an alternative to driving into and out of the city. A 'park and ride' scheme can't easily be provided as there is no suitable railway station- however please see details of my proposal to see how this could easily be done.

6. There is a 'hidden agenda' behind the GARL.

The GARL is inextricably linked with 'Crossrail'. This is a scheme to link up the railway West of Glasgow with the Railway out of Queen St station heading East.

Also it is desirable to strengthen rail services towards Ayr & Prestwick due to real demand.

I assert that the case for 'Crossrail' should be made on its own merits. If it's such a good idea then it will be able to justify itself financially.

In reality Crossrail is by no means a proven affair. It must by pass Glasgow Central completely and can only use Queen St. low level after a significant detour. It may never happen.

As far as the services to Ayr are concerned, the services could be strengthened by adding extra coaches. I used to use this line myself and nine car trains were standard in the 1970's. Why not simply restore them?

I am aware that work would be needed on signalling to facilitate this but this could be a tiny part of the money saved by not building the GARL. Platform length is also an issue, but surely only at the two very new stations. Nearly all the platforms on this line were built by the Victorians when they laid the railway. They made them long enough.

While the above two aims have a degree of merit, we risk spoiling the rail link to the airport by trying to make it too wide ranging. It's meant to be the Glasgow Airport Rail Link not the West of Scotland railway upgrade scheme.

7. The GARL is impractical at times of low demand.

This is very significant.

Aircraft movements at Glasgow are not constant hour by hour. There are peak times and quiet times. A constant 15 minute service as proposed by GARL will have zero passengers at the quietest times but must run nevertheless.

For example 1130 on Tuesday may be very busy with a single charter flight but very quiet on the other six days. The GARL has no way of coping with this variation in demand. Some trains will be empty, just as the present 'airport' bus often runs empty. At least overcrowding is unlikely to be a problem.

Why spend all this money to run empty trains?

Discussion of the stated 'policy Objectives of the Bill'

1. "To stimulate economic growth in the West of...."

How exactly can the GARL do this? It will certainly permit travel between Glasgow and its Airport, but so would any (less costly) proposal to provide rail access. My proposal provides much more *inclusive* access to the Airport and there are other ideas which also do this.

Frankly sorting out the M8 road congestion would be much more valuable to this part of Scotland than the GARL could ever be. Yet the GARL will do almost nothing in this vital area.

2. "To contribute to a sustainable basis for the future growth....."

What? Again, any scheme to provide rail access to the Airport can do this for Glasgow. If Prestwick could use longer trains, provide them.

3. "To support the sustainable regeneration of the M8...."

What's really needed is some alternative to using the M8 but quite how this Policy Objective relates to the GARL is less than clear. If this objective really means 'building more railway would be good for the area' then justify and build it. There is no way that all the works of the GARL are required just to provide rail access to the airport as I will show in Part two.

4. "To promote social inclusion and accessibility by connecting areas of low car ownership.....to economic opportunities"

This is false. The GARL provides an exclusive 'Heathrow Express' type link between Glasgow Airport and Central Station. It could hardly be more restrictive in its appeal. Expressly it does not stop at the three stations where such conditions are most likely to be found i.e. Hillington East/ West & Cardonald. *And were it to do so, its already limited appeal to businessmen would be further diminished.*

5. "To provide a high quality, high capacity...attract car and other users...."

Lets start in Glasgow. A potential GARL customer must first get to Central Station. If he needs to drive there, why not simply drive to the Airport? Road links could scarcely be better.

If we start with an airline passenger arriving at the airport again only those whose final destination is within easy reach of Glasgow Central Station will gain much by using the service. The majority will leave the airport as they always have, by car, either their own which is parked nearby, a relative or friend who collects them or

perhaps by Taxi for shorter trips. Some of course *would* use a rail service but its appeal is limited.

6. "To provide public transport services.....and allow for the future development... With bus, car, rail, cycling and walking"

These are laudable aims but this is lip service and no more. The GARL does zero to promote these "interchange opportunities". We need a site near the Airport, easily accessed by car, rail, bus, taxi, bike, walking and Aircraft. All the GARL does is provide a direct service between two points.

If this is a real Policy Objective of the GARL then it plainly fails to meet it..

Part Two. What we should build in its stead

Firstly I am aware that what I propose could not be an amendment to the GARL Private Bill. However I expect that the Bill will fall for the reasons I've outlined above. Some alternative way of providing rail access to the Airport will still be required as it is a stated priority of the Scottish Parliament.

I assert that the GARL is a bad idea but I'm aware that if there was no other way of providing a Glasgow Airport Rail Link then perhaps, in the absence of an alternative, it might still go ahead.

I want to be very clear. There is an alternative.

SKM stated that "Mr Wallwork's scheme would appear to be feasible in principle. It is likely that it can be implemented quicker and more cheaply than the heavy rail solution,....."

Please refer to the report entitled "Assessment of Mr Wallwork's Proposals". It was produced for the Rail Branch of the Scottish Executive by their own consultants, Sinclair Knight Merz.

There is a copy of my proposal at the back and I have sent you an illustration of the scheme along with a hard copy of this objection.

A major complaint is that the Rail Branch **absolutely refused** to evaluate the 'Park and Ride' aspect of my proposal. For example, no estimate of likely demand for it has been done although potentially demand could be enormous.

The 'brief paper' which they commissioned from SKM dealt only with the 'Rail' part of my proposal. The benefits of the road congestion relief part of the scheme were specifically *excluded* from the report. SKM were instructed **not** to examine this.

If we want true '*integrated*' public transport how can we ever achieve it if integrated planning and assessment of schemes is beyond us?

Simply put, my scheme provides the following advantages.

(a) **All** stations on the Glasgow to Gourock/ Wemyss Bay line get great access to the airport. The Ferries too.

(b). Rail access to the Airport is provided inexpensively but in proportion to anticipated demand. Could easily **save £150m**.

I estimate max cost of my scheme at £40m.

(c) No need to lay the expensive extra track between Arkleston and Shields Junctions.

(d) No re-electrification work needed.

(e) No extra trains needed. Or extra services

(f) **No problem coping at times of low demand. Driverless light rail trains only.**

(g) No need to do any work at Central Station.

(h) No environmental impact at all. For clarity it does NOT go on the nature site near St. James interchange.

(i) The playing fields are unaffected. And with the blight of the GARL removed could be improved and properly maintained.

(j) No loss of amenity for those close to the proposed viaduct.

(k) Will generate little or no planning objections, unlike GARL. Again for clarity my proposal will **not** affect the take off and landing 'cone' at Glasgow Airport. I've checked.

(l) My proposal does away with the 130metre walkway. The terminus is **inside** the actual terminal building.

(m) Finally, a key part of my proposal is provision of a large park and ride site very near to the Airport.

I must emphasize that this is **not** for the benefit of 'Airport' users.

It is for the benefit of ordinary car bound commuters who clog the M8 twice a day, for several hours, and who have little or no choice but to put up with the rush hour congestion.

With this scheme they are able to leave the car at the new 'Glasgow Airport' station and continue into town by train. This has huge environmental benefits for Glasgow. Thousands of cars per day absent from both rush hours. The evening one is typically 2-21/2 hours)

Thousands of cars not parked in Glasgow all day or lowering the air quality with unnecessary exhaust emissions.

Surely these benefits should have been studied and evaluated? *They were not.*

I also wish to add that throughout the years that I have worked on this I have found the SPT to be singularly uninterested in my proposal (or anybody else's for that matter). I have had only about thirty minutes with Alistair Watson and both he and the SPT seem unable or unwilling to grasp even the basic concept of my ideas even when pointed out in the simplest of terms.

I realise that it is not the job of this committee to sort out the transport needs of the West of Scotland. Just like the Rail Branch found themselves unable or unwilling to study a road congestion relief scheme so you will no doubt be restricted to commenting on the GARL as outlined in the Private Bill.

We need the ability to conduct proper integrated planning if we ever wish to have a 'joined up' public transport network in Scotland. What use is it if a scheme such as mine can't be examined because of petty bureaucratic restrictions.

It's *not* too late for an outbreak of common sense. But it nearly is.

SUBMISSION FROM LIGHT RAIL (UK) LTD

The proposals for the Glasgow Airport Link offer an inappropriate solution because many issues are not satisfactorily addressed and we believe that this proposal of heavy rail solution is not capable of addressing these issues for the Glasgow Airport link.

The consideration of a Light Rail Solution given in the MVA Final report prepared for Strathclyde Passenger Transport Executive November 2002, I wish to rebutt as listed before

In the SPT report P 14 > 18 Paisley Gilmour Street Link, it is proposed that a People Mover option being used, running from Gilmour Street NE to the White Cart, along the western edge crossing over to the east side at Laigh Park. Continuing up the side of the White Cart under the M8 Bridge and turns West crossing the river again and entering the airport complex from the East with the station being situated at the south eastern side of the airport terminal building

Basically they are saying two trams shuttling between airport <> Gilmour Street on a dual tracked elevated structure at a height of 5-6m with a walkway in the centre

Therefore we wish to object to the proposed scheme on the following grounds

1. The light rail option was not considered in its broadest scope either at the Paisley end or the Glasgow end
2. The proposed scheme is a significantly over engineered solution for the Paisley Airport Section
3. Given Para 3, this represents a very expensive and not value for money solution with very few local benefits
4. A traditional continental tramway type solution would achieve the schemes objects and provide a range of significant local and regional benefits at a much lower cost including local parking linked by tram to the Airport
5. A low cost tramway as per Para 4 using part of Option X as outlined in the Promoters Memorandum but threading the line under the M8 and into location F
6. At the Glasgow end, the line stops inside Glasgow Central Station with no connection to either Queens Street Railway Station or Buchanan Street Bus Station, both important traffic generators.
7. By stopping at Glasgow Central, this will infact create a closed shuttle system with very few connections with the rest of the Central Belt, Eastern & Northern Scotland
8. Ref Para 6, By using Central Station only, this will increase the likelihood of direct car journeys by passing any public transport provisions
9. I would like to record that by using a Light Rail steel on steel option at the Glasgow end, including the provision of a Quality Bus Corridors when street running north of the Clyde, running along Osborn Street, up Past Central Station to Queen Street then by Buchanan Street, and Anderston bus

- Stations, looping back to join itself will represent a better more value for money than the current proposed closed shuttle
10. The Light Rail option will give a better DDA compliance ratio and achieve a better regeneration outcome than stated by STPE
 11. The construction of additional trackage to link Glasgow to Gilmour Street to Heavy Rail Standards including signalling etc., we are opposed to on the grounds of not being required and not necessary but should be built to Light Rail continental standards
 12. The operating costs and the modal switch achieved by Light Rail elsewhere in the UK will not require any ongoing subsidy and can attract additional private funding
 13. There appears to have been insufficient Public Consultation and the narrowness of the question band is questionable
 14. In rebuttal of the list given in the MVA Report Summary P 14 > 18,

1. Stated P 14 > 18, MVA Report	Light Rail (UK) Ltd Comments
2. Proposed route using a People Mover option with trams	Wrong mode & route, I would question the writers experience in this field
3. Potential impact on properties from construction dust	This would be greater with the proposed scheme
4. Impact on the setting and character of Listed Building	This would be greater with the proposed scheme
5. Potential impact on the Site of Nature Conservation (SINC)	Agreed
6. Loss of wildlife habitats and disruption to wild life corridor	This would be greater with the proposed scheme although the Report apparently contradicts itself in Para 4.3.3.
7. Townscape Impact	Agreed but this would be greater with the proposed heavy rail scheme with OHLE gantries etc., and the erosion of other green spaces
8. Visual Impact along the White Cart corridor	Agreed
9. Loss of land along route	This would be greater with the proposed scheme
10. Potential impact on travellers due to narrowing of Weir Street/Sneddon Street	Agreed if they are referring to support stations but if not, street running with robust re-allocation of road space
11. Loss of land & property values	This would be greater with the proposed scheme initially but evidence shows that Light Rail schemes increase property values
12. Potential contamination of water in the White Cart	Agreed only if there is an accident
13. Impact on existing planning consent	Agreed
14. Possible incompatibility with airport development plan	Agreed

SUBMISSION FROM LIGHT RAIL SOLUTIONS LTD

We would like to present evidence to the committee on the bill for the Glasgow Airport Rail Link (GARL), as currently proposed by SPTE, on the grounds that the scheme offers a less than optimum solution if adopted in the form of heavy passenger rail.

The provision of a short heavy rail shuttle service of the nature proposed for the Glasgow Airport link in the current parliamentary proposals is inappropriate because heavy rail infrastructure is relatively inflexible, much more costly to provide, much more costly to operate and, in consequence, like all heavy rail passenger services will always require continuing and significant annual operating subsidies drawn from the public purse than would a light rail alternative

There are bottlenecks in the heavy rail network between the Airport and Glasgow which we believe will not be properly resolved by the scheme as proposed. This means that the reliability and punctualities of the existing timetables will be diminished and that future growth through more frequent train service patterns and passenger service levels will always be inhibited by the available capacity provided by this scheme at Glasgow Central and its approaches. Similarly Paisley Gilmour Street station offers serious capacity challenges to the additional services to the Airport.

The proposed link will be unlikely to deliver reliably, either the initial or planned future levels or frequency of service normally expected between city centres and major international airports. We believe that the scheme will not be able to deliver in full, the anticipated traffic growth forecasts for the airport itself.

We believe that the 50% increase in rail use, measured by passenger kilometres as originally proposed in Central Government's The 10 Year Transport Plan (July 2000) and as adjusted in subsequent Scottish Government policy documents, and as adopted locally for the Greater Glasgow conurbation, will be significantly inhibited by this scheme.

Furthermore, the self-contained "dedicated shuttle" nature of the service means that it will not be directly connected to important destinations within Scotland. All rail passengers, normally encumbered by baggage, will require physical interchanging (detrain/walk/entrain) at Glasgow Central, therefore the scheme will not provide any benefits to populations beyond the airport or Glasgow Central, by connecting into the wider Scottish railway network. Consequently, the need for a heavy rail scheme is much diminished.

We believe that alternative more affordable solutions have not been properly explored nor considered sufficiently to justify the capital and revenue burden that this scheme will place upon the public purse, and that the business case and socio-economic appraisals are therefore inadequate and incomplete. A solution involving light rail should have been thoroughly considered which could provide higher frequency of service, less intrusive and much cheaper infrastructure, better accessibilities, serving greater numbers of potential passengers, and providing better connectivity links within the city and with other parts of Scotland, much better and

easier DDA compliance, and no future demand for significant annual public operating subsidy.

Therefore we wish to give evidence to the committee on the proposed scheme on the following grounds:

1. We believe the scheme does not offer the best value for public money, when compared with light rail alternatives, which have lower unit capital cost and do not require annual public operating subsidies.
2. We believe light rail alternatives will realise more benefits for passengers. We believe that the planned benefits of a light rail alternative are similar to those of a heavy rail solution but, based on other UK experience, their extent will be much greater. The impact on regeneration and social exclusion of the proposed heavy rail scheme and a light rail alternative has not been fully evaluated.
3. We believe that adopting a light rail alternative will improve the financial viability to an extent which requires no annual operating subsidy from the taxpayer and provide much more frequent services at lower cost as well as shorter journey times.
4. We believe that the capital cost of a light rail alternative will be significantly less than for a heavy rail scheme, thereby reducing the costs to the taxpayer of implementing an airport rail link.
5. We believe that the intrinsically lower capital cost of a light rail alternative, and the clear ability of light rail in the UK to trade profitably on the operating account means that there is scope for developing sources of funds, other than the taxpayer, via the private sector, unlike a subsidy hungry heavy rail airport link.
6. We believe that the limiting capacity of bottlenecks in the Glasgow rail network not addressed by this scheme means that the future growth potential of the link will always be inhibited by limited availability of train paths and the higher priority given to other rail services which share that limited capacity. A light rail alternative provides a much more affordable means of tackling these bottlenecks, reducing risk, improving frequencies, maintaining punctuality and service reliability as well as providing better network integration with local bus and rail services. A light rail alternative is more able to avoid detrimental effects on local passenger services within the local rail network.
7. We believe that the self contained shuttle nature of the proposed airport link is more suited to a dedicated light rail alternative, particularly since there is no stated intention to integrate the airport link into the wider rail network, thereby providing a choice of destinations within Scotland.

We look forward to hearing from you and the opportunity to present our evidence in person to you.

SUBMISSION FROM STRATHCLYDE FIRE AND RESCUE

Strathclyde Fire and Rescue received information regarding the above proposed Bill on 2nd January, 2006. Since that date senior officers have had meetings with key personnel, including the Senior Airport Fire Officers from both Glasgow and London (Heathrow) Airports.

With regards to the purpose of the Bill:

- the authorisation of the new railway spur from a new elevated station at Glasgow Airport causes Strathclyde Fire and Rescue no concerns in principle;
- the authorisation of works to the existing railway including the remodelling of Wallneuk Junction and the proposed additional track causes Strathclyde Fire and Rescue no concerns in principle;
- the authorisation of road and other works, including the relocation of the existing fuel farm at Glasgow Airport, necessitated by the railway works, causes Strathclyde Fire and Rescue no concerns in principle;

In all of the above cases, while there is no objection in principle, Strathclyde Fire and Rescue would expect to be kept fully updated on proposed works as they progress to ensure that the works themselves do not increase the risks to the public, or firefighters attending potential incidents, and that works will not adversely affect day to day operations of the Service.

With regard specifically to the relocation of the existing fuel farm, it is assumed that Strathclyde Fire and Rescue will be fully consulted on the detail throughout the process and that the relocated fuel farm will be developed to current industry standards, taking account of all relevant legislation, guidance and best practice. In that event, it is anticipated that the development of the new facility may actually reduce some of the risks inherent in such installations.

ANNEXE 2

OBJECTION FROM RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL

I refer to the above Bill which was introduced to the Scottish Parliament on 31 January 2006. On behalf of and as instructed by The Renfrewshire Council, I hereby object to the following provisions of the Bill:-

Section 1 - This section permits the carrying out of the scheduled works and the ancillary works which are identified in Sections 2 and 3. These include the compulsory acquisition of and extinguishment of rights in parts of St James Park Paisley and rights of access for various purposes. If this is permitted without further reference to the Council, it may result in a reduction in the number of football pitches at St James Park to the detriment of the Council and those currently using the facilities. Adequate provision must be made to ensure that sufficient facilities remain available for use prior to the Bill becoming law. The reason for this objection is further clarified in the objections to the sections of the Bill detailed below.

Section 5 - This relates to access. The method by which access and egress is taken to and from St James Park could potentially impact upon the use of the existing sports pitches owned and operated by the Council. The interests of the Council and the local inhabitants will be affected adversely by a reduction in the number of pitches available for use at any given time and so the protection and specification of the access route(s) to St James Park must be ensured before the Bill becomes law. While the Roads Authority can object to any proposed access additional to those shown on the plans, its consent cannot be unreasonably withheld. The Council is concerned that the terms of this section will not provide it with sufficient protection in this vital area.

Section 10 - The Council is concerned that it can only reasonably impose conditions relating to the discharge of water into artificial watercourses and is not in a position to prevent discharges into natural watercourses. This may be contrary to the common law position which provides that the artificial discharge of water need not be accepted by a lower tenement. The impact of this section could be materially to prejudice the use and enjoyment of Council owned land both now and in the future.

Section 11 - The Council is concerned that safeguarding works need only be carried out if the Authorised Undertaker considers them necessary or expedient. They can also be carried out on land in the vicinity of the works albeit that a notice need be served by the Authorised Undertaker and a decision ultimately be made by an Arbiter. The Council would wish to ensure that it could require any necessary safeguarding works to be undertaken together with explicit confirmation that the new facilities at St James Park are included in the definition of 'Works' contained in the Bill. This will ensure that the Council can require the Authorised Undertaker to carry out safeguarding works if it considers them to be necessary in the vicinity of the recreational facilities and landscaping which the Authorised Undertaker is to carry out on behalf of the Council. The Council is also concerned that works can be carried out in the vicinity of the viaduct for a period of five years. This could impact on the future use of the park and its facilities. If this section is not amended, the Council's interests

could be prejudiced both financially and with regard to the continued use of the land for sporting and recreational uses.

Section 12 - This section permits the compulsory acquisition of land. This allows for the potential acquisition of land which effectively severs St James Park into two separate parks, one forming, in the main, Plot 75 on the Plans and one forming, in the main, Plot 78. This is excessive. The same result can be achieved by giving the Authorised Undertaker rights of access for maintenance and temporary rights of possession for construction purposes. This objection is linked with the objection to Section 13 which gives the Authorised Undertaker the right to acquire subsoil and airspace. These rights apply in respect of the areas covered by Section 12 of the Bill. If outright acquisition of the area on which the viaduct is to be constructed proceeds, the Council will require to be assured that it will have continued rights of access to all areas beneath any viaduct which is to be constructed together with confirmation that it can, if necessary, obtain compensation for loss, damage etc. which may arise when future maintenance to the viaduct is carried out. Without such explicit provision, the interests of the Council and those using the recreational facilities could be prejudiced.

Section 16 - This allows for temporary access for specific purposes. The Council requires clarification that the recreational facilities identified in Schedule 6 include the construction of the new playing fields and changing facilities/pavilion at St James Park. This section is of great concern to the Council in that it could result in the whole of the east side of St James Park being occupied for the purpose of permitting the carrying out of the works and in the whole of the park being put out of service while the landscaping and recreational works are being undertaken. The amenity of this area and the community use to which it is currently put could be severely prejudiced by reason of the actions permitted by this section.

Section 17 - This allows set off of an increase in the value of adjoining land resulting from the carrying out of the Authorised Works. This could result in the compensation received by the Council for land acquired by the Authorised Undertaker being reduced because of works which the Authorised Undertaker is required to carry out to ensure the future provision of recreational facilities in the Renfrewshire area. This would appear to be prejudicial to the Council.

Section 23 - This allows access for surveys etc. This could materially prejudice the use and enjoyment of Council owned land and in particular those areas which are currently used for recreational facilities. Although compensation is payable in terms of this section, this would not prevent the disruption to the use of the facilities at St James Park.

In addition, the section does not provide for reinstatement which would be essential if adequate provision of the pitches is to be maintained.

Section 31 - the Council is concerned that the protections afforded to it by reason of SPTE being the party by whom the various obligations within the Bill are owed will be reduced to an unacceptable extent if the powers given to SPTE are transferred to a third party commercial operator. The Council is provided with some comfort in dealing with SPTE in that it is a public body and the Council has councillor representation on it. Such confidence would not be available in respect of a third party/commercial

entity. In addition, the Council would be concerned that undertakings given by SPTE to the Council could be frustrated by reason of the transfer of rights and obligations under the Bill to a third party. It may be that as a result of actions by such a third party in implement of their rights and obligations, SPTE may be unable to fulfil the specific contractual and other obligations owed by it to the Council.

Section 36 - The Council understands that this section of the Bill effectively grants planning permission in terms of Class 29 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 other than for any viaduct or bridge and that the Council will have rights to refuse its consent to the proposed viaduct or the bridge in limited specified circumstances. The Council considers that it is essential that it retains some input into the specification of the viaduct and bridge structures in order to protect its rights and interest and those of the local community in this area and if it is the intention of this section to erode or restrict the rights provided in Class 29 which the Council considers it retains, then this letter should be treated as a formal objection to this section. The Council would also wish to retain a right to specifically deal with any application for Hazardous Substances Consent in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Hazardous Substances) (Scotland) Act 1997. The Council objects to Section 36 if it is the intention of that section to grant such consent under permitted development rights. The Council considers that its interest would not be protected without having an input into the granting of such consent.

Plots 135 and 136 - This is an access road into Greenlaw Industrial Estate. The Council owns premises within this estate and currently leases them to various tenants. The Authorised Undertaker is seeking to compulsorily acquire this land for access for construction. The Council requires an assurance that it and its tenants will be assured of continued and uninterrupted access to the premises which are owned by it and leased to various tenants.

In general, therefore, and in addition to the other specific sections detailed above, the Council is objecting to those sections of the Bill which could result in prejudice to its use and the use of local people of the facilities at St James Park due to the Bill permitting any form of acquisition of land, temporary occupation of land, any taking of access rights and the carrying out of any works at or adjacent to St James Park. These include sections 1, 5, 11, 13, 16 and 23. In addition, in order to ensure the continued provision of adequate football and recreational facilities in the Renfrewshire area and the continuity of the twenty two already identified grass league sized pitches, the Authorised Undertaker is required to provide football pitches and facilities at remote locations. No formal agreement has been reached with the Authorised Undertaker and until such an agreement is formalised, the Council cannot be assured that its interests are adequately protected.

The Bill affords insufficient protection to the Council in respect of the continued provision of football pitches and recreational areas at St James Park and continued access to these facilities and in addition, it does not specify the works which the Authorised Undertaker will have to undertake to ensure the continued provision of these facilities. The only reference is to 'recreational and landscaping' neither of which guarantee to the Council that it will be provided with the minimum essential facilities and landscaping. It is accepted that SPTE have agreed to enter into a

Minute of Agreement in terms of the attached letter. However, as has been established in case law, (Ayr Harbour Trustees -v- Oswald 1883 WL 19044 (HL) and Triggs -v- Staines Urban DC 198 WL 23516) the terms of the Bill, should it become an Act of Parliament, would supersede the provisions of any Minute of Agreement or contract which would be treated as void. SPTE cannot fetter its statutory powers merely by entering into an agreement with a third party. The Bill currently permits the temporary occupation and/or compulsory acquisition of and/or the taking of access rights over areas of St James Park. Should SPTE or its successors subsequently require to carry out works on or acquire land or take access in breach of the terms of its agreement with the Council, the Act would take precedence and SPTE would be authorised to enter onto or acquire land or take access notwithstanding that such occupation or acquisition breached the terms of its agreement.

The Council must therefore insist that its interests are protected in the Bill. This can be achieved in a number of ways.

1. The Minute of Agreement can be annexed to the Bill and a provision included which will state that nothing in the Bill will allow SPTE or its successors to carry out works which would be in breach of the terms of the Agreement.
2. The inclusion of the Council as one of the parties specified in Clause 42 which prevents interference with or the entering onto of land without the consent of the owner. Any amendment to this section would have to ensure that the Council would be in a position to withhold its consent if it were not satisfied that its interests were protected by the existence of a formal agreement relating to the remote sites as well as the provision of adequate facilities at St James Park.
3. The qualification of specific sections of the Bill to prevent works being carried out or land acquired or access taken or temporary occupation of land to the detriment of the Council's interests or contrary to the terms of the Agreement.

OBJECTION FROM NETWORK RAIL

1. Introduction

We, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited ("Network Rail"), object to the above Bill being promoted by Strathclyde Passenger Transport Executive. Network Rail's objections are set out below. The parts and sections refer to those included in the Bill as lodged.

We would emphasise that our objections are not to the principle of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link that the Bill is seeking to authorise, but instead to specific provisions within the Bill and their impact on the rail network ("The Network"). The proposals impact on one of the most important rail corridors in Scotland, between Paisley Gilmour Street and Glasgow Central. As such, we consider it vital that no works should be authorised that would prevent the ongoing safe operation of services over this rail corridor. We believe that the Bill, as drafted, raises fundamental issues that affect the ability to run existing rail services.

Notwithstanding the above, we wish to stress our willingness to negotiate with the promoters of the Bill and their advisers in relation to the matters covered in this objection.

2. Background to Network Rail

(1) Network Rail owns and operates the vast majority of the rail infrastructure of Great Britain and is primarily responsible for maintenance, repair and the renewal of track, stations, signalling and electrical control equipment. Train services on the Network are operated by Train Operating Companies to which Network Rail grants rights to use its network in the form of access contracts approved by the Office of Rail Regulation.

(2) The activities of Network Rail as network operator are regulated by the Office of Rail Regulation by means of a network licence granted under Section 8 of the Railways Act. The purpose specified in the network licence is to secure the operation and maintenance of the Network, the renewal and replacement of the Network, and the improvement, enhancement and development of the Network, in each case in accordance with best practice and in a timely, economic and efficient manner so as to satisfy the reasonable requirements of persons providing services relating to railways and funders in respect of the quality and capability of the Network.

(3) Network Rail, as licence holder, is required to take such steps as are necessary or expedient so as to achieve the above purpose to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, having regard to all relevant circumstances, including the ability of the licence holder to finance its licensed activities.

(4) Network Rail is under a duty (enforceable by the Office of Rail Regulation) to operate and manage the Network efficiently and economically, so far as reasonably practicable and having regard to all relevant circumstances, to satisfy the needs of train operators and rail users. Network Rail is also under duties as regards the safety of the Network, and in particular is required under The Railways (Safety Case) Regulations 2000, pursuant to the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974, to have a safety case which has been approved by the Health and Safety Executive, and to comply with it.

3. Objections

We have set out below how Network Rail is adversely affected by specific elements of the Bill. The Bill, as drafted, would substantially and adversely impact on the land available to Network Rail as network operator, and prevent or very severely restrict operation of passenger and freight services on the Network.

3.1. Part 1: Scope of the works

Section 1 – Power to construct works

Section 1(1) authorises the authorised undertaker to construct and maintain the scheduled works. These include the construction of seven numbered works

described in Schedule 1 of the Bill which impact on the lines described in Section 1 above which form part of the Network. These works are Work Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 5, 6.

Section 3 Ancillary Works

Many of these works relate to works on the Network eg. Platforms and altering the position of railway track or of railway apparatus.

Section 5 – Access to works

Section 10 – Discharge of water

Section 11 – Safeguarding works to buildings

As land and buildings of Network Rail essential for operation of the Network both within limits of deviation and without may be included, Network Rail would wish to agree a method and protection for the exercise of such powers, so as to ensure the continued safe and economic use of Network Rail land and interests.

3.2 Part 2: Land

The provisions in Sections 12-28 of the Bill grant the authorised undertaker compulsory purchase powers and rights of temporary occupancy over the land specified in the Bill. Network Rail is shown as owner of over 70 plots in the Book of reference accompanying the Bill.

Network Rail may agree to and permit use of its land for construction of the proposed rail link, subject to certain terms and conditions in relation to, *inter alia*, safety, design, network performance and technical approvals.

Network Rail objects to the inclusion in the Bill of the authorised undertaker being granted powers to compulsorily acquire all of that land which has been identified in the Parliamentary Plans, the Book of Reference and as described in schedule 5 to the Bill. The inclusion of these powers would reduce Network Rail's interest as landowner and seriously impact on their statutory role as defined in the 1993 Railways Act.

Network Rail is seeking the deletion and removal from the Bill of any compulsory purchase acquisition rights being sought over Network Rail owned land. Such powers would affect the safety of the operational railway and Network Rail's ability to control and operate the railway and accordingly would have an adverse and substantial impact on Network Rail's obligations as network operator, increasing their potential liabilities and creating a potential for loss of revenue.

If any part of the Network was to be subject to CPO, this would affect compliance with Network Rail's network licence in relation to that area, and we would be unable to continue to operate the network over the affected areas. We believe compulsory purchase powers are unjustified as there is a regulated framework within which Network Rail could consider consenting to entry onto land.

Section 16 – Temporary use of land for construction of Works

This section allows the authorised undertaker to take access over and/or occupy land listed in schedule 6 to the Bill for a temporary period in connection with the carrying out of the authorised works. Certain use of the land listed in schedule 6 over which these rights of temporary possession are sought include Network Rail's land, some of which is currently operational railway.

In certain cases there is no restriction on the nature of the access or possession required for construction purposes and no limitation on the way in which these rights will be executed. In particular, there are no provisions as to how such access or possession will be subject to the operational and safety requirements of the adjacent railway.

Network Rail objects to the authorised undertaker being permitted unilateral access to and/or possession over those areas of land without Network Rail being satisfied that it will comply with Network Rail's safety, operating and technical requirements. Unless such an undertaking is imposed, this use of the land will adversely impact Network Rail. It will infringe on its responsibilities as landowner and railway operator. It will have the potential for loss of Network Rail revenue resulting from performance issues on the operational railway, together with increasing the risk in terms of safety of the Network.

Accordingly, Network Rail require that the authorised undertaker's rights to take temporary access or possession over Network Rail land, including current operational railway, is not permitted without an express requirement on the authorised undertaker to satisfy Network Rail that there are no risks that would place Network Rail in breach of its statutory duties or otherwise adversely affect Network Rail's role as network operator.

Section 23 – Power to enter land for survey, etc.

This will require control, via consent from Network Rail, to ensure safety to comply with Health and Safety requirements.

Section 35 – Listed Buildings

This clause envisages works to Glasgow Central Station, which is a listed building in the ownership of Network Rail. Again, Network Rail will require to agree any works as owner of the structure.

4. Specific Concerns

4.1 Lineside Accesses

The authorised undertakers's proposals extinguish a number of current lineside accesses that are used whenever inspection, fault response, incident response, maintenance or renewal works are undertaken on our infrastructure. Removal of these without their replacement by new facilities of similar functionality is

unacceptable to Network Rail because of the adverse impact that this would have on our core activities.

4 Train Performance

In order to allow meet the proposed train service pattern with sufficient functionality the overall rail system requires a combination of, or all, of the following: (1) new rolling stock with specified acceleration and braking characteristics; (2) a change to train timetable potentially affecting the access rights of other Train Operators; and /or (3) sufficient rail infrastructure.

The authorised undertaker's proposals include changes to the current train timetable and a measure of rail infrastructure improvements to incorporate the additional services between Glasgow Central and Glasgow Airport. Such timetable changes, without the requisite necessary changes to rail infrastructure may have an adverse effect on existing Network Rail regulatory obligations to achieve year on year improvements in the punctuality and reliability of train services. Until sufficient design and modelling is undertaken by the authorised undertaker, Network Rail, as the Network Infrastructure Controller, is not in a position to assess if sufficient infrastructure has been proposed. This also has the potential for loss of Network Rail revenue resulting from knock on performance impacts on the operational railway.

5. **Matters out with the Bill and Explanatory Document**

The Bill fails to include a number of issues which in Network Rail's view which are necessary, and these are :-

Network Rail and its predecessors have been involved in the statutory process for gaining authority for the construction and maintenance of a new railway on numerous occasions where the authority was being sought under either the Westminster private bill procedure (procedure no longer used except for hybrid bills), the Transport and Works Act 1992 Order procedure in England and Wales, or alternatively in Scotland, pre-devolution, by way of Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act 1936. It is established practice through these procedures for the resultant legislation to include protective provisions to give specific protection for the affected railway undertaker, in particular, Network Rail. The procedure for Scottish Private Bills is for an agreement to be entered into outside the Bill to cover the protective provisions which are outlined below.

Such provisions would include, but not be limited to :-

- (1) The authorised undertaker not being able to exercise certain powers without the consent of Network Rail including the power to acquire or use any railway property or to take access to any railway property;
- (2) Provisions for fencing to separate construction from operation railway;
- (3) Network Rail being satisfied with the plans of the proposed works, affecting the Network together with method statements, specifications and programmes before

commencement of construction of specified works. This means that the relevant safety and engineering conditions can be complied with;

(4) Network Rail requiring the authorised undertaker to reinstate or replicate any assets to the standard that existed prior to construction of the works;

(5) Provisions for recovery by Network Rail of expenses which Network Rail may be required to incur in altering any existing railway property to allow inclusion of the new asset;

(6) The authorised undertaker making good to Network Rail all costs, damages, expenses incurred by Network Rail as a result of the construction and maintenance of the railway works or by reason of an act, error or omission by the authorised undertaker or its contractor; and the authorised undertaker undertaking to indemnify Network Rail for any claims, demands, etc arising out of the railway works.

In view of the above, Network Rail requires an agreement to be entered into with the authorised undertaker whereby the authorised undertaker will undertake to comply with such provisions. It is Network Rail's position that the powers being sought in the Bill should not be granted without the necessary controls and safeguards required to protect the Network being in place.

Network Rail has been negotiating an agreement with the authorised undertaker, and progress has been made, but it has not been possible to reach final agreement prior to the expiry of the objection period.

OBJECTION FROM BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

On behalf of our clients British Transport Police Authority, established under Section 18 of the Railways & Transport Safety Act 2003 (the "**2003 Act**") having its principle office at The Forum, 5th Floor North, 74-80 Camden Street, London NW1 0EG ("**the Authority**") and British Transport Police Force, established under Section 20 of the 2003 Act and having its headquarters at Camden Point, Camden Road, London, NW1 9LN ("**BPT**"), we object to the detail of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill as introduced into the Scottish Parliament on 31 January 2006 (the "**Bill**") by Strathclyde Passenger Transport Executive.

In this Objection, references to the "**Promoter**" are to Strathclyde Passenger Transport Executive and to (a) any regional transport partnership established under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 which has succeeded or shall succeed Strathclyde Passenger Transport Executive as the promoter of the Bill and (b) any party constituting the "**authorised undertaker**" as defined in the Bill.

Neither the Authority nor BTP objects to the principle of the Bill.

The Authority and BTP's objections to the detail of the Bill are referred to briefly below in Paragraph 1 and set out more fully in Paragraph 2.

1. Introduction

BTP is the Great Britain's only national police force. That fact and the specialist nature of its policing activities, being limited to railways and railway facilities (including those of London Underground) and certain tram schemes make BTP an unique and specialist police force.

General provision was first made in 1858 for the appointment of Constables to police the construction of canals and railways. Therefore, railway policing has been distinct from civil policing arrangements throughout Great Britain for over 150 years. The current legal basis for BTP's existence, however, is the 2003 Act - which came into force on 1 July 2004 – and which, at Section 31, gives BTP jurisdiction on the railway and purposes connected to, occurring on or in relation to a railway in Great Britain.

The Authority is, by virtue of Section 20 of the 2003 Act, under a statutory obligation to secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force (a) to be known as British Transport Police Force, and (b) to police the railways. The Authority is also under a statutory duty to defray the expenses of BTP.

The Authority and BTP have no objection to the general principle to the Bill. They do, however, believe that, unless the issues set out below are addressed, the enactment of the Bill and the construction and operation of the authorised works as defined in the Bill ("**the authorised works**"):

- will be inadequately policed;
- may not be secure by design;
- may adversely affect the policing and security of Glasgow Airport and the existing railway network and facilities;
- will adversely affect BTP's existing property rights;
- compromise BTP's operations and effectiveness in the Glasgow and Paisley areas; and so
- place BTP and the Authority in breach of their existing contractual and statutory obligations.

The concerns of the Authority and BTP with the Bill are more fully set out in paragraph 2 below but can be summarised as follows:

1. incorporation of crime reduction and security measures and procedures;
2. provision of police facilities at Glasgow Airport Station;
3. protection of existing BTP operational capacity and facilities;
4. alterations to Glasgow Central Station; and
5. power and obligation to contract for police services.

The Authority and BTP are of the view that the Bill should not be passed into law unless amendments are made to the Bill or sufficient legally binding assurances are given by the Promoter to the Authority and / or BTP to ensure that all of their concerns referred and the possible consequences outlined above and explained in further detail below are properly addressed.

2 Objections

The Authority and BTP object to the following points of detail in the Bill:

2.1 Crime reduction and security

The Promoter has not thus far consulted BTP on the crime and security risks posed by either the construction or operation of the authorised works.

All major construction projects can be a catalyst for criminal activity affecting the project itself or the surrounding area. Those risks can range from petty theft and vandalism to fraud or extortion.

Railway infrastructure, operations, staff and passengers can equally face a range of threats ranging from petty crime to terrorism. The latter threat is heightened at an interface with air travel. The railways can also be used by criminals as a means of transport.

Not only should the design and specification of the authorised works incorporate crime reduction measures and features to facilitate the provision of police services but the manner in which the authorised works are procured and executed should take account of crime reduction and security considerations.

It is therefore imperative that BTP with its expertise and experience of railway policing matters, including major projects, be involved in the development of the design and project management of the authorised works.

The Authority and BTP wish the Promoter to actively engage with BTP in this regard and to that end to enter into a police services agreement (or series of such agreements) for the provision of services associated with the design, specification, project management and operation of the authorised works.

To the extent that the Promoter does not agree to enter into any such agreement, the Bill Committee should amend the Bill to both authorise and require the Promoter to do so.

2.2 Police facilities at Glasgow Airport Station

The plans and drawings submitted with the Bill as introduced do not indicate inclusion of police station facilities at the proposed Glasgow Airport Station.

The Authority and BTP believe that that is a material omission.

The Promoter should have included provision of a police station of an appropriate size and specification at the airport rail station as part of the authorised works.

The Authority and BTP wish this issue to be addressed by a suitable legally binding agreement with Promoter.

The Bill, however, should be amended to authorise the Promoter to make provision for these facilities and, in the event of the Promoter not agreeing to enter into a suitable agreement with BTP and the Authority before the enactment of the Bill, to require the Promoter to provide such facilities.

2.3 Protection of existing BTP operational capacity and facilities

The rationale behind the airport rail link is to increase the number of people travelling by rail. This will mostly be felt on the west and central Scotland rail network, particularly at Glasgow Central and Paisley Gilmour Street stations.

The Authority and BTP are concerned that unless steps are taken to address the possible direct and indirect consequences of the development and operation of the authorised works, the effectiveness and efficiency of BTP's existing operations in the Glasgow and Paisley areas may be affected.

That will place BTP and the Authority in breach of their existing statutory and contractual obligations, for these reasons the Bill should not be enacted until this matter is resolved.

BTP and the Authority's particular concerns are with resourcing, work flows and facilities. They wish the Promoter to actively engage with them to develop a fuller understanding of these issues and to agree the manner in which they shall be addressed.

2.4 Alterations to Glasgow Central Station

The Authority and BTP are not satisfied with the level of information available to date on a number of operational and safety critical aspects of and apparent likely impact of the Promoter's proposals in so far as they affect Glasgow Central Station ("**the Station**").

The Station is not only one of the busiest stations in Scotland but is an operational base for BTP officers serving a wider area.

It is therefore essential that nothing is done that will adversely affect normal BTP operations at or conducted from the Station, or indeed the ability of BTP and other emergency services to respond to incidents there.

Whilst noting that the plans and drawing submitted with the Bill indicate that the existing vehicular access to platform level from Hope Street is to be retained and reserved for emergency service access, BTP and the Authority feel that further consideration of the practicalities of what is proposed is required.

The Authority and BTP object to the proposed loss of platform level car parking spaces, some of which are currently used for operational purposes by BTP and the proposed amended vehicular access and egress arrangements at the Station.

BTP require to be able to move people and equipment (including but not limited to prisoners) to and from the Station in as secure and concise a means as is practicable. To facilitate effective operations, BTP vehicles should be able to be parked as close as possible to the police station at the Station as is possible. Any alternative parking arrangements must be secure to prevent loss of specialist equipment and other material from BTP vehicles and to protect them from sabotage or vandalism.

The proposed alternative arrangements appear to create the possibility of congestion in the vehicular access and egress arrangements to platform level and, due to the loss of the vehicle ramp connecting the platform level of the Station to Broomielaw, make access to the Station by certain types of emergency vehicles, in particular for fire engines, impossible.

The Authority and BTP are concerned that this may not only compromise the ability of BTP to use the police station at the Station as a base for wider operations but more importantly for the ability of the emergency services as a whole to respond to a major incident at the Station.

It is essential that the Bill is not enacted until these issues are satisfactorily addressed. The Authority and BTP hope that the Promoter will actively engage with them to resolve the concerns expressed above.

In the event, however, that this element of this Objection is not withdrawn by the Consideration Stage of the Bill, the Authority and BTP request that the Bill Committee amends the Bill to provide for a restriction on the authorised undertaker's powers in so far as they may affect the Station such that BTP and the Authority may impose requirements as they may reasonably make for the protection of the effective provision of policing of the railways and the provision of emergency services' response to events at the Station.

2.6 Police services agreement.

The Authority's obligations in respect of BTP are referred to in Paragraph 1 above.

Section 33 of the 2003 Act authorises the Authority to enter into police services agreements (each a "PSA") for BTP to provide police services and to govern incidental and ancillary matters.

The British Transport Police (Police Services Agreement) Order 2004 (the "PSA Order") was made by the Secretary of State for Transport in exercise of powers conferred upon him by Sections 34(1) and 74(1) of the 2003 Act.

The PSA Order requires that, with effect from 1 July 2004, Network Rail and every person referred to in Article 2(1) of the PSA Order (which includes the train operators) shall enter into a PSA.

As a result of the PSA Order, the existing railway network and all operations upon it is subject to a series of PSAs which between them provide for the policing of the railways and the funding of the same.

The Authority and BTP wish the authorised works and operations upon them to similarly be covered by PSA arrangements.

Accordingly, the Authority and BTP request that the Bill Committee amend the Bill to expressly provide that, to the extent that the Promoter or authorised undertaker are not already so authorised and bound, they shall be authorised and bound to enter into a PSA in respect of the authorised works.

3. Engagement with the Promoter

The Authority and BTP look forward to a constructive dialogue with the Promoter to identify the means to resolve the various grounds of objection set out above.

The Authority and BTP believe that many of the concerns with the Bill as detailed in this Objection could be resolved by the Promoter entering into an appropriately drafted PSA.

As detailed above, however, the Authority and BTP believe that several amendments will nonetheless require to be made to the Bill and request that the Bill Committee makes them.

4. Fees and expenses

In connection with this Objection and any agreement reached pursuant to it, the Authority and BTP seeks an undertaking from the Promoter to reimburse all legal and other professional fees and expenses incurred by the Authority or BTP in connection with and arising from the Bill and the Promoter's proposals.

5. Withdrawal of Objection

This Objection will be withdrawn in the event that the Authority and BTP receive:

5.1 an undertaking from the Promoter in a satisfactory form and on terms that meet the requirements set out in Paragraph 2 (*Objections*) and 4 (*Fees and expenses*) above; and;

5.2 in so far as the requirements set out in Paragraph 2 (*Objections*) above have not been satisfied by an undertaking from the Promoter, confirmation that the Bill Committee have agreed to amend the Bill as requested in this Objection.

SUBMISSION FROM VISIT SCOTLAND

Introduction

VisitScotland welcomes the opportunity to submit written evidence to the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill Committee on the proposals to provide a new railway service between Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Central Station.

VisitScotland operates from over 140 locations throughout the country with our main offices in Edinburgh and Inverness. We have a considerable array of local expertise throughout our network which stretches from Lerwick to London.

As an organisation we have three key roles with related objectives. These are:

- To attract visitors to Scotland
- To engage with partners within the industry
- To add value to the visitor experience.

As the national tourism agency we have two customers – the consumer (visitor) and the tourism industry itself. We have a strategic role as the lead public sector agency for tourism to provide leadership and direction for the development of Scottish tourism to ensure we leverage the maximum possible economic benefit for Scotland. In addition, we exist to support the development of the tourism industry in Scotland and to market Scotland as a quality destination.

Consumer Attitudes

As visitors become increasingly cash rich and time poor, the journey is becoming a more important element of the visitor experience. Research suggests that visitors want to reach their destination within three hours and as the trend towards short breaks increases, easy and quick access to Scotland will become even more important, as will movement around the country.

Although VisitScotland has not carried out specific research regarding visitor preferences in respect of travel from airports, these trends would suggest that a rail link between Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Central would be welcomed by visitors to Scotland. The research being undertaken by the Scottish Executive (as referred to in the *Tourism Framework for Change*) may provide more detailed information.

VisitScotland does undertake a Consumer Attitudes Survey which asks a limited number of questions on transport. This identifies that 45% of our visitors arrive by plane, with this percentage rising to as much as 91% for some of our overseas visitors. It also tells us that ease of travel to a destination is important for 55% of our visitors, while 62% of visitors cite ease of travel around Scotland while here being an important factor.

Airlines

Because direct access to Scotland is becoming increasingly important for our visitors, VisitScotland works closely with Scottish Enterprise and BAA Scotland to encourage airlines to introduce new routes to Scotland. VisitScotland is often involved at the very early stages of negotiations to discuss joint promotional opportunities. Our experience of airline negotiations would suggest that airlines are primarily influenced by the size of the market (the city and its conurbations); the economics of landing charges; and additional sources of financial assistance (e.g. the Route Development Fund, promotional activity / investment by organisations such as VisitScotland).

While links from the airport might not be a primary consideration for airlines, it should be borne in mind that Scottish airports are competing for new routes on an international level. Many of our competitors already have good rail links from their airports to city centre destinations. A rail link from Glasgow airport to the city centre would therefore assist Glasgow in competing for new routes.

Summary

In summary, VisitScotland agrees that the rail link between Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Central will be welcomed by both visitors and airlines.

**GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL:
WRITTEN EVIDENCE**

SUBMISSION FROM INVERCLYDE COUNCIL

Inverclyde Council supports the proposed Glasgow Airport Rail Link as it assists in the stimulation of economic growth in Inverclyde through increasing the capacity of the regional rail network; as the proposal complements the regeneration of the A8/Inverclyde Corridor by developing rail capacity; and, as it improves public transport access to Glasgow Airport for travel and for job opportunities.

Inverclyde Council has promoted major regeneration plans within the A8 Corridor (Riverside Inverclyde, below) and the Council recognises the connection between economic development and effective transport networks. The adopted Local Plan for Inverclyde addresses population decline which is the major challenge for our area and seeks to create and channel development within the A8 Corridor and identifies this as a high priority. The Council has a clear focus on the strategic planning for this area and, together with its Community Planning Partners, is investigating in a programme of major infrastructure investment and improved accessibility: the Council's objective is to promote and sustain Inverclyde as a competitive, place of choice with accessibility to the Glasgow City region. The Glasgow Airport rail link assists the Council's aspiration for good public transport systems with strong external links within the City region.

The Scottish Executive's Regeneration Statement has identified Inverclyde as an area for Urban Regeneration Company status for its Riverside corridor. This major initiative which is called "Riverside Inverclyde" is promoting major development within the A8 Corridor involving planned 2,700 new houses with industrial and commercial site developments and increased job opportunities. This housing-led regeneration will be benefited by efficient transport networks.

Inverclyde Council is also supportive of GARL through its strategic partnerships within the Clyde Valley Community Planning Partnership, the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan Group and through the joint transport strategy for Western Scotland.

The supplementary written Statement from the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Joint Structure Plan recognises the importance of Glasgow International Airport and the importance of its growth and expansion. Glasgow Airport is a national priority and in order to safeguard the future of the airport there is a strategic need to improve public transport access to the airport and particularly rail links thereto.

The Council is a member of the Clyde Valley Community Planning Partnership and has supported the strategic importance of the development of Glasgow Airport and its role in the Western Scotland economy. Glasgow Airport is a major employer; it has a key role in increasing national and international accessibility to Western Scotland; it contributes to the

development of the tourism industry; and it assists the promotion of Western Scotland for inward investment. Inverclyde's regeneration plans are assisted by the proximity and accessibility of our area to Glasgow Airport.

The Council has endorsed the Joint Transport Strategy for Western Scotland and this has identified the Glasgow Airport rail link as being important in the support of the growth of Glasgow Airport; in the provision of a fast and reliable service which would assist the reduction in road congestion; and, in its potential for improved services and accessibility to the rail network as a result of the upgrade to existing track.

The details of the proposed scheme involves the creation of a new junction on the Inverclyde line east of Paisley St James station for the new branch line to the Airport. The Council has noted the options appraisal for the various alternatives which have been considered over time and has noted that there is no proposed, viable alternative to the scheme which is the subject of the Bill. Passengers will be able to interchange from the Inverclyde and Ayrshire catchment areas at Paisley Gilmour Street. This interchange does open up greater travel choices from and to Inverclyde. A quality environment at the hub will be important for the rail travelling public. The Council recognises that GARL will allow the opportunity to develop extra services for Inverclyde by utilising the additional capacity that will be available after the works are completed.

The Council is keen to promote internal connections within the rail network and to promote modal shift by improving public transport integration in key corridors by the development of services, the creation of interchanges and improved infrastructure. The Council is promoting a major transport interchange as part of its area renewal programme within Gourock and this will be accessible from the rail network for purposes of improved connections to Argyll and Bute and the Cowal Peninsula.

It is important for the Council that GARL will not only serve movements directly from Glasgow but will provide a direct rail link for access to the Airport from east and west. In respect of benefit to Inverclyde, the GARL will be able to provide a choice of travel mode for passengers and employees which will encourage modal shift by reducing the number of car journeys through the provision of an easier and direct rail link from Inverclyde: resultant traffic volumes may reduce on the A8/M8 which will assist in reducing levels of pollution and travel times.

The Council supports the Joint Transport Strategy in its efforts to achieve a sustained shift in modal travel from the private car to public transport in order to reduce congestion, increase journey reliability and improve the environmental pollution impacts of growing traffic volumes. Importantly, the GARL supports economic and social activity in enhancing overall regional accessibility. The Council's own Local Transport Strategy comments on the problem of poor levels of access especially by rail and public transport to Glasgow Airport for Inverclyde residents and businesses. The GARL is seen as an opportunity which would enhance accessibility to Glasgow Airport. In

addition, it is recognised that Inverclyde can be promoted as a strategic location in relation to the airport.

The formation of GARL could have a significant effect on the ability of destination visitors to gain access to the public transport infrastructure and thus assist short break and business visitors to Inverclyde. It can be anticipated that Inverclyde could benefit from this but the overall economic assessment at this stage is unquantifiable.

In summary, improved rail access from the airport to the West of Scotland will benefit Inverclyde in our area's aspiration to be a place of choice and readily available access to and from the Airport hub is seen as clearly being positive.