The Committee will meet at 10.10 am in Committee Room 6.

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

   **Panel 1**
   Steven Fitzgerald, Chief Executive, Infratil Airports Europe Ltd;
   Douglas Dewar, Financial Director, Scottish Airports Ltd;
   Derek Hendry, Development Director, Scottish Airports Group;

   **Panel 2**
   James King, Board Member, Passenger Focus Group, Scotland;
   Robert Samson, Passenger Link Manager, Passenger Focus;
   Marjory Rodger, Director of Government Relations, Confederation of Passenger Transport UK;

   **Panel 3**
   John Halliday, Head of Transport Planning and Integration, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;
   Douglas Ferguson, Director of Operations, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;
   Simon Temple, Director, Faber Maunsell;
   Brian Cuthbert, Principal Consultant, Faber Maunsell.

Terry Shevlin
The following papers are attached for this meeting—

**Agenda item 1**
Written Evidence  
Promoter Responses
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. This was previously submitted to Members at the Committee’s meeting on 18 April 2006.

2. Written evidence has been provided by the following organisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glasgow Airport Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Passenger Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confederation of Passenger Transport UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBMISSION FROM GLASGOW AIRPORT LIMITED

1. We refer to the invitation from the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill Committee ("the Committee") to submit the views of Glasgow Airport Limited on the general principles of the Bill and the adequacy of the accompanying documents. We thank the Committee for this opportunity to put forward our views of the Bill, which we have set out below.

2. Taking the policy objectives first, we acknowledge that the objectives support existing United Kingdom, Scottish and regional objectives and are generally broad in nature. As to whether the Glasgow Airport Rail Link (GARL) will meet the objectives expressed in the Promoter’s Memorandum, we have, where appropriate, made a number of observations. The Committee will appreciate that we are not in a position to confirm that the policy objectives will be met either in whole or part.

3. We consider that GARL may meet the Promoter’s second objective to contribute to a sustainable basis for future growth of Glasgow International Airport (Glasgow Airport) in terms of regional and national Government objectives. It is important to note that this sustainable growth will rely on a wide package of ground transport measures including regional and national policies to manage the demand for surface access. This work will require recognition that all modes of transport have a part to play in the development of the airport, including the need to upgrade road capacity on a number of regional roads used to access Glasgow Airport. In this regard we note that paragraph 5.23 of the Government’s White Paper ‘The Future of Air Transport’ refers to a potential rail link to Glasgow Airport and notes that this could form one element of a potential package of surface access improvements that may be needed to cater for increased traffic volumes associated with Glasgow Airport’s future growth.

4. We acknowledge in respect of the Promoter’s third objective, that the GARL scheme will probably contribute to sustainable regeneration of the M8 corridor. However, Scottish transport policy does not discount the provision of additional road capacity and we suggest that the capacity of the M8 itself needs to be addressed as part of an holistic objective led policy.

5. As regards the fifth objective, we note that GARL intends to provide a high quality, high capacity, safe, frequent and relatively fast service between Glasgow Airport and central Glasgow. However, this will not be sufficient in itself to deliver the objective’s stated aim of attracting airline passengers out of their cars. With regards to airline passengers the provision of adequate facilities for securing baggage and the cost of travel (particularly where group travel is concerned) will be key to the service’s attractiveness. It is unclear whether the provision of space for baggage fits with other local objectives relating to providing high capacity on rail routes and Scottish objectives relating to the cost of operating the railway.

6. The explanatory notes to the Bill contain an estimate of expense of the capital costs of £160m which have been stated in fourth quarter 2004 prices. We note that there is a contingency of 28% which seems to be on the low side given the current
state of the development and design of the project. Experience elsewhere on other rail- way projects has resulted in adopting a higher level of contingency or optimism bias as it is sometimes referred to of approximately 60%, which is then reduced as the project becomes better defined and developed.

7. We would suggest that the Committee should scrutinise the capital cost estimate so that it may satisfy itself as to the adequacy of the estimate and in particular to inquire as to whether Network Rail has provided any of the estimates for items such as signalling, overhead line electrification and for works on their existing infrastructure or alternatively has endorsed the estimates prepared by the Promoter.

8. Paragraph 16 of the explanatory notes to the Bill states that the Bill will have the same effect as would a compulsory purchase order in other types of scheme e.g. for roads.

9. Further paragraph 17 states that compulsory purchase under the Bill must be on the same standardised basis as any other compulsory purchase in Scotland.

10. It has been long held that a compulsory purchase order should only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest. A promoter should be sure that the purposes for which it is seeking statutory powers for compulsory acquisition of land and rights should sufficiently justify interfering with the property rights (including those protected by the European Convention on Human Rights) of those parties with an interest in the land affected. In essence there needs to be clear evidence that the public benefit will outweigh the private loss.

11. We would suggest that the Committee needs to scrutinise the economic and financial case for the scheme so that the Committee can be satisfied that there is a proper case to justify the granting of statutory powers of compulsory acquisition to the Promoter. This scrutiny is particularly important as the availability of funding for the project referred to in paragraphs 203 and 205 of the explanatory notes to the Bill is somewhat uncertain. Funding is stated as being anticipated and conditional upon the project financial business case being approved by key parties. The ability of landowners to plan future development should not be prejudiced by uncertainty as to whether compulsory purchase powers of long duration will ever be exercised for the purposes of this project.

12. Quite separately, the Committee will be aware that Glasgow Airport Limited has objected to the application of any powers of compulsory purchase to Glasgow Airport’s land and that objection will stand even if the Committee concludes that there is a case for compulsory purchase of land in relation to other parts of the route.

SUBMISSION FROM PASSENGER FOCUS

Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill
Passenger Focus welcomes the opportunity to comment on the general principles surrounding the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill.
Passenger Focus supports the aims of the Bill and believe that the rail link will be of particular benefit in the following areas:

i) Developing the capacity and capability of the national and regional rail network

As well as providing a rail link between Glasgow Central station and Glasgow Airport, the provision of an extra stop at Paisley Gilmour Street will enhance existing services in the Glasgow-Paisley corridor and open up journey opportunities from the Ayrshire and Inverclyde catchment areas.

Work on the existing rail network (particularly at Wallneuk junction) will also create additional capacity that could be used to develop extra services for Ayrshire and Inverclyde. It is important, however, to ensure that the work on the rail link does not compromise the potential to re-instate a 4th track on the existing network rail route.

We would also seek assurances as to the status of the rail link and the services to be provided once the rail link has been completed. Schedule 31 of the Bill states that although SPTE is the promoter of the Bill it will not necessarily own or operate the railway. It also creates the legal framework whereby SPTE can transfer responsibility for the rail link to a third party. This is sensible – as is the expectation (in the notes to the Bill) that the alterations to the existing rail network will transfer to Network Rail. However, this still leaves the issue of the ‘new’ part of the link and the status of the airport services themselves.

We understand that it is not possible to specify issues of ownership in the Bill – the issue of who actually runs services being subject to separate railway licensing regulations. However, we would like to see a commitment to the principles of through-ticketing, inter-available fares, provision of information and passenger representation. In essence we would like a commitment that the rail link will be part of the national rail network rather than a separate operation in the manner of the Heathrow Express.

ii) Enhanced public transport services to Glasgow Airport and modal integration within the area.

Arguments surrounding the sustainability of air travel and the expansion of airport capacity are outside Passenger Focus’ main remit. However, we do take a keen interest in the potential impact on surface access to airports and the way in which rail can play a part in meeting this demand as part of a properly integrated transport package.

The Future of Air Transport White paper (December 2003) outlined the potential growth in demand at Glasgow Airport. Passenger numbers have already grown by nearly 60% in the 10 year period between 1995 and 2004 and the White Paper envisages a continued increase in demand from 6.5million in 2001 to 10.4 million in 2015 and to 15.4million in 2030.

However, only 6% of trips to/from the airport are currently made by public transport - either bus or a combination of train and bus (source Faber Maunsell 2005). GARL will help to address this. Patronage forecasts on the new rail services are estimated to be approximately 1.4 million passengers in the opening year, rising to 1.8 million in 2030. Moreover, transport modelling shows that about 80% of passengers using
GARL will transfer from private car or taxi. [Source: Promoters memorandum to the Bill]

The air link will, therefore, clearly enhance the provision of public transport in the area and puts rail at the heart of an integrated transport system. The air link and the proposed fast, regular interval Caledonian Express service from Glasgow Central to Edinburgh will reinforce integration, and the business case for each, by providing a straightforward interchange at Glasgow Central for passengers from a wide range of destinations to the east of Glasgow in the event that the latter service is implemented.

SUBMISSION FROM THE CONFEDERATION OF PASSENGER TRANSPORT UK

Thank you for forwarding to CPT the opportunity to submit written evidence to the Lead Committee in respect of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill.

CPT did write to SPTA giving qualified support of this project. A copy of that letter dated 08 February 2005 is attached and CPT's views remain unaltered.

From that base, and turning to the General Principles of the Bill – that is to say:

Is a new railway service between Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Central Station a sensible policy to pursue?

CPT has one important additional point to make.

CPT feels strongly that prior to proceeding, those responsible must ensure that STAG has resulted in a thorough testing of the options.

Is heavy rail actually the best solution or are there other, more cost effective options that would give many of the benefits? For example, since this project was first floated, product development has seen the launch of guided buses such as the ftr which are flexible, have the glamour of trams, do not require the infrastructure disruption of heavy rail and can be implemented at a fraction of the cost of heavy rail.

08 February 2005

Alistair Watson
Chair
Strathclyde Passenger Transport Authority
Consort House
12 West George Street
Glasgow G2 1HN

Dear Councillor Watson,

Glasgow Airport Rail Link Public Consultation
As the trade association for bus, coach and light rail, the Confederation of Passenger Transport is pleased to have been given the opportunity to respond to the consultation specified above.

CPT initially opposed the heavy rail links to both Glasgow and Edinburgh airports on the grounds that both airports were served by first class bus partnerships; neither proposed rail link would significantly relieve congestion; and we failed to see how either would meet best value criteria.

However, we now recognise the strategic benefits of linking most conurbations of a significant size into an effective integrated network. We also recognise that the commitments have been given by the Scottish Executive and that both heavy rail links will be implemented.

Accordingly, CPT is now supporting these commitments and wants to work in partnership with the heavy rail link stakeholders to ensure that the travelling public benefit from the best possible transport network.

To achieve this, CPT views that it is essential that the bus and coach operators are fully involved in planning the ensuing multi-modal service network, and thus in achieving multi-modal integration.

If this commitment is to be successful, as much of the population of the west of Scotland as possible must directly benefit from easier access to the airport. CPT members want to be fully consulted active participants in the service delivery of this Scottish Executive commitment.
GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL: 
REPLIES FROM THE PROMOTER

Background

1. A paper containing the promoter's written replies to the Committee's questions on the Bill and its accompanying documents was submitted to the Committee for its meeting on 18 April 2006.

2. This paper is an edited version of the promoter's original paper, containing the replies to issues that are most likely to be examined by the Committee at its meeting on Monday 8 May.
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RESPONSE FROM THE PROMOTER ON THE COMMITTEE’S QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS ON THE BILL’S GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Economy

Question 1: With reference to the first bullet point of paragraph 4 of the Promoter’s Memorandum, what evidence do you have to suggest that developing the rail network contributes to economic growth, with reference to the existing, extensive railway and underground system in the west of Scotland?

1. As part of the work undertaken in preparation for the parliamentary submission, the Promoter commissioned consultants to undertake an assessment of the wider economic benefits of the GARL project. These consultant’s subsequent report was entitled the Assessment of Wider Economic Benefits report (“AWEB”) and has been made available on the Promoter’s GARL website. The report outlined that the Promoter is aware from previous experience throughout the UK and Europe that rail transport investment projects such as GARL are capable of producing a number of potential significant effects and impacts, in terms of land use planning, regeneration and socio-economic related issues.

2. Whilst there is a well established rail network in the SPT area, there are some significant direct benefits that will be realised as a result of the GARL project including:

   - The existing rail network between Paisley Gilmour Street and Shields Junction is at or near capacity, however the introduction of a third track directly as a result of the GARL project will increase rail capacity by up to 50% between Paisley and Shields Junction.

   - The creation of 2km of branch line will open up access to Glasgow Airport from the wider rail network either directly or through interchange at Paisley Gilmour Street or Glasgow Central Stations.

   - As indicated within the Promoter’s Memorandum (paragraph 115) the GARL project will have an estimated Net present Value of £64 million (i.e. the economic benefits of GARL will outweigh the costs by £64 million).

3. Further quantified benefits identified for the GARL project (including development effects and wider economic benefits) are outlined in our response to Question 2 below. In addition to these potential benefits (i.e. employment, floorspace, development and investment), it is anticipated that there would be a series of other benefits and impacts. These broadly comprise the following features:

   - significant local labour market and training benefits;
- business activity and competitiveness;
- market and investor confidence;
- image and place competitiveness – in terms of both the Airport and surrounding City region;
- potential regeneration benefits, via greater accessibility to employment and services, which may enhance leisure, recreational and tourism opportunities; and
- impact on visitors and tourism potential – helping to cement positive first impression and City image, key to encouraging repeat visits.

Question 2: Paragraph 14 of the Promoter’s Memorandum refers to that fact that the Glasgow Airport Rail Link will “bring the benefit of good airport accessibility and related economic benefit to the whole region”. Can it be explained how the “whole region” will benefit economically?

4. The AWEB report prepared in support of the GARL project provides detail of the quantifiable and non-quantifiable economic benefits of the project to the wider region. The main quantifiable wider economic benefits of the GARL project are noted as follows:

- **Conurbation wide employment**: Support for continuing employment growth of at least 65 jobs per annum (1,300 jobs in 20 year period) in Glasgow and Renfrewshire, and 5 jobs per annum (100 jobs in 20 year period) in Ayrshire and Inverclyde;

- **Tourism and leisure employment**: 275 gross new jobs and 96 net additional new jobs from increased tourism expenditure;

- **Paisley Town Centre**: enabling the development of a new opportunity for up to 135,000 square feet office market accommodation and up to 675-700 gross new jobs and 315-328 net additional new jobs over 3-4 year period;

- **Gross Added Value**: Generation of additional Gross Added Value of at least £2.1 million per annum in Glasgow and Renfrewshire; £0.16 million per annum in Ayrshire and Inverclyde; £3.14 million per annum from tourism and leisure employment; and in excess of £10 million per annum from Paisley town centre based employment (post-completion). In total, this would represent between £283 to £290 million over 20 year period.

5. A number of non-quantifiable economic benefits are also highlighted, including: supporting continuing economic growth at Glasgow Airport continued support for employment growth associated with the Clyde Waterfront Regeneration Initiative; contribution towards the potential for
additional tourist and visitors numbers and the linked expenditure; as well as supporting the competitiveness of the City region in relation to conference market and other general future business opportunities.

6. In the context of the above matters, although the core benefits of the GARL project will relate primarily to Glasgow, Renfrewshire, Ayrshire and Inverclyde, there will be other benefits to the wider West of Scotland by virtue of improved rail services and greater accessibility to over 143 rail stations.

Question 3: What is the predicted growth in job numbers at Glasgow and Prestwick airports directly attributable to GARL, what types of jobs are expected to be created and who is likely to fill these jobs?

7. The assessment of the GARL project was conservatively based on the Department for Transport forecasts of air passenger growth. Consequently, no increase in air passenger numbers at Glasgow, or Prestwick, was assumed as a result of the GARL project. As employee numbers are largely a function of air passenger numbers, no increase was assumed as a specific result of the GARL project. The increase in employee numbers is therefore solely due to the Department for Transport forecast of passenger growth. The additional employees will cover a range of occupations from flight crew to maintenance staff and employees in retail outlets. No change in the pattern of home origins of employees has been assumed, although the employment catchment of the airport is likely to grow as the number of staff increases.

8. In reality, the assessment was conservative and the GARL project would help support the continuing growth of the airport both in terms of passenger numbers and job numbers.

9. For example, there is an estimated potential for up to 15,000 jobs at Glasgow Airport, in line with the anticipated growth in passengers volumes outlined by the Government Aviation / Air Transport White paper, where Glasgow Airport itself is expected to double to some 15 million passengers by the year 2030. The Promoter believes that the GARL project will play a key part in this growth by helping to deliver the surface access strategy for Glasgow Airport.

10. It should be noted that whilst our assessment did not directly assume an increase in jobs at the airport as a result of the GARL project, the 650 jobs created in Glasgow and Renfrewshire over the next ten years could be located at or close to the airport.

Question 4. Can more detail be provided to substantiate the claims made in paragraph 117?

11. As part of the work undertaken in preparation for the parliamentary submission, the Promoter commissioned consultants to undertake an
assessment of the wider economic benefits of the GARL scheme. This assessment was prepared to provide a broad examination of the wider economic benefit for West Central Scotland, with particular emphasis placed upon the immediate GARL route corridor, particularly within the City of Glasgow and Renfrewshire, but then also the benefits for the wider regional area comprising Inverclyde and Ayrshire.

12. The assessment comprised a number of individual but integrated components which were combined to provide the wider economic benefits identified in the Promoters Memorandum. This included: initial examination of the potential broad qualitative and quantitative benefits of rail investment; identification and assessment of the headline impacts; detailed analysis of a business survey, undertaken to support and provide justification for the GARL; and calculation of the wider quantitative benefits, in terms of employment impacts across business, leisure and tourism, as well as construction and other non-quantifiable impacts.

13. The gross employment impacts were considered in context of the likely displacement, leakage and multiplier effects, and net additional employment impact provided. This was then matched by a broad assessment of output in terms of Gross Added Value impacts attributable to GARL. A summary of these benefits has been provided previously by the Promoter in paragraph 117 of the Promoter’s Memorandum. The wider economic benefits are outlined within the Promoter’s answer to Question 2 above and are summarised again below. The core quantifiable wider economic benefits of the GARL project are noted as follows:

- Conurbation wide employment: Support for continuing employment growth of at least 65 jobs per annum (1,300 jobs in 20 year period) in Glasgow and Renfrewshire, and 5 jobs per annum (100 jobs in 20 year period) in Ayrshire and Inverclyde;

- Tourism and leisure employment: 275 gross new jobs and 96 net additional new jobs from increased tourism expenditure;

- Paisley Town Centre: enabling the development of a new opportunity for up to 135,000 square feet office market accommodation and up to 675-700 gross new jobs and 315-328 net additional new jobs over 3-4 year period;

- Gross Added Value: Generation of additional Gross Added Value of at least £2.1 million per annum in Glasgow and Renfrewshire; £0.16 million per annum in Ayrshire and Inverclyde; £3.14 million per annum from tourism and leisure employment; and in excess of £10 million per annum from Paisley town centre based employment (post-completion). In total, this would represent between £283 to £290 million over 20 year period.
14. A number of non-quantifiable economic benefits are also highlighted, including: supporting continuing economic growth at Glasgow Airport; continued support for employment growth associated with the Clyde Waterfront Regeneration Initiative; contribution towards the potential for additional tourist and visitors numbers and the linked expenditure; as well as supporting the competitiveness of the City region in relation to conference market and other general future business opportunities.

Question 5. Paragraph 65 quotes Glasgow City Council’s City Plan; “the absence of a rail link to Glasgow Airport places it at a disadvantage compared with other UK and European airports…”. Does the promoter have any relevant information on other UK and European airports with rail links and the economic benefits they enjoy as a result?

15. With respect to other UK airports, Chart 1 below shows airports with annual passenger numbers of 1 million to 22 million in 2005. Heathrow (more than 64 million), Gatwick (more than 30 million) and airports with passenger numbers of below 1 million lie outside the scope of the chart. The chart demonstrates that Glasgow (8.8 million) and Edinburgh (8.4 million) are the two airports with the largest annual passenger numbers that do not possess a rail link. It can be seen that many smaller airports already enjoy a direct rail connection and some have recently been opened (such as London City and Cardiff Airports).

Chart 1

16. With respect to other European airports, Chart 2 below shows cities/airports that are in direct competition with Glasgow for Conventions,
Trade and Tourism. Chart 2 shows that, with the exception of Prague, Helsinki and Dublin airports\(^1\), all competitor cities possess a rail link.

### Chart 2

#### Passenger Numbers (millions) at European Airports (2005 unless otherwise stated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>With Rail Link</th>
<th>No Rail Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. (Further information in relation to other UK and European airports is provided in our response to Annex 4 question 8.)

18. Furthermore, the research and consultation undertaken in preparing the AWEB report illustrates the perceived requirement for the provision of direct airport rail links, as part of an overall integrated multi-modal transport network.

19. First and second tier regional cities in Europe compete for investment and business opportunities and operate in a highly competitive environment. It has been indicated by consultees including Scottish Enterprise, Glasgow City Council and the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Tourist Board that, for Glasgow to continue to compete successfully in such a business environment, it is considered essential for the conurbation to have an equivalent high quality business infrastructure, transport connections and services, including airport rail / light rail connections, and a high quality gateway experience to boost overall positive perceptions of the potential investor/visitor. This includes both potential mobile business investment and leisure business, where the latter offers immense potential for business expenditure.

20. Discussions with GARS consultees indicates that it remains firmly their view that the implementation of the fast Airport rail link will be a significant

---

\(^1\) Proposals for a metro rail connection to Dublin Airport are currently in development by Department of Transport Ireland
contributory factor in supporting not only business but also tourism in the
Glasgow conurbation and throughout the West of Scotland.

21. This position has been re-affirmed by the recent statement made by Alan Wilson, the Chief Executive of Scottish Council for Development and Industry (Scotsman, 5 April 2006), who strongly support the GARL project. He states that “where our major cities do lag badly behind their European counterparts is in connectivity by air and rail. Glasgow, for example, is in 39th place on rail links and 43rd on air links… and this lowly position for Scotland’s biggest city clearly underlines the importance of going further.” The GARL project will therefore be a key ingredient in ensuring that Glasgow (and Scotland) is able to compete with other major European cities.

22. As a key illustration of this competitive requirement at a ‘flagship’ level, all cities hosting Olympic Games in recent years have ensured that such airport – city rail transport infrastructure were provided, as an essential ingredient of their competitive bid. For example, Athens, Sydney and Barcelona each of developed a system specifically for this purpose. Indeed, the International Olympic Committee questions as to robustness of London’s bid for the 2012 Olympic Games focused upon the quality of the city’s transport links and ability to transport large numbers of people across the conurbation, despite possessing direct rail links from each of the city’s airports. Cities hosting the Commonwealth Games are also largely similarly equipped, with only Melbourne, the 2006 Commonwealth Games host City, being the exception with public transport access by bus only. The bid by Glasgow to host the 2014 Commonwealth Games will only strengthen the need for such a direct rail link service.

23. Research by the Airports Council International highlights the economic and social significance of airports as key aspects of air transport systems and the economy. The research covering airports across 45 European countries indicates that the accessibility that airports bring to a region is perhaps the single most important of these factors. It confirms that airports are not only key drivers for economic, social and tourism development and investment, but also act as a catalyst for improved accessibility. It notes that restricting the development or capacity of an airport would have subsequent implications for the local economy. In this context, the development of Glasgow airport and its ability to continue to be competitive with other major cities will be limited should there be no direct airport rail link.

Questions as Listed in Annex 1 with corresponding answers

Questions on the Bill’s General Principles:

Transport Benefits

Question 6. For clarification, in terms of the policy objectives set out in paragraph 4, can you define what the Ayrshire/Inverclyde/M8 corridors are
and what exactly is meant by “the sustainable regeneration of the M8 corridor and Ayrshire/Inverclyde corridors”?

1. In the context of paragraph 4, the Ayrshire/Inverclyde/M8 corridors are generally defined as the M8 corridor between Glasgow city centre and Port Glasgow, the Inverclyde rail corridors served by the Wemyss Bay and Gourock train services and the Ayrshire rail corridors served by the Ayrshire trains that route via Paisley Gilmour Street as broadly indicated on the map attached at Appendix 1. As indicated on said map, the Ayrshire corridor mainly includes parts of North and South Ayrshire.

2. The development of the rail network capacity in the key transportation corridors such as the M8 and in Ayrshire/Inverclyde can greatly assist in supporting the overall GARL objective of sustainable regeneration. Benefits will be felt through the increased platform capacity at Central Station that will afford opportunities for service development, specific potential benefits through improved reliability and rail capacity in the Paisley to Glasgow corridor that will impact on the North and South Ayrshire Council and Inverclyde Council areas served by the existing rail infrastructure. With 50% more services calling at Paisley Gilmour Street it is anticipated that this capacity improvement will have a beneficial effect for those other stopping rail services between Paisley and Glasgow.

3. It is recognised that rail transport investment (including investment in the GARL project) is capable of producing a number of potential significant impacts, comprising sustainable regeneration. In particular, such investment in the rail infrastructure will provide greater accessibility and choice of transport, as means of reaching place of employment and services, as well as other amenities (leisure, recreation and tourism).

4. Overall sustainability and regeneration will be enhanced by virtue of related effects of rail investment, such as development and wider economic benefits, covering job and floor space creation, development and investment. This will all provide for a more sustainable approach to development, living and movement. The importance of the latter will be addressed through public transport network upgrading, consisting in part by the GARL project and its associated increase in rail network capacity.

Question 7. While paragraphs 8, 9, 34 and 64 provide some explanation of how the rail link will benefit Prestwick Airport, is there any further evidence on the expected benefits for Prestwick?

5. The GARL project will provide additional track capacity between Paisley Gilmour Street and Shields Junction. This will facilitate the operation of up to 6 trains per hour between Ayrshire and Glasgow throughout the day (i.e. an extra two trains per hour over and above the four GARL trains per hour). This will benefit passengers to and from Prestwick Airport both by providing them with a more frequent service and by reducing crowding on the route. This will help facilitate the further development of Prestwick Airport.
However the quantitative analysis undertaken for the GARL project did not examine the effects of any increase in use of Prestwick Airport as a result of additional train services to Prestwick Airport station.

6. In addition, as a direct result of introducing a third track between Paisley Gilmour Street and Shields Junction, operational performance modelling has shown that the three track solution would lead to higher levels of reliability along this section of route when compared to the base year for assessment (2004).

7. A further benefit for travellers between Glasgow Airport and Prestwick Airport would that a passenger could step on a train at Prestwick Airport, change trains in Paisley and get off a train at Glasgow Airport (or vice-versa) without having to switch travel modes, thus increasing the accessibility of both airports by rail. This additional choice in mode of travel would be specifically beneficial to any transfers between both airports.

Question 8. Paragraph 16 states that GARL will also allow the opportunity to develop extra services for Ayrshire or Inverclyde by utilising the additional capacity that will be available after the works are completed. Can more detail be provided on this statement?

8. The GARL project would provide a third track between Shields Junction and Arkleston Junction and would increase the capacity of Arkleston and Wallneuk Junctions. These improvements would provide additional track capacity between Paisley Gilmour Street and Shields Junction. Operational performance modelling has shown that it would be possible to operate up to two extra trains per hour over this section of the route in each direction, in addition to the GARL service and current passenger and freight services. However, the timetable would need to be re-structured to accommodate these services and further infrastructure works could be required between Shields Junction and Glasgow Central and west of Paisley.

9. These additional trains could serve either the Ayrshire or Inverclyde lines. During the assessment of the GARL project, a sensitivity test was undertaken on the economic benefits of providing two extra services per hour to Ayrshire. The analysis demonstrated that the value of the benefits increase by more than the value of costs leading to an improvement in the economic case for the project. This indicates that it is likely to be worthwhile to provide additional services using the GARL infrastructure. However, the precise destinations, stopping patterns and date of introduction of such services have not been determined, nor has the investment case been made for any additional infrastructure works that may be needed.

10. The Promoter, because of the integrated nature of rail problems and solutions, has had to confine the case for the GARL project to that presented but paragraph 16 of the Promoter’s Memorandum is intended to
highlight the potential additional benefits which could arise if the GARL project is approved and built.

**Question 9.** Paragraph 27 states that current plans are for a service of four trains per hour in each direction. Is this sufficient given the current and predicted airport passenger figures set out in paragraphs 8, 36 and 37? If the frequency of the service had to be increased, could this be accommodated by the Bill proposals? Would any increase in frequency alter significantly the expected environmental impacts of the scheme? Have the relevant bodies mentioned in paragraph 27 indicated that they are content with the projected frequency?

(i) **Is this sufficient given the current and predicted airport passenger figures set out in paragraphs 8, 36 and 37?**

11. The GARL patronage forecasts demonstrate that adequate capacity will be available on the GARL service with the forecast increase in air passenger, and airport employee numbers. A 15-minute interval frequency is considered to be adequate to meet air passenger requirements, for example Heathrow Express, Gatwick Express, Stansted Express and the Arlanda Airport Link in Stockholm all operate at a 15-minute interval. The assessments undertaken to date have considered 3 car trains operating on the GARL service. However, 8 car trains could be accommodated at stations along the route which would allow capacity to be more than doubled with no increase in frequency. Therefore, the infrastructure within the Bill has allowed for future growth.

(ii) **If the frequency of the service had to be increased, could this be accommodated by the Bill proposals?**

12. As noted in response to Question 8, the GARL project could allow up to two additional services per hour to operate over the main line between Paisley and Shields Junction. These could operate to the airport, to Ayrshire or to Inverclyde line destinations. Furthermore, the double track branch line to the airport was selected mainly because it provides capacity to operate additional services to the airport in the future, if required. However as noted above there is also substantial capacity available by lengthening trains to increase capacity.

(iii) **Would any increase in frequency alter significantly the expected environmental impacts of the scheme?**

13. The environmental impacts of the proposed service frequency are based on 4 trains per hour, equating to 8 movements per hour, and as discussed above there is capacity to increase the service to 6 trains per hour (i.e. 12 movements per hour). The main potential environmental impact associated with this change would be with regard to noise generated by the operation of GARL. It is estimated that a service increase from 4 to 6 trains per hour would generate an additional noise level of 1.75dB. However, guidance
indicates that noise increases of less than 3dB are not generally detectable by the human ear and therefore it is unlikely that this change would be noticeable. Therefore it is considered that a service increase from 4 to 6 trains per hour would not significantly alter the environmental impacts of the scheme.

(iv) Have the relevant bodies mentioned in paragraph 27 indicated that they are content with the projected frequency?

14. The analysis performed by SKM for the Scottish Executive, which determined the 4 trains per hour projected frequency, was accepted by the steering group of that study as the optimum solution. The Steering Group comprised representatives from the Scottish Executive, Scottish Enterprise, Department for Transport, BAA and the Strategic Rail Authority. The study also consulted with a wider stakeholder group including the rail operators and Network Rail (at that time Railtrack Plc).

15. The recent work undertaken by the Promoter in preparation of the Bill has confirmed that this frequency provides the optimum solution. The detailed analysis was undertaken in close consultation with the Scottish Executive, Transport Scotland, Network Rail, First Scotrail and has been presented to the Freight Operating Companies.

Question 10. Paragraph 28 mentions the estimated patronage figures for the new rail services:

- Please explain how these figures were calculated and the margins of uncertainty in calculating them;

16. Total demand for the GARL service will comprise 3 elements: -

- Air passengers;
- Airport employees; and
- Non-airport passengers between Paisley and Glasgow who switch to using the additional train services between Paisley Gilmour Street and Glasgow Central.

17. These three sources of demand were assessed separately.

18. For air passengers Faber Maunsell developed a new Glasgow Airport Access Model (GLAAM) to predict the response of air passengers to the introduction of GARL. GLAAM was developed using locally collected Stated Preference survey data (refer to our response to Question 31), ensuring that the model reflects how users of Glasgow airport value the various elements of the journey experience (time, cost etc) and any preferences for one mode relative to another. Stated Preference is a well-established research technique for establishing the demand for new transport services. The GLAAM model was calibrated to reproduce the latest available Civil Aviation Authority data on access modes used to Glasgow Airport. In order to forecast the market share of the rail link, it was included as a travel
option in the model and changes in factors such as congestion were also taken into account. Future air passenger growth was assumed in line with DfT forecasts.

19. A Glasgow Airport Employee Access Model (GLEAM) was also developed. This was calibrated to reproduce the travel choices in the 2004 Glasgow Airport Employee survey. Future employee forecasts were supplied by BAA, assuming the DfT forecasts for air passenger growth (which are lower than BAA’s own forecasts).

20. The assessment of non-airport demand was based on the use of an incremental mode choice model that was developed to model potential transfer to rail by non-airport users. This model used data from SPT’s Strathclyde Integrated Transport Model (SITM).

21. The assessment is based on models that attempt to predict the aggregate effect of millions of individual decisions on mode choice. The models use decision-making algorithms based on sound research, and conform to best practice. These models were calibrated so that they reproduced observed mode split proportions in the base year. This gives the best starting point for forecasts. However, in order to test the robustness of the assessment (and as a proxy for margin of uncertainty), a number of sensitivity tests were undertaken. These examined the impact of factors such as higher or lower air passenger forecasts, higher or lower petrol costs and different values placed by air passengers on travel timesavings. In each case the overall economic case for the scheme remained positive.

- Please provide more detail on the profile and number of the likely passengers, with reference to new passengers; redistribution of passengers from existing services; “air passengers”; and “employees”;

22. The forecast annual patronage for 2009 and 2030 is shown in the table below. It indicates that several effects will occur. Firstly, air passengers and airport employees would switch from other modes to use the new GARL service. Secondly, the increase in frequency between Paisley Gilmour Street and Glasgow Central from eight to twelve trains per hour would attract some extra passengers to rail. These passengers would be attracted by the higher frequency which results from GARL rather than by the GARL service itself and would therefore not all use the GARL trains. Thirdly, existing rail passengers between Paisley and Glasgow would have a wider choice of departures and some would choose to use the GARL trains.
The table below presents the proportions of the total GARL patronage by trip type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 ('000s)</th>
<th>2030 ('000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air passengers</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Airport related trips new to rail</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total extra trips on rail</strong></td>
<td><strong>815</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,222</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Airport related trips that previously travelled on the existing services on the Paisley Gilmour Street to Glasgow Central Route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>573</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total trips on GARL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,388</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,849</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. It can be seen from the above table that the proportion of the GARL patronage originating/terminating at the airport would be around 40% of total usage of the service in the early years of operation. This percentage would increase over time due to the relatively rapid growth of the airport. By 2030 over 50% of users would originate or terminate at the airport.

- **What evidence is there to suggest that the rail link will contribute to relief from road congestion and the environmental impacts of road traffic? Is it possible to predict how much traffic will be removed from the M8 as a direct result of the rail link?** (You may also wish to substantiate the claim in paragraph 59, that “rail travel has relatively less emissions than road traffic”.)

24. Information is available from the modelling on the previous mode of air passengers and airport employees. In total, 159000 person trips would transfer from cars and taxis in the opening year, and 279000 would transfer in 2030.

25. This reduction in vehicle trips would result in positive air quality benefits along the M8 corridor. Based on these figures, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Section 3, Part 1 Air Quality, February 2003, HMSO methodology predicts that ambient levels of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, benzene and suspended particulate matter at receptors within 50 metres of the M8 alignment would fall by up to 0.1%. The methodology states that there is unlikely to be any effect on air quality due to road traffic at properties beyond 200m from any roads that experience a change in traffic flow.
26. With regard to global levels of carbon dioxide (CO₂), based on the estimates of passenger numbers using GARL in 2009 and 2030, assuming that average road journey saved by the opening of the rail link would be 16km and that any reductions would be offset by the net remote emissions of power consumption of the rail network, savings would be of the order of 1,400 tonnes CO₂ per annum in 2009, rising to over 1,800 tonnes per annum in 2030 with GARL in place.

27. With regard to the reference in paragraph 59, that “rail travel has relatively less emissions than road traffic” it should be noted that in July 2004 the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport was asked a question on the CO₂ emissions of various modes of transport from London to Edinburgh. In terms of road and rail travel his answer is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London to Edinburgh</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions per passenger - journey (kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail (modern high speed electric train)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What calculation has been made of the likely impact (in terms of patronage and economics) of the rail link on existing bus and taxi operators in the area?

28. The use of bus services to and from Glasgow airport with and without the GARL project is shown in the chart below.
29. This shows that bus services to the airport are expected to more than double their revenue by 2030. The introduction of GARL would reduce the gain in revenue (shown by the two lines) because passengers should perceive a benefit in the shorter journey time and journey reliability to and from Glasgow city centre and Paisley. There is an expected impact from the competition afforded by the Rail Link but by 2030 the revenue value is expected to be 50% more than the pre-GARL annual total.

30. In the “with GARL” situation, all other things being equal, bus operators’ revenue from air passengers and airport employees would be reduced by an annual average of £188,000 over the 60 year appraisal period. This has been included in the economic appraisal. This does not take account of the commercial reaction to the new market entry of GARL as an alternative transport mode and the potential for the bus market to satisfy new demands not open to rail.

31. SPT is actively encouraging new bus services to take advantage of new opportunities arising from the introduction of the GARL project.

32. The impact of the GARL project on taxi operators is illustrated in the figure below.

33. As can be seen, the taxi trade is expected to experience large increases in revenue over the current position over the life of the project appraisal period. The estimated effect, all other things being equal, is that with the introduction of GARL total taxi revenues would recover after a three-year period. There is an estimated £1.64m annual average disbenefit to the taxi industry as a whole. As can be seen from the predicted revenue graph, the taxi industry revenue growth is expected to grow in line with previous growth predictions. The Promoter has not appraised the economic
disbenefit to the taxi industry within the economic appraisal as it is probable that other markets would be generated e.g. as a direct result of GARL and the Promoter has not sought to forecast what reaction the taxi industry would have in relation to forecast congestion on the M8 motorway. It is the Promoter’s assumption that the economic benefits would be derived, in part, from journey time savings and these would result from a transfer from all forms of road transport, including bus and taxi, onto the rail link.

34. An important aspect of the modelling at Glasgow Airport is that it does not change the parking charges that exist in the base year, and also the scenario for parking is unconstrained i.e. car park capacities are not considered. It is unlikely that the growth in predicted passenger numbers, and therefore car journeys, could be accommodated in the existing number of car parking spaces. However, the cost of providing the extra parking spaces implied by the growth in the revenue of the parking providers has not been assessed, and is outside the scope of the Promoter’s study. If extra parking capacity cannot be provided, then the parking charges of the private sector would tend to increase to match supply to demand. This would tend to increase the demand for taxis, and increase their patronage and revenue over the current situation still further. Again, this effect on taxi demands has not been appraised by the Promoter.

- If other public transport operators increased or decreased the frequency of their service to the airport, how would this affect economic and patronage figures for GARL?

35. The main potential impact would be from changes in the frequency of the express bus link to Glasgow City Centre, which will compete directly with GARL. The Promoter has undertaken sensitivity tests with a doubling or a halving of service frequency on this service. This has been shown to have negligible effect on GARL and the benefit to cost ratio remains constant at 1.28.

Question 11. Paragraph 31 states that the rail link meets all of the objectives of national government transport policy. Can more information be provided about how accessibility to the airport from Social Inclusion Partnership and regeneration areas and new zones in the Scottish index of multiple deprivation will be improved? Are comparative figures available showing the safety of rail and road based modes? In what way does paragraph 31 explain how the promoter is meeting national government transport objectives on economy and environment?

36. The proposed rail link is expected to increase accessibility by public transport with key benefits realised by the socially disadvantaged (for example those who do not have access to a private car and have to rely on public transport). The provision of a fast, direct service between Glasgow city centre and the Airport, with the provision of one stop at Paisley Gilmour Street station to allow interchange with services to Inverclyde and Ayrshire, will particularly benefit these groups and will, in practice, increase
accessibility of the public transport network and accessibility to employment opportunities. It is considered that GARL will increase accessibility to Glasgow Airport and Paisley from not only Glasgow Central Station, but also from Glasgow Queen Street station via the free inter-station bus service. GARL would provide an integrated journey, with one ticket.

37. The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation shows that there is a concentration of those classified as most deprived along the River Clyde corridor. The GARL project provides up to 50% extra rail capacity between Paisley Gilmour Street and Shields Junction with associated reliability benefits for all rail services along this corridor. It also opens up access to the airport job market together with the extra jobs attracted into the area, all of which must increase accessibility to jobs, amenities and other social provision.

38. It is anticipated that the regeneration area wards will seek to benefit from the transport improvements resulting from the airport rail link, primarily by virtue of increased accessibility and greater job and labour market opportunities being created throughout the wider area, as well as other opportunities situated within the City Centre and elsewhere across the City.

In what way does paragraph 31 explain how the promoter is meeting national government transport objectives on economy and environment?

39. In terms of economy, the greatest impact will be experienced in relation to employment, with up to +650 additional jobs being created in Glasgow (+600) and Renfrewshire (+50) over a period of ten years. This is equivalent to +65 additional jobs per annum. Since these impacts would likely result from the introduction of the Airport rail link, they would occur mainly inside the City region, but also in areas in close proximity to the rail link corridor through Paisley and Glasgow South. In relation to employment sectors, it is anticipated that the greatest employment increases will occur amongst financial and business services, public administration and less so in retail and catering. This will provide some opportunities for employment in providing support services as well as the more highly skilled occupations.

40. The Airport rail link is also estimated to contribute to an additional +£2.1 million per annum in terms of potential total gross value added to the Glasgow and Renfrewshire economy. This would be the equivalent to up to +£21 million gross value added over a 10-year period.

41. In respect of property related impacts it is estimated that the Airport rail link could help support and lead to the development of up to 135,000 sq ft of new office accommodation in Paisley town centre, which in turn could support a further 650-700 gross new jobs in the town centre over a period of up to 4 years.

42. A number of non-quantifiable economic benefits have also been highlighted in the supporting documents, including: facilitating continued economic
growth at Glasgow Airport; continued support for employment growth associated with the Clyde Waterfront Regeneration Initiative; contribution towards the potential for additional tourist and visitors numbers and the linked expenditure; as well as supporting the competitiveness of the City region in relation to conference market and other general future business opportunities.

43. It is therefore expected that the Glasgow Airport Rail Link would provide benefits to businesses and residents alike through improved accessibility to employment and also through the widening of the available labour market.

44. In addition, the direct transport benefits arising from the project are in excess of the costs required to construct and operate the new rail scheme. This results in a Net Present Value for the scheme of £64 million (i.e. the GARL project’s economic benefits would outweigh its costs by £64 million) as stated in para 115 of the Promoter’s Memorandum.

45. In terms of environment, the GARL project would provide an alternative sustainable mode of transport to Paisley and the Airport. The environmental appraisal indicates that approximately 80% of the air passengers using GARL are predicted to transfer from private car or taxi, along with more than 35% of employees, contributing to the relief of congestion and reducing some of the environmental impacts of road traffic.

Question 12. Paragraph 44 states that one of the overall aims of the Scottish Executive transport policy is “a clean environment”. Does the promoter have any relevant information on the local environmental impacts of air travel and how these environmental impacts are likely to change if there is greater air travel to and from Glasgow and Prestwick airports? Within this context of increasing air travel and its environmental impact, how do the environmental benefits of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link compare? Can you provide similar information on the local economic impacts of air travel?

46. The Promoter has based the GARL project on the Aviation White Paper (DfT) central forecast for air travel in the U.K. as it relates specifically to the expected growth at Glasgow Airport. In this regard the local impacts of air travel are related to the forecast changes in air travel and this is a matter that the Promoter has taken from the Aviation White Paper. The Promoter understands that such impacts relating to air travel (e.g. aircraft noise) are matters being taken forward in the development of the Airport Masterplan by the airport owners BAA. For example, BAA set out in their draft Masterplan (July 2005) at Section 8.2 proposals associated with Safeguarding the Environment with respect to air noise, ground noise, air quality, water environment, biodiversity, landtake, waste management, energy use and heritage.

47. With regard to Prestwick Airport, the Aviation White Paper states at section 5.26 “Our appraisal shows no significant local environmental impacts
associated with growth at Glasgow Prestwick. Indeed, noise impacts should reduce over time as older aircraft are replaced by quieter, more modern ones.”

Within this context of increasing air travel and its environmental impact, how do the environmental benefits of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link compare?

48. The intention of the GARL project is to cater for the increase in numbers of air passengers using Glasgow Airport, as predicted in the Aviation White Paper, and allows for the emerging proposals in the airport operators’ Outline Masterplan for Glasgow Airport. The main direct environmental benefit with regard to the development of the GARL project compared to the predicted increase in air travel is related to surface access whereby the proposal would enable a modal shift from road to rail for air passengers and employees using the Airport.

49. Traffic modelling of the impacts of modal shift from road to rail has shown that it will make a contribution to the reduction on the overall level of traffic on the M8 without other demand management interventions e.g. airport access charging, high occupancy motorway lanes, restrictions on car parking availability. Such strategic demand management interventions and the benefits derived there from are outwith the scope of the GARL Private Bill but will be a consideration of the Regional Transport Strategy which SPT intends to publish in March 2007.

50. The reduction in vehicle trips will result in positive air quality benefits along the M8 corridor. Based on these figures, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Section 3, Part 1 Air Quality, February 2003, HMSO methodology predicts that ambient levels of carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, benzene and suspended particulate matter at receptors within 50 metres of the M8 alignment would fall by up to 0.1%. The methodology states that there is unlikely to be any effect on air quality due to road traffic at properties beyond 200 metres from any roads that experience a change in traffic flow.

51. With regard to global levels of carbon dioxide (CO₂), based on the estimates of passenger numbers using GARL in 2009 and 2030, assuming that average road journey saved by the opening of the rail link would be 16 kilometres and that any reductions would be offset by the net remote emissions of power consumption of the rail network, savings would be of the order of 1,400 tonnes CO₂ per annum in 2009, rising to over 1,800 tonnes per annum in 2030 with GARL in place.

52. It has not been possible to establish the magnitude of these savings in the context of air travel in Scotland as a whole although the Promoter is continuing to research this and will revert to the Committee if further data is found. It is clear however that in the context of CO₂ emissions in Scotland as a whole (not just from air travel) that this saving will be small. For
example, the total CO₂ emissions for Scotland in 2000 from all sources including air travel was 61 megatonnes.

**Can you provide similar information on the local economic impacts of air travel?**

53. The AWEB report undertaken in support of the GARL project did not consider the local economic impacts associated with the growth in air travel in general as this was beyond the scope of the project. The report focused specifically on the range of ‘wider economic benefits’ of the GARL project (also cross-reference to Q3 above).

54. The AWEB report does identify the positive support (and benefit) and role of GARL towards continuing economic growth at Glasgow Airport. For example, approx. 15,000 jobs could be supported at Glasgow Airport should the projections for passenger number growth outlined by the UK Government Aviation/Air Transport White paper were to be achieved. This envisages that Glasgow Airport could almost double the current passenger volumes of circa 8 million to 15 million passengers by the year 2030. This could have subsequent local economic impacts.

**Question 13. Paragraph 56 states that “a new rail station at Glasgow Airport would help to maximise the opportunities for interchange at Scotland’s busiest airport”. Can more detail be provided of what this means, with particular reference to the likely patronage of the rail link and other forms of transport?**

55. A key aspiration within the Outline Masterplan produced by BAA for Glasgow Airport was the need for the airport’s internal road system to undergo a major reconfiguration, with the creation of an integrated public transport interchange giving priority to key public transport services. GARL would assist in achieving this aspiration. For example, Glasgow Airport is the terminus for a number of bus routes at present, and this is likely to increase in future as the airport expands. The provision of GARL would provide opportunities for bus-rail interchange at the airport, providing benefits to passengers. This would lead to some increase in the use of both GARL and bus services providing benefits to operators and potentially resulting in a further increase in bus service levels to and from the airport. This would lead to benefits to people travelling to the airport and would encourage the use of more sustainable access modes. The provision of GARL would also facilitate coach and taxi interchange.

56. The economic assessment, conservatively, did not take account of any benefits from improvements of other transport services in line with the opportunity to develop the transport interchange facility, as it is not currently committed.

**Question 14. Paragraph 57 states that “A new Glasgow Airport Station and the intermediate stop at Paisley Gilmour Street would provide opportunities**
for increased information provision on all public transport facilities”. What, in practical terms, does this sentence mean?

57. The new airport station could become an important gateway to the public transport network for many visitors to the region. With one interchange at Paisley, the Inverclyde and North and South Ayrshire coastal areas would be accessible from the Airport by rail. The Promoter has been encouraged by BAA’s outline plans to develop a public transport hub located at the airport station that would include bus and taxi provision. There is the potential to develop the bus network using this facility for those areas not served by rail.

58. The opportunity exists to ensure that high quality information on all public transport services can be made available within the station. The existing SPT travel Centre at Glasgow Airport could relocate from the arrivals hall to the new airport station.

59. SPT travel centres provide independent travel information and advice on all forms of public transport within the Strathclyde area. The travel centres provide a wide range of services for all modes of public transport in the Strathclyde area and beyond, including:

- Journey planning.
- Independent information for bus, coach, rail, Subway and ferry travel in the Strathclyde area.
- Tickets and information for express coach travel throughout Strathclyde, Britain and Europe.
- Tickets and information for tours and excursions.
- Local travel cards and season tickets for most major bus operators.

60. Paisley Gilmour Street station would also become an important node on the public transport network for many visitors and would be used by air passengers and employees to interchange with rail services on the Ayrshire (North and South Ayrshire Council areas) and Inverclyde lines and bound for local stations between Paisley and Glasgow Central. Again the opportunity exists to ensure that high quality information on all public transport services can be made available within the station.

Question 16. Paragraph 67 quotes the Aviation White Paper as saying that road and rail capacity must be sufficient to cope with the transport demands of expansion. How will the Rail Link guarantee that this requirement will be met?

62. The GARL project would provide sufficient rail capacity to cope with the forecast level of rail demand at the expanded Airport and will contribute towards tackling road capacity pressures on the Paisley to Glasgow city corridor. However, the GARL project is only one element of the overall surface access requirements of the airport and other measures are likely to
be required. This is being addressed in BAA’s Glasgow Airport Masterplan – for which the Promoter is a consultee.

Question 17. Paragraph 105: Why was the decision taken to recommend one additional track between Shields Junction and Arkleston rather than two additional tracks? What implications does that decision have for the capacity of the line?

63. During the development of the GARL project an assessment was made of the implications of providing two (as at present), three and four tracks between Shields Junction and Arkleston. Timetable development work showed that the airport service could be accommodated, in addition to all existing levels of passenger and freight services, with a three track layout. Operational performance modelling showed that the three track solution would lead to higher levels of reliability than in the base year for assessment, 2004. It would also allow for a limited increase in service levels above the 2004 level within that section of new track between Shields Junction and Arkleston. A four track solution was estimated to be at least a further £30m in capital cost terms and would deliver very little in additional benefits to the GARL project alone. The case for a fourth track was therefore considered to lie outside the GARL project. However, it should be noted that the third track will be positioned in such a manner as not to preclude the provision of a fourth track in the future.

64. While there may be additional benefits from a four track solution, in terms of further increases in service levels on the Ayrshire and Inverclyde Lines, they are outwith the scope of the GARL project, which only requires three tracks between Shields Junction and Arkleston. It is important to note that further infrastructure works, for example at Glasgow Central, or in Ayrshire are likely to be needed to accommodate the additional services that could make use of a fourth track between Shields Junction and Arkleston. The matter of replacing a fourth track between Paisley and Shields Junction is a wider strategic consideration for Scottish Ministers in partnership with SPT and is likely to have wider implications for other rail infrastructure investment plans across the Scottish rail network.

Question 18. How can the promoter demonstrate that there will be sufficient space for passengers’ baggage on the rail link?

65. The Promoter is actively engaged with Transport Scotland who are developing a rolling stock strategy across the entire network for Scotland.

66. The Promoter will be working closely with all industry partners, notably Network Rail and the franchisee, to ensure that the internal layout and configuration of the rolling stock meets the needs of the customer profile for the GARL services. This will include detailed consideration of seating layouts and space for luggage as well as ensuring compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act in terms of areas and space for mobility impaired passengers.
Question 20. Paragraphs 74 and 75 explain why the option of more frequent bus services between Glasgow City Centre and the airport was discounted. Solutions such as dedicated bus lanes, additional motorway lanes and hard shoulder running were discounted because of “end point congestion”. Could this congestion have been avoided or lessened by reconfiguration of the M8 motorway and/or Glasgow airport?

3. “End point congestion” is due to problems with capacity at Kingston Bridge, at the slip roads to the M8 and at Glasgow Airport. The proposals listed, such as providing bus lanes, additional motorway lanes and hard shoulder running, are all dependent on the ability of the road infrastructure to meet capacity at the bottlenecks. The bottlenecks are in areas such as at the Kingston Bridge and slip roads. While the suggested solutions stated that traffic speed could be increased between these points, total capacity is constrained by these critical locations. As such, the proposed solutions would be contrary to general transport policy. There are alternative, more efficient ways, of solving the transport problems.

Question 21. Paragraph 77 explains that a number of light rail routes were ruled out on the grounds of higher capital costs and a lack of accessibility improvements for south west Scotland. What are the capital and running costs of these various routes in comparison with GARL? While it is claimed that the interchange at Paisley Gilmour Street offers greater accessibility improvements for south west Scotland, did the light rail routes not offer greater accessibility by extending to Glasgow Queen Street station?

4. With respect to accessibility, all of the routes accessing Glasgow Queen Street (light rail and heavy rail options) would offer an additional level of accessibility. The Promoter believes that the GARL project provides a robust case by connecting the airport to the heavy rail network with a stop at Paisley Gilmour Street (for accessibility to the south west) and then directly to Glasgow Central Station for accessibility to Glasgow and trips onwards. There are opportunities to complement the GARL project that will provide additional accessibility via Glasgow Queen Street. With respect to heavy rail, the Promoter is actively promoting the Crossrail project which would provide an opportunity for additional accessibility, not only for services to and from Glasgow Airport, but for all trips between the south west and north east. (For further details on Crossrail please see the Promoter’s answer to Question 13 of Annex 1). At the same time, the Promoter is currently undertaking a wide ranging study to look at the complementary role of light rapid transit (including light rail) to the well established heavy rail network within the Glasgow conurbation and investigate public transport throughout the Promoter’s area. These investigations and specifically the Promoter’s promotion of Crossrail should complement the GARL project’s proposals within a comprehensive transport strategy.

- To what extent will pressure on car parking at the airport be reduced?
1. The GARL project would reduce the number of car park spaces required by around 187,000 parking space days per year.

- Is more detail available on how this will support the Greater Glasgow and Renfrewshire economy?

2. As outlined within paragraph 117 of the Promoter’s Memorandum, in addition to the transport economic benefits, it has been estimated that there will be considerable wider economic benefits arising as a result of GARL. For example it has been estimated that the project could:

- Deliver approximately 650 jobs to Glasgow and Renfrewshire over the next ten years;
- Create a further 60 jobs to run the new GRL service;
- Support the development of up to 135,000 sq ft of office accommodation in Paisley Town Centre, which would provide the opportunity of a further 675 jobs for Paisley town centre over 3 to 4 years
- Help to bring 52,500 additional UK and overseas visitors and contribute towards £10 million in additional expenditure every year to Glasgow, Renfrewshire and Inverclyde; and
- Support Glasgow’s estimated £115 million conference sector.

- What is meant by “Improve sustainability”?

3. GARL would increase the attractiveness of public transport as an option for trips accessing Glasgow Airport. It would therefore increase the use of an environmentally less harmful mode (rail), and decrease the use of environmentally relatively more harmful modes (car, taxi). GARL would contribute to a sustainable basis for the future growth of Glasgow and Prestwick Airports in terms of government and regional objectives for airport surface access. GARL would also support the sustainable regeneration of the M8 corridor and Ayrshire / Inverclyde corridors by developing rail capacity.

Access

Question 27. Paragraph 101: Will the Promoter update the Committee on the proposal for authorised mobility impaired vehicles to use Gordon Street for set down and pick up at the main entrance to the station?

4. The Promoter has held detailed discussions with Glasgow City Council and Network Rail on the proposals for the use of Gordon Street for set down and pick up of authorised mobility impaired at the main entrance to the station. In general, the principle for set down and pick up of authorised mobility impaired vehicles has been agreed with both parties. A technical note with supporting drawings has been submitted to Glasgow City Council and Network Rail and their formal approval is currently awaited.
5. In summary, the proposal is to allow the area beneath the canopy at the main entrance to Glasgow Central for the set down and pick up of authorised mobility impaired vehicles.

6. This means that authorised mobility impaired passengers will be able to pick up and set down at the main entrance to Glasgow Central station.

**Question 28: Paragraph 54: Please advise how the rail link would ensure compliance under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995? Are there aspects where compliance will not be provided?**

7. All new facilities to be provided as part of GARL will be designed to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the Disability Discrimination Act 2005 (“DDA 1995” and “DDA 2005”).

8. The DDA 1995 and 2005 do not define regulations, guidance or best practice for the design of buildings, including rail station infrastructure and passenger facilities, for disabled persons. There is, however, a range of Codes of Practice and Standards that have been published regarding accessible building design and for public transport facilities in particular. These Codes of Practice and Standards have informed the basis of the Preliminary Design undertaken to date and have included:

   - Strategic Rail Authority – Train and Station Services for Disabled Passengers: a Code of Practice – February 2002 (revised March 2005)
   - UK Department for Transport – Inclusive Mobility: a guide to best practice on access to pedestrian and transport infrastructure (November 2002)
   - British Standards Institution - BS 8300:2001 - Design of building and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people – Code of Practice (October 2001)
   - Centre for Accessible Environments – Designing for Accessibility – 2004
   - UK Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions – Guidance on the Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces
   - EU Directorate General for Energy and Transport - ‘COST 335’ – study entitled “Passengers’ Accessibility of Heavy Rail Systems”

9. The preliminary design for Glasgow Airport Station has been developed following discussion with BAA, Network Rail, First Scotrail and Renfrewshire Council, amongst other key stakeholders. Initial reference has been made to a range of corporate design standards developed by these stakeholders.
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10. The preliminary design has allowed for the following features that would aid accessibility within the passenger areas:

- 5 metre wide platforms with a minimum gradient fall back from the platform edge and tonally contrasting tactile paving warning strip at platform edge in accordance with Railway Group Standards
- broad and level concourse areas (minimum 12.5 metre width) free from columns and with floor finishes in accordance with BAA Design Standards and to meet SRA slip resistance requirements
- wheelchair accessible toilet provision in accordance with SRA, BAA and BS 8300 requirements
- general toilet provision with suitable dimensional clearance to allow ambulant disabled access to cubicles and urinals in accordance with SRA, BAA and BS 8300 requirements
- split level customer information and ticket sales points with high and low level service area
- stairwell and wheelchair accessible lifts provided at Airport Station and at interface with Terminal Building to provide compliant access at changes in level
- 3 metre wide link connection bridge to Terminal providing sufficient space for wheelchairs to manoeuvre and pass
- Two 1.4 metre wide passenger conveyors on bridge incline with audible warnings on approach to assist the transfer of passengers to/from Terminal in accordance with BAA guidance

11. The design of the above features will continue to be developed through the next stage of design development, which will also take account of:

- directional signage and customer information signage in typeface, mounting, size and tonal contrast meeting codes of practice and other relevant design standards including those of BAA, the Promoter and First Scotrail.
- tactile / Braille signage for visually impaired passengers
- finishes with suitable tonal contrast to assist those passengers with visual impairments
- tactile warning at level changes and platform edges
- hand and tapping rails at relevant changes and level and guardrails
- induction loops at customer service locations
- audible announcements for customer information throughout the Station
• stairwell, ramp and lifts design to meet with standards in terms of dimensions, finishes, fittings and warnings etc.
• a range of station furniture which is clearly organised, tonally contrasts with surroundings and dimensionally compliant including a range of seating options to offering resting points for passengers with varying needs
• all glazed screens with suitable manifestation warning strips
• lighting levels to meet standards and provide consistent lighting coverage without causing glare

12. At Glasgow Central Station the removal of car parking to accommodate the new platform will reduce conflict between passengers and vehicles and the proposed new concourse arrangements will provide barrier free access to platforms 11a, 12 and 13 without a road crossing. This will improve the passenger experience and accessibility. The proposals will ensure there is no net loss of parking spaces for mobility impaired users and an alternative, convenient location will be provided for set down and pick up of mobility impaired customers at the main entrance to the station.

13. Furthermore, the Promoter has consulted widely with Accessibility groups during the development of the project to date and is committed to ongoing consultation to ensure the practical experience from such groups is incorporated into the design.

14. There are examples of some practical difficulties that are experienced on the existing rail network (e.g. platform gaps) by Accessibility groups that the Promoter will not be able to address as part of the GARL project. However, the Promoter, in accordance with its “Access for All” policy objectives, is committed to influencing such issues on a wider network basis.

Question 31. Has a survey been carried out with possible users of the Rail Link (for example airport staff referred to in paragraph 190) to indicate whether they are likely to use the link? If so, what are the results?

15. A survey of air passengers was undertaken to establish the way in which air passengers at Glasgow Airport choose between travel alternatives. This formed the basis for the development of the Glasgow Airport Access Model (GLAAM). These surveys took the form of Stated Preference (SP) surveys. SP surveys are designed to determine attribute valuations (for example – in-vehicle time, service frequency, or how respondents value bus against rail) by asking respondents to select from a set of hypothetical but realistic scenarios.

16. Survey responses were obtained by interviewing arriving passengers at Glasgow Airport, by sending questionnaires directly to major employers in the Glasgow area through telephone surveys and via interviewer led surveys in Glasgow City Centre.
17. A total of 638 SP surveys were obtained. Of these, 485 were leisure and 153 were business trips. This is a large sample for an SP survey, where 100 respondents per market segment is generally considered adequate.

18. Roger Tym & Partners as part of their remit to assess the wider economic impacts of the GARL project, undertook a survey of selected businesses across the Glasgow Conurbation by means of a postal questionnaire sent to named individuals. Of the total number of survey questionnaires distributed (86), some 24 businesses replied.

19. A survey of all airport employees was undertaken by BAA in 2004 and made available to the Promoter. This information was used in the development of the forecasts of rail patronage as related to employees.

Question 32. Apart from the specific examples given in the Memorandum, what other examples are there of the Bill or accompanying documents being amended as a result of feedback given during the consultation process? Where was it not possible to amend the Bill or accompanying documents in light of feedback given?

Other examples of the Bill or accompanying documents being amended as a result of consultation:

20. The vast majority of issues raised during the consultation process were considered by the Promoter and where relevant are addressed in the Promoter's Memorandum.

21. Regular consultations have been undertaken with BAA in relation to the Airport station location, relocation of the fuel farm, and on funding and project delivery issues. BAA was keen to ensure that the rail link and the location of the station did not form a barrier to future expansion of the Airport and the scheme design has taken due consideration of these constraints.

22. Additional examples of the Bill or accompanying documents being amended as a result of feedback are as follows:

- Airport station location was chosen to take account of the emerging BAA Masterplan and extensive discussions with BAA, with a further requirement to relocate the existing airport fuel farm facility to an alternative site within the airport due to the station location.

- A double track branch line was chosen in order to future proof further expansion of the rail network, as a result of feedback from key stakeholders in the rail industry, including the Scottish Executive, Network Rail and the Promoter.

- Requirement for the provision of vehicle set down / pick up facilities at Glasgow Central Station, as a result of feedback from Glasgow City Council.
• Requirement to ensure that the existing service bay on Gordon Street will remain available for deliveries to Glasgow Central Station, as a result of discussions with the Network Rail Station Manager.

• As a result of discussion with Renfrewshire Council, Section 41 of the Bill which disapplies statutory restrictions applying to the St James Park playing fields was extended so as to disapply any restrictions arising from the fact that the land is held by the Council as land forming part of the common good of a local authority (please refer to paragraph 91 of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill).

• Discussions took place with BAA on the inclusion in the Bill of protective provisions in relation to Glasgow Airport. In recognition of this, the Promoter has inserted a new section (section 29) which contains a restriction on the exercise of the compulsory purchase powers of the Bill in relation to operational airport property (please refer to paragraph 142 of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill). The Promoter has not included other protective provisions which had been suggested for inclusion on the grounds that the object of these provisions could more appropriately be achieved through agreement outside the Bill.

**Examples where it was not possible to amend the Bill or accompanying documents in light of feedback given:**

• Scottish National Heritage (SNH) provided feedback to the statutory consultation for the ES, outlining that they considered the fuel farm should not be located adjacent to the Local Nature Reserve. This feedback has fed into the development of a mitigation strategy for the replacement aviation fuel farm facility.

• Local bus and taxi operators raised concerns regarding the impact of the GARL project on the growth of the bus and taxi industry. Whilst it was not possible to amend the Bill or accompanying documents to directly address this feedback, BAA’s proposals for the provision of an integrated transport hub at Glasgow Airport will provide travellers with greater choice and flexibility regarding journeys to and from the Airport.

• St James Park – Community Councils and residents requested an alternative route to avoid impact on St James Park. Whilst an alternative route was explored previously by others and more recently by Faber Maunsell within the content of the St James corridor, the alternatives were not considered feasible. However, the views of local residents have fed into the mitigation strategy to minimise impact of the promoted scheme.

**Question 34: Given other scheduled and ongoing major transport infrastructure projects (for example, Waverley, Edinburgh Trams, work associated with the London Olympics), what makes the Promoter satisfied**
that, if the Bill gains Royal Assent, there will be sufficient engineering and construction capacity available to carry out the works?

23. The Promoter believes that, from current evidence available, there is sufficient engineering and construction capacity to carry out the works for GARL. This is in line with the view taken by the Construction Confederation, who state on their website that “The public sector is construction’s single largest client ….. We believe that construction does have the capacity to deliver; the real area of concern is our bidding capacity which is often stretched by an inefficient and costly procurement process.”

24. With respect to procurement and bidding capacity the Promoter is currently undertaking a detailed procurement and contracting strategy analysis as part of the Value for Money assessment. This work includes a detailed market sounding exercise where the views of the market on commercial, financial and risk allocation aspects of the potential project are being requested to capture this understanding in the procurement and contracting analysis and ensure an efficient process is followed. Furthermore the Promoter has regular dialogue on this matter with Transport Scotland and Network Rail specifically relating to the rail sector of the construction industry.

Question 35. What will be the impact on airport traffic levels at Glasgow and GARL patronage if proposed developments at Edinburgh Airport are approved? What will be the overall impact of the M74 extension on traffic flows?

25. The study team has not produced the forecasts for the number of air passengers using Glasgow Airport. The Department for Transport (DfT) maintains a model, SPASM, that provides forecasts for the number of air passengers for UK airports. This is the tool that was used to provide forecasts for the White Paper “The Future of Air Transport (DfT, December 2003) which determined the demand at both Glasgow and Edinburgh Airport. The study team used the ‘Modified Central Case’ forecasts as supplied by the DfT’s consultants. The use of this central case was confirmed in discussions with the DfT and the Scottish Executive. It is therefore the DfT’s planning conclusion that the levels of air demand at Glasgow take account of the forecast demand arising at Edinburgh.

26. The M74 Northern Extension was included in the modelling for this project; the effects on lowering the access time to Glasgow Airport for that corridor are therefore included. A scenario without the M74 Northern Extension was not produced as it is a committed scheme that is proceeding independently of the GARL project. However, should the M74 Northern Extension not proceed for whatever reason it is likely that the economic case for GARL would improve.
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Question 36. Are there any other relevant local or national transport or planning developments that may affect the overall case for the Glasgow Airport Rail Link and, if so, can the Promoter demonstrate how these developments have been taken into account?

27. At the start of the modelling process for GARL, a number of existing or planned transport developments were identified in discussion with the Promoter, Faber Maunsell and key stakeholders (Scottish Executive, Glasgow City Council and Renfrewshire Council) as being likely to be implemented within the timeframe of GARL and hence may potentially impact on travel patterns within the study area. The table below outlines those schemes that were identified and whether they were included within the base transport model in either the year 2009 and/or 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M77/Glasgow Southern Orbital</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnieston Bridge</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopbriggs Relief Road</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Towns By-pass Saltcoats/Stevenson/Ardrossan</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaward St</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 Capacities 2005/6</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M74 Northern Extension</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Services Glasgow - Renfrew/Paisley/Erskine added via Finnieston Br.</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-metro services Northbank : City Centre-Scotstoun via Broomielaw/ SECC/ Expressway/ South Street</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Electric/Argyle Line Revision Dec.05</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow-Stirling service extended to Alloa</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow-Cumbernauld/Falkirk service with Gartcosh stop added</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M80 Stepps-Haggs</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 Baillieston/Newhouse</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkintiloch Link Road</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8 Capacities</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✔ = included, ✗ = not included

28. As the above table outlines, a number of significant schemes have been taken account of within the GARL scheme including the M74 Northern Extension and a number of bus and rail enhancements. The analysis undertaken for GARL did not test the exclusion of the above schemes as they are deemed committed works. However, as a proxy to future changes in transport and/or developments a number of sensitivity tests were undertaken. Notably a sensitivity test that assumed only half of the rate of growth at the airport was undertaken, the results of which still showed that the economic case for GARL would remain positive.
29. There are a number of other potential complementary developments at various stages of completion that have not been taken into account but could have a positive impact on GARL and are summarised below.

30. The current Crossrail scheme that is being promoted by the Promoter will have a beneficial impact on GARL. The Crossrail project is widely regarded as one of the most important strategic rail infrastructure projects in Scotland, because it closes a critical gap in the Scottish rail network. The project has the potential to join south-west Scotland with the rest of the country, by constructing the missing link across Glasgow. It opens a huge range of possible new rail connections across Scotland by integrating the network and providing faster journey times. Crossrail will also improve local Glasgow conurbation rail links and support economic regeneration in some of city’s poorest areas. The project would also:

- Improve national connections linking north and south Glasgow rail networks; and
- Expand the potential for direct travel to Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Prestwick International Airport from other parts of Scotland.

31. Bishopton is recognised in the National Planning Framework as the preferred area for long-term expansion to the west of Glasgow. As identified in the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan the area is well related by the rail network to Glasgow Central station. Services on this line have the potential to be enhanced through improvements associated with the development of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link.

32. Johnstone South is identified in the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan in relation to the proposed expansion area. This will provide an opportunity to provide new and improved local social and community facilities including local retail provision. The site has good existing accessibility to the rail network via Milliken Park station. It will provide the opportunity to investigate the provision of park and ride facilities which are currently lacking at the station. Rail services have the potential to be enhanced through improvements to the rail infrastructure associated with the development of the proposed Glasgow Airport Rail Link.

33. Riverside Inverclyde is a joint initiative between Inverclyde Council, Scottish Enterprise Renfrewshire, Communities Scotland and the Private Sector to promote the economic regeneration of approximately 4 miles of generally derelict land from Port Glasgow through to Greenock. The development comprises a £400 million regeneration initiative which will deliver locally, over the next ten years, 2,500 new quality homes, 2,500 new jobs and more than 530,000 square feet of new business accommodation. All stations serving Riverside Inverclyde including Greenock Central, Cartsdyke, Bogston and Port Glasgow will be linked to the airport via interchange at Paisley Gilmour Street.

34. North East Phoenix/East Candren is identified within the Renfrewshire Local Plan (March 2006). The proposed development area will comprise
major business, industry, housing and warehousing development. The development site is located immediately adjacent to the south west of St James Interchange (M8/A737). Rail services have the potential to be enhanced through improvements to the rail infrastructure associated with the development of the proposed Glasgow Airport Rail Link.