GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL COMMITTEE

AGENDA

6th Meeting, 2006 (Session 2)

Monday 22 May 2006

The Committee will meet at 10.30 am in the Civic Suite, Renfrewshire Council, Paisley.

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

   **Panel 1**
   Roddy Fairley, Manager, Strathclyde and Ayrshire Area, Scottish Natural Heritage;

   Dave Batty, Casework Support Officer, West Areas, Scottish Natural Heritage;

   Christopher Connor, Local Air Quality Specialist, Scottish Environment Protection Agency;

   June Dawson, Senior Planning Officer, Scottish Environment Protection Agency;

   **Panel 2**
   Don Marshall, Chair, Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development;

   Gordon Craig, Member, Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development;

   Archie Anderson, Chairperson, Paisley North Community Council;

   Mae Marshall, Secretary, Paisley North Community Council;

   Alan Hopkirk;

   **Panel 3**
   Don Marshall, Chair, Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development;

   Gordon Craig, Member, Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development;
Archie Anderson, Chairperson, Paisley North Community Council;
Mae Marshall, Secretary, Paisley North Community Council;
Alan Hopkirk;
Mary Gildea;
Archie Berry;

Not before 2.00 pm

Panel 4
Tavish Scott MSP, Minister for Transport and Telecommunications;
Bill Reeve, Director, Rail Delivery, Transport Scotland;
Damian Sharp, Head of Major Projects, Rail Delivery, Transport Scotland;

Panel 5
Douglas Ferguson, Director of Operations, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;
John Halliday, Head of Transport Planning and Integration, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;
Charles Hoskins, Manager, Projects, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport;
Paul Irving, Partner, John Kennedy and Co;
Simon Temple, Director, Faber Maunsell;
Brian Cuthbert, Principal Consultant, Faber Maunsell;
Ashley Parry Jones, Business Development Manager, LandAspects.

2. Appointment of an assessor: The Committee will consider whether to direct the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, subject to the Bill proceeding to Consideration Stage, to appoint an assessor to consider and report to the Committee at Consideration Stage.

3. Item in private: The Committee will decide whether to consider its draft Preliminary Stage report in private at future Committee meetings.

Terry Shevlin
Clerk to the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill Committee
85233
Room T2.60
Scottish Parliament
EH99 1EP
terry.shevlin@scottish.parliament.uk
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GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL:
WRITTEN EVIDENCE

Introduction
1. Written evidence and objections from the following organisations and
   individuals giving oral evidence at the Committee’s meeting of 22 May have
   previously been circulated to the Committee:
   • SNH
   • SEPA
   • Archie M. Berry
   • Paisley North Community Council
   • Alan Hopkirk
   • Mary Gildea
   • Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development

2. The Committee has also been provided with further or supplementary written
   evidence, most of which is in relation to points made by the Committee at
   previous meetings. The evidence that has been provided is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Sharp, Director General of the International Air Rail Organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde Partnership for Transport - Supplementary Written Evidence on objections from statutory objectors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde Partnership for Transport - Supplementary Written Evidence on Consultation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde Partnership for Transport - Explanatory Paper by the promoter on processes and authorisations not forming part of the Bill</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde Partnership for Transport - Supplementary Written Evidence following the meeting of the GARL Private Bill Committee on Monday 8 May 2006</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private Bills Unit
May 2006
Andrew Sharp  
Director General of the International Air Rail Organisation

1. I have read quite a lot about the proposed rail link (including the Bill itself and some of the supporting documentation) and I am reasonably aware of the geography and the constraints. It is certainly my view that the proposals before the Scottish Parliament are a good idea.

2. There are very few airport rail links which are not successful. The only two of the 100+ around the world which can really be considered to be unsuccessful are those at Durham Tees Valley (formerly Tees-side Airport) and in Sydney.

   • Teesside Airport station opened in 1971. It is on the regional line between Darlington and Middlesbrough, and has an hourly local service calling at all stations. The airport station is a very basic halt, some distance from the terminal building, and passengers had to negotiate a long footpath to connect. The inconvenience and the infrequency led to low use. But for the odium attached to railway closures, the station would have been closed years ago: instead, the service was reduced drastically - I think one train a week stops there, in one direction only.

   • The line serving Sydney Kingsford Smith airport was opened in 2000. It is on a loop connecting Sydney Central station with the suburban network, and one of its purposes was to allow some commuter trains to by-pass a congested junction a few miles outside Sydney. Service is provided by high-capacity double-deck commuter trains: in the morning peak (also the peak for arriving inter-continentals passengers) there is little space on the trains. There is no dedicated baggage space. There are several stops between airport and city. A premium fare is charged at the 3 stations on the loop: this is unpopular locally. The stations, the infrastructure and the trains are owned by different entities. The airport and Central station are both south of Sydney Harbour: most Qantas frequent fliers live north of Sydney Harbour. Changing trains at Central Station to get to the north side is not easy: there are stairs and narrow subways to negotiate. All of these factors led to low patronage: the company owning the stations went into liquidation.

3. Lessons from unsuccessful links are that low frequency, inconvenient positioning of stations, poor on-train facilities and multiple stops are unpopular. Glasgow will have a good frequency, well-sited stations, trains of a reasonable quality and only one intermediate stop.

4. Lessons from successful links are that a frequent and reliable service is valued. If the service is good, people will use it - even with a premium fare.

5. There are two aspects of the proposed service where I do not have full information and which you might like to discuss with the promoters: both are important success factors.
• First, baggage space is important. Air passengers have baggage, and need somewhere to put it. They can be nervous or suspicious, so they need to be able to see their bags. On Oslo's airport express, all seats face luggage stacks: people can always keep an eye on their baggage. On Heathrow Express, luggage stacks are transparent, as are the overhead racks. The latter has the advantage that it is less easy to leave something behind - a matter rather more crucial on a train to the airport than on a commuter journey! Train floors on the same level as platforms are also valuable for people with wheeled bags, golf carts or push-chairs.

• Second, trains need to run at times passengers need them. I believe that the first flight from Glasgow is at 5.55, with a further 10 - 15 departures between 6.00 and 7.00. Passengers normally need to be at the airport at least an hour before departure to check-in. Will the train service, the timetable, permit this? What about weekends, when traditionally services thin out?

6. My experience is that fares are largely irrelevant to the passenger. Some sections of the press delighted in saying that Heathrow Express cost more per mile than Concorde, but omitted to say that taxis were twice as expensive as Heathrow Express and therefore more than twice as expensive per mile than Concorde! For business travellers, often the company is paying (and even on premium-priced airport expresses, the fare is generally less than half the taxi fare). And people who have just paid £500 to cross the Atlantic are not deterred by paying £15 for a quality train journey. However, tickets do need to be easy to buy - ideally with instructions in common languages - and there could be some kind of integrated ticketing (and Glasgow Central Station already has the necessary 3-letter IATA code to facilitate this).

Strathclyde Partnership for Transport

Supplementary Written Evidence On Objections from Statutory Objectors following the meeting of the GARL Private Bill Committee on Monday 15 May 2006

The Promoter has now responded in writing to all the Objectors, and the Promoter has subsequently had follow up discussions or correspondence with all.

A summary of the post objection consultation is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Objector</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hutchison 3G (UK) Ltd</td>
<td>Engaged in correspondence regarding agreement to allay Hutchison’s concerns. Promoter preparing draft agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scottish Gas Networks plc</td>
<td>On-going discussion regarding agreement to allow withdrawal of objection. Agreement to follow precedent set in respect of Waverley project, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Details of which are being finalised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>O2 (UK) Ltd Engaged in correspondence regarding agreement to allay O2’s concerns. Promoter preparing draft agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SP Power Systems Ltd, SP Transmission Ltd &amp; SP Distribution Ltd Promoter advised SP that the provisions in the Bill already dealt with their concerns. SP disagrees and stated that they would contact Promoter in writing to note their requirements. Await written response from SP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Renfrewshire Council Heads of Terms agreement dealing with phasing of the works mitigation and compensation, is in the process of discussion and negotiation. RC submitted revised draft on 12/5/06 to Promoter for consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>British Transport Police Authority &amp; British Transport Police Force Responded in detail to objection in letters dated 11/4/06 and 12/5/06, and also requested a meeting by telephone and e-mail of 25/4/06. Furthermore the Promoter has now written to BTP (16/5/06), to engage in detailed discussions, regarding input into the design and construction process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NATS (En route) plc &amp; NATS (Services) Ltd Promoter recognises the need to give a sufficient level of protection and intends to co-operate fully with the objector to meet their concerns. Drawings requested by NATS, now submitted. Detailed response to NATS to be issued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Network Rail Objection now withdrawn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Royal Mail Group plc &amp; Post Offices Ltd Draft agreement received. Promoter is in the course of adjustment and finalisation of the agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Glasgow Airport Ltd Draft minute of agreement dealing with land, design, construction and procurement issues currently being developed. Transport Scotland engaged in ongoing discussions with GAL on funding contribution and investment opportunities which will arise, and these matters have a direct bearing on the finalisation of the minute of agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
BTP – British Transport Police
GAL – Glasgow Airport Ltd
RC – Renfrewshire Council
SP – Scottish Power
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Supplementary Written Evidence on Consultation following the meeting of the GARL Private Bill Committee on Monday 15 May 2006

In reference to the GARL Committee Hearing on Monday 15th May 2006 and specifically to a number of witness statements in relation to the Promoter’s Consultation, the Promoter sets out below additional information by way of confirmation of the Promoter’s own evidence and an explanation as to some apparent “gaps” in the Promoter’s general consultation.

The Promoter, as a Public Body, has sought to achieve the highest standard for its Consultation and has taken extreme care throughout the process. The Promoter’s Memorandum fairly sets out the depth of the Consultation on GARL.

Public awareness of the formal consultation period was high with individuals in the Glasgow and Paisley area having the opportunity to see or hear something about the consultation in the media up to 14 times.

The consultation activity included:

- 12 Public exhibition events,
- 5 Public Meetings,
- 38,532 leaflets and information packs distributed to local households, businesses and on trains and buses,
- 14 media channels through which the GARL proposals were broadcast
- 9 Focus Groups or interest group meetings including businesses, residents, environmental, historical, accessibility and playing field users,

As well as a wide consultation covering the general public, communication was targeted at interest groups and those likely to have a direct interest. We have recorded that in addition to the 917 people who called at the Public Exhibitions, 388 people were directly engaged through the Public Meetings. A database was created of all known organisations and advice sought from third parties, including the Scottish Executive, as to what organisations should be directly targeted. Using this database pro-active communication included a letter and leaflet to announce the start of the consultation and another reminder when the consultation was coming to a close.

Information leaflets and letters inviting organisations to be involved in the consultation were specifically sent to:

- Paisley North Community Council (on its formation)
- Scottish Women’s Football
- Minority Community Groups
- Fairline Coaches Limited
- Linn Park Buses Limited
- Citylink Limited
- Business in the Murray St Industrial Estate
- Affected tenants within the airport
- Properties in the vicinity of the proposed construction compounds
- Properties in the Elderslie area to advise on the extension of the freight loop
- Properties within and around Central Station
- St James Playing Field users

The formal Consultation period lasted 17 weeks (extended by SPT to allow comment on new information – i.e. wider economic benefits and information about the playing fields) and will continue throughout the project. A detailed consultation report has been produced for the project and this was updated further prior to the submission of the Private Bill by way of an addendum to the original report. These are also available on the GARL project website.

The Promoter wishes to emphasise that the apparent gap in relation to the emergency services, the Bus Service operators and the Park & Ride operators are matters that should be understood in the context of what has actually been done in consulting these bodies.

Consultation with Emergency Services
The Promoter has recognised the central importance of this area and consulted with TRANSEC (the central Department for Transport body responsible for transport safety and security throughout the UK, for both air and rail). The Promoter was advised that the level of consultation was appropriate, commensurate and sufficient for this stage in the project development. The Promoter also discussed matters of detail with British Transport Police and Strathclyde Fire & Rescue (for changes at Glasgow Central Station and the fuel farm) acknowledging that at a strategic level TRANSEC were content. (The Committee has already seen written evidence by the Promoter summarising its consultation activity with regard to security and health & safety issues). The Promoter has always expected, should the GARL Bill receive Royal Assent, to continue its detailed and continuous dialogue with the emergency services as soon as the Promoter appoints its consultant for the detailed design.

Given that the respective services do not appear to be content with TRANSEC’s view and the Promoter’s efforts to date, the Promoter is arranging, as a matter of urgency, to meet with the individual Services and collectively with them through the Emergency Services Co-ordinating Group. The Promoter can advise the Committee on Monday 22nd May 2006 of progress in this regard.

Bus Operators
The Promoter confirms that it has sought to consult with Fairline Coaches Limited, primarily following a detailed letter sent to them in February 2005. There has also been an opportunity through the Business Focus Group to have a dialogue with the Promoter but again Fairline Coaches Ltd did not take this up. For the Bill Committee’s information, Citylink and Linn Park buses, other established operators at the Airport have been actively engaged in the Consultation process. Indeed at the request of Citylink, SPT supplied 1500 consultation leaflets for distribution on the Citylink bus service.

At the Hearing of 8th May 2006 oral evidence was provided on behalf of the Confederation of Public Transport (CPT) to the effect that they were not consulted. The Promoter would like to confirm to the Committee that CPT were a consultee for
the GARL project and can supply documentary evidence to this effect. The Promoter
acknowledges that CPT have made further detailed comments which it will be
attending to in the next stage of development of the GARL project and continuing its
consultation with CPT.

In terms of the oral evidence which the Promoter has given, the Promoter would like
to emphasise that SPT is an organisation that sees no distinction between the public
transport offerings provided to the public; the Promoter strives to establish, given a
bus de-regulated market, the most appropriate form and function of public transport
for the situation presented. This is fully compliant with the principles of STAG.
Indeed, in terms of Glasgow Airport, the Promoter is aware that bus services will
provide a valuable ingredient for the Public Transport mix and is actively engaged
with BAA in the development of the Transport Hub concept for the Airport rail station.
The Promoter has assisted BAA in the past with the management and organisation of
bus services at the Airport and understands that such expertise may be called upon
for the future and particularly in relation to the Transport Hub. The Promoter will
continue the constructive dialogue with BAA on this matter.

Park and Ride (P&R)
The Promoter acknowledges that SIAPRA were not consulted, even though Mr
McGlynn (Chairman of SIAPRA) as an affected party was involved and fully engaged
in the consultation. SIAPRA is not an organisation which is known to the Promoter
and indeed the Promoter was unable to establish a contact address or details of
membership on being advised by the PBU that the organisation was providing
evidence to the Committee. It is regrettable that Mr McGlynn did not alert the
Promoter to the existence of SIAPRA during discussions with both him and his
agents during the course of the project. However, the Promoter will endeavour, given
that the organisation has now made itself known, to establish a meaningful dialogue.

While the Promoter has stressed how well GARL fits with stated European, Scottish,
Regional and Local policy, the policy basis on which the Promoter makes its case for
the air link must be emphasised. The growth of car use is a concern to UK and
European Policy makers as it affects urban areas. While the Scottish Government’s
target of maintaining car use at 2001 levels may be revised in due course, the
concerns over the growth of car use will remain and policies and interventions that
seek to ameliorate these trends are central to the Promoter’s aims and objectives.
There is thus no ambiguity in that the Promoter is seeking to promote alternatives to
the use of car; Park and Ride forms part of a strategy within which such policy aims
can, in part, be achieved.

SIAPRA’s evidence is of concern since it seems that their commercial objective is
simply to maximise car parking around the airport. Contrary to the impression that
may have been given, Mr McGlynn’s approach is not commensurate with Local
Authority road traffic reduction targets nor does it accord with the Promoter’s policy
objectives or indeed that of Scottish Ministers. The Promoter will therefore seek to
engage with Mr McGlynn, SIAPRA and the Association’s members with a view to
developing appropriate proposals for Park and Ride and seek to ensure that any
proposal will fit with the Regional Transport Partnership’s emerging Regional
Transport Strategy.
Mr Wallwork’s Proposal
Mr Wallwork advised that the park and ride element of his proposal had not been assessed and made it clear that this element was a distinctly separate scheme in its own right. The Central Scotland Corridor Study by the Scottish Executive in 2002 considered such a strategic Park and Ride site near Glasgow Airport and the analysis of such an option was undertaken within the guidance contained in STAG. The Scottish Executive’s decision¹ was that such a scheme was not to be taken forward.

The Committee will recall the Promoter’s evidence that the Promoter is developing a Park and Ride Strategy for the West of Scotland and this will identify strategic Park and Ride sites. The Promoter acknowledges that car travel will continue to be a dominant mode of access to the airport but does not agree, in policy terms, with the notion of unfettered supply (of car parking) around the airport. This will act as a car trip attractor and will contribute to road congestion, work contrary to Local Authority road traffic reduction targets and be questionable in terms of environmental impact and sustainability. It is well recognised that if car parking supply is available at relatively low cost, car trips will be generated if there is a demand for the destination such as is the case at the airport. It is the role of SPT, as the regional transport authority, to balance the needs of society with the costs and impacts of solutions in consideration of any transport proposal of a strategic nature.

¹ Central Scotland Transport Corridor Studies, Decisions, January 2003
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Explanatory Paper by the promoter on processes and authorisations not forming part of the Bill

Introduction

1. This Paper has been produced in response to a request for further information on the Bill from the Scottish Parliament’s Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill Committee (“the Committee”) as set out in an email from the Clerk to the Committee to the Promoter dated 26 April 2006.

2. The Paper gives firstly a very brief outline of what will be approved by virtue of the Bill, if it is passed by the Scottish Parliament and receives Royal Assent. It then summarises the further legislative consents and authorisations which will be required to allow for the construction and operation of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link (“the Railway Project”).

In layman’s terms the Bill, if passed, will give the following powers:

(a) Legal authority to construct the new railway
(b) Compulsory purchase powers
(c) Planning permission (outline)

The Bill does not deal with the following:

(d) Funding for the scheme and procurement
(e) Detailed design
(f) Ownership and operation of the railway
(g) Detailed rail approvals eg. Network Change, Station Change and Timetabling
(h) Construction methodology
(i) Planning permission (detailed consents)

3. These matter are dealt with in further detail below.

The Bill’s purposes

4. The principal purpose of the Bill is to give statutory authority to the Promoter and its successors (referred to in the Bill as “the authorised undertaker”) for the construction of works to provide a new railway service between Glasgow Airport and Glasgow Central Station. The works comprise:

(a) the construction of a new railway spur from a new elevated station at Glasgow Airport, passing on viaduct over the M8 motorway, across St James’ Park and the Murray Industrial Area and joining with the existing railway east of Paisley St James Station; and
(b) works to the existing railway including the remodelling of Wallneuk Junction east of Paisley Gilmour Street Station; additional track between
Arkleston Junction and Shields Junction and at Elderslie; and additional track and new platform at Glasgow Central Station.

5. The Bill also provides for the alteration of a length of Murray Street and the construction of a new access road leading off the slip road to the M8 at Glasgow Airport. In addition, the Bill would enable the authorised undertaker to construct miscellaneous works and do other things, within the limits of deviation and limits of land to be acquired or used, required in connection with or in consequence of the railway works. This includes the provision of replacement aviation fuel farm facilities at Glasgow Airport. In the Bill the works that would enable these miscellaneous things to be done are called “the ancillary works”.

6. Provision is also included for the compulsory acquisition of land for the Railway Project and implementation of the compulsory purchase powers, so that the Bill would have the same effect as would a compulsory purchase order in other types of scheme e.g. for new road schemes. The complex body of compulsory purchase provisions contained in both legislation and case law, are applied to the Bill, so that those affected by the Bill are on the same footing as those affected by compulsory purchase orders. Given the extent of these provisions, writing the entire statutory compulsory purchase and compensation code into the Bill is not a practical option.

7. Section 40 of the Bill incorporates the terms of this body of legislation and case law and the Bill will give effect to it, subject to some amendments designed to streamline the process and to give effect to modern legislative improvements which have been made in England and Wales but not Scotland.

Approvals and authorisations through provisions in the Bill
8. The Bill provides for various matters connected with the Railway Project, which would therefore receive general Parliamentary approval if the Bill receives Royal Assent (in effect outline approval subject to specific approval of site-specific details). These matters are referred to below.

Provisions regarding roads
9. Section 7 of the Bill is designed to ensure that the regime under Part IV of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (“the 1991 Act”) for dealing with utilities’ apparatus affected by road works will apply to the authorised works. This regime includes a process for identifying and agreeing work required, including any necessary diversions of apparatus, and also deals with the costs of these works. It provides for a contribution to be payable by the utilities in respect of work carried out in relation to their apparatus.

---

2 See paragraphs 16 to 20 (inclusive) of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill for a fuller explanation. The Promoter has also produced a Policy Paper In Respect Of Compulsory Purchase and Compensation (dated 2 May 2006) summarising the law on compulsory purchase and compensation in Scotland, which has been lodged with the Scottish Parliament and will shortly be available to download on the Promoter’s website for the Railway Project (www.spt.co.uk/garl/index.html).

3 See paragraphs 35 to 37 (inclusive) of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill for a fuller explanation.
10. Section 8 of the Bill permits the authorised undertaker to enter into agreements with the roads authorities to carry out any works to existing roads authorised by the Act. The authorised undertaker is also authorised to delegate by agreement its powers to alter or maintain such altered roads.

11. Section 9 of the Bill permits the authorised undertaker during construction temporarily to stop up, alter, or divert roads.

**Provisions regarding drainage**

12. Section 10 of the Bill ensures that the authorised undertaker can effectively drain its works, during construction and thereafter and to use any available watercourse or any public sewer or drain for such drainage purposes. The discharge of water into an artificial watercourse or a public sewer or drain would require the consent of the person to whom it belongs (who in the case of a public sewer or drain would be Scottish Water or the roads authority).

**Provisions regarding relocation of utilities’ apparatus**

13. Schedule 7 to the Bill relates to the possible relocation of water, gas, electricity, sewerage and telecommunications services to allow for construction of the Railway Project. Schedule 7 therefore establishes a baseline statutory framework to cover the relevant issues and interests of the utilities providers.

14. Some matters relating to the possible relocation of water, gas, electricity, sewerage and telecommunications services are therefore likely to be the subject of specific formal agreements. Others will rest on the statutory framework set out in existing legislation and specifically imported into the Bill.

**Provisions regarding Planning permission**

15. The development authorised by the Bill will be permitted development. In layman’s terms, this means that the Bill will, if it receives Royal Assent, effectively grant outline planning permission for the Railway Project.

16. While the Bill will, if it receives Royal Assent, effectively grant outline planning permission for the Railway Project, the prior approval of the relevant planning authority in respect of the detailed plans and specifications would still be required before construction could be commenced. (Including the detail of any listed buildings affected by the project for which special provision is made in Section 35 and Schedule 8 to the Bill).

---

4 See paragraph 38 of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill.
5 In Sections 224 to 227 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
6 See footnote 7 above.
7 Under Class 29 of Schedule 1 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 (SI 1992/223).
8 See Section 36 of the Bill.
9 Glasgow City Council and Renfrewshire Council.
10 As the Railway Project will include “the erection, construction, alteration or extension of any building, bridge, ... or ... the formation, laying out or alteration of a means of access to any road used by vehicular traffic”: see Class 29 of Schedule 1 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992, paragraph (2).
17. An important qualification to the preceding paragraph is that Subsection (2)(b) of Section 36 of the Bill imposes a restriction on the extent of the permission given for new fuel farm facilities at Glasgow Airport. The intention is that the Bill should authorise a replacement which is equivalent to the existing fuel farm facilities (which will be displaced by the railway works), and that is all that has been assessed in the Environmental Statement accompanying the Bill.

**Approvals, authorisations and other processes outwith the Bill**

**Hazardous Substances consent for fuel farm replacement**

18. The specific consent of the relevant planning authority (Renfrewshire Council in this case) would be required in respect of the presence of hazardous substances (i.e. airline fuel) in the proposed replacement fuel farm facility at Glasgow Airport. Among the factors which the relevant planning authority have to assess when considering a formal application for a hazardous substances consent is any advice and recommended conditions which the Health and Safety Executive as a Statutory Consultee provide to the planning authority in this regard.

**Financial Business Case and Procurement Strategy**

19. The project Financial Business Case (FBC) is a more detailed financial development of the financial elements of the Economic case. The Economic Case is the overall case for the project in terms of assessment of all benefits and costs, the result of which are that the benefits of the project outweigh the costs by a factor of 1.28.

20. The purpose of the FBC is to undertake a more detailed analysis of the financial elements to ensure that the optimum procurement strategy in achieving Value for Money is reached. This work is an iterative process that involves a detailed analysis of the various procurement options, contracting strategy, risk assessments, operating costs and revenue analysis and funding. The ongoing development of the FBC is being undertaken fully in accordance with the HM Treasury Value for Money Guidance and a final draft is programmed for the end of September 2006. The key parties involved in this analysis and final decision include the Promoter; Scottish Executive; Transport Scotland; BAA; the rail franchisee (currently First Scotrail) and Network Rail.

**Funding Commitments for Capital and Running Costs**

21. The funding arrangements for the Railway Project’s capital and running costs are conditional upon the Bill receiving Royal Assent and are currently still under discussion with the bodies concerned. They are not therefore contained within the Bill’s provisions though reference is made to them in the Bill’s supporting documentation as required under the Scottish Parliament’s Standing Orders. It is therefore likely to be the case that funding arrangements for the Railway Project’s capital and running costs will be finalised before the Bill receives Royal Assent but dependent upon both Royal Assent and approval of the Financial Business Case being given.

---

11 See paragraphs 200 to 206 (inclusive) of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill.
Design Strategy

22. The final detailed design of the Railway Project still requires to be undertaken. It is envisaged that this will not be done until after the Bill receives Royal Assent and the detailed design and construction contract to construct the Railway Project is let by the Promoter. At that stage the Promoter’s principal contractor would complete the detailed design of the railway tracks, bridges, stations and other new infrastructure to be provided as part of the Railway Project. However, whilst the final detailed design is not envisaged to be complete until after Royal Assent, the Promoter is continuing to develop the scheme design to mitigate risks, achieve the best opportunity for completion of the overall programme and ensure best value for the eventual detailed design and construction contract, without of course pre-empting the eventual outcome of the Parliamentary process. This approach has been endorsed by Transport Scotland.

23. While the final detailed design of the Railway Project still requires to be undertaken, that is not to say that no design work has been undertaken. The Promoter has undertaken a great deal of preliminary design work following on from the work done to consider the alternative transport options for a new transport link to Glasgow Airport. Following selection of the preferred route corridor for the heavy rail link, further design work was carried out to develop the preliminary design to the level of detail required to properly draft the Bill and its supporting documentation (including the Parliamentary Maps, Plans and Sections) and submit these to the Scottish Parliament.

24. The technical design of the Railway Project has been carried out in accordance with Railway Group and Network Rail Company Standards and Her Majesty’s Railways Inspectorate (“HMRI”) Principles and Guidance. Road and bridge design has been in conjunction with Glasgow City Council, Renfrewshire Council and the Scottish Executive, and in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, taking cognisance of local planning guidelines, environmental impacts, safety issues, operational constraints and issues along the routes. Technical consultation informed (and continues to inform) the design process and comments raised have been taken into account in developing the preliminary design of the Railway Project. Consultees included the Scottish Executive, Network Rail, BAA plc, Renfrewshire Council, Glasgow City Council, British Transport Police, Glasgow Central Station’s manager, HMRI, the Health and Safety Executive, Historic Scotland, the Scottish Amateur Football Association, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (“SEPA”), Scottish Natural Heritage (“SNH”), SportScotland and the West of Scotland Archaeological Service.

---

12 See paragraphs 71 to 96 (inclusive) of the Promoters Memorandum submitted with the Bill for a description of the studies carried out by Sinclair Knight Merz to assess alternative transport options and alternative heavy rail options, and paragraphs 97 to 114 (inclusive) of the Promoters Memorandum for a description of the subsequent design work carried out for the Promoter by Faber Maunsell to develop the preliminary design for a heavy rail link to the Airport with the preferred option corridor.
Code of Construction Practice and environmental mitigation measures

25. A draft Code of Construction Practice ("CoCP") has been developed to set out an outline of the Contractor’s responsibilities in implementing the proposed environmental mitigation measures associated with the scheme’s construction impacts. (The current draft CoCP is dated 22 March 2006\(^{13}\)). The CoCP will continue to be developed during the next stages of project development and incorporate issues arising from ongoing consultations\(^{14}\). The CoCP will also in due course include reference to particular environmental mitigation works which the Promoter undertakes to carry out at specific locations along the railway route.

26. It is worth noting that the CoCP will remain a (periodically updated) draft until after the Bill has received Royal Assent and the contract to construct the Railway Project is let by the Promoter. At that stage the CoCP would be finalised and the Promoter’s contractors contractually bound to comply with it. The Promoter has produced a Policy Paper on its Code of Construction Practice which explains all these issues in more detail\(^{15}\).

27. The detailed construction strategy on which the final contract will be let by the Promoter will require to be prepared by the contractor in line with the CoCP.

Ownership and operation of the Railway

28. The powers of the Bill will be conferred initially on the Promoter. Provision is made for the Promoter to transfer the railway undertaking and related powers in whole or in part, and to share or delegate any of the powers of the Bill under section 31 of the Bill. Strathclyde Partnership for Transport will not necessarily own or operate the railway. For instance, the expectation is that ownership of the alterations to the existing rail network will be transferred to Network Rail as the national rail infrastructure operator\(^{16}\). In the absence of section 31 the powers in the Bill would not be transferable. It should be noted that any transferee will be subject to the same restrictions, liabilities and obligations as SPT.

29. The Bill does not state that the authorised undertaker may operate the railway and related facilities. This is because statutory authority to operate the railway will be conferred in another way. Under Section 6 of the Railways Act 1993 the operation (including maintenance) of a railway asset (which includes track and other infrastructure and stations) requires a licence under Section 8 of that Act, and Section 122 of the Act confers the benefits of statutory authority on a

\(^{13}\) Currently available to view and download on the Promoter’s Glasgow Airport Rail Link website at http://shandwick.fs-server.com/spt/uploaded/ufile468.pdf.

\(^{14}\) See paragraph 124 of the Promoters Memorandum submitted with the Bill.

\(^{15}\) At the time of writing this is about to be lodged with the Scottish Parliament and will shortly be available to download on the Promoter’s website for the Railway Project (www.spt.co.uk/garl/index.html).

\(^{16}\) See paragraphs 151 to 157 (inclusive) of the of the Explanatory Notes to the Bill for an explanation of the Bill’s provisions regarding the making of formal agreements to transfer some or all of the authorised undertaker’s powers arising once the Bill is enacted.
licensed operator\textsuperscript{17}. Without such a licence, no services could operate on the railway.

**Fares, Timetables, Railway health & safety etc**

30. The Promoter has produced a Paper on Rail Regulation\textsuperscript{18}. This sets out the various bodies who jointly own, operate, run and supervise railway operations in Scotland. It also includes details on responsibilities for the rail network and infrastructure, railways health and safety responsibilities and enforcement, train operation and timetabling, and the setting of fares. The regulation of railway services is, subject to limited exception, a reserved matter under the Scotland Act 1998 and accordingly it would be beyond the competence of the bill to address matters such as the timetabling or fare structure of the new service.

31. Outwith the Bill a number of regulatory approvals will be required, the key ones being described below:

**Network Code**

32. Each train operator or other party holding access rights to use the rail network has a bilateral track access contract with Network Rail. The Network Code is a common set of rules applying to all parties to regulate track access contracts with Network Rail. In particular the Network Code sets out the industry procedure governing, amongst other things, the construction of the timetable and changes to the network and appeals to The Office of Rail Regulation.

**Network Change**

33. Part G of the Network Code refers to the Network Change Process. The Network Change Process is administered by Network Rail and must be applied where a change is proposed to the infrastructure which may affect, for example, network performance in terms of punctuality and journey time, maintenance and operating costs, track capacity and timetables.

34. There are 2 categories of Network Change:

a) those proposed by Network Rail

b) those proposed by a Train Operator

35. Irrespective of the proposer, Network Rail must give notice of the proposed Network Change to all Passenger and Freight Operating Companies who may be affected by the proposal, as well as to other stakeholders such as The Office of Rail Regulation, Transport Scotland, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport, etc., with a proscribed deadline for response.

\textsuperscript{17} Statutory authority to operate the railway will also result from the incorporation of the Railways Clauses Consolidation (Scotland) Act 1845: see paragraphs 11, 17 to 20 (inclusive), 66 and 190 of the Explanatory Notes.

\textsuperscript{18} At the time of writing this is about to be lodged with the Scottish Parliament and will shortly be available to download on the Promoter’s website for the Railway Project (\url{www.spt.co.uk/garl/index.html}).
36. The likely overall time to complete the Network Change process is of the order of 6 - 9 months, but may extend if the proposed change is complex in nature.

Timetable Change
37. Part D of the Network Code refers to the Timetable Change process. Administered by Network Rail it is the procedure by which changes to the Timetable are made. The process commences at least two years prior to the date of implementation of the proposed timetable.

38. It is an iterative process with defined stages during which Network Rail must balance the requests for train paths from the different operating companies, together with engineering requirements, with a view to producing a robust timetable acceptable to all parties.

39. In the event of a failure-to-agree situation there is an appeals procedure against any Network Rail decision, leading ultimately to The Office of Rail Regulation for a ruling.

Station Change
40. Station Change is the contractual, statutory, and regulatory process required to make and document amendments to regulated station access agreements at franchised and Major Stations.

41. The Station Change process can be initiated by either the Train Operating Company as lessee or by Network Rail as owners where there is a proposed change to the infrastructure of the station, e.g. platform lengthening/shortening, alteration to amenities, operational changes, etc.

42. The process is similar to the Network Change process in terms of laid down response deadlines and consultees, consultation with others, financial aspects and the need to reach agreement with others affected by the proposed change before change can be implemented.

43. The likely overall time to complete the Station Change process is of the order of 5 to 8 months, but may extend if the proposed change is complex in nature.
Do your patronage figures show the number of passengers who will be travelling to the airport from Glasgow and those who will be travelling to the airport from Ayrshire and Inverclyde?

Table 1 below shows the number of air passengers who would use GARL to or from Glasgow Airport by origin/destination area. The table also shows the percentage of GARL users by area. Table 2 shows the equivalent information for all air passengers. The tables show that 19.5% of GARL air passenger users would come from Ayrshire and Inverclyde combined. This is more than the proportion of all air passengers from these areas, approximately 12%. This demonstrates that GARL would provide a relatively attractive travel option from these areas.

Table 1 GAML Passengers by Landside Origin/Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2009 Passengers</th>
<th>2030 Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City &amp; East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Scotland, England and Wales</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Scotland</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>456,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 All Air Passengers by Landside Origin/Destination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2009 Passengers</th>
<th>2030 Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City &amp; East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayrshire</td>
<td>821,000</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>189,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries &amp; Galloway</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>564,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Scotland, England and Wales</td>
<td>2,609,000</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Scotland</td>
<td>2,236,000</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,468,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More information on concessionary train fares currently operating in the west of Scotland area (confirmation of whether the economic case took account of existing concessions to bus passengers would also be useful).

The Scheme for Rail journeys (concessionary train fares) is open to people aged 60 years old and over and many disabled people if they live permanently in the area covered by the Scheme and start and end journeys within the scheme area. A 40p concessionary fare is charged for rail journeys of up to 10 miles. A half-adult single or half-adult return fare is charged for journeys over 10 miles. Return fares and through ticketing are allowed. People who are 60 years old and over aren’t allowed to travel before 9am on weekdays.

The Scheme covers the following Council areas:
Argyll & Bute, North/South/East Ayrshire, East/West Dunbartonshire, East Renfrewshire and Renfrewshire, Glasgow, Inverclyde, and North/South Lanarkshire.

The economic case did not take specific account of existing bus passenger concessions. However, according to Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) survey data only 12.9% of air passengers are aged 60 or over. This represents the segment of the market for GARL that could be at risk from the availability of free bus travel to or from the airport. In order to simulate the effect of the difference between the concessions offered on rail and bus, we have undertaken a sensitivity test with zero fare on bus and the above concession on rail in the leisure market. This has the effect of reducing overall total GARL use by approximately 0.5%. It is not surprising that the reduction in usage is small because, in cash terms, the additional cost of using rail is low, particularly in the context of the whole journey including the flight itself. Clearly concession passengers will, like others, value the rail link’s benefits in terms of journey time and reliability.
Figures (presented in percentage terms) of the economic impact of GARL on bus and taxi operators.

The initial impact of GARL will be to reduce the number of air passengers and employees using bus to access the airport by 9.5% of the total who would be using the bus in the absence of GARL. However on the basis of the Department for Transport air passenger forecasts, the growth of the airport will result in bus passenger numbers recovering to their pre-GARL levels within five years. By 2030 bus use to the airport will be 51% higher than immediately before GARL opens. The potential impact on bus operators has been included in the economic case for the scheme. It should be noted that the economic case in relation to buses is conservative in 2 respects. Firstly, recent growth at Glasgow Airport has been much more rapid than forecast by Department for Transport. In 2005, 8.8 million passengers used the airport, exceeding the Department for Transport forecast for 2010 of 8.7 million. If this continues, bus ridership will recover to its pre-GARL level more quickly than forecast. Secondly, no account has been taken of the opportunities that will exist to provide new services to the airport as it expands and to take advantage of the bus-rail interchange opportunities that will be provided at the surface access hub to be created in the vicinity of the airport station.

GARL will initially reduce the number of air passengers and employees combined using taxi to access the airport by 4.6%, relative to the position without GARL. Based on Department for Transport forecasts, taxi user numbers will recover to their pre-GARL level within three years. By 2030, taxi use will be 65% higher than immediately before GARL opens. The points above about the conservatism of the forecasts apply to taxi as well as bus. It is also important to note that the loss of income would be shared between Renfrewshire taxi operators for trips from the airport and operators from Glasgow or other authorities for trips to the airport. The impact on taxi operators has not been included in the quantified economic case. The reasons for this include:

- The restrictive licensing regime at Glasgow Airport means that taxi operators should be able to recoup any theoretical loss of revenue – the main impact will be to reduce queuing times for taxi users;
- One of the objectives of the scheme is to contribute to alleviating congestion on the M8. From this viewpoint taxis can be considered as similar to private cars as they take up the same amount of road space for a similar number of passengers. Indeed, the impact may be greater as, for each trip conveying passengers, there will be an empty trip in the opposite direction;

The assessment of changes in taxi revenues does not consider the practicalities of accommodating the increases in taxi numbers at the airport. The new taxi pick-up/drop-off facility at the surface access hub might need to be larger to accommodate the higher number of passenger numbers without GARL. If the dis-benefit to taxi operators is included, then the saving in this potential extra cost should also be included. The proposals for the surface access hub – which is not part of the core GARL scheme - are not currently developed to the point where a robust cost estimate is available.
Details of any discussions between the Promoter and Infratil on how GARL will “contribute to a sustainable basis for the future growth of Prestwick Airport in terms of government and regional objectives for airport surface access” And how any extra rail capacity generated by GARL could benefit Prestwick.

The Promoter has consulted with Prestwick Airport both in direct communication with Mr Fitzgerald and also through our involvement on the Prestwick Airport Consultative Committee. The key elements of correspondence are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact Method</th>
<th>Parties Involved</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb 05</td>
<td>e-mail from</td>
<td>Steven Fitzgerald - GPIA</td>
<td>• GARL must not reduce service frequency or capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Research suggests passengers for GARL will be less than GPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding should be evenly distributed amongst Scottish airports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Feb 05</td>
<td>e-mail to</td>
<td>Steven Fitzgerald - GPIA</td>
<td>• GARL would not be reducing GPIA services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Feb 06</td>
<td>e-mail to</td>
<td>Dugald Cameron - PIK</td>
<td>• Confirming 3-track proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Noting Objection period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Feb 06</td>
<td>e-mail from</td>
<td>Dugald Cameron - PIK</td>
<td>• Thanks for Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Request that 4-track can be provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to meeting the policy objective stated in the Bill, the key area in which Prestwick Airport will benefit is related to the increased capacity that is provided between Glasgow Central and Paisley. This increased capacity will ensure not only that there is no diminishing of the reliability of trains to Prestwick Airport (which was a key point made by Mr Fitzgerald in his email) but indeed the increased capacity will improve the reliability of trains to Ayrshire including those to/from Prestwick Airport. This will contribute to ensuring the rail service remains an attractive and sustainable means of surface access to Prestwick Airport and in doing so meet the policy objective.

Furthermore, whilst the GARL Bill is not directly promoting additional services to Ayrshire (and Prestwick Airport) we are ensuring that such services are not precluded in the future, specifically within the area between Paisley and Glasgow. There are direct steps being taken in the design of the GARL project with one practical example of this being the new overhead line equipment support structures (and new third track) being placed in such a way that allows for a fourth track to be accommodated.
and hence could provide further capacity in the future. It is important to note that the GARL project is not claiming any incremental benefit from any additional services, although the costs for the above works are included in the project. As such the project is further assisting to meet this objective by taking active steps to protect the corridor for future development.

From an operational point of view, is it possible to have direct train journeys between (a) Glasgow Airport and north/east Scotland by means of the rail link trains reversing at Glasgow Central and then proceeding to Edinburgh” and (b) Glasgow Airport and Ayrshire/Inverclyde without stopping at Paisley. The Committee understands from Manchester Airport that such direct journeys may improve patronage.

(a) It would be feasible for the rail link services to reverse at Central and proceed to Edinburgh either via the Shotts Line (in which case the trains would need to be diesel powered) or using the electrified line via Carstairs. A further reversal would be required to access areas in the North. While these proposals are not an intrinsic part of the project and have not been included in the economic case, they could form part of the ongoing development of services from Glasgow Airport, subject to them having a positive business case. Alternatively, the City Union Line could be upgraded to passenger standards permitting access to the lines out of Glasgow Queen Street via Springburn. SPT is currently planning this upgrade as part of the Glasgow Crossrail project”

(b) With GARL, Airport access to and from Ayrshire/ Inverclyde without stopping at Paisley would be possible but only if there was a reversing movement on the rail network. This reversing manoeuvre would either occur east of Paisley Gilmour Street (for Ayrshire services) or east of Paisley St James (for Inverclyde services). Such reversing movements imply that the train must stop (safely and without impediment to other services) and then the driver change ends to take the train to its destination. We have been advised through other projects that driver changes of this nature are discouraged – on longer multiple units drivers may have to exit the train to get to the other end. Such a manoeuvre would also require the train to change tracks from the Up to the Down direction (and vice versa for the opposite direction). Missing out Paisley (the fourth busiest station on the Scottish Rail network) would present a missed opportunity for Inverclyde connectivity and for Paisley itself.

It is accepted that greater direct connectivity (without the need to change trains) will enhance patronage. The need to interchange is inconvenient to passengers, takes additional time in waiting at the interchange and introduces greater uncertainty about journey reliability, a particularly important issue for air passengers. These factors are a disincentive to the use of rail. Clearly it will not always be possible to provide direct through services, so it is also important to minimise the disincentive of interchange by providing frequent services to the airport to minimise waiting time, good physical links at interchanges and high quality passenger information to reduce uncertainty.

When considering the case of Glasgow Airport the geography does not readily lend itself to a wide range of direct through services. The Airport lies on the south bank of the River Clyde and is thus constrained on a north/ south axis. The Airport is also positioned north of the main Ayrshire to Glasgow rail lines and to achieve through
services from Ayrshire without reversal would require both a deviation of the Ayr line around Paisley to the north west but also then a continuation from the airport either back onto the Paisley to Glasgow line or a new line via Renfrew and Braehead. The Promoter suggests that for much less capital investment the objectives for connectivity can be achieved.

The Crossrail project would facilitate the operation of through services to the East and North and this is being actively developed by SPT. However, GARL stands on its own, capable of delivering significant economic and social benefits, and represents in its own right a project worth delivering. SPT recognises that there are opportunities for further incremental development. Indeed the Manchester example demonstrates a successful strategy of incremental development given that investment in rail is costly and such investments often follow incremental economic growth.

The Promoter recognises the advantages of connectivity and indeed this has been a central plank of SPT’s rail strategy to date. The Promoter has an unparalleled record of new station opening and new rail line development. In promoting the GARL Bill the Promoter confirms its continued commitment to maximising the use of the railway asset and will be actively engaged with Transport Scotland (the new transport agency responsible for Scotland’s railway) to develop future service patterns that will enhance the investment through the GARL proposal.

Why has funding for the rail link been sought from the operators of Glasgow Airport but not from the operators of Prestwick Airport?

The Committee will be aware that Prestwick Airport has a rail station and the costs for constructing the station included a contribution from Prestwick Airport, as confirmed in recent evidence by Mr Fitzgerald. Prestwick Airport currently own and maintain the Prestwick Airport Rail Station.

Whilst the funding from Glasgow Airport is being sought directly by Transport Scotland, the Promoter understands that this is on a similar basis to that previously gained from Prestwick Airport for Prestwick Airport Rail Station and therefore the Promoter believes that there is absolute equity of treatment in this regard.

Can you confirm whether –from Glasgow Central to the airport and back – one of the lines will be dedicated solely to GARL trains or will it share the line with other trains, thereby possibly leading to delays behind other trains, etc? Further, will there be special, dedicated trains for GARL passengers, which include more space for luggage, etc?

GARL services will operate from a dedicated platform at Glasgow Central station and will be the sole user of the airport branch, including the airport station. However GARL will not have exclusive use of one track between Glasgow Central and the airport branch junction.

During the development of the project, a number of methods of operation were considered. These included an option where the third bi-directional line between Shields Junction and Arkleston Junction was exclusively used by airport trains. It was found that this was less reliable than the alternative based on the shared use of all
three lines. In essence, the latter leads to all three lines operating well within their capacity. However the option where the bi-directional line is used exclusively by airport trains results in it being used very intensively by airport services in alternating directions. If a train in one direction is delayed, it will delay the next train in the opposite direction with a consequent delay to the next train and so on. There would be little opportunity to recover once an initial delay had occurred and there is a risk that delayed GARL trains would in turn delay other services between Glasgow Central and Shields Junction or in the Paisley area. It was found that a preferable method of operation would be for trains heading towards Glasgow to use the existing line and the new line for most of the day, but with the new line used by outbound services in the evening peak, when the outbound service is most intensive.

Detailed modelling of the operational performance of the GARL timetable has been carried out using Network Rail’s preferred modelling software, RailSys. The RailSys model, developed by a specialist consultancy – RWA Rail, has been audited by Network Rail and accepted by them. The model shows that the preferred GARL operational solution leads to a reduction in delay, within the Glasgow – Paisley corridor, of 26 seconds per train, despite the addition of the GARL services. This demonstrates that the infrastructure specified in the Bill is adequate to support a robust and reliable service.

The precise specification for the GARL trains is still under discussion with Transport Scotland. Transport Scotland have advised that the GARL trains will be procured as part of the rolling stock strategy for Scotland, which will ensure the best value is achieved through economies of scale. In addition Transport Scotland have confirmed that it will be possible to have a specific train with luggage facilities for the new GARL services, whilst ensuring the mechanical and electrical components are compatible with the wider fleet. It is important to note that all trains will start from the airport so that arriving air passengers should not have difficulty finding space for luggage. In the reverse direction, the trains will be shared with commuters as far as Paisley Gilmour Street. However, as BAA stated to the Committee, the peak times for air passenger flows differ from the normal commuter peaks, so capacity for passengers and their luggage should not be a problem.

Can you explain how GARL will provide better interchange for cyclists and walkers?

Unlike bus services, cycles will be carried on GARL services. This will provide a direct interchange with cycling as a mode of transport at Glasgow Central and Paisley Gilmour Street. It will also allow cyclists travelling to the airport from other stations, to interchange onto GARL to reach the airport.

By improving public transport links to the airport, walk and cycle access to stations will be encouraged, relative to the alternatives of using car or taxi for the whole journey. The Committee has also received evidence from BAA on their plans to develop a transport interchange at Glasgow Airport around the rail station as part of their Masterplan for future growth. The Promoter believes that without GARL the opportunities for development of the interchange (including facilities for cyclists) would be less than if GARL is introduced. An example of such a facility where this integration has been a success is at Manchester Airport and the Promoter believes
there is an excellent opportunity for this to be developed at Glasgow Airport in partnership with BAA.

Both aspects highlighted above meets the objective to “allow for the future development of enhanced interchange opportunities with….cycling and walking”. Furthermore, and as already indicated to the Committee, the Promoter has recently commissioned a separate study of potential upgrading of Paisley Gilmour Street. This may result in a further improvement in interchange opportunities for cyclists and walkers.

*At the Committee Meeting on 8th May, Marjory Rodger stated “We are not saying that a bus option should definitely have been chosen. We are saying that that option should have been considered more carefully, given that we now have tram buses, which were not around at the start of the project. They look like trams but are buses and we can get about 300 of them for the cost of one train.”*

There are several types of rubber tyred vehicle on the market which provide intermediate options between conventional buses and rail vehicles and could be described as “tram buses”. These include the Streetcar vehicle recently introduced in York by First. There are also other designs such as GLT and Translohr. The Streetcar is the cheapest of these options and is understood to have a capital cost of approximately £250,000 per vehicle. It uses conventional bus technology but is designed to present a tram-like image. It operates on street in the same way as a normal bus. Conventional rail vehicles have a capital cost of approximately £1 million per vehicle, while articulated light rail vehicles typically cost of the order of £1.25 million. However the latter would have a higher capacity than Streetcar. All these costs are dependant on the number of vehicles ordered and the precise vehicle specification. On a comparable basis, rail vehicles have a capital cost which is 3 to 4 times higher than Streetcar. However rail vehicles typically have a service life of 30 to 40 years compared to 15 years for buses.

While new technology options will inevitably become available during the development of any major scheme, we do not consider that the development of “tram buses” is sufficiently significant to require a review of the reasons why a rail based solution was adopted.

*At the Committee Meeting on 8th May, Mr Steven Fitzgerald stated: “Before coming to Infratil Airports Europe Ltd, my role was as general manager of airport operations at Sydney airport, and I went through the introduction of the rail link there. Unfortunately, that was a financial failure and the private sector company that was involved remains in receivership. The quality and price combination was not competitive in relation to bus services and upgraded roads. Sydney's rail link was introduced just prior to the Olympics, at the same time that roads were upgraded and other things happened. The forecasters got the numbers on the demand for the rail link wrong.”*

The Promoter fully accepts that this statement is correct. However our understanding is that current usage of the Sydney Airport Rail Link, by air passengers and employees, is 178,000 people per month, equating to an annual total of 2,136,000.
This represents 7.6% of the 28,288,150 passengers using Sydney Airport in 2005. The forecasts for GRL in 2009 are that 456,000 air passengers and 94,000 employees will use the rail link. This constitutes 6.3% of the 8,727,449 air passengers forecast to use the airport in 2010. Accordingly the forecasts for Glasgow are lower than the outturn result at Sydney. The issue is therefore that the operator of the Sydney Airport Rail Link was overly optimistic in his predictions, not that the rail link itself has been a failure. These lessons have been learned by the Promoter's team and the GRL forecasts are conservative.

There are some interesting comparisons between Sydney and Glasgow. Both airports are similar distances from the city centre and have good, if congested, road links into the central area. However fares at Sydney are significantly higher than at Glasgow. At current exchange rates the fare from the International Terminal station is £5.21 and from the Domestic Terminal £4.96, significantly higher than the £3.30 proposed for GRL. These fares are approximately 40% of the equivalent taxi fare, while at Glasgow the proposed fare would be about 20% of the typical taxi fare to the city centre. It is also worth noting that the Sydney Airport stations are on a through commuter line, leading to difficulties for air passengers at peak commuting times.
GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL COMMITTEE:
ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

Purpose
1. One of the roles for the Committee at Preliminary Stage is to determine (a) whether the accompanying documents lodged with the Bill satisfy the technical criteria that are set down in the Standing Orders and (b) are adequate to allow for proper scrutiny of the Bill.

2. If the Committee decides that the accompanying documents are not adequate, it can require the promoter to provide further supplementary accompanying documents. The Committee will be taking evidence on the Bill's accompanying documents at its meeting of 22 May.

3. This paper reproduces the “technical criteria” relating to accompanying documents that are set out in Standing Order Rule 9A.2 and which apply to the Glasgow Airport Rail Link Bill. As several of these criteria have been supplemented by determinations made by the Presiding Officer (which can be found in the Guidance on Private Bills), relevant extracts from these determinations have also been provided.

4. The Committee is invited to consider this paper in advance of taking oral evidence on the Bill's accompanying documents.

Accompanying documents

5. The accompanying documents required for GARL are as follows:

   a) **Explanatory Notes** which summarise objectively what each of the provisions of the Private Bill does (to the extent that it requires explanation or comment) and give other information necessary or expedient to explain the effect of the Private Bill.

   b) A **Promoter's Memorandum** which sets out—
      i. the objectives of the Private Bill;
      ii. whether alternative ways of meeting those objectives were considered and, if so, why the approach taken in the Private Bill was adopted; and
      iii. the consultation which was undertaken on those objectives and the ways of meeting them and on the detail of the Private Bill together with a summary of the outcome of that consultation (including that carried out with the mandatory consultees).

   c) An **Estimate of Expense and Funding Statement** setting out the estimated total cost of the project proposed by the
Private Bill and anticipated sources of funding to meet the
cost of the project. The Presiding Officer has also
determined that the Statement should provide:

- a detailed cost breakdown of each element of the
  project;
- an estimate of the timescales over which such costs
  would be expected to arise and an indication of the
  margins of uncertainty in any such estimate;
- a detailed breakdown of all anticipated and
  committed sources of funding including for both
  capital and running costs; and
- an estimate of the timescales over which funding
  would be expected to be required and an indication
  of the margins of uncertainty in any such estimates.

d) Maps, plans, sections and books of references as the
   Presiding Officer may determine. The relevant determination
   is contained in annexe 1 to this paper.

e) An Environmental Statement setting out such information
   on the anticipated environmental impact of the Bill as would
   (if it applied to the Private Bill) be required by Schedule 4 to
   the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999/1). (Annexe 2 reproduces
   Schedule 4.)

f) A Promoter's Statement which sets out—

i. details of the notification of the proposed Private Bill
   given by the promoter to such persons or classes of
   person having an interest in heritable property affected by
   the Private Bill as the Presiding Officer may determine.
   The relevant determination states that those who require
   to be notified are persons whose interests are registered
   in the Sasines Register held by Registers of Scotland; or
   registered on the Land Register; or on the latest version
   of the valuation roll; or as ‘the owner’, ‘the lessee’ or, as
   the case may be, ‘the occupier’ of any land or buildings
   (other than the owner, lessee or occupier of which cannot
   be ascertained after reasonable inquiry).

ii. details of the notification of the proposed Private Bill
   given by the promoter to and the consent to the proposed
   Private Bill obtained by the promoter from members of
   that body corporate: (a) the methods used and copies of
   any letters and advertisements used to notify members of
   the holding of a meeting to discuss and/or obtain consent
   for the promotion of the Private Bill; and (b) the method in
   accordance with the promoter’s own rules or otherwise
   and of the voting (if any) by which consent was obtained
   from the members.
iii. details of the advertisement of the promoter’s intention to introduce the Private Bill in accordance with the determination of the Presiding Officer.

iv. a statement listing the premises where the Maps, plans, sections and books of references and other documents which are relevant to the Private Bill but are not accompanying documents may be inspected or purchased, together with an undertaking to send a copy of those documents to the relevant partner libraries and mandatory consultees; and

v. an undertaking to pay any costs that may be incurred by the Parliamentary corporation during the passage of the Private Bill in respect of such matters as the Parliamentary corporation may determine.

g) An agreement under which the promoter—

i. assigns to the Parliamentary corporation copyright in the Private Bill, the Explanatory Notes, the Promoter’s Memorandum, the Estimate of Expense and Funding Statement, and the Promoter’s Statement; and

ii. licenses the Parliamentary corporation to use or reproduce as may be required for the Parliament’s purposes such plans, maps, sections, books of references and Environmental Statement or any other document submitted to the Clerk by the promoter on introduction or subsequently.
Annexe 1: Maps, plans, sections and books of references

The information that is required in terms of the maps, plans, sections and book of reference for GARL is as follows:

Maps
These must be based on an Ordnance Survey map at a scale not smaller than 1:50,000, with the general course of direction or boundaries of the proposed work or alteration shown and, where appropriate, show the line of any proposed works. These should be submitted in colour.

Plans, sections
Plans must be drawn to a horizontal scale not smaller than 1:2,500. A key plan, showing the general location of works, must be drawn to a scale not smaller than 1:50,000. They must show clearly the line or situation of the whole of the work and where the construction is, or demolition or alterations are, to take place. Where it is the intention of the promoter to apply for powers to make any deviation from the line of the proposed work, then the limits of any such deviation must be defined on a plan and all land included within those limits must also be defined. A plan must be provided of any building yard, courtyard or land within the curtilage of any building or ground cultivated as a garden, either in the line of the proposed work, or included within the limits of deviation. A plan or plans, showing clearly any land that it is proposed to acquire compulsory, must also be provided.

Sections and cross-sections of works must be drawn to the same horizontal scale as the plans. In respect of the vertical scale, this must be no smaller than 1:500.

Where tunnelling as a substitute for open cutting or a viaduct as a substitute for solid embankment is required then this must be marked on the plan (in the case of tunnelling, by a dotted line). Where a length is stated on the plan, it must be stated in kilometres and metres.

In the case of a Bill that seeks to authorise the construction or alteration of any railway or tramroad, the distances in kilometres and metres from the commencement of the work must be marked on the plan. Details of the radius of every curve not exceeding one kilometre in length must also be noted on the plan. Where the Bill seeks to authorise the construction or alteration of a railway or tramroad so as to form a junction with an existing or authorised line of railway or tramroad, the course of the existing or authorised line must be shown on the plan for a distance of 500 metres on each side of the proposed junction, on the same scale as the first-mentioned railway or tramroad.

In the case of a Bill that proposes to authorise the diversion, widening or narrowing of any road, navigable river, canal, railway or tramroad, the course of the diversion, and the extent of the widening or narrowing, must be marked upon the plan and, if it is intended to divert any public footpath, the course of such diversion must be marked upon the plan.
The information provided on all copies of plans and sections must be accurate. The plans and sections can be submitted in black and white. Key features, such as any limits of deviation of the works and the precise boundaries of each plot of land to be compulsorily acquired, must be clearly delineated on the relevant plans. Plans and sections should be drawn to a larger scale than the minimum prescribed if this is necessary to achieve reasonable clarity and accuracy.

**Book of Reference**
Where a Bill seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of land, or the right to use land or to carry out protective works to buildings, or the compulsory extinguishment of servitudes and other private rights over land (and of navigation over water) the promoter must provide in a Book of Reference a list of the names and addresses of the owners, lessees and occupiers of all lands and buildings that may be compulsorily acquired or used or who have interests in any land or water in or over which rights would be extinguished or in those rights. The promoter is not required to include information about owners or lessees whose identity cannot after reasonable enquiry be ascertained.

The names and addresses listed must be extracted from the most recent information available. The source or sources of the information must be shown.
Annexe 2: Schedule 4 to the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999

INFORMATION FOR INCLUSION IN ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENTS

PART I

1. Description of the development, including in particular-
   a. a description of the physical characteristics of the whole development and the land-use requirements during the construction and operational phases;
   b. a description of the main characteristics of the production processes, for instance, nature and quantity of the materials used;
   c. an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions (water, air and soil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation, etc.) resulting from the operation of the development.

2. An outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant or appellant and an indication of the main reasons for his choice, taking into account the environmental effects.

3. A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development, including, in particular, population, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, including the architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors.

4. A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment, which should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the development, resulting from:
   a. the existence of the development;
   b. the use of natural resources;
   c. the emission of pollutants, the creation of nuisances and the elimination of waste,

and the description by the applicant or appellant of the forecasting methods used to assess the effects on the environment.

5. A description of the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and where possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment.
6. A non-technical summary of the information provided under paragraphs 1 to 5 of this Part.

7. An indication of any difficulties (technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered by the applicant or appellant in compiling the required information.
GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL COMMITTEE:
APPOINTMENT OF AN ASSESSOR

Introduction
1. At Preliminary Stage, a private bill committee can decide to direct the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body - subject to the bill proceeding to Consideration Stage - to appoint an "assessor" to consider and report to the committee at Consideration Stage.

2. If the Committee so decides, the assessor could report to the Committee in one or both of the following ways:
   a) with recommendations on which outstanding objections should be grouped; which objectors should give evidence on these grouped objections; and, whether evidence should be given orally, in writing or both¹;
   b) on the evidence given to the assessor, with recommendations as the assessor considers appropriate.

3. Consideration Stage has two distinct phases. The first involves hearing evidence relating to the detail of the Bill and any outstanding objections to it. Following consideration of the evidence (whether by an assessor or by the committee), the committee will prepare a report giving its decisions on the objections considered. The second phase of Consideration Stage involves the committee meeting in a legislative capacity, to consider and dispose of any amendments to the Bill.

Background
4. A recent report by the Procedures Committee, Private Bill Committee assessors², recommended that the Parliament accept a proposal by the Scottish Executive for the Parliament’s private bill procedures to be changed.

5. In essence, the Committee report proposed that private bill committees should have the option of appointing an independent assessor to hear and consider objections during the first phase of Consideration Stage. The primary benefit of the proposal was described as its capacity to "reduce the burden on MSPs in dealing with what are at times highly complex and technical matters", while also enabling the process to be conducted more efficiently.

¹ At Preliminary Stage, the Committee must reject any objections where the objector’s interests are, in the opinion of the Committee, not clearly adversely affected by the Private Bill. Any remaining objections would be considered in detail at Consideration Stage (if the Parliament agrees that the Bill should progress). If the Bill does proceed to Consideration Stage, the Committee (or the assessor) can group together two or more objections it considers to be the same or similar. It (or the assessor) can then choose one or more objectors from a group to give evidence in relation to those objections. The Committee (or assessor) must also invite evidence from the promoter and any objector whose objection has not been grouped.
6. While the Procedures Committee was “less convinced than the Scottish Executive” of the potential of the proposal to save time in the process, it agreed that “the ability to appoint an assessor is a useful option for Private Bill Committees to have”. The Committee therefore recommended that the Parliament agree to make the Rule changes that would be required to allow an assessor to be appointed.

7. The Procedures Committee’s motion to change Standing Orders was debated and agreed to in the Parliament on 18 January 2006. Consequently, Chapter 9A of the Standing Orders was amended to include provision for the appointment of an assessor (and related procedures).

8. It is important to note that while an assessor could report to a committee in the ways highlighted above, it would remain the sole duty of the committee to decide and report on any outstanding objections at Consideration Stage; the revised Standing Orders make clear that a committee could accept in whole or in part, or reject, any report by an assessor. Furthermore, after an assessor reports, a committee could take such other steps as it thinks fit, for example, referring further matters to the assessor for consideration and report, or itself taking further evidence.

Decision
9. The Committee is invited to discuss and agree whether it wishes to direct the SPCB to appoint an assessor to consider and report to the Committee at Consideration Stage, subject to the Bill proceeding to Consideration Stage. The Committee is also invited to discuss, with reference to paragraph 2, the areas on which it would like the assessor to report.

10. If the Committee so decides, it will be for the Parliamentary corporation to appoint an assessor that it considers to be suitably qualified, subject to such terms and conditions as it considers appropriate. If the Committee decides not to appoint an assessor, the Committee would be responsible for carrying out the functions mentioned in paragraph 2.

11. It is anticipated that if the Bill progresses and if an assessor is appointed, he or she would commence work shortly after Preliminary Stage has concluded.