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GLASGOW AIRPORT RAIL LINK BILL:
FURTHER INFORMATION AND SUPPLEMENTARY WRITTEN EVIDENCE

Background

1. The Committee has been provided with further information and supplementary written evidence, in relation to points raised at previous Committee meetings. The evidence, attached at annexe 1, is as follows:
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ANNEXE 1

RESPONSES FROM THE PROMOTER

Supplementary Written Evidence on the Regeneration of Paisley Gilmour Street Station

The promoter has commissioned a passenger flow and amenity study to be carried out in respect of Paisley Gilmour Street station. The results of this are expected in Autumn/Winter 2006. Depending on the results of this study, the Promoter aims to pull together an action plan in conjunction with the key stakeholders, namely Network Rail, Transport Scotland and Renfrewshire Council.

Supplementary Written Evidence on the Consultation Process

A number of issues regarding the consultation process were raised at recent committee meetings. This written evidence seeks to clarify the issues raised and inform the committee about the scope of the consultation.

Information about the proposed route

The main consultation material – leaflet and exhibition boards – focussed on the GARL route being proposed by the Promoter. It was not thought appropriate to take a “vote” on other options considered due to the amount of previous work and decisions that had narrowed the option down to the St James route and the fact that the Scottish Executive had already declared this as its preferred route.

A copy of the initial consultation leaflet is enclosed with this written evidence. The leaflet provided information about the proposed route, the process of a private bill and the consultation, questions and answers, key facts about the airport and the proposed route and a map superimposed with the proposed rail link.

The consultation leaflet and the project website provided a form to allow feedback about the proposals. This form was used to collect the key statistics for the consultation. The questions asked were:

- What do you think about the Glasgow Airport Rail Link?
  - Strongly Support
  - Support it
  - Not Sure
  - Against It
  - Strongly against it

- Please tick which option you prefer for crossing St James Park
  - Embankment
  - Viaduct

Please state the reason for your choice.
The rail link will cross the playing fields at St James Park. If you have any suggestions to maximise the remaining playing field space or to provide an alternative please include them here.

As indicated on the enclosed leaflet, the Glasgow Airport Rail Link was clearly outlined under the heading ‘What is Glasgow Airport Rail Link?’ and illustrated on the route map. There was no specific mention of any alternative routes.

**Information about alternative routes**

Although the Promoter was not considering other routes by the time of the consultation, it was thought important to provide background information on the other routes that were considered and why they were not being taken forward.

Throughout the consultation period SPT made available information about alternative routes that had been investigated. This included a 16 page A4 briefing pack which was made available at public meetings, exhibitions, on the internet and by post if requested. A copy of the information pack is attached.

The briefing pack explained ten alternative routes that were examined and ruled out by previous studies. The pack then explained four further options at St James including a route to the west of St James Park incorporating a short tunnel (A), a route skirting the west of St James Park (B), a route crossing St James Park and Greenock Road (C) and the preferred route as proposed in the Bill (D). The information pack clearly identified the preferred route.

A total of five formal public meetings were held. Each meeting started with a presentation that included information about the routes that had been ruled out by previous studies. There followed a substantial number of questions from the public about alternative routes and these were answered in detail by the project team.

Information about alternative routes was also provided at five focus groups held with residents and businesses along the line of route. The project team also attended meetings where alternative routes were discussed with a grouping of playing field users, Paisley North Community Council and St James Residents Associations.

Although the other routes were not provided as options that people could state a preference for, they were made public and discussed in an open forum with the Promoter explaining why those options had not been taken forward.

Comments made during the consultation were recorded and section four of the Consultation Report, which is available on the project website, lists this information, including the number of respondents who suggested alternative routes. A total of 31 respondents are recorded as recommending alternative routes.

It was made clear at all public meetings and focus groups that SPT was consulting on their preferred route.
Consultation statistics
The consultation statistics were accurately reported in the Public Consultation Report. The statistics relating to those who supported GARL were taken from the formal responses of those who filled in a consultation leaflet or used the online feedback facility.

The Public Consultation Report listed the statistics for the questionnaire as follows:

What do you think about the Glasgow Airport Rail Link?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Against</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which option do you prefer for crossing St James Park?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embankment</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viaduct</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Public Consultation Report did record that a number of petition type of responses were received including a postcard campaign (515) and a leaflet published by the SNP (26). These were not included in the main consultation statistics as the wording could not clearly be translated to the wording of the official consultation questions.

Paisley North Community Council stated that they were concerned that the postcard campaign had been attributed to them in the Promoter's Memorandum. The postcards did not state who they were produced or published by. SPT was under the impression that the postcards were produced by the Community Council as we had received an enquiry from Renfrewshire Council who had been asked to fund the production of the postcards by Paisley North Community Council. In addition, questions were asked about the postcard campaign at a meeting held with St James Residents’ Association.

Membership of the St James’ Residents Association, Paisley North Community Council and SADD are similar so therefore it was difficult to tell which group in particular had organised the postcard campaign.
The Promoter can advise that a full review of the consultation process is likely to take in the order of **four to six weeks**. This would include a thorough review of the consultation report, the strategy, consultation tactics, collateral used and the way consultees were identified and communicated with.

**Supplementary Written Evidence on Consultation with GNER**

The Promoter confirms the oral evidence given at the Committee meeting on 22 May 2006 in relation to consultation undertaken with GNER, as summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting/Discussion/Event</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Issues/Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 2004</td>
<td>Consultation leaflet and letter sent</td>
<td>Christopher Garnett, CE, GNER</td>
<td>Letter sent to all key stakeholders announcing start of consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and 11 Nov 04</td>
<td>Public Exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheme details presented from 9am to 8pm at a stand in the main concourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td>Letter sent</td>
<td>Christopher Garnett</td>
<td>Letter sent to all key stakeholders to remind re: consultation close date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dec 04</td>
<td>Transportation Focus Group</td>
<td>Christopher Garnett invited but did not attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May 05</td>
<td>Central Station Users Group</td>
<td>Martin Lawrence (GNER Business Manager)</td>
<td>• Presentation of project and impacts at Glasgow Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ML asked what issues were raised by the 18% not in support of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ML asked if car parking issues were raised during consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 June 05</td>
<td>Letter sent</td>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
<td>Letter re: compulsory purchase powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov 05</td>
<td>Engineering Conference</td>
<td>Bob Fletcher (GNER)</td>
<td>Presentation of the GARL project to the rail industry. CD copies of presentation issued by post afterwards to attendees by Network Rail who chaired the Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 March</td>
<td>Letter sent</td>
<td>Martin Lawrence</td>
<td>• Thanks for input during</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Promoter fully acknowledges that GNER have raised many more detailed points on the Bill, as part of their detailed objection, than those discussed during the consultation set out in the table above. The Promoter is currently liaising with GNER’s solicitor to arrange a meeting to discuss all matters in their objection.

**Supplementary Written Evidence on Health Impact Assessment**

**Introduction**

As stated in oral evidence to the committee on 22 May 2006 a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is not a requirement of the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 and was therefore not included in the Environmental Statement for GARL.

**Statutory Requirement**

Further research indicates that there is no statutory requirement for HIA for any project although the UK government has signalled its commitment to promoting HIA in the 2003 Tackling Health Inequalities report which recognises the importance of assessing the impact of policy on these issues. In addition, a number of UK national policies, programmes and guidance make reference to the use of HIA including:

- New Deal for Transport White Paper, Department of Transport, July 1998
- The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030, Department of Transport, July 2004

It should be noted that although health issues are mentioned in these documents undertaking an HIA is not referred to as a mandatory activity.

In the Promoter’s experience, a HIA has been requested occasionally as an adjunct to undertaking Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for Local Transport Strategies (LTS). Note that the requirements for SEA are covered in Scotland by the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005 (“the 2005 Act”) which repealed the earlier Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Scotland) Regulations 2004. The 2005 Act deals specifically with SEA for plans and programmes and is not to be confused with the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 under which the GARL EIA was carried out. All that said there is no requirement in the 2005 Act to undertake an HIA as part of an SEA either.
Methodology

HIA is an approach that informs decision making at all levels and considers the potential impacts of decisions on health and health inequalities. It identifies actions that can enhance positive effects and reduce or eliminate negative effects. However, although there is no single agreed national approach or methodology for undertaking an HIA the following steps are normally undertaken.

1. Deciding what proposals require assessment by HIA (Screening).
2. Deciding the parameters for carrying out a HIA including developing assessment methods (Scoping).
3. Identifying and considering the evidence for potential impacts the proposal may have on health (Consultation, Data Collection and Review, Appraisal and Assessment).
4. Developing specific recommendations for decision makers to improve the proposal, including recommendations for addressing inequalities (Consultation with Stakeholders).
5. Further engagement with decision makers to encourage adaptation of the proposal (Consultation with Stakeholders).
6. Monitoring and evaluation to check recommendations were adopted and whether a positive impact on health was achieved.

It should be noted that as HIA is normally undertaken at the strategic level, findings are rarely quantitative.

Timescales

From a review of previous studies, the lack of a defined methodology or mandatory requirement and its strategic and qualitative nature indicates that HIA can be an extended process, taking possibly a minimum of three months to complete but probably much longer.

Supplementary Written Evidence from the Scottish Independent Airport Park and Ride Association

The aim is to ensure that the patronage figures for the proposed Glasgow Airport Rail Link (GARL) are increased, which in turn, will help to ensure the project is financially viable and not a drain on the public purse.

I propose that practical steps are taken to leverage the best value from the existing private sector Park and Ride (PAR), by ensuring that SPT signage for PAR is prominently displayed and that through-tickets are available to enable customers to purchase car parking and a GARL rail ticket at the same time. This would be similar to the service provided by SPT, for example at Shields Rd underground station.

This package would be particularly attractive to commuters from the west of the airport eg Greenock and Port Glasgow who currently drive to Glasgow city centre, as parking at Glasgow Airport car park currently costs around £10 a day. These commuters could park their car at a PAR in one of 3 sites, ie the Airlink site next to Paisley St James Station, QPark in Linwood, and Park Safe in Paisley Town centre, at a cost of around £10 for 5 days as a weekly ticket.
and then be transferred in clean, reliable buses to the GARL station to continue their journey into Glasgow city centre. This would of course require guaranteed access to Glasgow Airport and designated statutory SPT/PAR bus stops at close proximity to the GARL station.

This is a genuine suggestion from our members to assist the GARL scheme and to ensure that the best of the private and public sector combine to offer an improved service for all future GARL users.

If you require any further information on any aspects of this scheme, I will be more than happy to explain it in more detail.

Supplementary Written Evidence from the Confederation of Passenger Transport

Evidence from Arriva Scotland West

1. NO discussions were ever entered into with SPT regarding bus contribution when options were being considered.

As part of the Airport Transport Forum and Quality Partnership, Airport Bus Operators would be informed through BAA master plans of evolution at the Airport. This does not mean consultation as no influence on GARL could occur.

2. BAA commissioned a report on social inclusion and access to employment at Glasgow Airport in 2004 which intimated 13% of existing customers travel from Glasgow City Centre. From this report it is noted that over 50% come from Renfrewshire (25% Paisley)

The Glasgow Airport surface access targets denote the growth of existing bus routes and, where demand exists, establish new bus routes. Mr Hendry’s oblique reference to operator’s failure of expansion is due to the report establishing socially excluded or deprived areas. Unfortunately these are not the same as commercially viable ventures.

3. Arriva operate a 10-minute main day frequency from Paisley Gilmour Street Station to Glasgow Airport with a journey time of 9 minutes. A joint-ticketing arrangement between Arriva and First Scotrail exists where passengers from any destination can gain a through ticket to/from Glasgow Airport. A Bus Route Development Grant submission which included a dedicated service between both points (utilising DDA compliant vehicles with luggage space) was denied in 2004. The journey time for this service was 7-minutes using 2 buses.

4. As you have indicated, the stance charges are designed to increase. This is the third increase in three years which consists of (in Arriva terms) 50% in 2004, 50% in 2005 and, if the current proposal remains un-flexible (removal of ‘ceiling’), will constitute a service bursting 400% (negotiations on-going as this would mean withdrawal)
5. The modal interchange point where bus-rail interchange opportunities have been expressed may be lost on non-West of Scotland Committee members as Mr Ferguson’s remarks may be summarised thus:

- The Gryffe Valley, Bridge of Weir and Kilmacolm areas have a 50-minute M8 Express bus service which passes Glasgow Airport, does he expect passengers to negotiate an urban network of buses just to utilise a rail link at Glasgow Airport? (Should they even wish to, passengers would use Johnstone or Paisley Rail Stations before GA)

- The Erskine area has a 10-minute frequency, 50-minute end-to-end Glasgow Service which extends pre and post current rail operation times, again no expectation can be assumed of passengers wishing to extend/break their travel pattern for the privilege of utilising the train (Also, Bishopton station is 10-minutes away!

- Dumbarton has it’s own rail station etc, etc, etc.

**Evidence from Scottish Citylink**

Things have now moved on slightly with regard to the route between Glasgow Central and Glasgow Airport.

Linn Park who were previously only operating every half hour and not really a competitive entity have now gone head to head on this route. Before this I would estimate that between the two companies we were carrying in excess of 600,000 people per year on this route.

From an industry point of view this now means that the service levels between the two companies gives a 7/8 min frequency between 0540 and 0730 then a 5 minute frequency from 0730 through to around 1830 then every 15 mins or less there after Mon - Sat and They operate every 10 mins on Sunday also whilst we are every 15 mins. To this end you will see that there is an extremely good service now.

Scottish Citylink would like to push for a statutory quality partnership on this corridor that all operators buy into to improve the quality, offer faster journey times through greenways and "hard shoulder" running and better infrastructure and vehicles. Even if there was no competition on the route, with these commitments and improvements in place, I would think that the benefits would generate the passenger revenues that a service as frequent as less than 10 minutes and 15 mins into the evenings would pay for commercially.

This proposal would require commitment from the PTE and the Local Authorities.
Airport Parking Prices

Short Stay (NCP) – Advanced booking
1 week = £43.20 (saving of £22.80 on gate price)
2 weeks = £93.60 (saving of £49.40 on gate price)

Short Stay (NCP) – Gate Rate
£5.50 per day (no minimum stay)

Long Stay Flightplan (NCP) – Advanced booking
1 week = £25.20 (saving £7.80 on drive up price)
2 weeks= £54.60 (saving of £16.90 on gate price)

Long Stay Flightplan (NCP) - Gate Rate
£4.20 per day (minimum of £16.80)

“5 days or more” – for users who do not perhaps want to use long stay there is a mid-priced product which has a minimum charge of £36 which works out at £7.20 per day.

Glasgow Central Parking Prices

Oswald Street NCP
Per day = £11.50 (9-24 hours)

Mitchell Street NCP
Per day = £14 per day

SPICe
Responses from BAA

Glasgow Airport Passenger Flights - 2005/06

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flights</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Flights during 2005/06</td>
<td>96,693</td>
<td>8,819,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>11,237</td>
<td>1,150,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>867,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>18,607</td>
<td>2,017,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheduled Passenger Flights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flights</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Scheduled Passenger Flights during 2005/06</td>
<td>85,694</td>
<td>6,642,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>9,179</td>
<td>742,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>5,617</td>
<td>503,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>14,796</td>
<td>1,245,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charter Passenger Flights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flights</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Charter Passenger Flights during 2005/06</td>
<td>10,999</td>
<td>2,177,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>407,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>364,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total between the hours of 23:30 and 08:29</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>772,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is for all scheduled and charter passenger flights between 23.30 and 08.29 during the period 01/04/05 to 31/0306
Further response from BAA

Further to my earlier email my clients have asked me to make it clear to you and to the Committee the vast majority of flights between 23:30 and 08:29 which are referred to are the early morning departures and arrivals which are concentrated between 06:00 and 08:29. Very few therefore relate to night flying.