

## ANNEX A

### GENERAL PRINCIPLES

#### General overview of scheme and need for railway

**1. What assessment has been carried out into the local, regional and national impact of the railway not proceeding?**

**Q. The promoter states that certain benefits referred to in its Base Case and Promoter's Memorandum would not be realised if the railway did not proceed. Please provide further detail and specific examples of the detrimental impact locally, regionally and nationally of the railway not proceeding.**

All the appraisal work carried out during the development of the scheme has been aimed at identifying and quantifying the benefits of building the new railway and linked improvements. It therefore follows that these are the benefits which would not be realised if the new railway is not built. These benefits include:

- Reduction in travel time to existing users of public transport in the corridor, where currently a change of vehicle/mode is needed if travelling from, say, Airdrie to Edinburgh or Bathgate to Glasgow
- Access to a reliable, fast, punctual transport system which will connect people with jobs, health facilities, education, etc. This presents new travel opportunities for those without access to a car, which they could not otherwise access because the journey by public transport would take too long or would involve too many changes of vehicle/mode
- Reduction in overcrowding on the Edinburgh-Falkirk-Glasgow line (E&G), as some passengers will switch to the new line for journeys where currently they change at Queen Street low level station or drive to stations on the E&G
- Access to the national rail network
- Stimulating economic growth of the Airdrie to Uphall corridor
- Reductions in car traffic on the major road network, helping to reduce travel times for other users and also the associated emissions, noise and accident potential.

At national level, the railway has been shown to provide good value for money, in terms of the spending of public money. The benefits of the scheme outweigh the costs under the standard analysis of benefit cost ratio (BCR). Please refer to paragraphs 135-142 of the Promoter's Memorandum for further details. This analysis shows that the proposal offers good value for money, generating the following costs and benefits assessed over the standard 60 year appraisal period:

Present value costs	<b>£376m</b>	Net present value <b>£303m</b>
Present value benefits	<b>£679m</b>	

The value of the benefits divided by the value of the costs provides a benefit to cost ratio of 1.81; in other words, the benefits significantly outweigh the costs.

At regional level, the increase in accessibility brought about by the line has been shown to increase economic activity in the form of population growth and job creation. Many of the areas benefiting from increased economic activity are defined as deprived in the Scottish Executive's list of deprived communities, and these areas would not see these benefits if the line was not constructed. As a result, they would not develop as quickly as if the line was built – unless other equivalent measures were adopted.

At local level, the communities from Bathgate to Uphall will not gain direct access to North Lanarkshire and Glasgow by rail. The communities from east of Glasgow to Airdrie will not obtain direct rail access to West Lothian and Edinburgh.

**2. Please detail what the linked improvements are.**

**Q. The promoter's evidence shows 'examples' of the linked improvements'. Are there any further linked improvements?**

The linked improvements are all works shown in the maps, plans and sections from Airdrie station through to the buffer end at Drumgelloch, and from the point where the alignment of the old solum meets with the operational track at Bathgate through to Edinburgh. Reference to the maps, plans and sections for the specific sheets is as follows:

<b>Sheets</b>	<b>Content</b>
Sheets 1-3	Airdrie station to buffer end at Drumgelloch station. Works consist of reconfiguration of the existing station car park, reconstruction of the station platforms, and provision of station footbridge with lift system to provide access between platforms. Other works consist of removal of the existing Drumgelloch station and associated infrastructure. As part of the works, the nearby Gartlea Road overbridge and A73 road overbridge will be reconstructed.
Sheets 41-61	Bathgate to Edinburgh. Specifics listed below:
Sheets 41-42	Construction of a light maintenance depot for rolling stock at the site of the former EWS rail freight depot with associated access road, and the relocation of the existing Bathgate station. The access road includes the expansion of the existing roundabout on Whitburn Road, a new bridge under the railway at Bathgate Foundry and a new roundabout within the grounds of the foundry. The relocated station at Bathgate will have car parking spaces for 395 cars, a turning circle for buses and taxis, ticket office and waiting room for passengers. Access to the Glasgow bound platform will be provided via a DDA-compliant footbridge. Also included is the demolition of the nearby bridge over the railway, locally known as 'Rennies Bridge'.
Sheet 43	Works consist of parapet upgrade works to Blackburn Road

	overbridge.
Sheet 44-46	Works consist of parapet upgrade works to the A7066 overbridge, demolition of Inch Farm overbridge, and construction of a new footbridge 10m east of Inch Farm overbridge. In addition, works consist of construction of a rail freight depot, with associated connection to the mainline railway, parapet upgrade works to the M8 overbridge and parapet upgrade works to Starlaw Road overbridge.
Sheet 47	Works consist of parapet upgrade works to Deans Road overbridge and re-decking works to Station Road overbridge.
Sheet 48	Works consist of demolition of the private overbridge known as 'Luggie Bridge', parapet upgrade works to Deans North Road, and construction of a new station platform at Livingston North station.
Sheet 49	Works consist of re-decking the existing public footpath overbridge at Camps Rigg. Subject to discussions with West Lothian Council, a temporary bridge may be constructed during the works. Parapet upgrade works to Knightsbridge West Road will also be undertaken.
Sheet 50	Works will consist of demolishing the existing private bridge over the railway at Deer Park Golf Course and the re-decking of the existing public footpath overbridge at Morrison Way carrying the path known at the 'The Loan Path'. Subject to discussions with West Lothian Council, a temporary bridge may be constructed during the works.
Sheet 51	Works consist of parapet upgrade works to the A899 Livingston Road overbridge and the associated M8 slip road overbridges. Also, the re-decking of the existing accommodation bridge at Todd Square.
Sheet 52	Works consist of collision mitigation works to Pumpherston Station Road underbridge, construction of a second platform at Uphall station, construction of a station footbridge, construction of a station car park to the north of the M8 motorway with associated bridge over the M8 Motorway to the Station Platforms.
Sheet 53	Works consist of collision mitigation works to Drumshoreland Station Road underbridge.
Sheet 54-55	Works consist of the provision of electrification masts on the existing Birdsmill Viaduct.
Sheet 56	Works consist of a new access track from Cliftonhall Road (B7030) to the Bathgate Branch railway, approximately 70m west of Newbridge Junction.
Sheet 57	Works consist of demolishing a public footbridge and construction of approximately 50m of public footpath at Harvest Road, Newbridge.
Sheet 58	Works consist of re-decking the existing private accommodation bridge at Norton Mains. A temporary bridge will be provided for use by the farmer.
Sheet 59	Works consist of re-decking the existing public road overbridge at

	Roddinglaw Road. Subject to discussions with City of Edinburgh Council, a temporary bridge may be constructed during the works.
Sheet 60	Works consist of re-decking the existing public road overbridge at Gogar Station Road. Subject to discussions with City of Edinburgh Council, a temporary bridge may be constructed during the works. Other work consists of re-decking the existing private road overbridge at the former Gogar Goods Yard.
Sheet 61	Works consist of a new access track from Russell Road to the existing Midcalder lines.

## Railway within local, regional and national transport plans

**6. How will the proposed service integrate with other proposed rail projects such as the Edinburgh and Glasgow airport rail links and the Borders railway?**

**Q. What strategic planning is taking place on the integration of the Airdrie-Bathgate railway with other proposed rail projects and who is taking this planning forward?**

Transport Scotland has commissioned Network Rail's Strategic Access Planning Unit to undertake train planning and modelling work to look at the network impact of various major schemes such as: Stirling-Alloa-Kinross; Waverley remodelling; Airdrie-Bathgate rail link; EARL; and the Borders rail link. This work is being managed jointly by Network Rail and Transport Scotland through various stages. The initial report on this is due in late October 2006, but we anticipate that further work will be required beyond that to reach the optimum network timetable solution. This work is likely to run into 2007.

**8. How will the proposed railway fit within existing timetabling and capacity constraints on existing services west and east of the proposed route?**

**Q. Does the promoter foresee any timetabling difficulties or capacity constraints that could be detrimental to the proposed railway?**

Electrification of lines through the Mound Tunnels in Edinburgh and into platforms 12-15 at Waverley station will be required to allow the proposed level of service to run without impacting on other existing services. These works are due to be undertaken as part of the Edinburgh Waverley infrastructure project, delivered by Network Rail. It is scheduled to be completed well in advance of the introduction of the new Airdrie-Bathgate rail link services.

The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link has been modelled to integrate with services west of Glasgow by matching with appropriate services from either Balloch or Helensburgh through to Edinburgh Waverley. The new service will also be timed to fit available slots at Newbridge junction to minimise the impact on main line services. There may be some flexing of existing services required when the final timetable is decided, but the exact extent of this will be established as the timetable work is developed further.

Notwithstanding the separate wider modelling work (mentioned in the response to question 6), the timetable modelled for this project is part of a stand-alone project. It

is not designed to directly interlink with any other proposed new services. No other infrastructure projects, other than the Edinburgh Waverley infrastructure project, are required to introduce the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link.

## **Alternatives to achieving policy objectives**

**9. What consideration was given to enhancing bus services along the Glasgow–Airdrie–Bathgate–Edinburgh corridor; what was the outcome of such consideration and how did this fit with the policy objectives of the Bill?**

**Q. How will the proposed railway increase ‘overall public transport patronage’ (table 11.16 A8 corridor plan, CSTCS)?**

The proposed railway will increase overall public transport patronage by a combination of the following:

- People switching from car travel to rail throughout or rail based park and ride for an existing journey
- People making new trips to different destinations because travel is now easier (for example to a leisure or shopping location which can now be reached more easily than in the past)
- People travelling more frequently for journeys they already make by rail because the service is quicker and more frequent.

## **Economic development and social regeneration**

**17. Are (a) West Lothian’s and (b) North Lanarkshire’s current or future social inclusion and regeneration policies entirely dependent on the establishment of the railway and, if so, what would the impact on these policies be if the railway did not proceed?**

**Q. Please provide examples of the impact on the social inclusion and regeneration policies and specific schemes and projects of both local authorities of the railway not proceeding.**

In the absence of the railway, the local councils would need to consider other measures to stimulate regeneration of these communities. As access to jobs is a critical issue, this would imply alternative transport infrastructure.

The Promoter’s consultant received the following response from North Lanarkshire Council to the original question:

*“The re-opening of the railway line is a key component in the delivery of the regeneration of the Airdrie and villages area. Providing a crucial west/east link and a key access point to otherwise relatively isolated settlements which are served by an existing bus network which does not operate after 6.00pm. It will allow individuals access to employment opportunities, both part time and full time, in other parts of North Lanarkshire, Glasgow, Bathgate area and further east. It will be of particular benefit where these opportunities operate working practices which mean a start or finish time outwith the existing bus schedules.*”

*“The lack of affordable, reliable transport which operates throughout the day is a major obstacle for individuals seeking work who live in the communities served by the new railway line.*

*“The positive outcomes of the line will impact on some of North Lanarkshire's most disadvantaged areas as defined in Regeneration Outcome Agreement. The re-opening of the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link will therefore contribute positively to wider efforts to regenerate North Lanarkshire.*

*“It will also lead to improved access to training and educational opportunities, especially for young people and for those who do not have regular use of a car. Improved access for Airdrie and Coatbridge residents to colleges in West Lothian and Edinburgh will increase the range of training and educational opportunities available. This will be beneficial to those attending further rather than higher education who are dependant upon opportunities within commuting range of their homes.*

*“If the re-opening of the railway line was not to proceed then it is likely that few of the benefits identified above would be available to these communities. Additionally, it is likely to result in a population shift with younger people with no easy access to transport moving elsewhere to gain employment or training.”*

West Lothian Council has identified Armadale as a Core Development Area (CDA) in the Edinburgh & Lothians Structure Plan 2015. The railway will play a key role in the development of this CDA, providing direct rail access to Edinburgh and Glasgow city centres and other significant employment areas such as Edinburgh Park.

**19. In what ways does the railway offer opportunities over any other forms of transport in improving social inclusion and regeneration?**

**Q. What are the ‘key employment locations that are expected to increase in importance over the next five to 10 years’?**

Key employment locations are Edinburgh Park, Livingston, Glasgow and Edinburgh city centres.

**Environmental**

**20. How will the promoter encourage a modal transfer from car to train?**

**Q. What scope is there to increase further the number of parking spaces at Airdrie station beyond the current proposed increase of 16 spaces and what constraints are there on the promoter not increasing this number further?**

The Promoter is working with Transport Scotland and North Lanarkshire Council to establish if there is an economically viable option at Airdrie to provide further car parking capacity.

One such opportunity is to reposition the stabling siding to release an area of land to provide a further 28 spaces in addition to the currently proposed 16 extra spaces, giving a revised capacity of 194 spaces compared with the current level of 150.

The constraints on the Promoter are:

- The station is in a heavily populated area and the provision of further car parking outwith the existing station boundary would import economic and environmental impacts which would not be sustainable
- The alternative of providing a multi-storey car park within the existing station car park would import economic and environmental impacts which would be unsustainable
- Provision of car parking in excess of 200 spaces would create traffic impacts/difficulties at the Victoria Place/Cairnhill Road junction, and potentially impact on house land rights and increase in compensation costs.

**21. How many car journeys annually will be removed from the M8 and local roads to the railway?**

**Q. Please provide a breakdown of the make up of the projected increases in car traffic on the A801 (Armadale/Whitburn) road.**

The annual figures provided are derived from models of three separate time periods, AM peak hour (0800-0900), average inter peak hour (1000-1600) and PM peak hour (1700-1800). The figures for the A801 are shown by individual time period in the table below.

A801 (Armadale/Whitburn)	AM Peak Hour		IP Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound
absolute change	-10	+60	+2	-2	+50	-30
% change	-1%	8%	0%	0%	6%	-3%

**23. By how much will traffic pollutant levels from the M8 be reduced as a result of the railway?**

**Q. Is the marginal reduction in traffic pollution emissions offset by any increase in pollution from the proposed railway?**

No. The proposed railway is electrified, so there will be virtually no local pollution as a result of trains running along the line.

**25. With whom and on what did the promoter consult over the proposed relocation of the cycle path (national cycle network route 75) and what changes to the proposed new route stemmed from this consultation?**

**Q. Please submit a copy of the detailed cycle route and what is the precise website address to access an e-copy of the report?**

The railway and cycle route plans, as well as the Road & Cycle Ways Report, can be downloaded from [www.airdrieathgateraillink.co.uk](http://www.airdrieathgateraillink.co.uk). Both documents can be found

within the 'Bill' section of the website. A hard copy of the cycle path plans is also enclosed.

**27. *What is the cost of providing the proposed new cycle path?***

**Q. Please provide a revised estimated cost for the proposed new cycle route inclusive of those items previously excluded from the £4.7 million estimated cost.**

The revised estimated cost, including previously excluded items, is £7.2 million.

In the Promoter's original response to this question, the excluded items include an element for property acquisition costs. The Committee will appreciate that the sum allocated to that item is sensitive as it potentially could affect the local property market. The Promoter therefore regards this as one of the commercially sensitive pieces of information which it cannot reveal in a disaggregated form. It is hoped that this global figure will suffice for the Committee's purposes.

It is also worth noting that this figure may give a false impression of the likely final cost if, for example, the risks were not to materialise. In such circumstances, the final cost may be less.

**31. *What alternative provision is the promoter making for the loss of wildlife habitat along the proposed route, for example, the loss of bird feeding and breeding grounds at Caldercruix?***

**Q. What discussion has the promoter had with bodies such as the RSPB, SNH or the Scottish Wildlife Trust on this issue?**

The following bodies were consulted in the preparation of the Ecology Chapter 10 of the ES:

- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB Scotland)
- Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
- Scottish Executive Environment Group (SEEG)
- West Lothian Council (WLC)
- North Lanarkshire Council (NLC)
- Conservation and Greening Unit, North Lanarkshire Council
- Scottish Ornithologists Club
- Draft ES consultations with WLC, NLC and SNH.

Summary of key consultation advice relating to ecology:

- Full account must be taken of the relevant wildlife legislation backed up by surveys to establish the status of protected species (SEEG)
- Surveys must be undertaken at an appropriate time of year for species. Any mitigation must also take account of impacts in the context of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan (West Lothian Council and North Lanarkshire Council)
- Protected species surveys are recommended on the basis of existing knowledge (SNH).

#### Consultations with RSPB

- RSPB Scotland stated that it is unlikely that any important wild bird populations will be affected but the EIA should include a bird study. Where bird habitats are lost, compensatory provision must be made, especially for any scrub.

#### Consultations with SNH

SNH recommended that consideration should be given to a biodiversity strategy in terms of how to maximise the potential for increasing biodiversity and its future management and maintenance. Therefore, full cognisance has been made of legal obligations in addition to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, Network Rail Biodiversity Action Plan and all relevant Biodiversity Action Plans.

Consultation with Scottish Wildlife Trust was not undertaken at this stage of the project, although we would welcome its inclusion in the ongoing consultation process with all relevant bodies detailed above.

#### Route options and choice of stations

***41. What is the distance and journey time between each station from Airdrie to Bathgate and what are the projected journey times from Helensburgh and each stop thereafter to Edinburgh Waverley?***

**Q. Please confirm that the distances shown in the table are the distances to each station from Airdrie i.e. 14.8 miles from Airdrie to Bathgate.**

That is correct.

#### Accessibility and railway integration with other modes of public transport

***47. What impact will the railway have on existing bus passenger levels and services?***

**Q. Will the railway impact on bus passenger numbers on stations feeder services and how?**

With the introduction of the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link, the patronage of existing feeder buses is more likely to increase than decrease, although this particular aspect has not been specifically evaluated and our recent research indicates that there are no existing station feeder buses operating at present within the corridor. The impact on existing bus services within the corridor is as previously answered in the original response to question 47.

**Q. What commitments have been made to safeguard or enhance existing bus services?**

Please see the previous response to questions 38 and 42 in the Preliminary Stage Questions which outlines the Promoter's discussions in relation to bus service enhancements. No commitments have been made to safeguard services as this is a matter for the local authorities and the bus operators to take forward. That said, the

Promoter will continue its discussions with the local authorities as the project develops.

### **Patronage forecasting and revenue yield**

**49. *How will the promoter stimulate and encourage passenger uptake on the railway?***

**Q. How will the promoter encourage a modal shift from car to the railway?**

As outlined in the Promoter's response to Question 20 of the Preliminary Stage Questions, one of the criteria for choosing the sites for the relocated and new stations between Drumgelloch and Bathgate was their capacity to accommodate park and ride facilities. In addition, the redevelopment of existing station facilities at Airdrie, Livingston North and Uphall Station includes increasing the capacity of car parking facilities. Overall, this will provide an additional 1,101 spaces at the seven stations, which is intended to encourage car users to switch at least part of their journey from car to train.

**50. *What are the passenger uptake projections for each of the first 10 years of the railway's operation between (a) Glasgow and Edinburgh and (b) Airdrie and Bathgate and how do these compare against similar routes and the national growth rate?***

**Q. Is any further modelling being undertaken to project passenger uptake numbers over the first 10 years of the railway's operation?**

Not at present. Modelling has been carried out which indicates the level of growth referred to in the Promoter's initial response and below.

**Q. Is the Scottish Executive's Transport Model for Scotland the standard modelling tool used for transport infrastructure projects of this type and size or are other modelling exercises carried out?**

The Transport Model for Scotland (TMfS) has been designed for use in the appraisal of medium to large scale transport infrastructure or policy proposals in Scotland. The railway proposals were previously assessed during the Central Scotland Transport Corridor Studies (CSTCS) using the Central Scotland Transport Model (CSTM), the predecessor model for TMfS. The strategic nature of the proposals, affecting a large number of travellers across central Scotland, means the model is well suited to this application. The model itself has been independently audited during its development.

Both models identified the need for the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link and both produced positive benefit to cost ratios, although the CSTM did not consider intermediate stations in its analysis.

**Q. What specific figures and informed projections can the promoter provide on passenger uptake numbers and fare revenue yield over the first 10 years of the railway's operation?**

In accordance with our initial response, the modelling has forecast a 22% increase in patronage on the Airdrie-Bathgate link in the first 10 years of operation.

## **Project costs and risk management**

**62. What is the cost of (a) providing a new light maintenance depot at Bathgate and (b) relocating the car transfer/storage yard from Bathgate to Boghall?**

**Q. Please provide revised estimated costs for the light maintenance depot at Bathgate and the car transfer/storage yard at Boghall inclusive of those items previously excluded from the respective £4.7 million and £6.2 million estimated costs.**

The previously stated figures for the depot construction costs included all physical work associated with buildings, roads and hard standing, platforms, ramps, lighting and security. They did not include track and drainage costs, or the other previously stated exclusions.

Total all-inclusive costs are:

Bathgate LMD	£12.8m
Boghall car transfer/storage yard	£14.9m

This, however, may give a false impression of the likely final costs if, for example, the risks were not to materialise. In such circumstances, the final cost may be less.

**65. The operating costs in 2006 are £9 million. How does this compare with the annual running costs of comparable lengths of railway line?**

**Q. Other recent railway projects have identified comparable operating costs with other railway lines. Please provide further details in response to the question above.**

It is extremely difficult to give costs for comparable lengths of railway line as this would assume an identical fit in terms of speed profile, frequency of trains, types of rolling stock, signalling and infrastructure. Because of this, estimating costs per mile based on other railway lines is a profound assumption and would not provide a like-for-like comparison.

**67. What conditions, if any, have been attached to the funding allocation from the Scottish Executive?**

**Q. As requested, please give details of any funding conditions attached by Transport Scotland.**

There are no funding conditions other than the business case, which must be robust.

Network Rail and Transport Scotland have in place a robust review mechanism for the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link to monitor the project closely and ensure value for money. This includes:

- A quarterly review of the project's process against cost and time targets

- A re-examination of the business case each time there is a need for commitment of significant expenditure
- A four-weekly project review meeting where the risks and opportunities are closely examined
- A Gateway Review, scheduled for autumn 2006, which will examine the project at critical stages to give assurance that it can progress to the next stage
- A stipulation that permission will be sought before entering into any third party agreements.

**68. *What risk management strategy does the promoter have in place to ensure the project comes in on time and budget?***

**Q. Please give details of the risk management strategy e.g. does it adopt best industry practices, what monitoring is undertaken, is any independent risk management evaluation carried out.**

The risk management arrangements are documented in a project risk and opportunities management plan. This requires four weekly reviews of key risks and opportunities to ensure ownership by individual project team members and that control and mitigation actions are progressed to planned timescales. New emerging risks are also identified and registered at this meeting.

Full quantified risk analysis is carried out four times per year using industry best practice software packages. The results are used to reshape the risk profile of the project and reorder risk management priorities.

The Promoter believes this approach represents industry best practice.

## ANNEX B

### ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

#### Promoter's Memorandum: Consultation

**1. *What guidance or remit was given to the promoter, and from whom, on how to consult, with whom, on what, and when?***

**Q. Drawing on the 'consultation' experience from other Private Bills what did this promoter do differently to these promoters?**

Harrison Cowley, the promoter's public consultation and public relations consultancy, was able to learn from previous consultation on projects such as the Waverley Railway project.

As the consultation strategies were based on STAG, there were many similarities such as the setting up of a project website and project helpline and producing public information leaflets and exhibition boards. The consultation team for the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link also held many public meetings as the consultant and the Promoter agreed at an early stage that public meetings were an effective way to inform large numbers of people about a scheme. It also provided a public forum for discussion which enabled the Promoter to gauge public opinion on the project.

The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link consultation strategy was also similar to the Stirling-Alloa-Kincardine consultation in that they held multiple public meetings and exhibitions within the line-of-route communities (details within the Promoter's Memorandum). The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link consultation strategy also included additional methods by which the public could feed back to the Promoter and request information, such as leaflets with free-post feedback forms. The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link website also incorporates interactive features such as the opportunity for browsers to add their details to the newsletter distribution list and to register their support for the project with just a simple click on the interactive button.

Unlike the Waverley Railway project and the Stirling-Alloa-Kincardine consultation, the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link has provided a page on the project website dedicated to the Bill. Here viewers can download copies of the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link Bill and accompanying documents, the Promoter's Memorandum and the Environmental Statement. They can view route maps of the railway and cycleway and can access documents such as the Network Rail Guide to Compensation and the Cycleway Roads Report.

**4. *Did the promoter seek the views of local community groups as to the form and timing of its consultation and, if so, how and from which groups?***

**Q. As requested, did the promoter seek the views of local community groups as to the form and timing of its consultation and, if so, how and from which groups?**

Prior to all public meetings and exhibitions, the Promoter sought the views of local MSPs, councils, councillors and community councillors as to the timing and nature of the consultation. Each group was advised by letter, email, telephone or at face-to-face meetings. There were no objections raised to the proposed timings of the meetings.

**8. Was the consultation on this project on a par with consultation for such infrastructure projects and with Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance?**

**Q. Was any independent evaluation carried out into the adequacy of the promoter’s consultation arrangements?**

No. STAG was closely adhered to but there was no independent evaluation.

**12. How many offers were made to the promoter to attend public meetings, how many were accepted and subsequently attended, where did these take place and what was the public attendance at each?**

**Q. The question requests details of offers of meetings made to the promoter. Please provide.**

The Promoter was not invited to attend any public meetings. The Promoter was proactive in organising public meetings (see Promoter’s Memorandum for details of meeting dates, location and attendance) and was advised by its consultants on the most appropriate timing for the public meetings.

The Promoter has offered its attendance at community council meetings and has been invited to community council meetings and interest group meetings – such as the West Lothian Access Committee – but there were no invitations to public meetings.

**18. What assurances have been given and agreements and safeguards are in place with respect to the protection of public utility apparatus?**

**Q. What was the outcome of the consultation with public utility companies and what assurances to date have been, or will be, given?**

The following table summarises recent meetings held to date and details of meetings yet to be held with the utility providers.

<b>Utility Company</b>	<b>Date Met</b>	<b>Status</b>
BT	Awaiting response	Following up initial contact
Cable & Wireless	Awaiting response	Following up initial contact
Gamma Telecom	Not Affected	Not Affected
National Grid	23-Jun-06	Validating cost estimate received
NTL Telewest	Not Affected	Not Affected
O2	Objector management process	Objector management process
Orange	Not Affected	Not Affected
Scottish Gas	30-Jun-06	Awaiting cost information

Networks	Objector management process	Objector management process
Scottish Power	03-Jul-06	Awaiting cost information
Scottish Water	11-Jul-06	Awaiting cost information
Shell	18-Jul-06	No protective provisions required, work around existing provisions
Three	Not Affected	Not Affected
Thus	27-Jun-06	Awaiting cost information
T-Mobile	Awaiting response	Following up initial contact
Vodafone	02-Aug-06	Awaiting drawing information, likely not to be affected

Meetings were held with utility providers in order to apprise them of the scheme, the parliamentary process and the likely timescales. The meetings also sought to confirm records of plant and equipment in the affected areas and for the utility providers to advise of likely costs associated with any necessary diversionary or protective measures works required in advance of the construction period.

At the time of writing, information is awaited from the major utility providers for their cost estimate as to the likely level of cost for necessary work to make safe their apparatus. Following receipt of this information and agreement on the level of apparatus affected, the Promoter will then seek to enter into a protective provisions agreement with the respective utility company as necessary or agreement by side letter. This process is ongoing.

## ANNEX D

### OTHER ISSUES

#### Advanced Purchase Scheme

**6. *Will an advance purchase scheme be available in respect of this scheme and, if so, how will the scheme operate and what criteria will be applied?***

**Q. When will the promoter's draft APS be finalised and submitted to Transport Scotland?**

Network Rail has now prepared a draft APS scheme which will be sent to Transport Scotland week commencing 28 August 2006 for review. It is an early draft and we anticipate we will be meeting with Transport Scotland to discuss it very shortly.

It may be helpful for the Committee, subject to the qualification that Transport Scotland still needs to review the draft, to have an overview of the approach adopted by the Promoter in framing its proposed scheme.

A general point to note is that it is not considered possible to create a 'one size fits all' approach to the issue of APS; it seems correct that schemes between promoters may differ in terms of qualifying criteria to reflect the individual nature of projects. As such, we consider it entirely possible to have schemes which are different and what works for one project will not necessarily work for another.

We consider that any process should be clear to people about what the benefit/intent of the scheme is; how it works; what happens in the event of disagreement; the appeal mechanism (if any); and the final relationship with the right of compulsory purchase contained in the relevant Bill. This ensures expectations are properly and consistently managed and it assists with overall risk management in terms of time and cost.

In broad terms, the APS proposed by Network Rail identifies those properties which would be deemed to suffer from statutory blight if the Bill received Royal Assent and enables the Promoter to acquire these properties in advance of Royal Assent. It goes further in that it does not require affected homeowners to demonstrate any special circumstances and sets out a process by which an offer will be made and the basis of valuation. It is understood that this exceeds what is proposed in other schemes. The Promoter would anticipate starting this process as soon as the scheme is approved by Transport Scotland, the project's principal funding source.

If the advance offer was accepted, the owner would have an option to remain in his/her home as tenant on a commercial basis and would be given six months' notice to quit when the property was required for the project, or for disposal in the event that the project did not proceed. If the offer was not accepted, the property would be subject to compulsory purchase if the Bill received Royal Assent and the normal associated compensation and appeal processes would apply.

This proposal reflects the specific impact of the project on the properties it is proposed are covered by the scheme and provides earlier certainty to those affected.

Once the scheme is approved, the Promoter will publish the scheme and commence discussion with affected homeowners.

### **Implementation of mitigation measures**

**18. *The Committee draws attention to the code of construction practice and noise and vibration policy documents that were prepared and applied to the recent Edinburgh tram and Borders railway Bills. The Committee invites the promoter to consider these documents and the commitments and standards set and to submit a code of construction practice and a noise and vibration policy for this project.***

**Q. When will these policies be submitted to the Committee?**

A draft code of construction practice (CoCP) has been prepared and is in the course of further revision prior to submission to the Committee and to the local authorities along the route, in particular in their planning capacity, for further discussions. The responses will be considered and the CoCP revised as appropriate. A further draft will be available for the Committee to inform the Preliminary Stage.

As previously explained, the draft CoCP will continue to be developed in consultation with those affected by the works as well as the local authorities. It will not be finalised until the contractor is appointed and the CoCP can reflect the works as designed for construction. The final version will be approved by the local planning authority in whose area it is to operate.

The Noise and Vibration Policy is in the process of preparation. A draft will be available for the Committee to inform the Preliminary Stage.

**19. *While it will be for this Committee to determine what amendments are made to this Bill at phase two of Consideration Stage, what consideration has the promoter given to indicating a commitment to propose draft amendments to the Bill that would attach the environmental statement, code of construction practice, noise and vibration policy and Crichton Down Rules to the Bill?***

**Q. When will the promoter report on its further consultations with local authorities on the implementation of the noise and vibration policies?**

The timetable for the preparation and submission of the draft Noise and Vibration Policy is set out in the response to question 18 (above). The discussions leading to the submission of that document are part of an iterative process leading up to its final implementation. Of necessity, discussions regarding implementation will be general in advance of detailed design. It is anticipated that detailed implementation of the Noise and Vibration Policy will be discussed with the local authorities on a regular basis as design and subsequent construction progress. Discussions regarding substantive implementation will largely take place after Royal Assent.

**20. What consideration did the promoter give to the noise and vibration policies for both Edinburgh tram and Waverley Bills and, in particular, the noise threshold levels for these schemes and what elements of these policies have been incorporated into the environmental statement for this scheme?**

**Q. What elements of the Edinburgh trams and Waverley railway environmental statement noise and vibration chapters were not incorporated into the promoter noise and vibration assessment for this railway?**

The Edinburgh Tram criteria for evaluation of construction noise were as follows:

*“13.3.2 Evaluation Criteria*

*To evaluate the impact of construction noise it is necessary to establish criteria above which some noticeable adverse effect may be experienced. Thresholds above which a significant construction noise impact is considered to occur are set out in Table 13.2. Further details are given in Appendix 1.*

*“Table 13.2 Criteria for Significant Noise Impacts During Construction*

<b>Period</b>	<b>Building/Location (façade level)</b>	<b>Threshold for Significant Impact L<sub>Aeq</sub></b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Daytime (0700-1900)	Dwellings/Offices	75 dB	To maintain speech intelligibility
	Educational Buildings	65 dB	To maintain speech intelligibility in classrooms
Evening (1900-2300)	Dwellings	65 dB	To avoid disturbance
Night-time (2300-0700)	Dwellings	45 dB	To avoid sleep disturbance

*“The criteria in Table 13.2 apply at 1m from the façades of residential and other noise sensitive properties and take into account reflection effects. It should be noted that these criteria are not aimed at providing noise limits for construction activities, but are used to determine whether significant impacts are expected to occur.”*

The Waverley ES provided the following information in relation to impact of construction noise:

*“Although BS 5228 does not propose noise standards for daytime periods, it suggests that acceptable noise levels in the evening (1900-2200 hours) may need to be 10 dB(A) lower than daytime levels. DoE Advisory Leaflet (AL) 72 gives advice as to preferred maximum levels of construction site noise at residential locations during daytime hours (0700-1900). Since the criterion of speech interference forms the basis of the recommendations, they can be taken as applicable to commercial*

*buildings as well as residential properties. The leaflet states that the noise level outside the nearest occupied room should not exceed:*

- *75 dB(A) in urban areas near to main roads in heavy industrial areas*
- *70 dB(A) in rural, suburban and urban areas away from main road traffic and industrial noise.”*

The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link ES provides detail on the protection afforded to the public in respect of construction noise. The present version does not yet contain any prediction of construction noise levels as no information on work schedules was available at the time of writing. Instead, it outlines guidance on construction noise level targets to be adopted. The information provided in the Edinburgh Tram ES relating to evaluation of significant impact has therefore not been adopted. However, information in relation to noise limit values has been provided in greater detail than that included in the Waverly ES.

The means of evaluation for operational noise as laid out in the Edinburgh Trams ES was not considered because no impacts were considered to occur when the predicted level was below 55dB(A) and 45dB(A) thresholds. As described below:

*“The significance of noise from new developments is usually evaluated:*

- *By comparing the levels of noise that are expected to be generated with the new source against threshold levels at which annoyance or disturbance of everyday activities is likely to occur*
- *By considering the change in noise that will occur with the development in operation.*

*“This assessment adopts both approaches drawing guidance from Planning Advice Note PAN 56 (1) and other sources discussed in Appendix 1. The potential for a significant noise impact is considered to arise if the overall ambient noise at a receptor (calculated as a free-field level) exceeds 55 dB  $L_{Aeq\ 16\ hour}$  during the daytime (0700-2300 hours) and 45 dB  $L_{Aeq\ 8\ hour}$  at night (2300-0700 hours).”*

This has been addressed in the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link assessment as shown in the table below, and it can be seen that predicted levels of less than 55dB(A) were taken into consideration.

### Categorisation of the Significance of Noise Impact

Predicted Railway Noise Level $L_{Aeq,18h}$ Free field*	Increase in $L_{Aeq}$ (over existing residual)			
	1 < 3	3 < 5	5 < 10	>10
<55	negligible	negligible	minor	minor
55 < 60	negligible	minor	moderate	moderate
60 < 65	negligible	minor	moderate	substantial
> 65	negligible	moderate	substantial	substantial

In the ES, the Promoter considers the vibration section to be more robust than that for the Edinburgh Trams. The vibration recommendations for the Airdrie-Bathgate rail link includes specific guidance on vibration isolation of rail sections in addition to the dose and upper vibration limits criteria. In the draft CoCP, it is anticipated that the vibration criteria and limits are in line with best practice. This would make the criteria equivalent to those for the Waverley line.

Measures to decrease the operational impacts of vibration transmission to properties close to the tracks will be addressed at the detailed design stage.

### Railway safety

**21. Has the promoter prepared and published a policy paper on railway safety similar to those done for other recent Private Bills and, if so, please give details?**

**Q. Please provide further details of this railway safety policy paper.**

The Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations (ROGS) have been developed to implement the EU Rail Safety Directive, and will replace some existing rail safety regulations, in particular that dealing with railway safety cases. These new regulations came into force on 10 April 2006. The Railway Safety Case Regulations will be phased out on 1 October 2006, when they are replaced by the Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations. On 1 October 2006 all existing Railway Safety Cases will become deemed safety certificates/authorisations. The purpose of the Safety Case is to provide assurance that a railway operation has effective arrangements in place to ensure the safety of workers, the travelling public and others who may be affected by the operation.

Key sections of the Network Rail Safety case are:

- Description of scope of operation
- Risk assessment management and control
- Operations and maintenance
- Description of organization, roles and responsibilities

- Safety Policy Statement
- Safety Management System
- Train and station operator's railway safety cases
- Management of interfaces
- Review arrangements.

**Enclosures**

- Annex A Q25: cycle path plans