

**CHIEF OFFICER LIAISON GROUP MEETING  
TUESDAY 2<sup>ND</sup> JUNE 2015 AT 10:00AM**

Tea and coffee will be available from 9.30am

1. Welcome to the meeting and apologies for absence
2. Minutes and Matters Arising from the meeting of the Chief Officers held on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2015
3. Shared Services
4. Draft Agenda for Partnership Board Friday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2015

**AGENDA A – POINTS FOR DECISION**

- A1. Minutes of the Partnership Board meeting – Friday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015
- A2. Matters Arising
- A3. Minutes of the Performance & Audit Committee – Friday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015
- A4. Matters Arising
- A5. Projects Report
- A6. Finance Reports
  - A6.1 Unaudited Statement of Accounts 2014-15
  - A6.2 Finance Officer's Report
- A7. RTS Delivery Plan
- A8. SEStran Stations
- A9. Access to Healthcare
- A10. SEStran Strategic Cross Boundary Cycle Development
- A11. HR Policy Review - **Provisional**

**AGENDA B – POINTS FOR NOTING**

- B1. Annual Treasury Management Report
- B2. Annual Internal Audit Report
- B3. Decriminalised Parking Enforcement – CEC Services



- B4.** East Coast Mainline Authorities (ECMA)
- B5.** Rail Franchises – Provisional
- B6.** Minutes of SESplan Cross Boundary Impacts Group
- B7.** High Speed Rail Update
- B8.** Consultation Responses by SEStran
  - B8.1** Network Rail Inclusive Design Strategy
  - B8.2** Tactran RTS
  - B8.3** Fife Sustainable Development
  - B8.4** Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee - Freight Transport
  - B8.5** Midlothian Council Local Development Plan
- B9.** Consultation Responses by Joint RTP Chairs
  - B9.1** Roads Collaboration
  - B9.2** Climate Change
- B10.** Minutes of Sub-Groups
  - B10.1** Access to Healthcare – 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015
  - B10.2** Rail Forum – 10<sup>th</sup> April 2015
  - B10.3** Sustainable Transport Forum – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2015
  - B10.4** Airport Forum - 29<sup>th</sup> May 2015
  - B10.5** Chief Officer Liaison Group Meeting – 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2015
- B11.** Minutes of the Joint RTP Chairs – 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015

**5.** AOCB

**6.** Date of Next Meeting

**Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2015 at 10:00am**, Calton Suite, The Glasshouse Hotel, 2 Greenside Place, Edinburgh, EH1 3AA.



CHIEF OFFICER LIAISON GROUP MEETING  
10.00 AM TUESDAY 24<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2015

**Present:**

Angela Chambers	SEStran
Julie Cole	Falkirk Council
Neil Dougall	Midlothian Council
Andrew Ferguson	Fife Council – Legal Adviser to SEStran (from 10:15am)
Peter Forsyth	East Lothian Council
Jim Grieve	SEStran
Trond Haugen	Adviser to SEStran
Andrew Hutt	SEStran
Graeme Johnstone	Scottish Borders Council
Alex Macaulay	SEStran
Graeme Malcolm	West Lothian Council
Bob McLellan	Fife Council
John Saunders	SEStran
Brian Sharkie	CEC
Iain Shaw	CEC – Treasurer Services to SEStran

## Apologies:

Mac West Clackmannanshire Council

[illegible]



<b>/2.</b>	<b>Minutes and Matters Arising from Chief Officers – 18<sup>th</sup> Nov 2014</b>	
	<p>(B2) Mr Macaulay confirmed that the date of the SEStran Abellio Stakeholder event has been arranged for Friday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2015.</p> <p>(B2) It was noted that a redacted version of the Abellio contract is on the website and TH will send a copy of the link to Officers'.</p>	<b>TH</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Shared Services</b>	
	<p>Mr Macaulay provided an update to the group and advised that the RTP's Lead Officers' were in the process of arranging a meeting with the Improvement Service and their legal advisers to establish if the RTP's could be the legal mechanism to assist local authorities in delivering shared services across the roads maintenance portfolio. A date has been set for early March and AM will report back to a future meeting. The main concern of the RTP's is if LLP's are formed, it could undermine their position.</p> <p>Meeting representation was discussed and Dr McLellan suggested a meeting between SEStran, Partnership Councils and the Improvement Service. It was agreed that a joint meeting with the key contacts should be arranged.</p>	<p><b>AM</b></p> <p><b>AM</b></p>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Draft Agenda for the Partnership Board – Friday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>	
<b>A1</b>	<b>Minutes of the Partnership Board meeting – Friday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2014</b>	
	The minutes were noted.	
<b>A2</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
	<p><u>C1. SESplan Co-Location</u></p> <p>Mr Macaulay noted that the lease at Claremont House will expire mid-February 2016.</p>	
<b>A3</b>	<b>Minutes of the Performance and Audit Committee – Friday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2015</b>	
	Meeting scheduled as above.	
<b>A4</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
	N/A	
<b>A5</b>	<b>Projects Report</b>	
	<p>Update provided by Mr Grieve, with the following key points for noting;  <u>RTP1</u>  Stagecoach is installing a ticket machine based system on their buses, which is compatible with SEStran's, subject to some minor adjustments. The surplus kit is being installed on First buses and will result in a full fleet of Stagecoach and First buses in the area being equipped. The adjustments being made to the system will allow discussions with small operators to commence. Completion date expected by Dec 2015.</p>	



<b>/A5</b>	<b>Projects Report</b>	
	<p><u>Bus Improvement Fund (BIF)</u> Two awards of £500k each have been granted and will be used to extend the bus fit-out programme and install TV screens in public places. A further bid of £500k has been placed with Scottish Enterprise for the installation of TV screens in business premises and the outcome is expected soon. The general use of technology was considered and the group agreed that there was still a place for RTPI/Information screens.</p> <p><u>RTPI Media Strategy</u> Following a promotional exercise, access to the app has increased by 600k. This is mainly due to users accessing the system via the Traveline app.</p> <p><u>Sustainable Travel Awareness</u> Edinburgh College awarded £20k of grant funding from SEStran.</p> <p><u>Weastflows</u> Project due to end this week, although meetings have been held with MEP's in Brussels to carry forward the work already undertaken on the project in relation to sustainable flows of freight.</p> <p><u>NweRIDE, CHUMS and Social Care</u> All current projects with links to car sharing schemes.</p> <p><u>Additional Investment</u> Between £2.61-£3.11m additional funding has been brought into the region by SEStran since March 2013.</p>	
<b>A6</b>	<b>Finance Reports</b>	
<b>A6.1</b>	<p><u>Finance Officer's Report 2014/15</u> Mr Shaw summarised the report and noted the small overspend of £11k in the core budget which will be offset by an under spend in projects; the forecast is that the budget will be balanced. Also for noting is the EU grant income of £620k to be re-claimed and this is being managed through the cash flow arrangements with the City of Edinburgh Council.</p>	
<b>A6.2</b>	<p><u>Revenue Budget 2015/16</u> Mr Shaw presented the report, advising that estimates had been updated following the Board meeting last December. The report is proposing that Council requisitions remain fixed at £200k (unchanged since 2012/13) and assumes that Scottish Government will continue to support the organisation at the same level of grant funding of £782k. The report outlines two potential savings options and recognises the ongoing financial challenges faced by local government. The savings options were discussed by the group and it was noted that for a £200k contribution, £2.3m of additional funding had been awarded to the region, equating to a leverage of 11:1. Mr Ferguson raised concerns that the saving options could compromise the provision of SEStran's statutory requirements and would require an impacts assessment to be carried out, if approved.</p>	







<b>A11</b>	<b>Air Forum</b>	
	This is an additional item and is asking the Board to approve the appointment of Chairs of the SEStran Air Forum and of the Rail Forum.	
<b>B1</b>	<b>Franchises (Provisional)</b>	
	Mr Haugen noted that this would be an item of update, subject to there being any notable issues to report.	
<b>B2</b>	<b>Claremont House Lease</b>	
	See item A2.	
<b>B3</b>	<b>Active Travel Funding Update</b>	
	Mr Macaulay noted the report is an update on progress to date and includes the success of the partner authorities in obtaining grant funding from Sustrans.	
<b>B4</b>	<b>Minutes of the SESplan Cross Boundary Impacts Group</b>	
	For information and noting.	
<b>B5</b>	<b>High Speed Rail Update</b>	
	For noting. Sir David Higgins, Chair of HS2 had attended meetings of the HSR group and Keith Brown will keep HSR in his remit.	
<b>B6</b>	<b>Consultation Responses by SEStran – For Noting</b>	
<b>B6.1</b>	<u>Midlothian Council Local Development Plan</u>	
<b>B6.2</b>	<u>Freight Infrastructure</u>	
<b>B6.3</b>	<u>Fife Air Quality Strategy</u>	
<b>B6.4</b>	<u>Location of Mid-Calder High School</u>	
<b>B6.5</b>	<u>Scottish Air Quality Strategy</u> To be moved to the A agenda.	
<b>B7</b>	<b>Consultation Responses by Joint RTP Chairs</b>	
<b>B7.1</b>	Freight	
<b>B7.2</b>	Air Quality Strategy	
<b>B8</b>	<b>Minutes of Sub-Groups – For Noting</b>	
<b>B8.1</b>	<u>Equalities Forum</u> – 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2015	
<b>B8.2</b>	<u>Bus Forum</u> – 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2015	
<b>B8.3</b>	<u>Chief Officer Liaison Group</u> – 24 <sup>th</sup> February 2015	
<b>B9.</b>	<b><u>Minutes of the Joint RTP Chairs – 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014</u></b>	
	For noting.	
<b>5</b>	<b>AOCB</b>	
	Mr Macaulay noted that he is a member of the Smarter Choices, Smarter Places Steering Group.	



<b>6</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
	The date of the next meeting has been scheduled for <b>Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2015 at 10:00am in SEStran Offices, 130 East Claremont Street, Edinburgh.</b>	



## PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING

**HELD IN DEAN OF GUILD ROOM, CITY CHAMBERS, HIGH STREET,  
EDINBURGH, EH1 1YJ.  
ON FRIDAY, 20 MARCH 2015  
10.00 A.M. – 11.45 A.M.**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisational Title</u>
	Councillor Russell Imrie	Midlothian Council (Chair)
	Charlie Anderson	Non-Councillor Member
	Cllr Donald Balsillie	Clackmannanshire Council
	Graham Bell	Non-Councillor Member
	Cllr Stephen Bird	Falkirk Council
	Councillor Tony Boyle	West Lothian Council
	Councillor Pat Callaghan	Fife Council (Vice Chair)
	Councillor Ian Chisholm	Fife Council
	Councillor Tom Coleman	Falkirk Council
	Councillor Gordon Edgar	Scottish Borders Council (Vice-Chair)
	Phil Flanders	Non-Councillor Member
	Councillor Jim Fullarton	Scottish Borders Council
	Councillor Irene Hamilton	Clackmannanshire Council
	Councillor Lesley Hinds	City of Edinburgh Council (Vice-Chair)
	John Jack	Non-Councillor Member
	John Martin	Non-Councillor Member
	Councillor Adam McVey	City of Edinburgh Council
	Councillor Joanna Mowat	City of Edinburgh Council
	Neil Renilson	Non-Councillor Member
	Councillor Derek Rosie	Midlothian Council (Sub Cllr J Bryant)
	Sandy Scotland	Non-Councillor Member
	Barry Turner	Non-Councillor Member
	Cllr Michael Veitch	East Lothian Council

<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation Title</u>
	Craig Beattie	City of Edinburgh Council
	Angela Chambers	SEStran
	Julie Cole	Falkirk Council
	Neil Dougal	Midlothian Council
	Andrew Ferguson	SEStran Secretary & Legal Adviser
	Jane Findlay	Fife Council
	Peter Forsyth	East Lothian Council
	Lisa Freeman	SEStran
	Jim Grieve	SEStran
	Trond Haugen	SEStran Adviser
	Andrew Hutt	SEStran
	Graeme Johnstone	Scottish Borders Council
	Alex Macaulay	SEStran Partnership Director
	Sarah Ryan	SEStran
	Iain Shaw	City of Edinburgh Council (Treasurer)
	Alastair Short	SEStran



<b>PRESENT:</b>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisational Title</u>
<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:</b>		
	Councillor Jim Bryant	Midlothian Council
	Carol Foster	Audit Scotland
	Councillor Nick Gardner	City of Edinburgh Council
	Ewan Kennedy	City of Edinburgh Council
	Councillor Alex Lunn	City of Edinburgh Council
	Graeme Malcolm	West Lothian Council
	Councillor Cathy Muldoon	West Lothian Council
	Councillor Joe Rosiejak	Fife Council
	Tom Steele	Non-councillor Member
	Mac West	Clackmannanshire Council

## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

The Chair confirmed that the Order of Business was as per the agenda.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None

### **A1 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Partnership Board meeting of Friday 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 were agreed as a correct record of proceedings.

### **A2 MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

### **A3 MINUTES OF THE PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The minutes of the Performance and Audit Committee of Friday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2015 were noted.

### **A4 MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

### **A5 PROJECTS REPORT**

The Board considered a report by Jim Grieve, Programme Manager regarding the current year's Projects Budget, which showed expenditure to 11 February 2015 of £981,345.

### **Decision**

The Board noted the contents of the report.



## **A6.0 FINANCE REPORTS**

### **A6.1 FINANCE OFFICER'S REPORT**

The Board considered a report by Hugh Dunn, Treasurer presenting the third update on financial performance of the core revenue budget of the Partnership for 2014/15. This report presented an analysis of financial performance to the end of January 2015.

#### **Decision**

The Board noted:-

- (a) It was projected that the overspend on core expenditure in 2015/15 will be contained within the approval total revenue budget of the Partnership;
- (b) All income and expenditure will continue to be monitored closely with updates reported to each Partnership meeting;
- (c) the month end balance of indebtedness between the Partnership and City of Edinburgh Council and the reason for these balances identified at paragraph 2.7.

### **A6.2 REVENUE BUDGET 2015/16**

The Board considered a report by Hugh Dunn, Treasurer presenting the revenue budget to the Partnership for approval.

#### **Decision**

The Board:

- (a) noted the report;
- (b) approved the revenue budget for 2015/16 together with the share of net expenses to be paid by each constituent council; as follows:-

Clackmannanshire	£ 6,664
East Lothian	£13,173
Edinburgh	£63,357
Falkirk	£20,422
Fife	£47,685
Midlothian	£11,008
Scottish Borders	£14,799
West Lothian	<u>£22,892</u>
	<u>£200,000</u>

- (c)/



- (c) noted that the proposed budget is subject to a number of risks and that all income and expenditure of the Partnership will continue to be monitored closely with updates reported to each Partnership meeting.

### **A6.3 ANNUAL TREASURY STRATEGY REPORT**

The Board considered a report by Hugh Dunn, Treasurer reviewing the investment activity undertaken on behalf of the Partnership during the first half of the 2014/15 Financial Year.

#### **Decision**

The Board agreed to continue the current arrangement outlined in Appendix 1.

### **A7 BUSINESS PLAN 2015/16**

The Board considered a report by Alex Macaulay, Partnership Director, presenting for Board approval the draft Business Plan for the South East of Scotland Transport Partnership

#### **Decision**

The Board approved the Business Plan following to the approval of the related budget papers also presented to the Board.

### **A8. RTS REVIEW**

The Board considered a report by Alastair Short, Strategy Manager on the Regional Transport Strategy Review.

#### **Decision**

The Board:-

- (a) noted the report; and
- (b). approved the Reviewed Draft Regional Transport Strategy for submission to Ministers for approval and the associated reviewed Equalities Outcome Report.

### **A9. SESTRAN STATIONS**

The Board considered a report by Trond Haugen, Adviser to SEStran updating on the progress of the various bids from SEStran and the SEStran Authorities for funding from the £30 million Scottish Station Fund (SSF), including a new SEStran/Falkirk Council bid for funding towards an additional car park at Falkirk High Station.

#### **Decision**

The Board:-



- (a)/
- (a) Noted the report; and
- (b) agreed that SEStran will act as Client on behalf of East Lothian and Borders Councils in respect of taking the design work forward for East Linton and Reston Stations, and delegating to the Partnership Director in consultation with the Solicitor to enter into the relevant agreements with the two Councils and Network Rail.

#### **A10. EAST COAST MAIN LINE AUTHORITIES**

The Board considered a report by Trond Haugen, Advisor to SEStran updating the Board on the continuing membership of SEStran and relevant SEStran authorities and relevant contribution for next year.

##### **Decision**

The Board agreed to:-

- (a) note the report;
- (b) the continued membership of SEStran and relevant SEStran authorities that contribute towards the membership (based on Section 2 of this report, and
- (c) agree a combined contribution next year from SEStran and the relevant SEStran authorities of up to £5,390.00.

#### **A11. AIR AND RAIL FORUMS**

The Board considered a report by Trond Haugen, Advisor to SEStran, on the appointment of new Chairs for the Air Forum and the Rail Forum.

The Board agreed to:-

- (a) Note the report:-
- (b) agreed to appoint Barry Turner as Chair of the Air Forum;
- (c) thank John Martin for all his hard work as retiring Chair of the Rail Forum; and
- (d) appoint Graham Bell as new Chair of the Rail Forum.

#### **A12. SCOTTISH LOW EMISSIONS STRATEGY**

The Board considered a report by John Saunders, Strategy Adviser on the Consultation Paper on a Low Emission Strategy for Scotland.

The Board agreed to:-

- (a) Note the report; and
- (b)/



- (b) Approve the Appendix to the report as SEStran's response to the Scottish Government's LES consultation.

#### **A13. ORR RAIL STATION USAGE STATISTICS**

The Board considered a report by Trond Haugen, Adviser to SEStran, on the increase in rail use between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

The Board agreed to:-

- (a) Note the content of the report; and
- (b) instruct the Director to instigate discussions with the rail industry about the need for increased investment in the existing network and services in the SEStran area.

#### **B1 AUDIT SCOTLAND – ANNUAL AUDIT PLAN**

##### **Decision**

The Board noted the contents of the Annual Audit Plan 2014/15 on their efforts.

#### **B2. RAIL FRANCHISES**

The Board considered a report by Trond Haugen, Advisor to SEStran, regarding the award of the rail franchises.

##### **Decision**

The Board noted the report.

#### **B3. ACTIVE TRAVEL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Board considered a report by Sarah Ryan, Active Travel Officer, regarding the next round of Sustrans Community Links funding.

##### **Decision**

The Board agreed to note the content of the report.

#### **B4. MINUTES OF SESPLAN CROSS BOUNDARY TRANSPORT AND LANDUSE APPRAISAL GROUP**

The minutes of the SESplan Transport Group meeting of 13th January were noted.

#### **B5 HIGH SPEED RAIL UPDATE**

The Board considered an update regarding, the work of the Speed Rail Group.

##### **Decision/**



### **Decision**

The Board noted the update.

#### **B6.1 MIDLOTHIAN COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The Board considered SEStran's response to the Midlothian Local Development Plan Consultation.

### **Decision**

The Board noted the response.

#### **B6.2 FIFE AIR QUALITY STRATEGY 2015-2020**

The Board considered SEStran's response to the Air Quality Strategy for Fife 2015/2020

### **Decision**

The Board noted the response.

#### **B6.3 RELOCATION OF WEST CALDER HIGH SCHOOL**

The Board considered SEStran's response to the Formal Consultation on the Proposal to relocate West Calder High School.

### **Decision**

The Board noted the response.

#### **B7.1. ICIC FREIGHT TRANSPORT IN SCOTLAND**

The Board considered SEStran's response to the ICIC Freight Transport in Scotland.

### **Decision**

The Board noted the response.

#### **B7.2 LOW EMISSION STRATEGY**

The Board considered a response on behalf of the RTP Chairs to a Scottish Government Consultation on Low Emission Strategy.

### **Decision**

The Board noted the response.

#### **B8./**



## **B8. MINUTES OF SUB GROUPS**

The Board considered the minutes of the following meetings:-

B8.1 Equalities Forum - 13th February, 2015

B8.2 Bus Forum - 20th February, 2015

B8.3 Chief Officer Liaison Group - 24th February, 2015

## **B9. MINUTES OF THE JOINT REGIONAL TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIPS CHAIRS**

The Minute of meeting held on 3rd December, 2014 was noted.

The Board noted the next meeting of the Partnership would take place on **Friday, 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 at 10.00 a.m.** at Diamond Jubilee Room, City Chambers, Edinburgh.

---



## A5 PROJECTS REPORT

### 1. 2015/16 Expenditure

- 1.1 **Appendix 1** to this report details the current year's Projects Budget which shows expenditure to 20 May 2015 of £248856.
- 1.2 SEStran's indebtedness evident at the end of last financial year and reported in SEStran's Annual Treasury Report 2014/15 has now been recovered.
- 1.3 Of the two major items referred to in the annual report, income from the Bus Investment Fund amounting to £475,000 was received in April 2015.
- 1.4 With regard to RTPI ERDF income, following the submission to the ERDF Managing Authority of a paper detailing Key Performance Indicators, illustrating the success to date of the scheme, two of the 5 Authority areas (West Lothian and Cross Borders) have been finalised and payments amounting to £372898.95 now verified for release.
- 1.5 The remaining 3 Areas are in the process of being verified by the Managing Authority and it is anticipated that the remaining payments will be received by the end of June.

### 2. RTPI

#### 2.1 Bus Investment Fund (BIF)

- 2.1.1 The Bus Investment Fund (BIF) operates as a challenge fund open to applications from public transport authorities working in partnership with operators, community transport, NHS, and other public or private sector partners.
- 2.1.2 The aim of the fund is to incentivise and enable partnership working to help improve bus services, partnerships, standards and infrastructure for communities across Scotland. The fund will support and encourage all relevant authorities to take up partnership working to help increase the standard of bus services to increase patronage thereby achieving a greater modal shift.
- 2.1.3 As reported previously SEStran was given two awards at the end of 2014, each of value £500k.
- 2.1.4 The first (BIF 2), to expand the bustrackerSEStran RTPI project by fitting out more buses operated by First Scotland East, accommodating changes imposed by Stagecoach and developing



a Vehicle Monitoring (VM) feed, is progressing as planned.

Other than the transfer of on-bus units from Stagecoach to First, the timetable for which is currently dictated by Stagecoach, the installation of kit on First vehicles will be complete by mid July.

- 2.1.5** The second bid (BIF 3) – also for £500,000 over two years – will fund equipping public premises with TV screens displaying real time passenger information through bustrackerSEStran as well as information on local events and services.

The award will fund the necessary TV and computer hardware where such equipment is not available, with public authorities funding installation, the provision of power, internet connections and contributing a modest annual fee after the first year to maintain the system with the target of rolling out up to 500 screens this financial year. The proposed maintenance charges are as follows:

- First year maintenance free
- Year 2 onwards - £250/annum per screen but for additional screens showing identical information, £100 per additional screen.
- For bus stations showing only stance data £150 per screen.

The launch event was successfully held on the 24<sup>th</sup> April at the Carlton Hotel, North Bridge which attracted over 40 attendees from a variety of public bodies with a high level of interest generated. Arrangement are in hand to install equipment in all campuses of Edinburgh College and in Forth Valley hospital with a number of other locations, including library services in Midlothian, East Lothian and Falkirk currently in the pipeline.

## **2.2 Media Strategy Update**

- 2.2.1** The radio campaign to encourage download of the free smartphone app proved to be effective. A significant rise in downloads was achieved.
- 2.2.2** Stagecoach have committed to displaying the bustrackerSEStran publicity materials on appropriate services for an extended period. This sort of long term exposure is essential to embed the system in the public consciousness and a similar commitment is expected from First Scotland East.
- 2.2.3** All parties (including the transport, communications and education departments of SEStran local authorities) have been given full access to the design files for the RTP1 marketing materials and are able to produce these as required. All SEStran authorities have been asked to display links to the bustrackerSEStran



website and app on their website indefinitely. Regular advertisements in council newspapers for distribution to local households have also been negotiated.

- 2.2.4** The recent RTPI digital screens launch event will play a significant role in highlighting the benefits of accessing the system through use of screens located in public places. These in themselves, it is anticipated, will have a significant impact upon public awareness by providing both direct access to local live bus times and heightened awareness of the app and website.

A further commercial advertising campaign may be beneficial once a significant number of digital screens are in position and all participating bus companies and local authorities are routinely ensuring that the advertising materials relating to RTPI are prominently displayed.

### **2.3 Scottish Enterprise Mobility Integration Challenge**

- 2.3.1** The trial, for which SE has granted £15k, is progressing well, involving 30 commercial enterprises. The purpose of the trial is to assess the commercial viability of the use of digital displays which, alongside live bus times, will include advertising appropriate to the business in which the screen is operating. Maintenance charges in the commercial environment have been initially set as follows:

- £500 per set-up.
- £300 per annum maintenance charge.

## **3. Sustainable Travel Awareness**

- 3.1** The Sustainable and Active Travel Grant Scheme is now open to 2015/16 applicants. The matched grant scheme offers grants of between £500 and £25,000 to potential applicants. Further details and criteria of grant schemes offered by SEStran can be found on the SEStran website. There is no formal deadline for applicants, but applications will be assessed as they are received within the financial year. All projects must be completed by the 31<sup>st</sup> of March 2016.

## **4. European Projects Update**

- 4.1** “NweRide” is a project within the North West Europe Interreg IVB Programme. The project’s aim is to improve individuals’ connectivity using dynamic lift share systems which are linked to public transport networks giving a higher probability of finding a trip solution.

- 4.1.1** The NweRide Final conference is to be held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June in Brussels. Car share stakeholders from across Europe are invited to attend the conference, in which the project results will be



shared and discussed. Workshops on the future of the shared networking platform will be held and the potential for a European Rideshare Association will also be considered. Further information on the conference can be found at <http://www.nweride.eu/>

**4.2 “CHUMS”** is a project under the umbrella of Intelligent Energy Europe (IEE). The project will seek to address the energy challenge of low car occupancy and the approximately 50% of journeys in cities that cannot be accommodated by conventional public transport modes. The aim of the project is to apply a composite CHUMS behavioural change strategy, developed by the consortium and to transfer the proven methods to the rest of Europe.

**4.2.1** The last CHUMS meeting was held in Toulouse on the 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> of April. SEStran presented experiences of the first round of the CHUMS manual Travel Plan activities. Personalised Travel Plans were offered and subsequently delivered to Edinburgh University staff and students at Easter Bush between March and April. Efforts were focussed on Car Permit holders, thus avoiding those already travelling by sustainable modes. As part of the Travel Plan delivery, promotional stalls with further information on alternative modes of sustainable travel were displayed at various locations within the Easter Bush Campus.

**4.3 “SocialCar”** aims to integrate public transport information, car pooling and crowd sourced data in order to provide a single source of information for the traveller to compare multiple options/services.

**4.3.1** The kick-off meeting for SocialCar is to be held on the 25<sup>th</sup> and the 26<sup>th</sup> of June in Rome.

## **5. Opportunities for New European Projects**

**5.1 Interreg.** SEStran are currently in discussion with potential partners for 2 fledgling projects in the next Interreg call.

**5.1.1 Sustainable Logistics Gateways** would develop the concept of the Forth Estuary and the surrounding SEStran region being established as a Sustainable Gateway to Scotland. This would seek to create an accreditation standard for the whole range of players in the Region involved in the conveyance of freight. The first of a two stage application was submitted on 18 May 2015 and a response is expected in July.

**5.1.2 City Logistics, “BUZZ”** is to look further into more sustainable and versatile means of freight delivery in busy urban centres. The first stage bid was also submitted on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2015.

**5.1.3** As a result of delays in the next Interreg programme, it is likely



that successful bids will not become live projects until the financial year 2016/17.

## **6. Additional National Funding Opportunities Recently Pursued**

### **6.1 Scottish Roads Research Board**

#### **6.1.1 Two proposals were submitted for consideration:**

1. The development and introduction of a mobile phone based ticket option for the One-Ticket, offering where currently only a paper ticket is available (value £120K)
2. Research and development of an on-bus, smart phone based RTPI system (value £125k)

Neither was successful.

### **6.2 Transport Research Board, Innovate UK**

#### **6.2.1 Three major areas were incorporated into this proposal:**

- a) Extending the scope of real-time passenger information to improve and integrate public transport passenger information and payments systems;
- b) Measures to support sustainable logistics, especially rail-based measures, in the Forth estuary area through the concept of a “sustainable freight gateway”
- c) Additional sustainable passenger transport choices to overcome existing barriers.

This bid too was unsuccessful. Alternative funding opportunities are currently being explored.

## **7. Recommendations**

**7.1** That the board notes the contents of this report and;

**7.2** Approves the maintenance charges to be applied to RTPI TV screens in public places.

**Jim Grieve**  
Programme Manager  
**May 2015**

## **Appendix 1: Revenue Projects Expenditure**



Policy Implications	None
Financial Implications	As detailed in this report
Race Equalities Implications	None
Gender Equalities Implications	None
Disability Equalities Implications	None



**PROJECTS - COSTS**

Centre	Centre Desc	CY Budget	Ledger @ 20/5/15	Add: 14/15 Income Due	Add: Invoices Payable	Revised Actuals
92004	ONE TICKET	0	5,283			5,283
92011	R15 PARK & CHOOSE STH TAY BRIDGE	35,000	0			0
92013	R17 SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AWARENESS	130,000	-45,000		46,715	1,715
92017	URBAN CYCLE NETWORKS	120,000	-82,085		82,085	0
92019	RTPI - REVENUE CONTRIBUTION	230,000	230,664			230,664
92032	R34 PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS	0	3,307			3,307
92042	R37 RTS MONITORING	5,000	2,400			2,400
92047	R41 SPECIALIST RAIL BUS ADVICE	35,000	0			0
92048	R42 REGIONAL DEV PLAN INPUT	20,000	0			0
92056	EU2 CONNECTING FOOD PORTS	0	-459		459	0
92057	EU SOCIAL CAR	47,000	0			0
92062	EQUALITIES FORUM ACTIONS	10,000	0			0
92064	EU WEASTFLOWS	0	-2,841		2,852	11
92065	EU NWE RIDE	64,000	0			0
92066	BIF 1	0	4,151			4,151
92069	EU CHUMS	68,000	27			27
92070	BIF 2	500,000	0			0
92071	BIF 3	500,000	1,298			1,298
92072	RAIL STATIONS DEVELOPMENT	850,000	0			0
		<b>2,614,000</b>	<b>116,745</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>132,111</b>	<b>248,856</b>

**PROJECTS - INCOME**

92035	REVENUE PROJECTS GRANT	-432,000	-432,000			-432,000
92004	ONE TICKET	-13,000	0	-5,283		-5,283
92017	URBAN CYCLE NETWORKS	-100,000	0			0
92019	RTPI - BUS OPERATORS	-138,000	414,210	-446,405		-32,195
92019	RTPI - 14/15 BUDGET UNDERSPEND C/FWD	0	-26,465			
92056	EU2 CONNECTING FOOD PORTS	0	17,821	-17,821		0
92057	EU SOCIAL CAR	-47,000	0			0
92058	EU4 LO PINOD	0	10,364	-10,364		0
92059	EU5 I TRANSFER	0	23,488	-23,488		0
92064	EU WEASTFLOWS	0	16,524	-16,524		0
92065	EU NWE RIDE	-34,000	3,692	-3,692		0
92069	EU CHUMS	-50,000	0			0
92070	BIF 2	-500,000	0			0
92071	BIF 3	-500,000	0			0
92072	RAIL STATIONS DEVELOPMENT	-800,000	0			0
		<b>-2,614,000</b>	<b>27,633</b>	<b>-523,576</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-469,478</b>

**NET EXPENDITURE**

<b>0</b>	<b>144,378</b>	<b>-523,576</b>	<b>132,111</b>	<b>-220,622</b>
----------	----------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------



**RTS Delivery Plan - Approach**

**DRAFT**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** The RTS approved by the Board on 20<sup>th</sup> March does not include a delivery plan, as the Scottish Ministers specifically indicated in a letter to SEStran in January 2008 that the delivery of the strategy was very much up to SEStran and its partners and did not require ministerial approval.
- 1.2** However, a Delivery Plan is required to provide the framework for SEStran's ongoing work programme based on achieving our RTS objectives.
- 1.3** Given the limited funding now available to SEStran, the plan related to the RTS 2015 will rely more on influence, guidance and co-ordination than on direct delivery when compared to the RTS 2008 Delivery Plan.
- 1.4** This report proposes a way forward for preparation of a new Delivery Plan covering the period 2015-**2023**.

**2. DETAIL**

- 2.1** The RTS 2014 has been submitted to Scottish Ministers for approval following the Board approval on 20<sup>th</sup> March.
- 2.2** Comments by Transport Scotland on the consultation draft RTS pointed out the large number of unfunded interventions at varying stages of development mentioned in the document. Most of these interventions are not directly under the control of SEStran. These comments highlight the need to produce a Delivery Plan that provides an appropriate context, and identifies and prioritises realistic action by SEStran.
- 2.3** RTS Guidance from 2006 suggests that RTPs should develop an Investment Plan covering the first 5 to 10 years of the RTS timescale setting out a programme of capital investment required for the successful implementation of the RTS. That is the format adopted for SEStran's 2008 Delivery Plan, which was also supported by an appraisal of interventions against RTS objectives.
- 2.4** Given the transfer of RTP capital allocations to individual local authorities by Ministers in 2010, this type of Investment Plan no longer appears relevant as SEStran is able only to influence rather than determine most transport investment decisions. Direct capital funding for RTPs now comes primarily



through competitive bids to national or EU funders. Future RTP capital funding streams are therefore highly unpredictable.

**2.5** It is proposed therefore that the Delivery Plan will have two main components.

The first will identify all the interventions included in the RTS and indicate their status, policy background, lead promoter, funding position and timescale together with SEStran's role, if any, in promoting the intervention. This will in effect be a collation of the investment plans of member local authorities and other agencies combined with identified aspirational interventions.

**2.6** The second component will identify SEStran's priorities for action, indicating the interventions for which SEStran can or should play a role in direct delivery, development of detailed proposals, provision of guidance, coordination or simply active support. This will also identify priority areas where capital funding may be sought for delivery and where limited revenue funding should be focussed.

**2.7** It is important to ensure consensus on the Delivery Plan with key partners, especially Transport Scotland and member local authorities. It is proposed therefore to hold early discussions, mainly through the Strategy Liaison Group, to ensure that the format and content of the Delivery Plan is agreed.

**2.8** It must be recognised that flexibility over SEStran's activities will be required given the absence of a specific capital budget. The Delivery Plan will form the basis for the work programmes set out in SEStran's annual Business Plan.

### **3. RECOMMENDATION**

**3.1** The Board approves the development of a Delivery Plan based on the approach described, to be brought back to a future meeting of the Board.

**Alastair Short**  
Strategy Manager

Policy Implications	Policy Development
Financial Implications	
Race Equalities Implications	
Gender Equalities Implications	
Disability Equalities Implications	



## **Access to Healthcare Progress Report**

### **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** On the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015 SEStran hosted a meeting chaired by John Jack, to discuss progress made and to agree an Action Plan in relation to access to health in the SEStran area.
- 1.2** The meeting was attended by most of the Health Boards in the SEStran area and the CTA.

### **1. DETAIL**

- 2.1** Following the initial workshop in March 2014, several visits were arranged to centres of good practice within Central Scotland. These were as follows:-

- The NHS Lothian Transport hub, Astley Ainslie Hospital;
- Scottish Ambulance Control Centre, South Queensferry;
- SPT offices and contact centre, Glasgow.

The members who attended these events were impressed with what could be achieved but were also pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the issues they had in their areas and how others have address them.

- 2.2** SEStran has also become involved with the various individual groups (Lothian and Borders) instigated by the health boards with the aim to encourage the sharing of good practice.
- 2.3** The meeting also considered a draft Action Plan, outlined below, to focus activities on where it was considered that the greatest benefits are likely to exist with co-ordinated activities.

#### **Draft Action Plan**

##### **Benefits of a coordinated Action Plan**

- Increase awareness of the inter-relationships between transport and health, to the benefit of service efficiency and delivery;
- Improve cross sector working between service providers;



- Improving public awareness of options available to access healthcare facilities;
- Reduce inequality of access to healthcare;
- Easier journeys for patients through improved co-ordination of transport issues and healthcare appointment bookings;
- Greater co-ordination of transport and healthcare provision; and
- Increased environmental and financial sustainability of transport to healthcare.

### **Short term Actions**

- Circulate a letter to all relevant decision makers emphasising the importance of ensuring good access to healthcare;
- Use the Health and Social Toolkit to provide a basis for identifying where improvements are required;
- Consider the patient “experience” and identify where improvements can be made in terms of information, procedures and services;
- Identify potential areas where a co-ordinated approach would be most beneficial;
- Continue fact finding visits to potentially benefit from best practice; and
- Hold group meetings on a regular basis to assess progress and opportunities for co-ordinated working (3 monthly).
- Find out the lessons learnt from the Government “trials”

**Potential Medium term Actions** (only progressed if it is agreed that a co-ordinated approach through SEStran would be beneficial in developing these actions)

- Assess the potential implementing the process of bookings being sent out with public transport travel plans (this could highlight where appointment times are inappropriate to certain patient);
- Assess the potential for a “hub” approach to co-ordinated transport booking not only for the ambulance service but social care, education and community transport;
- Provide a co-ordinated approach to information on travel options and a “one stop” information/booking facility;
- Consider the sustainable travel provision/facilities at healthcare locations and consider how they can be developed to improve accessibility for patients and staff; (initial accessibility analysis could provide an indication of areas with access problems)
- Look at provision of parking at healthcare facilities to improve their efficient use for patients with appointments and consider how staff use cars



2.4 The development of these actions will be further refined to provide a practical way forward. The most important element is learning from good practice elsewhere and identify where a co-ordinated approach can improve its application to benefit the health service and its patients.

### 3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The Board notes progress with developing improved access to healthcare and approves the actions as outlined above.

**Alastair Short**  
Strategy Manager  
June 2015

Policy Implications	Policy Development
Financial Implications	None
Race Equalities Implications	None
Gender Equalities Implications	None
Disability Equalities Implications	None



## SEStran Strategic Cross Boundary Cycle Development

### 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 At the end of the SEStran Urban Cycle Network Strategy for Investment published in 2010 it was recommended that further research into the development of strategic cycle networks be undertaken in four years time. Following capital funding provided by Sustrans, SEStran invited three consultancies to tender proposals for such research in October 2014. Using delegated powers, the Partnership Director appointed Peter Brett Associates LLP on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2014.

1.2 The following outputs are expected from this research:

- A study report identifying and evaluating current and potential future cross-boundary commuter cycle routes and facilities.
- A strategy report to help plan and guide investment in strategic cycling infrastructure that will encourage modal shift from single occupancy vehicles to more active travel modes for commuting throughout the region. This will incorporate both the review of the original UCN strategy alongside the results from the cross-boundary study report.
- An executive summary of the strategy report.
- A technical appendix covering the methodology, responses and consultation results.

1.2.1 At the time of writing these reports have yet to be finalised. An executive summary and links to the further reports will be included in the papers for the upcoming Partnership Board.

### 2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1. The Board approves the SEStran Strategic Cross Boundary Cycle Development reports and encourages the adoption of the recommendations within.

**Sarah Ryan**  
Active Travel Officer  
25 May 2015



**A10. SEStran Strategic Cross Boundary Cycle Development**

Policy Implications	Development of recommendations in final reports supports RTS Topics 16 and 17.
Financial Implications	Cost estimates for each recommendation (low/medium/high)
Race Equalities Implications	None
Gender Equalities Implications	None
Disability Equalities Implications	None



## **ANNUAL TREASURY REPORT 2014/15**

### **1 Purpose of report**

The purpose of this report is to provide an Annual Treasury Report for the financial year 2014/15.

### **2 Summary**

The Board has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management in the Public Sector, and under the code, an Annual Report on Treasury Management has to be submitted to the Board after the end of each financial year.

### **3 Investment Out-turn 2014/15**

- 3.1 During the financial year the Partnership maintained its bank account as part of the City of Edinburgh Council's group of bank accounts. Cash balances were effectively lent to the Council, but were offset by expenditure undertaken by the City of Edinburgh Council on behalf of the Partnership. Interest is calculated on the month end net indebtedness balances between the Council and the Board in accordance with the Local Authority (Scotland) Accounts Advisory Committee's (LASAAC) Guidance Note 2 on Interest on Revenue Balances (IoRB). The Board gains security from its counterparty exposure being to the City of Edinburgh Council. The monthly balances held within the Council's funds were:

	£
Opening Balance	-325,368.00
30 April 2014	-523,513.89
31 May 2014	-370,887.04
30 June 2014	-175,672.68
31 July 2014	-325,272.60
31 August 2014	-194,167.97
30 September 2014	-269,733.49
31 October 2014	-293,940.31
30 November 2014	-614,363.31
31 December 2014	-460,714.07
31 January 2015	-630,665.12
28 February 2015	-493,872.25
31 March 2015	-1,006,324.88

Interest is calculated from the average monthly balance over 11 months. The interest rate applied was 0.353%. The amount of interest charged was £1,067.00.

- 3.2 The month end indebtedness between the Partnership and City of Edinburgh Council principally reflects the cash flow timing differences of funded projects. This arises from payment of costs for projects by SEStran, in advance of receipt of grant. There are seven European grant claims (excluding RTPi) in the process of being settled as at 31 March 2015, with a total value of £0.074m. In addition, RTPi income of £0.446m and Bus



Investment Fund (BIF) income of £0.475m were both due at 31 March 2015 and in the process of being settled.

#### **4 Recommendations**

- 4.1 It is recommended that the Board notes the Annual Report for 2014/15.

**HUGH DUNN**  
Treasurer

---

**Appendix**      None

**Contact/tel**      Iain Shaw, Tel: 0131 469 3117  
([iain.shaw@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:iain.shaw@edinburgh.gov.uk))



## **DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT (DPE) COLLABORTIVE WORKING WITH THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL**

### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 In 2014, SEStran organised and convened a meeting to consider the implications of Police Scotland's withdrawal from parking enforcement. One of the key outcomes from the meeting was to establish scope for joint working between Local Authorities in Scotland particularly when adopting DPE.
- 1.2 At that meeting the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) briefed attendees on their experience of successfully delivering DPE since 1998 and Fife Council gave their perspective on introducing and operating DPE.
- 1.3 There was some interest in potential collaborative working between Local Authorities in the spirit of the SEStran Parking Management Strategy (2009) and it was recognised that joint working would be beneficial to those involved, particularly when economies of scale and potential savings are considered.
- 1.4 It was agreed at the meeting that SEStran would approach CEC to discuss what collaborative working opportunities they could provide to other Local Authorities.

### **2. Discussion**

- 2.1 CEC introduced DPE in 1998, as a result of the Police being unable to resource proper enforcement of parking restrictions. CEC immediately achieved greater control and improved the effectiveness of parking restrictions across the city. Edinburgh now has one of the largest DPE operations in the UK outside London.
- 2.2 CEC is able to assist and collaborate with Councils at all stages of the DPE process, including those with an existing DPE service, where there may be scope for shared services and efficiency savings.
- 2.3 Some of the most experienced parking professionals in Scotland currently work within CEC's Parking Operation. This knowledge base and resource is often consulted by other Local Authorities if DPE expertise is required.
- 2.4 CEC operate a Decriminalised Traffic and Parking Services Contract which was developed to foster collaborative working and shared services across Scotland, allowing partner Authorities to procure services from the contract.



2.5 The following contracted services, which can be procured in groups or individually, are available to collaborative partners through the Decriminalised Traffic and Parking Services Contract:

- On Street Enforcement Services
- Car Pound Services
- Bus Lane Camera Enforcement Services
- Pay and Display Services
- Suspension & Dispensation Services
- Lines & Signs Maintenance Services
- Cashless Parking Solution
- Permit Management Solution
- Back Office Support Services
- Online Services

2.6 CEC could also offer the following in-house services to potential collaborative partners:

- DPE consultation services (for those considering moving to DPE)
- TRO consultation and assistance
- Back Office Notice Processing
- Contract Management
- Fraud Prevention Duties

### **3. Recommendations**

3.1 That the board notes the contents of this report and instructs the Director to liaise further with CEC and other local authorities with a view to implantation of shared working.

**Jim Grieve**

Programme Manager

June 2015

**Appendix 1:** Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Meeting Agenda and Minute



Policy Implications	As detailed in this report
Financial Implications	As detailed in this report
Race Equalities Implications	None
Gender Equalities Implications	None
Disability Equalities Implications	None



**DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT (DPE) MEETING**  
**MONDAY 31<sup>ST</sup> MARCH 2014 AT 2:00PM**  
**DIAMNOND JUBILEE ROOM, CITY CHAMBERS, EDINBURGH**

A buffet lunch will be served at 1:30pm

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introduction            | Russell Imrie |
| 2. Previous Board Reports & Background | Jim Grieve    |
| 3. Update                              | Alex Macaulay |
| 4. Edinburgh Experience                | tbc           |
| 5. Fife Experience                     | tbc           |
| 6. Way Forward                         | All           |



**DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT MEETING**  
**2:00PM MONDAY 31<sup>ST</sup> MARCH 2014**  
**DIAMOND JUBILEE ROOM, CITY CHAMBERS, EDINBURGH**

<b><u>Present:</u></b>	Cllr Russell Imrie	Midlothian Council (Chair of SEStran)
	Cllr Donald Balsillie	Clackmannanshire Council
	Cllr Tom Conn	West Lothian Council
	Cllr Tim Day	East Lothian Council
	Cllr Gordon Edgar	Scottish Borders Council
	Cllr Derek Rosie	Midlothian Council
	Mr Angus Carmichael	Fife Council
	Ms Angela Chambers	SEStran
	Mr Mark Craske	NHS Forth Valley
	Mr Neil Dougall	Midlothian Council
	Mr Peter Forsyth	East Lothian Council
	Mr Jim Grieve	SEStran
	Mr Cliff Hutt	City of Edinburgh Council
	Mr Alex Macaulay	SEStran
	Mr Graeme Malcolm	West Lothian Council
	Mr Greg Pender	Falkirk Council
	Mr John Richmond	City of Edinburgh Council
	Mr Russell Steedman	Falkirk Council
	Mr Mac West	Clackmannanshire Council
	Mr Brian Young	Scottish Borders Council

**Apologies:** None

Ref.		Actions
<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	
	Cllr Imrie welcomed the group to the meeting and conducted round table introductions. Cllr Imrie noted that he had given a commitment at a previous SEStran Board to convene a meeting with the partner authorities to consider the implications of Police Scotland's withdrawal from parking enforcement. Suggested outcomes are; identifying options for the way forward; and establishing any scope for joint working.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Previous Board Reports &amp; Background</b>	
	Mr Grieve briefed the group, providing background history and summarising work undertaken by SEStran and its appointed consultants to date, including the development of a Regional Parking Management Strategy and the MVA study which included assessment of a region wide Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE), however, this was deemed to be unfeasible. The current status is that Police Scotland have withdrawn from providing parking enforcement services and although two authorities have successfully introduced their own schemes, most other	



	remaining local authorities are unable to make a viable business case.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Update</b>	
	As Mr Grieve had provided a comprehensive briefing, Mr Macaulay stated that no further update was required and the focus for the meeting would be to determine the way forward.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Edinburgh Experience</b>	
	<p>Cllr Imrie invited City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) to share their experience of implementing DPE and noted that it would be useful to hear accounts from both CEC and Fife to provide a comparison of the differing geographical locations.</p> <p>Mr Richmond advised that CEC had introduced DPE in October 1998, although the CPZ had extended since then. He noted that Police Scotland withdrew all services from day one of implementation and suggested that authorities contact Police Scotland to confirm what services are currently being provided in their areas. CEC outsourced the provision of Parking Attendants; however, Greenways were then still enforced by the police and back office duties carried out in-house. CEC suggested the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring enforcement contractor takes responsibility for equipment.</li> <li>• Assessing each location correctly so restrictions are applicable/comply with road/street use and orders.</li> <li>• Ensuring signage clearly defines duration of enforcement.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Richmond noted that CEC currently issue 160-170k tickets per annum, with 50% paid at 30 days whilst 2.5k vehicles are towed.</p> <p>An offer was extended to the Partner Authorities to visit the CEC Parking Team offices to review their operations.</p> <p>Mr Grieve set out a basic list of requirements for DPE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designation Order</li> <li>• Traffic Regulation Order's</li> <li>• DPE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enforcement facility</li> <li>- Notice processing facility</li> <li>- Car pound (if towing)</li> <li>- Penalty payment system</li> <li>- Substantial correspondence provision</li> <li>- Penalty/charges established</li> <li>- Appeals process</li> <li>- Surplus income to go back into transport</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Mr Hutt noted that a clearly defined parking strategy is essential and consideration must be given to the effects of off-street parking and the condition of signage and road lines. This led to a discussion about maintenance issues/options and cashless parking.</p>	



	<p>Cllr Edgar asked if vandalism was an issue and Mr Richmond advised that there are spates of missing signs, in particular, upon introduction of the greenways scheme. He noted that signage is generally mounted to lamp-posts and fencing and it is hoped that future signage will be constructed from plastic.</p> <p>Mr Richmond cautioned the group to expect bad press/complaints within the first 6 months of implementation.</p> <p>Mr Dougall queried whether there would be any scope for piggybacking the CEC contract and Mr Richmond confirmed that there is flexibility within the parking enforcement provision, however, any back office duties requirements would require CEC to up-scale their current operations. Mr Richmond also cautioned that a viable business case would still be a precursor to DPE introduction and this would take between 18-24 months for legislation to be granted.</p>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Fife Experience</b>	
	<p>Cllr Imrie introduced Mr Carmichael and asked if he could provide details of DPE from a Fife perspective.</p> <p>Mr Carmichael informed the group that Fife Council had implemented DPE last year. The region is small in comparison to Edinburgh and consists of urban and rural areas. He outlined the main features of the scheme as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcing completed in-house</li> <li>• Back office duties outsourced to ISIS (through English framework agreement as nothing currently available in Scotland)</li> <li>• Maintenance and enforcement dealt with separately where possible</li> <li>• Staff retention problems due to pay grade</li> <li>• Attendants and Road Inspectors responsible for line checking</li> <li>• Mobile phone app being developed, launch planned for later in year</li> <li>• 11 months since launch and 15% up on business plan projections</li> </ul> <p>The group had a general discussion about the key issues within their own town centres and local areas and many authorities are not in a position to make a viable business case individually.</p> <p>Mr Macaulay referred to the SEStran Parking Management Strategy produced in 2009 and advised that its objective was to obtain a degree of fairness and consistency across the region in terms of parking management. It recognised the differing characteristics and problems facing each area and the recommendations of the report were made based on these. He raised the question if there was scope for joint working either together or in smaller groups and suggested that there may be scope for economies of scale.</p>	



6.	Way Forward	
	<p>Cllr Imrie suggested that a review of current legislation was required and suggested adopting a collective approach in trying to find a solution. He handed over to Mr Grieve to outline his proposals for the way forward.</p> <p>Mr Grieve suggested the following options for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach Scottish Government to review legislation/business case criteria</li> <li>• Approach CEC to ask if they would be prepared to take on board providing DPE for the other partner authorities within the region</li> <li>• Establish if SEStran should lead a collective approach or should this be done individually</li> </ul> <p>Mr Malcolm suggested Cosla/Scottish Gov involvement would be useful and posed the question of whether a capital grant could be awarded to aid start up costs.</p> <p>Mr Macaulay noted that the SEStran Parking Management Strategy is a regional document that provides general guidance to the Partner Authorities, in respect of a consistent approach to parking controls with the SEStran area</p> <p>Cllr Balsillie asked if there were alternative options to DPE that could be considered.</p> <p>Cllr Imrie thanked the group for their participation and noted the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions to be consolidated and representations to be made and reported to a future meeting.</li> </ul>	



**Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB**
**Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015**
**Attendees**

Transport Scotland	Adam Priestley (AP) (Chair)
Transport Scotland	Paul Junik (PJ)
SESplan	Graeme Marsden (GM)
SEStran	John Saunders (JS)
SEStran	Alex Macaulay (AMC)
City of Edinburgh Council	Andrew McBride (AMB)
City of Edinburgh Council	Keith Miller (KM)
East Lothian Council	Grant Talac (GT)
Fife Council	Mark Barrett (MB)
Midlothian Council	Lindsay Haddow (LH)
Scottish Borders Council	Graeme Johnstone (GJ)
West Lothian Council	Chris Nicol (CN)
CH2M HILL	Colm Smyth (CS)
CH2M HILL	Chris Buck (CB)
SYSTRA	Jeff Davidson (JD)
JMP Consultants	John Milligan (JMil)
AECOM	Richard Cann (RC)

**Apologies**

Transport Scotland	Alison Irvine (AI)
SEStran	Alistair Short (JS)
City of Edinburgh Council	Ewan Kennedy (EK)
CH2M HILL	Julia Gilles (JG)
Fife Council	John Mitchell (JMit)
Midlothian Council	Neil Wallace (NW)

**PRINCIPAL ISSUES**

Ref.	On-going Issue	Update/Comment
2.1	TELMoS data on population forecast assumptions	Action: SESplan and SEStran to receive data on population forecast assumptions within TELMoS. Update: This will be included as an Appendix B to the Methodology note when confirmed with DSC
2.2	Employment allocation data for Scottish Borders to be reviewed re Borders Rail.	Action: Planning allocation data for Scottish Borders to be reviewed re class of employment land along route of Borders Rail Update: Employment land in Scottish Borders is allocated for classes 4, 5 or 6. No further information is available for sites along the Borders Rail route.
2.3	Draft Objectives note to be reissued	CH2M HILL has reissued draft Objectives Note to SESplan. SESplan responded with minor comments.
2.4	Programme dates	Action: Relevant Programme dates to be included in Table 9 of



Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

## Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015

	to be included in Methodology Technical Note.	the Methodology Technical Note. Update: Relevant dates have been included, Revised Technical Note will be issued shortly with Appendices attached.
2.5	Updated Risk Register to be circulated	Updated Risk Register has been circulated
2.6	Initial DCF meeting to be arranged	Ongoing. SESplan will be holding an internal meeting on 17 March.
3.1	Appraisal Lead Commission (CH2M Hill)	<i>Data Collection:</i> CH2M Hill have completed the collection of planning and transport data (WP4 and WP5 accordingly). Some assumptions have been made with respect to the transport network and these will be circulated to LAs for comment in the revised <i>Methodology for the Development of Reference and Future Development Demand Scenarios</i> Technical Note.
3.2		<i>Draft Methodology for the Development of Reference and Future Development Demand Scenarios</i> Technical Note has been revised and reissued. The note sets out a summary of the way forward for the finalisation of the Cross Boundary Impact Appraisal. This will be updated shortly to include Appendix A.
3.3		The outline programme was presented as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base Case Model– February 2015</li> <li>• Reference Case Model– May 2015</li> <li>• Future Case Model– July 2015</li> <li>• Option Development &amp; Testing – Summer/ Autumn 2015</li> </ul> These dates are included in Table 9 of the Final <i>Methodology for the Development of Reference and Future Development Demand Scenarios</i> Technical Note.
3.4		Work is continuing on hotspot analysis using SRM07 prior to the availability of SRM12 results.
3.5		<i>Objectives:</i> Draft Regional Objectives Note is being prepared and will be circulated in due course.
4.1	Transport Modelling Commission (SYSTRA)	SYSTRA have completed the base SRM12 model and are still working on the demand model. The finished model will be connected to the upper tier of TELMoS and TMfS.
5.1	Presentation on Base Model	The SRM12 base network has been updated to 2012 and the Edinburgh simulation area significantly enlarged. The number of



**Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB**
**Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015**

	Development (SYSTRA)	zones has increased significantly from around 400 to 874, which includes 96 'spare' zones to incorporate future developments and 68 zones specifically allocated to Park and Ride.
5.2		Rail matrices are from the 2007 model data, as this is based on 2001 Census journey to work data. These have been updated with 2012 services and with network changes since 2007.
5.3		SRM12 includes a 'flexible forecasting' capability which allows trip generation rates to be adjusted for individual zones if required. It also allows the impact of individual development zones to be identified.
5.4		New data was sourced from traffic signals, traffic counts, Tom-Tom journey times, public transport passenger survey and the 2011 Census (population and household datasets and travel to work movements at the LA level).
5.5		The model includes 45 calibration points which are used to adjust the matrices and around 100 validation points (in between the calibration points).
5.6		Aggregate Tom-Tom data for a 2012 neutral month has been used for calibration and validation. Traffic speeds in the PM peak (16:00 – 17:00) were compared with the inter peak (IP: 10:00 – 16:00) to highlight congested sections.
5.7		Rail data was sourced from the LENNON ticket database for 2012 and bus passenger occupancy counts were taken in 2014. It was noted that there is significant divergence between the two modes in both collection methodology and reliability of data.
5.8		2011 Census travel to work data at LA level for car drivers, rail and bus passengers was used for calibration and validation at the LA level.
5.9		Calibration and validation statistics are approaching acceptable norms, though some further refinement is still required.
5.10		A comparison was presented of modelled road journey times and observed Tom-Tom data. 96% of AM and PM modelled times were within 15% of the average observed times; 93% for IP times. 4 of the 84 data points were within 15%-20%. Model journey times are in general below observed times; i.e. journey speeds in the model overestimate observed data by approx. 8%.
5.11		At least 90% of modelled bus vehicle speeds are within 25% of timetabled speeds; however a lower proportion are within 15% of the timetable – ranging from 67% (PM) to 91% (IP). Bus occupancy data shows some significant changes compared to the 2007 model for some routes (>25%); the reasons for this are being examined. Rail patronage levels are within -5% and +15% of the observed Edinburgh cordon.
5.12		Results were shown of delay analysis, which generated some



Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015

		discussion as to various ways to analyse and display such data.
5.13		Analysis of 'through' traffic between the west of Old Craighall junction and the east of Hermiston Gait shows that this varies between 20% and 30%, depending on time of day and direction of travel. Eastbound flows are significantly greater than westbound flows for all 3 time periods.
5.14		Additional sources of public transport data were discussed. AMC advised that CEC owns real time bus data in Edinburgh and SEStran owns real time data across the wider SEStran region. This would allow analysis of actual performance vs timetable data. SYSTRA to discuss with SEStran and CEC.
5.15		AMC stated that congestion was a better metric over delay when considering the performance of junctions. This point was agreed.
6	Programme	A revised programme has been circulated for comment by CH2M HILL.
7	Risk Register	A revised Risk Register has been circulated for comment by CH2M HILL.
8	Other Group Member Updates	<p><u>Midlothian</u> – Working towards a publication date for the Proposed Plan of 23 March unless advised otherwise by Members given the uncertainty of publishing so close to the forthcoming General Election. A pre-publication version of the report is available on the Council's website.</p> <p><u>Scottish Borders</u> – the LDP is presently with the reporter and final document expected in late summer.</p> <p><u>City of Edinburgh</u> – Statement from CEC: "The Second Proposed Local Development Plan (LDP) was approved by Planning Committee in June 2014. It was published for an engagement period which ran from August to October 2014. A number of representations were received, including many seeking to change the LDP's proposals. The programme for the LDP's preparation intended that the Planning Committee would consider all representations at its meeting on 26 February and whether the plan should be modified before it is submitted for examination. In view of the issues raised and uncertainties caused by current appeals in terms of housing land supply matters, the Planning Committee will not consider the LDP reports on 26 February. A revised programme will now be prepared to consider the reports at the next scheduled meeting of Planning Committee on 14 May. We will inform everyone who made representations of the update to the LDP programme."</p> <p><u>Fife</u> – FIFEplan consultation has closed, with close to 4,000 comments. The plan is due to go to the Executive Committee in</p>



Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

**Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015**

		<p>May / June and subsequently to Government in late summer.</p> <p><u>SEStran</u> – The updated Regional Transport Strategy will go to the next partnership meeting on 20 March and submission to Ministers will follow.</p> <p><u>SESPlan</u> – MIR was scheduled to go to Committee on 23 February but is now scheduled for 18 May. A meeting is taking place on 10 March with TS and SEStran to discuss DPMTAG appraisal.</p> <p><u>West Lothian</u> – The exercise to sift through comments received during the MIR consultation is complete and a report will be presented to Committee in April or May. Following this it is proposed that the Proposed Plan will be published for consultation in Autumn.</p> <p><u>East Lothian</u> – TBC...Consultation on the MIR closed on 8 February, the representations are now being analysed. The current aim for production of the Proposed Plan is October 2015. As part of the process of producing the Proposed Plan, consultants have been commissioned to produce a micro simulation model of the Musselburgh / Tranent area to investigate the impact of LDP development sites in this area. The model will include the A1 trunk road interchanges at Old Craighall, Salters Rd, Dolphinstone and Bankton.</p>
9	AOB	None
10	Date of Next Meeting	<p>Meeting 13 – 31 March</p> <p>Meeting 14 – 28 April</p> <p>Meeting 15 – 26 May</p> <p>Meeting 16 – 30 June</p>



Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015

**PRINCIPAL ACTION POINTS**

Ref.	Date	Action	By Whom	Due Date
		SESplan to receive data on population forecast assumptions within TELMoS.	CH2M Hill / DSC	When available
		The <i>Methodology for the Development of Reference and Future Development Demand Scenarios</i> Technical Note will be reissued to include Appendices	CH2M Hill	27 <sup>th</sup> Feb
		SYSTRA to discuss real time bus data with SEStran/ CEC	SYSTRA / SESplan	27 <sup>th</sup> Feb



Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 12 Tuesday 24 February 2015

### Working Group Membership

Transport Sub-Group Members	Contact Details		
Agency/Authority/Company	Name	Phone	email
Transport Scotland	Alison Irvine	0141 272 7590	<a href="mailto:alison.irvine@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">alison.irvine@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Adam Priestley	0141 272 7596	<a href="mailto:adam.priestley@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">adam.priestley@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Paul Junik	0141 272 7252	<a href="mailto:Paul.Junik@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">Paul.Junik@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Stephen Cragg		<a href="mailto:Stephen.Cragg@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">Stephen.Cragg@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	Alex Macaulay	0131 524 5152	<a href="mailto:Alex.Macaulay@sestran.gov.uk">Alex.Macaulay@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	Alastair Short	0131 524 5150	<a href="mailto:alastair.short@sestran.gov.uk">alastair.short@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	John Saunders	0131 524 5166	<a href="mailto:John.saunders@sestran.gov.uk">John.saunders@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SESPlan	Graeme Marsden	0131 524 5162	<a href="mailto:Graeme.Marsden@sesplan.gov.uk">Graeme.Marsden@sesplan.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Graeme.Marsden@sestran.gov.uk">Graeme.Marsden@sestran.gov.uk</a>
West Lothian Council	Chris Nicol	01506 282326	<a href="mailto:Chris.Nicol@westlothian.gov.uk">Chris.Nicol@westlothian.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Andrew McBride	0131 529 3523	<a href="mailto:Andrew.McBride@edinburgh.gov.uk">Andrew.McBride@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Ewan Kennedy	0131 469 3575	<a href="mailto:Ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk">Ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Keith Miller		<a href="mailto:Keith.Miller@edinburgh.gov.uk">Keith.Miller@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
East Lothian Council	Grant Talac	01620 827 827	<a href="mailto:gtalac@eastlothian.gov.uk">gtalac@eastlothian.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Midlothian Council	Lindsay Haddow		<a href="mailto:lindsay.haddow@midlothian.gov.uk">lindsay.haddow@midlothian.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Lindsay.Haddow@midlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">Lindsay.Haddow@midlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Midlothian Council	Neil Wallace	0131 271 3459	<a href="mailto:neil.wallace@midlothian.gov.uk">neil.wallace@midlothian.gov.uk</a>
Fife Council	Mark Barrett		<a href="mailto:Mark.Barrett@fife.qcsx.gov.uk">Mark.Barrett@fife.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Fife Council	John Mitchell		<a href="mailto:john.mitchell@fife.qcsx.gov.uk">john.mitchell@fife.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Scottish Borders	Graeme Johnstone	01835 825138	<a href="mailto:gjohnstone@scotborders.gov.uk">gjohnstone@scotborders.gov.uk</a>

Appointed Consultants	Contact Details		
Company	Name	Phone	email
CH2MHILL	Julia Gilles	0141 552 2000	<a href="mailto:Julia.Gilles@ch2m.com">Julia.Gilles@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Colm Smyth		<a href="mailto:Colm.Smyth@ch2m.com">Colm.Smyth@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Denise Angus		<a href="mailto:Denise.Angus@ch2m.com">Denise.Angus@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Pamela Gidney		<a href="mailto:Pamela.Gidney@ch2m.com">Pamela.Gidney@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Chris Buck		<a href="mailto:Christopher.Buck@ch2m.com">Christopher.Buck@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Andrew Kelly		<a href="mailto:Andrew.Kelly@ch2m.com">Andrew.Kelly@ch2m.com</a>
SYSTRA	Jeff Davidson	0131 240 8926	<a href="mailto:jdavidson@systra.com">jdavidson@systra.com</a>
SYSTRA	Claire Mackay		<a href="mailto:cmackay@systra.com">cmackay@systra.com</a>
AECOM	Richard Cann	0131 301 8761	<a href="mailto:richard.cann@aecom.com">richard.cann@aecom.com</a>
JMP	John Milligan		<a href="mailto:John.Milligan@jmp.co.uk">John.Milligan@jmp.co.uk</a>



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 13 Tuesday 31 March 2015

### Attendees

Transport Scotland	Adam Priestley (AP) (Chair)
SESplan	Graeme Marsden (GM)
SEStran	John Saunders (JS)
SEStran	Alistair Short (AS)
West Lothian Council	Chris Nicol (CN)
Fife Council	Mark Barrett (MB)
Scottish Borders Council	Graeme Johnstone (GJ)
City of Edinburgh Council	Keith Miller (KM)
CH2M HILL	Colm Smyth (CS)
CH2M HILL	Pamela Gidney (PG)
SYSTRA	Jeff Davidson (JD)
AECOM	Richard Cann (RC)

### Apologies

Transport Scotland	Alison Irvine (AI)
Transport Scotland	Stephen Cragg (SC) / Paul Junik (PJ)
SEStran	Alex Macaulay (AMC)
City of Edinburgh Council	Ewan Kennedy (EK)
City of Edinburgh Council	Andrew McBride (AMB)
East Lothian Council	Grant Talac (GT)
Fife Council	John Mitchell (JM)
Midlothian Council	Neil Wallace (NW)
Midlothian Council	Lindsay Haddow (LH)
JMP Consultants	John Milligan (JM)

### PRINCIPAL ISSUES

Ref.	On-going Issue	Update/Comment
3.1	Appraisal Lead Commission (CH2M Hill) – Objectives	Finalised <i>Objective Setting Methodology Note</i> issued on 26 March alongside draft region wide study objectives for discussion.
3.2		<p>Recap provided of the two tiered approach to establish region wide and local objectives for the study. Region wide objectives to provide the indicators to assess the current and future status of the transport network and, in turn, the mechanism to identify and prioritise hotspots to form the focus of the study.</p> <p>The objectives also provide the basis to assess the relative performance of different measures. Noted the intent is not for the measures to achieve the objectives in full, but rather contribute to their achievement alongside wider non-cross boundary related mitigation interventions proposed in the area.</p> <p>Local objectives to also be developed where operational challenges and local issues specific to a location are not suitably</p>



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 13 Tuesday 31 March 2015

		captured by the region wide objectives.
3.3		<p>JS queried the framework for the draft region wide objectives and application – CH2M HILL clarified that for the purposes of this study the region wide objectives and associated indicators will serve to identify and prioritise hot-spots for focus and then provide the basis to assess the relative performance of different options.</p> <p>JS queried if the RTS indicators would be used to assess the performance of different options. CH2M HILL clarified that for the study the indicators are linked to the SRM12 model outputs and the RTS indicators were presented to illustrate how monitoring would be undertaken in the long-term through existing mechanisms.</p>
3.4		<p>KM queried if reducing journey times for all modes conflicted with the objective to increase travel by sustainable modes. It was noted that providing for private car travel would need to be balanced with providing for other modes as part of an integrated and multi-modal approach. It was considered the objectives should acknowledge the intent to increase the competitiveness of other modes in the future relative to the private car.</p>
3.5		<p>GJ queried how congestion would be measured – it was noted this could be through changes in queue lengths, journey times, demand/capacity ratios. It was noted demand/capacity ratios could be extracted for both the road and rail network.</p>
3.6		<p>JS noted a focus on indicators linked to model outputs potentially overlooked active travel modes. There was discussion around the possibility to extract from the model the distribution of short-distance trip as a proxy for sifting in terms of active travel potential.</p>
3.7		<p>There was discussion around peak and off-peak periods in relation to the RTS indicator around car users reportedly affected by congestion between 0700 – 0900. It was suggested the focus on the AM peak likely reflected this being the worse of the peak periods and inevitably survey related costs. It was noted that the demand constrained nature of the network within the study area in the future may require consideration of the shoulder peak when looking at for example journey time isochrones as a result of peak spreading due to demand exceeding capacity.</p>
3.8		<p>Challenges of hot-spot identification noted when using a demand constrained model. Screenlines extending beyond immediate location of problem will allow overall flow to be viewed across a wider area.</p>
3.9		<p>Comments on the draft region wide objectives to be returned to CH2M HILL (PG) <b><u>by 21 April.</u></b></p>
3.10	Appraisal Lead Commission (CH2M Hill) –	<p>Presentation provided of an example problem analysis focusing on the A720 on the basis this is expected to form a key corridor</p>



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 13 Tuesday 31 March 2015

	A720 Presentation	for analysis and mitigation.
3.11		Outline of key route characteristic, constraints and problem identification based on SRM07 analysis at this stage and to be validated against SRM12 when available.
3.12		<p>Problem headlines (from SRM07 analysis):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 38% rise in traffic volumes by 2024.</li> <li>• 61% increase in journey time by 2024.</li> <li>• 130% increase in delay at key strategic junctions (<i>Newbridge / Hermiston / Sheriffhall / Old Craighall</i>)</li> <li>• Accident rates higher than national average for equivalent road type (N.B. RC queried the basis of the national average – CH2M HILL to follow up).</li> </ul> <p>27% trips not from or to Edinburgh (20% from 'end-to-end').</p> <p>19% trips to and from areas within Edinburgh i.e. 80% trips potentially cross-boundary in nature. Point raised as to whether a trip from Portobello to Sheriffhall would be considered cross-boundary. Discussion highlighted challenges and need to define what constitutes a 'cross-boundary trip' within the context of this study.</p>
4.1	Transport Modelling Commission (SYSTRA)	Demand model and sensitivity tests (impact of changes in fuel costs) being run.
4.2		Bus validation issues and uncertainty in changes arising between data collected in 2007 and 2014. Further analysis required.
4.3		SRM12 and TELMoS model scenarios being run to understand changes required to reflect distribution of housing and employment land. Results of Tests A and B (as defined in the <i>Development of Reference and Future Development Demand Scenarios</i> Technical Note) to be reported at the next WG Meeting.
4.4		Coding of future year in SRM12 under way.
4.5		<p>Key next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Base year coding.</li> <li>- Building forecast years.</li> <li>- Looking at TELMoS model outputs and coding into SRM12.</li> <li>- Coding reference case and do-minimum.</li> </ul>
5	Programme	No update/action.



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 13 Tuesday 31 March 2015

6	Risk Register	No update/action.
7	Other Group Member Updates	<p><b>SESplan</b> – MIR is scheduled to go to Committee on 18 May. Planning Officer meeting held in connection with the Developer Contribution Framework. Meeting to be arranged between SESplan; Transport Scotland; Fife Council; West Lothian Council; CH2M HILL (Julia Gilles) and JMP (John Milligan) w/c 20 April to discuss potential funding mechanisms via developer contributions.</p> <p><b>SEStran</b> – Revised RTS approved by SEStran Board in March. Ministerial submission to follow.</p> <p><b>Fife</b> – Sign off on modelling to determine the impacts of FIFEplan upon trunk roads is required from Transport Scotland. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations now published and effective from 1 March.</p> <p><b>City of Edinburgh</b> – No change with representations received on the Second Proposed Plan to be considered at the next scheduled meeting of Planning Committee on 14 May.</p> <p><b>West Lothian</b> – No change with report on the MIR consultation to be presented to Committee in May. Following this it is intended that the Proposed Plan will be published for consultation in Autumn.</p> <p><b>Midlothian</b> – agreed publication date for the MLDP of 14 May 2015. The plan will be on deposit for representations for 6 weeks until 26 June.</p> <p><b>Scottish Borders</b> – no change on LDP which is presently with the Reporter and final document expected in late summer. Preparation of a new LTS is under way.</p> <p><b>East Lothian</b> – No update.</p>
8.1	AOB	Services Brief to be issued by TS to AECOM for the SRM model audit.
9	Date of Next Meeting	<p>Meeting 14 – 28 April</p> <p>Meeting 15 – 26 May</p> <p>Meeting 16 – 30 June</p>



## **SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal**

**Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB**

**Transport Group Meeting 13 Tuesday 31 March 2015**

### **PRINCIPAL ACTION POINTS**

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
		Comments on draft region wide study objectives to be returned to CH2M HILL.	ALL	21 April
		Developer contributions meeting to be arranged between SESPlan; TS; CH2M HILL and JMP w/c 20 April.	SESPlan	24 April
		AECOM to be issued with SRM Audit Services Brief.	TS	Immediately
		SYSTRA to discuss real time bus data with SEStran/CEC	SYSTRA / SEStran / SESplan	ASAP



# SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 13 Tuesday 31 March 2015

## Working Group Membership

Transport Sub-Group Members		Contact Details	
Agency/Authority/Company	Name	Phone	email
Transport Scotland	Alison Irvine	0141 272 7590	<a href="mailto:alison.irvine@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">alison.irvine@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Adam Priestley	0141 272 7596	<a href="mailto:adam.priestley@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">adam.priestley@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Paul Junik	0141 272 7252	<a href="mailto:Paul.Junik@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">Paul.Junik@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Stephen Cragg		<a href="mailto:Stephen.Cragg@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">Stephen.Cragg@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	Alex Macaulay	0131 524 5152	<a href="mailto:Alex.Macaulay@sestran.gov.uk">Alex.Macaulay@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	Alastair Short	0131 524 5150	<a href="mailto:alastair.short@sestran.gov.uk">alastair.short@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	John Saunders	0131 524 5166	<a href="mailto:John.saunders@sestran.gov.uk">John.saunders@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SESPlan	Graeme Marsden	0131 524 5162	<a href="mailto:Graeme.Marsden@sesplan.gov.uk">Graeme.Marsden@sesplan.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Graeme.Marsden@sestran.gov.uk">Graeme.Marsden@sestran.gov.uk</a>
West Lothian Council	Chris Nicol	01506 282326	<a href="mailto:Chris.Nicol@westlothian.gov.uk">Chris.Nicol@westlothian.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Andrew McBride	0131 529 3523	<a href="mailto:Andrew.McBride@edinburgh.gov.uk">Andrew.McBride@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Ewan Kennedy	0131 469 3575	<a href="mailto:Ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk">Ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Keith Miller		<a href="mailto:Keith.Miller@edinburgh.gov.uk">Keith.Miller@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
East Lothian Council	Grant Talac	01620 827 827	<a href="mailto:gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Midlothian Council	Lindsay Haddow		<a href="mailto:lindsay.haddow@midlothian.gov.uk">lindsay.haddow@midlothian.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Lindsay.Haddow@midlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">Lindsay.Haddow@midlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Midlothian Council	Neil Wallace	0131 271 3459	<a href="mailto:neil.wallace@midlothian.gov.uk">neil.wallace@midlothian.gov.uk</a>
Fife Council	Mark Barrett		<a href="mailto:Mark.Barrett@fife.qcsx.gov.uk">Mark.Barrett@fife.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Fife Council	John Mitchell		<a href="mailto:john.mitchell@fife.qcsx.gov.uk">john.mitchell@fife.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Scottish Borders	Graeme Johnstone	01835 825138	<a href="mailto:gjohnstone@scotborders.gov.uk">gjohnstone@scotborders.gov.uk</a>

Appointed Consultants		Contact Details	
Company	Name	Phone	email
CH2MHILL	Julia Gilles	0141 552 2000	<a href="mailto:Julia.Gilles@ch2m.com">Julia.Gilles@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Colm Smyth		<a href="mailto:Colm.Smyth@ch2m.com">Colm.Smyth@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Denise Angus		<a href="mailto:Denise.Angus@ch2m.com">Denise.Angus@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Pamela Gidney		<a href="mailto:Pamela.Gidney@ch2m.com">Pamela.Gidney@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Chris Buck		<a href="mailto:Christopher.Buck@ch2m.com">Christopher.Buck@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Andrew Kelly		<a href="mailto:Andrew.Kelly@ch2m.com">Andrew.Kelly@ch2m.com</a>
SYSTRA	Jeff Davidson	0131 240 8926	<a href="mailto:jdavidson@systra.com">jdavidson@systra.com</a>
SYSTRA	Claire Mackay		<a href="mailto:cmackay@systra.com">cmackay@systra.com</a>
AECOM	Richard Cann	0131 301 8761	<a href="mailto:richard.cann@aecom.com">richard.cann@aecom.com</a>
JMP	John Milligan		<a href="mailto:John.Milligan@jmp.co.uk">John.Milligan@jmp.co.uk</a>



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 14 Tuesday 28 April 2015

### Attendees

Transport Scotland	Adam Priestley (AP) (Chair)
SESplan	Graeme Marsden (GM)
SEStran	John Saunders (JS)
SEStran	Alistair Short (AS)
Fife Council	Mark Barrett (MB)
East Lothian Council	Grant Talac (GT)
City of Edinburgh Council	Keith Miller (KM)
City of Edinburgh Council	Andrew McBride (AMB)
CH2M HILL	Colm Smyth (CS)
CH2M HILL	Andrew Kelly (AK)
SYSTRA	Jeff Davidson (JD)
DSC	Andy Dobson (AD)

### Apologies

Transport Scotland	Alison Irvine (AI)
Transport Scotland	Stephen Cragg (SC) / Paul Junik (PJ)
SEStran	Alex Macaulay (AMC)
City of Edinburgh Council	Ewan Kennedy (EK)
West Lothian Council	Chris Nicol (CN)
Fife Council	John Mitchell (JM)
Midlothian Council	Neil Wallace (NW)
Midlothian Council	Lindsay Haddow (LH)
Scottish Borders Council	Graeme Johnstone (GJ)
CH2M HILL	Julia Gilles (JG)
AECOM	Richard Cann (RC)
JMP Consultants	John Milligan (JM)

### PRINCIPAL ISSUES

Ref.	On-going Issue	Update/Comment
3.1	Presentation on early work on the Land Use Transport Model interaction process (DSC)	AD presented the progress to date on the land use and transport model interaction process using LATIS.
3.2		The presentation briefly explained the TELMoS model, its underlying assumptions and its uses.
3.3		Initial runs of the model were performed based on REFERENCE DEMAND tests A and B as set out in the <i>Methodology for the Development of Reference and Future Development Demand Scenarios</i> Technical Note.
3.4		The results indicated for the period to 2024:



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 14 Tuesday 28 April 2015

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– 40,950 additional households (7% increase)</li><li>– 17,950 increase in population (1% increase)</li><li>– more smaller households, fewer larger ones</li><li>– 14,750 increase in jobs (3% increase)</li><li>– Take up of planned development<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Residential – all built</li><li>– Office – c40% built</li><li>– Industry – c25% built</li></ul></li><li>– Distribution of development influenced by<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Accessibility</li><li>– Transport schemes</li></ul></li></ul>
3.5		<p>The following issues were highlighted:</p> <p>Over-supply of new employment sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Equivalent of c30-40% increase in floorspace</li><li>• 84% of identified sites are in Fife and West Lothian</li><li>• Is provision based upon any assessment of demand?</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– The Economic Scenario<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SESPLAN area takes a share of national economic growth</li><li>• 5% growth in employment nationally 2012-2024</li><li>• Is this figure consistent with scenarios used in Strategic Development Planning?</li></ul></li><li>– The Demographic Scenario<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SESPLAN area takes a share of national population change</li><li>• Are there local figures that we should be applying?</li></ul></li></ul>
3.6		<p>The next steps will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complete work on reference case</li><li>• Appraise non-committed sites</li></ul>
3.7		<p>The presentation will be circulated amongst the WG and comments invited.</p>
3.8		<p>It was questioned how the results on the take up of planned developments compares with past trends. These figures were not immediately available but the trend will be examined for future results.</p>
3.9		<p>There was some discussion about the underlying economic assumptions used in the model. GM would pass on Oxford</p>



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 14 Tuesday 28 April 2015

		Economics scenario which were used to for the different scenarios in the Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA) 2014. AD to consider.
4	Appraisal Lead Commission (CH2M Hill)	Comments on Draft Regional Objectives have been received and are being considered. An amended set of Objectives will be issued in due course for agreement.
4.1		Limited appraisal of SRM07 ongoing. Awaiting SRM12 results for Hotspot appraisal and intervention investigations to proceed.
4.1	Transport Modelling Commission (SYSTRA)	SRM12 sensitivity tests are being amended and refined.
4.2		Bus validation issues and uncertainty in changes arising between data collected in 2007 and 2014. Further analysis ongoing.
4.3		Bus Journey time data is being investigated. SYSTRA given contact details of Stuart Milne in CEC.
4.4		Coding of future year reference case schemes in SRM12 progressing.
		A check of rail patronage data was requested especially with regard to pinch points in the rail network.
4.5		Assistance with TELMoS runs using TMfS ongoing.
5	Programme	Programme will be updated once TELMoS runs are finalised
6	Risk Register	Risk Register will be updated and recirculated following TELMoS results.
7	Other Group Member Updates	<p><b>SESplan</b> – MIR is scheduled to go to Committee on 18 May. MIR to be verified by LAs. Consultation for 8 weeks to start mid-July. Meeting to be arranged between SESplan, Transport Scotland, Fife Council, West Lothian Council, CH2M HILL and JMP prior to next WG meeting to discuss potential funding mechanisms via developer contributions.</p> <p><b>SEStran</b> – As previous. Revised RTS approved by SEStran Board in March. Ministerial submission to follow.</p> <p><b>Fife</b> – As previous. Sign off on modelling to determine the impacts of FIFEplan upon trunk roads is required from Transport Scotland. Final report is imminent.</p>



## SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 14 Tuesday 28 April 2015

		<p><b>City of Edinburgh</b> – No change with representations received on the Second Proposed Plan to be considered at the next scheduled meeting of Planning Committee on 14 May. CEC considering interventions at Maybury Junction as well as the on-going IBG TA.</p> <p><b>West Lothian</b> – TBC</p> <p><b>Midlothian</b> – TBC</p> <p><b>Scottish Borders</b> – TBC.</p> <p><b>East Lothian</b> – Working through MIR representations for end of May. Currently focussing on Education issues/differences between the compact and alternative strategies.</p>
8.1	AOB	None.
9	Date of Next Meeting	Meeting 15 – 26 May Meeting 16 – 30 June



## **SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal**

**Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB**

**Transport Group Meeting 14 Tuesday 28 April 2015**

### **PRINCIPAL ACTION POINTS**

<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
		Amended Draft Region wide study objectives to be reissued following comments.	CH2M	26 May
		Developer contributions meeting to be arranged between SESPlan; TS; CH2M HILL and JMP w/c 20 April.	SESPlan	26 May
		SYSTRA to discuss real time bus data with SEStran/CEC	SYSTRA / SEStran / SESplan	Ongoing
		Risk Register to be reissued	CH2M	26 May
		Programme to be reviewed and key dates reissued.	CH2M	Asap



# SESPlan Cross-Boundary Transport and Land Use Appraisal

Claremont House 130 East Claremont Street Edinburgh EH7 4LB

Transport Group Meeting 14 Tuesday 28 April 2015

## Working Group Membership

Transport Sub-Group Members		Contact Details	
Agency/Authority/Company	Name	Phone	email
Transport Scotland	Alison Irvine	0141 272 7590	<a href="mailto:alison.irvine@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">alison.irvine@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Adam Priestley	0141 272 7596	<a href="mailto:adam.priestley@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">adam.priestley@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Paul Junik	0141 272 7252	<a href="mailto:Paul.Junik@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">Paul.Junik@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
Transport Scotland	Stephen Cragg		<a href="mailto:Stephen.Cragg@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk">Stephen.Cragg@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	Alex Macaulay	0131 524 5152	<a href="mailto:Alex.Macaulay@sestran.gov.uk">Alex.Macaulay@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	Alastair Short	0131 524 5150	<a href="mailto:alastair.short@sestran.gov.uk">alastair.short@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SEStran	John Saunders	0131 524 5166	<a href="mailto:John.saunders@sestran.gov.uk">John.saunders@sestran.gov.uk</a>
SESPlan	Graeme Marsden	0131 524 5162	<a href="mailto:Graeme.Marsden@sesplan.gov.uk">Graeme.Marsden@sesplan.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Graeme.Marsden@sestran.gov.uk">Graeme.Marsden@sestran.gov.uk</a>
West Lothian Council	Chris Nicol	01506 282326	<a href="mailto:Chris.Nicol@westlothian.gov.uk">Chris.Nicol@westlothian.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Andrew McBride	0131 529 3523	<a href="mailto:Andrew.McBride@edinburgh.gov.uk">Andrew.McBride@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Ewan Kennedy	0131 469 3575	<a href="mailto:Ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk">Ewan.kennedy@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
City of Edinburgh Council	Keith Miller		<a href="mailto:Keith.Miller@edinburgh.gov.uk">Keith.Miller@edinburgh.gov.uk</a>
East Lothian Council	Grant Talac	01620 827 827	<a href="mailto:gtalac@eastlothian.gov.uk">gtalac@eastlothian.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">gtalac@eastlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Midlothian Council	Lindsay Haddow		<a href="mailto:lindsay.haddow@midlothian.gov.uk">lindsay.haddow@midlothian.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Lindsay.Haddow@midlothian.qcsx.gov.uk">Lindsay.Haddow@midlothian.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Midlothian Council	Neil Wallace	0131 271 3459	<a href="mailto:neil.wallace@midlothian.gov.uk">neil.wallace@midlothian.gov.uk</a>
Fife Council	Mark Barrett		<a href="mailto:Mark.Barrett@fife.qcsx.gov.uk">Mark.Barrett@fife.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Fife Council	John Mitchell		<a href="mailto:john.mitchell@fife.qcsx.gov.uk">john.mitchell@fife.qcsx.gov.uk</a>
Scottish Borders	Graeme Johnstone	01835 825138	<a href="mailto:gjohnstone@scotborders.gov.uk">gjohnstone@scotborders.gov.uk</a>

Appointed Consultants		Contact Details	
Company	Name	Phone	email
CH2MHILL	Julia Gilles	0141 552 2000	<a href="mailto:Julia.Gilles@ch2m.com">Julia.Gilles@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Colm Smyth		<a href="mailto:Colm.Smyth@ch2m.com">Colm.Smyth@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Denise Angus		<a href="mailto:Denise.Angus@ch2m.com">Denise.Angus@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Pamela Gidney		<a href="mailto:Pamela.Gidney@ch2m.com">Pamela.Gidney@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Chris Buck		<a href="mailto:Christopher.Buck@ch2m.com">Christopher.Buck@ch2m.com</a>
CH2MHILL	Andrew Kelly		<a href="mailto:Andrew.Kelly@ch2m.com">Andrew.Kelly@ch2m.com</a>
SYSTRA	Jeff Davidson	0131 240 8926	<a href="mailto:jdavidson@systra.com">jdavidson@systra.com</a>
SYSTRA	Claire Mackay		<a href="mailto:cmackay@systra.com">cmackay@systra.com</a>
AECOM	Richard Cann	0131 301 8761	<a href="mailto:richard.cann@aecom.com">richard.cann@aecom.com</a>
JMP	John Milligan		<a href="mailto:John.Milligan@jmp.co.uk">John.Milligan@jmp.co.uk</a>



## 1. HS2 Update

HS2 campaigners in Buckinghamshire face having to '[pay up](#)' for speaking out about the high-speed line while the election campaign is happening. The Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act 2014 means people who campaign on an issue which goes against one party but supports another have to pay a fee.

Stop HS2's Joe Rukin says they will break the law:

"We're going to keep saying 'stop HS', whether there's an election coming up or not and, as a result, we'll be breaking the law.

"We've got no choice because we're not going to be silenced."

Stop HS2 has produced various designs of posters and window stickers with the common theme of "We won't vote for any party that supports HS2".

Under the provisions of what the group call the 'Gagging Act', organisations and individuals engaged in joint campaigns which have the same objective, such as over 100 local actions groups and other organisations working together to get HS2 cancelled, have to provide figures for expenditure which can be interpreted as intended to promote or procure electoral success at any relevant election for parties or candidates who hold (or do not hold) particular opinions or who advocate (or do not advocate) particular policies.

Plans for a new rail link to [Heathrow Airport](#) as part of HS2 have been ruled out by the Secretary of State for Transport Mr Patrick McLoughlin MP.

Responding to a written question by Dominic Grieve MP about the Heathrow spur, Mr McLoughlin said: "I would now like to make clear that we do not intend to build the spur as part of Phase 1 or 2 of the HS2 scheme".

The minister cited the Davies Commission's report on future UK airport capacity findings - published in November - which "indicated that an HS2 spur is highly unlikely to be necessary to support any expansion of Heathrow airport".

A study by [No Palaver](#), a leading provider of accounting services to contractors, has found a steep rise in rail construction staff's pay from 2012 to 2014. Rail construction workers now have the highest average weekly pay in the construction industry, rising from £492.40 in 2012 to £856.50 in 2014. Average pay in the sector, has only risen from £582.50 to £587.70 per week between 2012 and 2014.

In November, a study by the University of Dundee claimed HS2 will need an average monthly workforce of 11,580 over the 15 years it will take to build. Anti-HS2 campaigners



have extrapolated from this to claim the wage increase would add more than £3bn to the current £50bn official cost of the project.

Stop HS2 campaign manager Joe Rukin said: "Ever since HS2 was first announced, the projected costs have gone up and this will only continue".

HS2 Ltd spokesman Alastair Cowan said: "It is too early to say whether these findings will have an impact or not. It is really important to remember that this is a long term project and during that time wages will go up and down many times."

## **2. Media Update**

The Yorkshire Post reported, 04/03/15, that officials have been told to re-write a major [transport plan](#) for the North which is expected to be a key element of the Budget later this month. The Chancellor was due to be presented 04/03/15 with an interim report on the plan ahead of the Budget on 18/03/15. That deadline will be missed after northern council leaders expressed concern that the first draft was too vague in terms of identifying particular transport schemes and timetables for their delivery.

The Treasury is also being pressed to include firm commitments on funding for the plan in the Budget. One source familiar with the discussions said the process was likely to continue "up to the wire".

The plan is being drawn up by Transport for the North, a body which brings together northern councils, the Department for Transport, the Highways Agency, Network Rail and HS2. It is likely to be suggested that Transport for the North should become a permanent body overseeing transport strategy across Yorkshire, the North West and North East and informing Government policy.

## **3. High Speed Rail Scotland Group**

No news of import to report.

## **4. Edinburgh- Glasgow High Speed Rail**

No news of import to report.



## 1. HS2 Update

The Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne made various mentions of HS2 when delivering the [Budget](#) on 18/03/15. In addition to publishing The Northern Powerhouse document the Government would fund a High Speed Rail Investment Summit in Birmingham, which will be delivered jointly by UK Trade and Investment and Marketing Birmingham and which will focus overseas investment to the UK on regeneration and supply chain opportunities created around HS2.

Plans to revolutionise travel in the north, including a new 'TransNorth' rail system and new road investments, were set out by George Osborne, Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg, Transport Secretary Patrick McLoughlin and northern city leaders on 20/03/15. [The Northern Powerhouse: One Agenda, One Economy, One North](#) set out plans to:

- slash journey times between major northern cities with investment in high speed rail
- develop new east-west road connections including a road tunnel under the Peak District
- introduce Oyster-style smart travel cards and simpler fares across the north

Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne said:

"Connecting up the great cities of the north is at the heart of our plan to build a northern powerhouse. This report has the potential to revolutionise transport in the north and we will work closely with TfN to help make it a reality.

"From backing high speed rail to introducing simpler fares right across the north, our ambitious plans for transport means we will deliver a truly national recovery where every part of the country will share in Britain's prosperity."

The House of Commons High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill Select Committee published its [First Special Report of Session 2014–15](#) 23/03/15. The report was published as guidance for the succeeding committee in the next Parliament (although each member is standing for re-election and will be member by default if returned by their respective electors); accordingly it is mostly concerned with the procedures of the petitioning process. However the Committee records that its priority is home purchase; in particular, the urgent necessity for the Need to Sell scheme to function properly, and efficiently. The Committee wants evidence that this is happening substantially before the end of the select committee process.

The House of Lords Economic Affairs Select Committee published its report on HS2, [The Economics of High Speed 2](#), this week [25/03/15]. The Committee concluded that the Government has not made a convincing case for HS2 and must do so before Parliament passes the Bill to enable the construction of the first stage of the railway to begin.

In its [press release](#), the Committee made the following points:



The Committee supports transport infrastructure investment. However, at a cost of £50bn HS2 will be one of the most expensive infrastructure projects ever undertaken in the UK. The Committee argues that the Government have not yet made a convincing case for why it is necessary.

The Government sets two main objectives for HS2: increasing capacity on the railway and rebalancing the economy but, concludes the report, it fails to make a convincing case for either.

### **On capacity**

Full information on railway usage has not been made publicly available by the Government, on the grounds of commercial sensitivity. The evidence shows that long distance trains arriving at and departing from Euston are, on average, just 43 per cent full and even during peak times are only between 50 and 60 per cent full. Overcrowding is largely a problem confined to Friday evenings and weekends on long-distance trains and to London-bound commuter trains.

There are less expensive options to remedy these problems than HS2 but these have not been properly reviewed.

### **On rebalancing the economy**

The Committee agrees with the objective to rebalance the economy but disputes the claim that HS2 is the way to achieve it. The evidence from other countries, such as France, shows that the capital city is the biggest beneficiary from high speed rail.

London would most likely be the biggest beneficiary from HS2. The Committee argues there is a strong case for improving the trans-Pennine links or building the northern legs of HS2 first, both of which could be a better way of rebalancing the economy than building the southern leg of HS2.

### **On cost**

The Committee says that the cost per mile of HS2 is estimated to be up to nine higher than the cost of constructing high speed lines in France. The Committee suggests that, if HS2 is to go ahead, the cost could be reduced by building it to run at 200 mph, as in Europe, instead of 250 mph, terminating the line at Old Oak Common or learning lessons from France to reduce the cost of construction.

The report suggests that the huge public subsidy to HS2, an estimated net £31.5 billion, conflicts with the Government's declared objective of making rail less dependent on public subsidy. The Committee argues that such large expenditure should be considered against the background of financial restraint. It queries whether the users of the proposed line, mainly business travellers, should carry more of the cost than is currently proposed.



The report also points out that the cost-benefit analysis for HS2 relies on out-of-date evidence, some dating back to 1994. The Department of Transport admits that fresh evidence is required and the Committee believes this should be provided before Parliament passes the HS2 enabling legislation. The Government's claim that the cost-benefit analysis placed HS2 in the high value-for-money category was disputed by a number of witnesses, who assessed it as being in the bottom 10 per cent of projects.

It is expected that the enabling legislation for HS2 Phase 1 will come to the Lords in the next Parliament and receive Royal Assent by the end of 2016. The committee concludes that this should not happen unless the Government has answered the important questions its report raises.

## **2. Media Update**

The Birmingham Post, 25/03/15, reported that Shadow Chancellor [Ed Balls](#) had revealed Labour could delay or scale back plans for a new high speed rail network - and build a new line linking the North East and North West first.

Labour would ask “big questions” about whether existing plans for HS2 phase two made any sense. Mr Balls said: “Getting on and doing east-west now is the priority.”

## **3. High Speed Rail Scotland Group**

No news of import to report.

## **4. Edinburgh- Glasgow High Speed Rail**

No news of import to report.



## 1. HS2 Update

Former First Minister, the Rt Hon. Alex Salmond MSP has suggested the Scottish National Party could demand that work on HS2, [starts in Scotland](#) as a price for backing a minority Labour government.

Speaking on the Andrew Marr Show on BBC1 on 22/03/15, Alex Salmond was pressed to set out what the SNP's terms might be if Ed Balls, as Labour chancellor, refused to negotiate a budget package in advance with the SNP and challenged the nationalists to vote it down.

"So I propose an amendment to [that] budget," the former FM said. "Let's say instead of this very, very slow train coming up from London, I think we should start it from Edinburgh/Glasgow to Newcastle and I put that down as a budget amendment. It would have substantial support from the north of England and other parties and would carry the House of Commons. What does Mr Balls do then?"

As part of the [Plaid Cymru](#) election launch, 27/03/15, Jonathan Edwards said getting Wales' rightful share from the High Speed Rail (HS2) project would be one of his key priorities if re-elected to Parliament.

Any money which is spent on policy fields already devolved to the National Assembly for Wales, such as Health, Education and Transport, automatically triggers a Barnett Consequential – equivalent to five per cent of the total cost – for Wales. From HS2 this would imply between £2 and 4 billion. However, Westminster has deemed it to be a 'UK-wide' project meaning there will be no Consequentials.

After four years of campaigning, Jonathan Edwards says his efforts resulted in the Welsh Government being awarded £35 million from the HS2 project spend this financial year. The Treasury has since said it would be giving no more money to Wales.

Ed Balls increased [uncertainty](#) surrounding HS2, 31/03/15, suggesting that a new trans-Pennine rail route [HS3] could be built before Phase 2. The shadow chancellor said a Labour government would go ahead with Phase 1 from London to Birmingham on its current timetable. But he said there were "big questions" about the subsequent part of the "Y-shaped" route, with separate new lines from Birmingham to Manchester and Birmingham to Leeds. "On the second phase there are big questions about whether or not we have the best value for money plan, not just on congestion but on connectivity," Mr Balls told regional journalists at an event last week. The next government would have to "stand back" and re-examine the scheme, he said.

The intervention is the second time that Mr Balls has challenged the wisdom of HS2. In September 2013 he accused David Cameron of "pride and vanity" in his determination to press ahead with the project at any cost. There could be better ways to spend the estimated £50 bn cost of the project, Mr Balls said at the time. The shadow chancellor had since fallen in line with his party's official stance, which is in favour of the entire HS2 project.



Mr Balls said it would be “absurd” to wait until HS2 was completed before going ahead with a so-called HS3 – the trans-Pennine route from Manchester to Leeds.

“I think the idea that we wait to do the east west upgrade until after we have done the second phase of north-south is topsy-turvy,” he said. “It is a plan with no economic or business logic at all.”

A spokesman for Mr Balls said he was merely arguing that it would be a mistake to wait until all of HS2 was completed before beginning preliminary work on an east-west route.

“We would want to sit down with David Higgins and HS2 Ltd to see exactly how we can deliver all transport infrastructure in a quick way and in a way that helps the whole country,” he said. “Getting on and doing east-west now is the priority”.

## 2. Media Update

The Lichfield Mercury reported, 02/04/15, that Whittington and Lichfield's [Stop HS2](#) action group has unveiled a new banner to mark the fifth anniversary of the project's inception.



## 3. High Speed Rail Scotland Group

No news of import to report.

## 4. Edinburgh- Glasgow High Speed Rail

No news of import to report.



## 1. HS2 Update

In the last fortnight all major parties competing in Scotland in the UK general election published their election manifestos. The following excerpts concern HS2.

The [Scottish National Party manifesto](#) argued that they would “back budget plans to invest more in the infrastructure of Scotland and the north of England, including the commissioning of high speed rail linking Glasgow, Edinburgh and the north of England”.

The SNP would also seek “adequate transport infrastructure investment, with a particular aim of improving transport and communication links across the north of these isles”. This would include:

Connecting Scotland to HS2 as a priority, with construction beginning in Scotland as well as England, and a high speed connection between Glasgow, Edinburgh and the north of England as part of any high-speed rail network. In addition, we will seek additional investment to support a more rapid roll out of superfast broadband and 4G across Scotland and to support wider and affordable access to the internet in our most disadvantaged communities, and for a Universal Service Obligation to be applied to telecoms and broadband providers ensuring everyone is able to access the communications they need.

It goes onto suggest that SNP MPs will seek to “rebalance the UK for the benefit of people in the north and west of these isles”. The SNP argue that:

Investment in so-called “national” projects in London, should be subject to normal consequential funding for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and that the North of England, in particular, should see a significant increase in infrastructure expenditure. Alongside the development of High Speed Rail from London to the Midlands, we will seek a commitment to deliver High Speed Rail between Glasgow, Edinburgh and the north of England as the first stage of a link connecting Scotland and the north of England to London. High Speed Rail should be constructed both from the north down and from the south up.

The [Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party manifesto](#) did not contain any reference to HS2 but the [Conservative Party Manifesto](#) made several references. The Conservatives would:

Build High Speed 2 – the new North-South railway linking up London with the West Midlands, Leeds and Manchester – and develop High Speed 3 to join up the North.

Invest £38 billion in our railway network in the five years to 2019. Electrification of the railways is a key part of our investment programme, with work already underway across the North, the Midlands, and South Wales; there are plans to go further in the rest of the country, including East Anglia and the South West. In



addition to rolling out our national high-speed rail network, with High Speed 2 and High Speed 3, we will complete the construction of the new east-west Crossrail across Greater London, and push forward with plans for Crossrail 2, a new rail route running through London and connecting Surrey and Hertfordshire.

Replace locally any biodiversity lost in the construction of High Speed 2.

The [Scottish Labour Party manifesto](#) indicated their support for HS2:

We will continue to support the construction of High Speed Two, but keep costs down. This will provide an important new connection to Scotland from England. At the same time, we will use the new powers of the Smith Commission to legislate to allow a “People’s Scotrail”, to make sure profits from our railways are reinvested in better services and cheaper fares, not lining the pockets of shareholders.

The [Labour Party manifesto](#) placed HS2 in the context of the North:

We will continue to support the construction of High Speed Two, but keep costs down, and take action to improve and expand rail links across the North to boost its regional economies.

The [Liberal Democrat manifesto](#) made several references to HS2. The Liberal Democrats would:

Enable more people to travel with rail upgrades across the country and HS2.

Develop a comprehensive plan to electrify the overwhelming majority of the UK rail network, reopen smaller stations, restore twin-track lines to major routes and proceed with HS2, as the first stage of a high-speed rail network to Scotland.

Support options for an intercity cycleway along the HS2 route, within the overall budget for the project.

The [Scottish Green Party manifesto](#) did not contain any reference to HS2 but the [Green Party manifesto](#) stated that the Greens would not support HS2:

The money to be spent on this hugely expensive project, which at best will reduce journey times for a few passengers, would be much better spent on improving the conventional rail connections between various major cities, improving the resilience of the existing network to climate change and reopening lines and stations that have been closed.

The manifesto also noted that “instead of prestige projects such HS2 and new runways, we need to prioritise local transport and make sure it is accessible to everybody”.

The [UKIP manifesto](#) made various references to HS2. UKIP argued that HS2 was poor value for money:



Taxpayers could get so much better value for their money if we left the EU, made reasonable cuts to the foreign aid budget, replaced the unfair Barnett formula, scrapped HS2, ended 'health tourism' and cut the cost of government.

Save £4 billion a year in capital expenditure by scrapping the HS2 vanity project, which will benefit the few at the expense of many.

The estimated cost is already £50 billion and HS2 Ltd is planning to spend over £800m in 2015/2016, before the project even gets the final go-ahead. The Government's own estimates show the cost will never be recouped.

HS2 is an unaffordable white elephant and, given other, far more pressing calls on public expenditure, such as the NHS, social care and defence, not to mention the need to reduce the deficit, it must face the axe.

UKIP also argued that HS2 was based on poor evidence:

In October 2013, Lord Mandelson, speaking in the House of Lords about the Labour government's decision to instigate the HS2 high-speed rail-link confessed that: "It was a political trophy project justified on flimsy evidence."

HS2 is running out of control. UKIP will stop this flawed vanity scheme in its tracks.

The argument that HS2 is needed to provide extra capacity has just weeks ago been questioned by the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee, which concluded that: 'the Government has not made a convincing case for why this particular project should go ahead.'

There is barely any evidence that HS2 will reduce the North-South divide: the north would get much quicker and higher benefit from investment in the infrastructure between northern towns and cities.

Potential environmental damage and blight was a further concern for UKIP:

HS2 will blight thousands of homes and wreak irreparable environmental damage across large tracts of central England.

## **2. Media Update**

The [Yorkshire Post](#) reported, 17/04/15, that Sir David Attenborough supports the campaign to have the Walton Hall estate recognized for its cultural importance by the United Nations. Walton Hall, home of 19<sup>th</sup> century naturalist Charles Waterton, will be passed by HS2 leading to fears that the world's first nature reserve will be despoiled. In the UK, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport is responsible for nominating sites for UNESCO World Heritage status. Approval could take as long as ten years.



The [Bucks Herald](#) reported, 17/04/15, a new ComRes poll that showed only 22% of the public are in favour of HS2 at its current cost of £50 billion, with 43% putting it as their last priority in a list of eight spending options. Just 1% of British adults said HS2 is their top priority for government spending, the lowest of all options tested. The Bucks Herald suggested this vindicated the positions of UKIP and the Green party.

### **3. High Speed Rail Scotland Group**

No news of import to report.

### **4. Edinburgh- Glasgow High Speed Rail**

No news of import to report.



## 1. HS2 Update

Patrick McLoughlin was returned as an MP and remains Secretary of State for [Transport](#). McLoughlin will likely be overseeing a major push into delivery of HS2 as its first phase hybrid bill passes through parliament. The intention is for it to attain Royal Assent next year.

The parliamentary process is not considered an insurmountable challenge as the scheme has maintained cross party support for years, with dissent being limited to the details rather than the overall question of whether the UK needs more high speed rail.

Labour has supported the project, but if the party had regained office in the election, its ministers were likely to have taken a close look at the cost of the scheme and also considered whether Phase 2 was feasible. Former shadow chancellor Ed Balls, who was not returned, warned there would be "no blank cheque" for HS2.

The Green Party and UKIP opposed HS2 and returned one MP each.

[Campaigners](#) have vowed to continue the fight to stop HS2 going ahead.

## 2. Media Update

Commentating on the return of David Lidington MP, the [Bucks Herald](#) [13/05/15] noted that:

There's no doubting the strength of feeling against HS2, but it wasn't as big a [sic] vote winner as the Greens and UKIP, who are both against the project, would have hoped. Tory David Lidington said UKIP voters were more likely to mention immigration to him on the doorstep than HS2...

While such a result will do nothing to make the government reconsider the scheme, it will hopefully silence all those who sneer at the 'self-interested nimbys' who oppose the line. When push came to shove, the Vale electorate voted for what they perceived to be in the national interest, not necessarily their own.

## 3. High Speed Rail Scotland Group

Price Waterhouse Coopers visited the Forth Road Crossing 12/05/15 to learn from the project team there. This was prompted by the supply chain event (which some HSRS members attended) with Sir David Higgins in January 2015. PWC are conducting an international cost benchmarking study for HS2 Ltd, looking across rail and other major projects.

## 4. Edinburgh- Glasgow High Speed Rail

No news of import to report.



## **Network Rail**

### **Inclusive Design Strategy –Draft**

#### **Comments by SEStran**

SEStran is a Regional Transport Partnership covering eight authorities in the south east of Scotland. An important element of our activities is trying to ensure equality of access to public transport for all users especially those with some sort of disability. Our Equalities Forum has been actively involved in considering access issues in the redesigns of Waverley Station and Haymarket Station. Experience from this involvement indicates that the basic appreciation of the need for accessibility measures is understood, but the mechanisms for meaningful input into design issues and implementation of measures is more problematic. It was only through persistent lobbying by our forum members that some of the measures now incorporated in the designs were considered.

The proposals identified in the Draft Inclusive Design Strategy are very much welcomed and will hopefully lead to consistency throughout the network. An important example of this requirement is disabled access to platforms where access is required at both the beginning and end of the journey. As highlighted in section 2.2 it is not only the physical environment that is important, but the ability of staff to help if required, especially at large stations such as Waverley. The booking of assistance is an obvious disincentive to travel by train. SEStran has recently been looking at the inconsistency of acceptance of various sizes of wheelchairs/scooters by various train operators, with the intention of publishing advice on our web site. Issues such as this add to the uncertainty in planning a rail journey and consistent advice and appreciation of the issues would be welcome. There are obvious overlaps with the policies and strategies of the Train Operating companies. It is important that there is a consistent approach and the various strategies/policies complement each other.

The interaction with Local Authorities/ adjacent land owners is a very important issue and ignoring the impact of measures within the station on external accessibility is not helpful. (e.g. Taxi access to Waverley Station and provision of a drop off point at Haymarket Station). A clear process on how these issues should be addressed early on in design process should be identified.

One of the most important elements of the strategy for SEStran is in 4.6, Engaging People. The SEStran Equalities forum is formed of representatives from a variety of disabled/equality groups and is an ideal grouping for consulting/discussing rail access issues. Direct contact with an Access and Inclusion Manager with our Equalities Forum and our Rail Forum would be of considerable benefit.

There is some concern over the composition of the Built Environment Accessibility Panel in that it addresses only one protected characteristic. People with other protected characteristics also have access issues and safety issues that are related to access. Therefore we would recommend considering something more along the lines of an equality forum that can address all equalities issues. It should be made clear that sensory impairments (sight and hearing) will be included in the BEAP. It is also not clear how the BEAP will interact with the RTP forums and the Access Panels facilitated by local authorities, and also the links to MACS and DPTAC. Whilst the expertise of the



BEAP is not questioned, local knowledge can be crucial to getting things right (for example the impacts around using the Calton Road entrance to Waverley Station, which may not be apparent to someone from outside the city). We would therefore like to see a clear commitment to involving local people and groups (such as the SEStran forum) in the production of the “Diversity Impact Assessment” and in any consultations. The Diversity Impact Assessment needs careful consideration to ensure that it provides measurable information to inform decision making rather than just a box ticking exercise.

In general the strategy forms a good basis in establishing a consistency of approach and facilities especially for those with disability. As with all good strategies, it is the implementation that is of prime importance.



### **Fife Local Development Plan: Supplementary Guidance “Making Fife’s Places” SEStran response to consultation**

SEStran welcomes the opportunity to comment on this Supplementary Guidance. This response considers the main document and Appendix G on Transport guidelines for development. SEStran has no comments on Appendices A to F.

#### *“Making Fife’s Places” main document*

In the response to the consultation on the Proposed LDP dated November 2014, SEStran welcomed the approach to spatial strategy and commended in particular para 7 of the Proposed Plan “...*proposing development focused on towns and villages ... Proposals for employment, housing, and local services are, where possible, located in close proximity to encourage sustainable and healthier lifestyles and to make integration with existing communities easier.*”

The response suggested that the forthcoming Fife’s ‘Designing Places’ Supplementary Guidance referred to in the Proposed Plan should highlight the importance of ease of pedestrian and cycle (ie resource efficient) access from new development to local facilities including those in the wider settlement and to local public transport nodes. It emphasised that walking and cycling should be seen as core transport modes for everyday use, not solely recreational.

SEStran therefore welcomes the content of Making Fife’s Places and considers that the importance of active travel and public transport is given appropriate emphasis. The framing of the guidance around the 6 key place making qualities set out in Scottish Planning Policy, Creating Places and Designing Streets is helpful, as is the evaluation checklist in Section 3.2 of the document. It is to be hoped the latter will assist in ensuring effective implementation of the Guidance; as for any policy framework, this will be crucial to achieving its aims and objectives.

Making Fife’s Places appears generally consistent with the SEStran Regional Transport Strategy and Sustainable Development Guidance. The only comment SEStran would make in relation to the content is that more guidance could be given to appropriate densities of development. Density is critical to the concept of ‘walkable neighbourhoods’, to the viability and use of public transport links and to sustainable commercial and retail provision. Higher densities around town centres and transportation hubs and along public transport corridors can contribute significantly to sustainable transport objectives.

#### *Appendix G: Transportation Development Guidelines*

SEStran welcomes Fife Council’s use of the SCOTS National Roads Development Guide as the basis for detailed implementation of the “Designing Streets” principles. It is accepted that there will be some detailed local variations from this Guide that can appropriately be set out in this Appendix.

It is clear that Chapter 2 of Appendix G details these variations while Chapter 3 sets out specific standards for parking provision for Fife. However, the purpose of Chapter 1, which indicates that it lists ‘Street Design principles’ is less obvious. It is unclear if these are variations or additional levels of detail to the SCOTS guide. In either case, the points made in this Chapter would benefit from being clearly cross-referenced to the SCOTS



guide in order to reinforce that this provides the context. This would also emphasise that the points included in this chapter are by no means a comprehensive list of the street design principles that will contribute to making a successful place.

Although it is understood – and clearly explained – that Appendix G is not intended as a free-standing document, it should still give the impression of being a part of the main document, as well as being related to the SCOTS Guide and national policy. SEStran is of the view that currently it gives little sense of reflecting the street design and user hierarchy principles that are emphasised strongly in the SCOTS Guide and in Designing Streets. While this may be more an issue of style than substance, it could still give the idea to users that road layout details are more important than ensuring pedestrians and cyclists are properly catered for. Inclusion of some key text at various points from the SCOTS Guide might help alleviate this.

As a point of detail, Chapter 3 proposes that smaller retail and office developments (<1000m<sup>2</sup>/2500m<sup>2</sup> respectively) have minimum parking standards applied. SEStran would question whether this is appropriate in town centre locations.

### *Conclusion*

“Making Fife’s Places” will be an important and positive component of both local and strategic development planning affecting Fife. It is hoped that the comments above are of help; SEStran would be very happy to discuss these issues further at any time.

SEStran  
Claremont House  
130 East Claremont Street  
Edinburgh EH7 4LB

*Above text submitted online to Fife Council consultation website 25 May 2015*





The Scottish Parliament  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

## Official Report

# INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

Wednesday 22 April 2015







---

**Wednesday 22 April 2015**

**CONTENTS**

<b>FREIGHT TRANSPORT.....</b>	<b>Col. 1</b>
-------------------------------	---------------

---

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT COMMITTEE**  
**9<sup>th</sup> Meeting 2015, Session 4**

**CONVENER**

\*Jim Eadie (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP)

**DEPUTY CONVENER**

\*Adam Ingram (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

\*James Dornan (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)

\*Mary Fee (West Scotland) (Lab)

Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con)

\*Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)

\*David Stewart (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

\*attended

**THE FOLLOWING ALSO PARTICIPATED:**

Michael Cairns (Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership)

Alex Macaulay (South East of Scotland Transport Partnership)

Anne MacKenzie (Network Rail)

Neil MacRae (Highlands and Islands Transport Partnership)

Phil Matthews (Transform Scotland)

Councillor James Stockan (Highlands and Islands Transport Partnership)

Nigel Wunsch (Network Rail)

**CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE**

Steve Farrell

**LOCATION**

The Adam Smith Room (CR5)







# Scottish Parliament

## Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee

*Wednesday 22 April 2015*

*[The Convener opened the meeting at 10:00]*

### Freight Transport

**The Convener (Jim Eadie):** Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the ninth meeting in 2015 of the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee. Everyone present is reminded to switch off mobile phones as they affect the broadcasting system. As meeting papers are provided in digital format, you may see tablets being used during the meeting. No apologies have been received.

Today's only agenda item is for the committee to take further evidence on its freight transport in Scotland inquiry. The committee will hear from two panels, the first featuring regional transport partnerships and Transform Scotland and the second featuring Network Rail.

I welcome Michael Cairns, strategy manager at Tayside and central Scotland transport partnership; Alex Macaulay of south east of Scotland transport partnership; Councillor James Stockan, chair, and Neil MacRae, of Highlands and Islands transport partnership; and Phil Matthews, chair of Transform Scotland.

We will go straight to questions. I will kick off by asking you all to provide the committee with an overview of your organisation and the role that it plays in Scottish freight transport.

**Alex Macaulay (South East of Scotland Transport Partnership):** As the committee will well know, SEStran is one of the seven regional transport partnerships in Scotland—the statutory regional strategic transport planning bodies. We cover an area from the Scottish Borders up to the River Tay, encompassing eight local authorities and a population of about 1.5 million people.

The committee will also be aware that the fundamental role of regional transport partnerships is to produce, monitor and assist with the implementation of a regional transport strategy, which we have done within SEStran. We have recently completed a review of the first regional transport strategy, which includes a wide range of policies and proposals in support of rail freight in the region and connectivity of the region to elsewhere in Scotland and beyond.

A fundamental element of that set of policies and proposals is our firm belief that the estuary of the River Forth and its surrounding land areas form the strategic logistics gateway for Scotland to mainland Europe and beyond. There are strong policies in support of that.

In that context, we are very supportive of the policies within the third national planning framework, which identifies the need for improved water-borne freight in the Forth estuary and is very supportive of Grangemouth as a logistics centre and development centre for central Scotland.

Over the years, we have been involved in a number of European Union-funded freight-based projects, such as the dryport project, the food port project, the logistics optimisation for ports intermodality: network, opportunities, development project—LO-PINOD—and the weastflows project. Last year, under the committee's former convener, we joined with partners in the weastflows project to give a presentation to a number of committee members on the outputs from it.

Those projects have identified a number of areas where improvements to freight logistics could be beneficial to the Scottish economy. For example in the dryport project, we have completed appraisals under the Scottish transport appraisal guidance for the Levenmouth rail link for the extension of passenger and freight services down to Levenmouth, and for the extension of the Stirling to Alloa line round to Rosyth with the Charlestown cord. It is important to get rail freight and maintain the rail freight sidings into the Rosyth port.

We have reinforced the role of Coatbridge as Scotland's main dryport centre and we have also produced a freight map and publications of rail freight services to and from Scotland to assist the industry in choosing the potential for rail rather than depending purely on road. In the food port project, we did an analysis of food products going in and out of Scotland. We are also active in lobbying for the Rosyth to Zeebrugge freight service, and I am glad to say that, with Scottish Government support, that now seems more secure than it was 12 months ago.

In our LO-PINOD project, we have carried out studies of the empty containers in Scotland. As the committee will know, Scotland is a net exporter, unlike the rest of the UK, the net result of which is that we have to pay for the import of empty containers in order to service the export industry. We also commissioned a bulk freight study of the ports around Scotland.

The weastflows project flagged up one of the major deficiencies, which we identified in the joint regional transport partnership chairs forum's submission to the committee, which is a shortage



of robust information on freight flows. That applies not just in Scotland but throughout Europe. As part of the weastflows project, we produced a set of trip matrices for the four main modes of freight movement on a zone-by-zone basis, across something like 70-odd zones in north-west Europe. I think that that is the first time that that has been achieved.

**The Convener:** We can come on to some of the specifics in the course of the session. Who else would like to provide an overview of their organisation and the contribution that it makes to the freight transport sector?

**Michael Cairns (Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership):** On behalf of Tactran, I would like to pick up on what Alex Macaulay has said. We are the regional transport partnership that covers Angus, Dundee, Perth and Kinross, and Stirling, with a population of about 500,000. We sit astride the main routes connecting the central belt with the west Highlands, Inverness and the north, and Aberdeen, so we are in a strategic location.

Along with other regional transport partnerships, we have a freight quality partnership that meets at roughly six-monthly intervals. Regular attendees are the Freight Transport Association, the Road Haulage Association, the region's ports and our local authority partners. Through the freight quality partnership, we have done quite a bit of work on looking at the road haulage sector, overnight parking, lorry route maps and providing a website for road freight information. We are also involved with the regional timber transport group, which is concerned with the movement of timber from felling to end user. That is a major issue in the region, as we have significant areas of forestry, many of which are coming up to the point of being felled at the moment.

We have had some involvement with the rail freight industry, but there is a bit of a hole in the rail freight sector generally. A lot of rail freight passes through the region, but there are currently no terminals within the region. However, we have looked at trying to develop facilities for timber, seed potatoes and bottled water in the region, and we have hopes for at least two of those over the next few months.

Similarly, we have been involved with European projects. The two that we have been involved in have concerned the last mile or city logistics. One was the ENCLOSE—energy efficiency in city logistics services—project, on which we worked jointly with Dundee City Council and the result of which was the production of a sustainable urban logistics plan setting out the way forward for promoting more sustainable logistics in Dundee. The other project is the LaMiLo—last mile logistics—project, and we are still working on the

development of an urban consolidation centre covering Dundee and Perth, and we hope to have something positive on that next year.

**The Convener:** Councillor Stockan, did you want to come in?

**Councillor James Stockan (Highlands and Islands Transport Partnership):** I very much value the opportunity to come and speak. I have a personal passion for transporting freight, having been involved in that in a past life, so to come and speak for the regional transport partnership is very important.

As you know, the HITRANS area is half the land mass of Scotland. We serve the most difficult places to reach—a hundred islands, but only a 10th of the population. The whole region, I believe, wants to be contributing to the national picture, but the freight structure and the legacy that we have need massive investment for us to be able to compete on a genuine basis with everyone else, because the world is moving on.

We use all modes of transport to export freight. We use air, rail, road and sea transport. Because of the vastness of the geographical area, different solutions have to be found for different situations.

Our transport system is becoming much more fragile as the world moves on. When I was first involved in moving things around, the just-in-time approach came along for deliveries of goods and getting goods to market; it has moved on now to just in the nick of time. The timescales are getting more difficult to meet.

I feel that we need to look at our infrastructure because, when we do not and when our infrastructure fails—as we hear about on the television when there are landslips or ferries do not come, and supermarkets are empty or fresh fish and lobsters do not make it to their market—we as a community become more vulnerable even than we are at present. We must make sure that we cover all those issues.

Investment is very important to enable us to remain a contributing part of the country. We need to make sure that things happen in the right way with the right investment for the future.

Our organisation is very interested in contributing to this inquiry. I know that you have read the submissions, so I am not going to say anything more; I am really interested in the questions that you have from the submissions.

**The Convener:** I am sure that we will come on to the issue of investment. Mr MacRae, do you have anything to add?

**Neil MacRae (Highlands and Islands Transport Partnership):** I have a couple of points related to practical engagement on freight.



We have a freight forum that brings together private stakeholders and local politicians, which I think is important. There are also rail and ferry user groups that provide opportunities for hauliers to contribute and engage with other stakeholders in the area by raising their concerns.

On top of that, I would draw attention to a number of the projects that are referenced in our submission. Similar to SEStran, we have been involved in European projects such as lifting the spirit, which we may talk about later. We have also carried out bits of research, including a freight capability study in 2010 that we hope has helped inform some of the investment that Network Rail will carry out on the Highland main line and the far north and west Highland lines.

**The Convener:** Thank you. Finally, we will hear from Mr Matthews.

**Phil Matthews (Transform Scotland):** Good morning. I am here as chair of Transform Scotland, which is the national alliance for sustainable transport. Our members are the major rail, bus and ferry companies, public bodies, and local and national groups campaigning for public transport, walking and cycling. Our primary interest is in encouraging a transport policy that is sustainable in the widest economic, social and environmental sense and that reduces the negative impacts of transport policy.

Our primary focus is on passenger transport, walking and cycling. We collaborate a lot with the Rail Freight Group, which I know has given evidence to the committee specifically on some of those issues. One of our main thrusts is investment in infrastructure, especially that which encourages more sustainable transport modes. Clearly that has implications for passenger transport and for freight as well.

Our primary support is for rail freight and for seaborne and canal-based transport where it is appropriate. To reflect on the reasons for that, the road haulage industry has all sorts of significant impacts. We know that heavy goods vehicles contribute adversely to road safety and that there are an awful lot of accidents involving HGVs. We know that one freight train can move 50 to 60 lorries off the roads. We know that rail freight has only about a quarter of the carbon emissions per tonne carried of road freight, and about one 10th of the particulate and NOx emissions. Given the concern about air quality at the moment, that is another significant issue.

My final point is that HGVs are a major contributor to wear and tear on the roads. We have been running a campaign recently on the poor state of repair on a lot of our roads; there is a £2.2 billion repair backlog. HGVs contribute a lot to the damage to our road infrastructure.

We would like to see all those things taken into account in appraising outcomes and encouraging more sustainable modes of freight transport wherever possible.

10:15

**The Convener:** Thank you. Mary Fee has some questions.

**Mary Fee (West Scotland) (Lab):** The committee is keen to use its inquiry to identify the main infrastructure obstacles to the free flow of freight. I ask each of you, in turn, to say what your most pressing difficulty is and how we could overcome it.

**Alex Macaulay:** There are two issues: infrastructure obstacles and operational obstacles. The lack of information is a major operational obstacle that discourages the use of rail freight and short-sea shipping as the two more sustainable modes, particularly for longer-distance freight movements. It is difficult to get information on services for rail freight and short-sea shipping. Anyone can go on to a website that will tell them all the public transport services that they need for the journey that they want to take. A common platform exists for passenger transport, but we do not have a common platform for freight transport. That seems to us to be a significant barrier.

There are a number of specific infrastructure issues. For example, the A1 down to the north east of England, where a lot of the short-sea shipping movements are based, really needs to be upgraded to dual-carriageway standard on both sides of the Scottish border. A more local example is that, in the SEStran region, we have been campaigning for many years for the completion of the A801 and M8-M9 link, which provides the link from central Scotland freight facilities down to Grangemouth, because that is a particularly bad section. In addition, the Edinburgh city bypass continues to be a thorn in our flesh, and that is just as much the case for freight movements.

I will not go on about rail freight because I know that you will hear from Network Rail later this morning, but it seems to us that there are structural problems with short-sea shipping. The competition in mainland Europe tends to be either public-sector owned or on a public-private partnership basis, so when a port wants to expand, there is immediate public sector support to provide connectivity by either rail or inland waterways. There are size limitations in our area, particularly at Grangemouth and Leith, and there are tidal access limitations for 24-hour access and operational issues associated with that.

As I said, we need a centralised information system. There are also issues about the frequency of the Rosyth to Zeebrugge ferry service. It will



become more frequent only as use of short-sea shipping increases.

We tend to forget the role of air in freight movement. Edinburgh airport, which is in our region, is the busiest passenger and freight airport in Scotland. That is due to a combination of dedicated freight planes using the freight depot at the east side of the airport and the increasing ability to use hold space in the greater number of longer-haul services in Scotland for high-value, low-weight freight.

There are a number of issues. As I said, I will not go into rail. We have our own local issues with rail as well as the national issues to do with gauge and electrification, but I will leave that for Network Rail to deal with later.

**Mary Fee:** You talk about a centralised information system. Who should facilitate the setting up of that?

**Alex Macaulay:** It should be a Government initiative. One of the anomalies in the current devolution settlement is that the Scottish Parliament has responsibility for ports and harbours but not for international movements, which remain with the Department for Transport at Westminster, and it is not particularly interested in whether a ship lands in Scotland or England as long as it lands somewhere in the United Kingdom. It has always seemed to us that there is a case for Scotland having much more hands-on involvement in international passenger and freight movements.

To be honest, the vast majority of road-based transport is local and, as we all know, the vast majority of it is within Scotland. The proportion of longer-distance road-based transport is much lower than for rail and shipping, but the volumes are still greater than rail or shipping. An information system is needed to identify and allow bookings on longer-distance movements to get the modal shift. We will not get the modal shift for the last mile other than through local shifts to different fuels, for example, but there is real potential for modal shift to rail and shipping for longer-distance services.

That is where we get into the international issues. A regional authority cannot create such a system. We have done our bit in that we have published as much as we can about the availability of freight depots for rail, for instance, but that does not give a centralised platform for information or make it easy to book, pay the charges and compare different carriers.

If we are strapped for cash, it is not a big capital investment to produce such a platform and the benefits to the freight logistics industry could be considerable. It needs to be a central—either

Scottish Government or UK Government—initiative.

**Mary Fee:** In previous evidence sessions, the last mile has been identified as one of the biggest obstacles to the free flow. Do you agree with that?

**Alex Macaulay:** I agree. It is a difficult nut to crack because there is a patently obvious clash between environmental considerations—noise and pollution—and efficient last-mile movements.

I do not know whether the committee noticed but, only last week—sorry, I am exaggerating; I think that it was in February—the Passenger Transport Executive Group, which is the public sector transport organisation in England, published a very good urban logistics report with case studies from throughout the UK of good examples of how to address the issue. If we are to be successful in improving urban logistics, we need to address the congestion in urban areas that logistics operators are faced with. They also use vehicles that pollute urban areas—the air quality management areas are suffering from freight traffic as well as all the other types of traffic so we need a mechanism to address that.

Mike Cairns mentioned Tactran's initiative for an urban freight consolidation or distribution centre. That is what we need. It needs to be combined with a good location close to the urban area so that alternative modes are viable and sensible. We could use electric vehicles that have a limited mileage capability, and electric bicycles and tricycles to get into narrow streets and pedestrianised areas.

It is a difficult nut to crack. Local authority policies have been very restrictive in relation to freight in urban areas, by quite rightly giving priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport. Freight is down the pecking order and 'twas ever thus. The last mile is difficult and local and regional authorities have the potential to take a much more proactive role in addressing the issue.

**Michael Cairns:** If anything, the operational issues are bigger than the infrastructural ones, in that air quality issues and so on arise from urban logistics. Within the Tactran region, the network is pretty good: the A90 is dualled throughout and the A9 is dual carriageway or is planned to be upgraded.

On roads, the only constraint that is identified in the strategic transport projects review but does not have a programme date, is the A90 through Dundee—the Kingsway and Forfar road—which suffers congestion during the day, particularly in peak periods when commuters coincide with through movements to the north east.



As I said before, we do not have any rail freight facilities in the region. A possible location has been identified at the port of Dundee, but a particular user and funding would need to be identified because it would cost in the region of £5 million to develop such a facility.

The ports are a bit of a mixed bag. Montrose has seen a considerable amount of investment and has been significantly upgraded during the past five to 10 years, partly using a freight facilities grant. At the other end, Perth port needs investment but it has declining tonnage. There is a conundrum around whether to invest and hope for a turnaround in the decline, given that it might continue anyway.

To come back to the operational issues, road freight movements are a big issue in the region—in Dundee and Perth and the newly designated air quality management area in Crieff. If anything, that is a bigger priority than addressing infrastructure.

**Neil MacRae:** I agree with Alec Macaulay and Mike Cairns, in that there is a mix of infrastructure and operational issues. I do not want to go into a long list, but maybe I will touch on a few of the important ones in respect of our area, by mode. We have touched on rail and how the single track and gauge restrictions on the Highland main line are a barrier to passenger services as well as to material and goods. Other weight restrictions on the far north and west lines are also a problem and we look forward to the investment from Network Rail in control period five for upgrades there.

On road, we welcome the investment plan for the A9 and A96. In essence, that draws attention to the other parts of the network that people in parts of the Highlands need to use before they can get on to those roads. For example, the A95, which is the road from Elgin to Aviemore, takes an enormous amount of whisky freight every year and that has enormous export value to the Scottish economy. We had an example of a haulier who said that he had spent £20,000 on replacement wing-mirrors in the past year because of problems with that carriageway.

We understand that there will not be the same investment as there has been in the A9 and A96, but we have tried to work with the local council to develop some shovel-ready schemes and we have done something similar for the spinal route in the Western Isles.

In terms of air, access to Heathrow is vital to the Highlands and we have made that clear in our submissions to the Airports Commission. I have a fact on that: 95 per cent of all long-haul seafood freight still goes through Heathrow. A significant element of that comes from the Highlands and

Islands and there are logistical problems with getting it to Heathrow.

I am sure that James Stockan will have more to say on ferries, but capacity is an issue on our regular ferry services to Orkney and the Western Isles, and it is becoming ever more of an issue. There is the problem of competing demands as a result of passenger expectations and freight requirements, and they can lead to problems with block booking and deck space, for example.

10:30

**Mary Fee:** Is that a seasonal thing? Is it worse in the summer?

**Neil MacRae:** Yes. We have done a piece of work on the issue in order to understand the demand, and we have found that demand at peak periods, from Friday through to Monday, is growing, and that that now extends into the October, Christmas and Easter holiday periods. It is a growing problem.

**Councillor Stockan:** On modal shift, there is a real opportunity for the very far north of Scotland to move some of the stuff that is taken by ship, which burns more carbon, on to rail, but it is difficult to start on that process because of restrictions. We have to look at it as a commercial operation. If we could open up overnight rail, there would be an opportunity to ensure that there is a daily service. There are a lot of issues to do with signalling and other bits and pieces, as well as being able to support that service. As far as Europe is concerned, the argument about territorial cohesion comes in, so we should be able to support that approach in some way through European programmes.

I see Mike MacKenzie nodding. Even for Oban, getting overnight freight on rail would take it off the road and provide huge advantages.

**Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP):** On that point, Councillor Stockan, I know that you have some quite radical and ambitious ideas. Could you be a bit more specific about what you would like to be done to improve rail?

**Councillor Stockan:** That is a hobby-horse of mine. The far north of Scotland, particularly Caithness, with a population of 25,000, and Orkney on top of that, with another 25,000, are a long way away from the centre. Some supermarket freight came in by rail, but that stopped because the chain—Safeway—moved on. We have an opportunity to have an overnight service both ways. I would add to that a sleeper service, because there will shortly be 85 sleeper carriages available. That could involve motorail. A combination train that takes stuff up is a huge opportunity to connect the periphery with the



centre of the country in a radical way. However, we need to be able to put in investment and we have to free up some of the blockages.

**Mary Fee:** Mr Matthews, do you want to comment on my earlier question?

**Phil Matthews:** First, I will echo a few of the points that have been made. The point about encouraging supermarkets and other big organisations to commit to rail is a good one. The marginal costs between rail and road might be different. It is about a corporate statement of intent. That is always worth while.

A point was made about the last-mile challenge in urban transport; that is a big issue. I do not pretend that there is an easy solution that will be applicable everywhere but, as has been said, we have some examples of good practice from elsewhere, so we should think about that. We should think about the use of electric vehicles and other means. The point about information is also important. We should have a rail freight system that is easy to use.

On infrastructure, a few key things need action. There is a need for investment at the rail freight terminals at Grangemouth, Mossend and particularly at Coatbridge. That could enhance the capacity and efficiency of operation of those centres. There are a lot of pinch points on the rail network for rail freight. Some of those are between Grangemouth and Aberdeen, where there are single-track bottlenecks and gauge restrictions because of tunnels and bridges. Some action there would be welcome.

As the previous speakers from the Highlands said, we have an awful lot of single track in Scotland, which is challenging for rail. We need passing and crossover loops, ideally of at least 775m, to allow long freight trains to use them. We need general enhancement. A lot of investment in rail that would benefit passengers would also benefit freight operation. I am talking about electrification and dual tracking where that is appropriate.

We have heard about the A9 and A96 corridors. A huge amount of public money is being committed to action on them over the coming 10 to 15 years or so. There is around £3 billion for the A9, another £3 billion for the A96 and a smaller amount for the rail infrastructure. However, we do not see any evidence that an integrated appraisal of, for example, the whole A9 corridor was done that looked at the differences. I use the A9 and know that many people's frustrations result from the number of heavy goods vehicles on it. It is clear that action on rail would remove some of that problem. We know that the rail journey from Inverness to Edinburgh is an optimum one for business users. The journey is too short for a

flight, but if the rail system was upgraded, we could get a lot of business users on the trains, as they are more user friendly than the road for working practices. That would take a lot of people off the road.

Why did we not think about the two issues together? What road and rail enhancements are needed and what could deliver the widest and best environmental, social and economic outcomes? That applies as much to investment that would benefit rail freight as to investment that would benefit passenger services.

**Mary Fee:** I will move on to ask about your relationship with freight operators. Do you have any good examples of how you have worked with them to encourage a more efficient operation? Do you work with them to help them to reduce their emissions? I ask Mr Matthews to answer first.

**Phil Matthews:** As I said, our focus is more on passenger transport than on freight, so I do not claim to have any direct relationship with the freight operators. It has been interesting to read some of the evidence that has been submitted. A lot of people have the sense that using rail freight is quite difficult. Rail freight has increased by about 70 per cent since privatisation, so something is happening—there is some growth.

Issues have been raised about how the market works. There might be issues about information, which has been touched on, or how the system works. A key challenge for freight providers is that they generally seek long-term contracts, whereas the demand is very much for short-term reactive transport. That is a challenge.

Some of the infrastructure investment that we would like in the rail freight industry might alleviate some of those issues and make the system more responsive. Particularly on lines in northern Scotland on which the freight volumes might be lower, there may be a case for freight providers to collaborate more and offer more joint services than they currently do.

There are challenges for the industry, but I do not claim to have any insights beyond that.

**Alex Macaulay:** Like the other RTPs, we have a freight quality partnership, which meets about once every six months. It is not just public sector representatives who attend its meetings; the ports, the airport and road haulage operators, for example, are involved.

Rather than simply tell the freight quality partnership what we are doing, we tend to ask what the problems are. The work that we did for the SEStran region freight review was a result of that. From that came a freight map for the region that identified not just preferred routes for road haulage but where the rest areas were. There was



a review of the quality and utilisation of the rest areas and why they were not as widely used as we expected them to be.

We have worked on that basis through the freight quality partnership, but we also engaged with the road haulage industry when the first threats came to the Rosyth to Zeebrugge ferry. When Superfast Ferries pulled out, the question was how we could encourage the industry to lobby for the reinstatement of the service. Once it was reinstated, the question was what the key issues were for the industry to encourage it back on to the ferry rather than heading off down to Newcastle, the north-east of England or further south.

What came out of that is interesting. We expected the cost to be the key factor for the industry, but it was not; the quality of service was the key factor. The industry was never very happy with the previous operator's handling of its trucks—the trucks would get damaged on the boat—whereas the new operator is much better. Another issue was the frequency and timing of the service and the turnaround time between Zeebrugge and destinations elsewhere in Europe, which affect operators' ability to get to where they have to go and get back to catch the next ship back to Scotland. We work well with the freight industry on that.

Through our European projects, we have worked with a number of freight operators that bring goods and services into Scotland from mainland Europe. A key issue that we have been quite active on over the past 18 months or so is the sulphur directive, which covers the North Sea—as you know, it is about reducing the level of sulphur emissions dramatically. That directive is now in place. There were big concerns about it and we lobbied the now cabinet secretary, Keith Brown, to see what could be done. As a result, he chaired a couple of sessions in Victoria Quay to raise awareness in the industry and cover the issues.

It is fair to say that the directive has not been quite as disastrous as it might have been for freight costs, because it has coincided with the reduction in the cost of oil-based fuel, so one thing has compensated for the other. The low-sulphur fuels are more expensive, but they are still cheaper overall, because of the base reduction in the price of a barrel of oil.

We have worked reasonably well within the freight quality partnership but, to be honest, it is fair to say that we could do more. We are getting someone different in to chair it. Rather than being chaired by someone from SEStran, the next meeting will be chaired by the Road Haulage Association's ex-director for Scotland, in the shape of Phil Flanders. He is enthusiastic and is keen to

get letters out to all the operators via the RHA and the Freight Transport Association. Again, the approach will be to ask, "What are your issues, guys?" rather than saying, "Here are the European freight projects that we have been involved in."

**Mary Fee:** Are the operators willing to work together to increase efficiency when they are in competition with each other? How can you facilitate that?

**The Convener:** I ask witnesses to keep their answers as brief and succinct as possible, as we have only just over half an hour for the rest of the session.

**Alex Macaulay:** I am not renowned for brevity, convener, so you should keep reminding me about that—put a clock in front of me.

Mary Fee raises a particular issue about competition. We firmly believe that a neutral platform is needed. We are keen to promote the idea in the Forth estuary of a gateway, which would involve all the operators—ports, airports, road and rail—that do business in that area in a joint management structure, which would lead towards accreditation of a sustainable logistics gateway. That has been tried elsewhere in Europe and is getting picked up there. We do not want Scotland to lag behind on that.

To achieve such a gateway, there needs to be a neutral platform where operators can share good ideas in a position of trust, so that they do not feel that, as soon as they mention their operations, the guy across the table will go away and pinch their customer. That is a big issue, particularly with road haulage and to a certain extent with rail haulage. There is a reluctance to share ideas and it leads to the situation that Mike Cairns mentioned, in which there is a serious lack of robust information on which to make sensible choices about freight logistics, because the information is all commercially sensitive. There is a reluctance to share information. We firmly believe that that is needed, and Mary Fee is right to bring that up.

**The Convener:** I apologise to Mary Fee—we will have to move on to the next question.

**David Stewart (Highlands and Islands) (Lab):** I will ask about sources of funding. Are freight grant schemes helping to get freight off our roads? If they are, perhaps the panel could tell the committee why there have been no awards of freight facilities grants since 2011.

10:45

**Michael Cairns:** We have found Europe to be a useful alternative source of funding. There is a catch, in that we always have to get match funding. One project that we were involved in provided 75 per cent funding, and the other



provided 50 per cent funding. Finding the match funding can be an issue at times, but Europe can assist in that.

It might not just be the freight facilities grant that is an issue. For some years we have worked with Highland Spring in Blackford in Perthshire to support the development of a railhead. Given what has happened in the company, it is possibly not—ironically in this case—the funding that has been an issue; it is a matter of the company having the right opportunity to develop the railhead, because it has been involved in company takeovers and mergers and so on. Such a project perhaps goes to the bottom of the list when a company is looking at reorganising the logistics function as it takes over companies and as the market changes.

There are a number of issues with the freight facilities grant, one of which is that it can be the subject of an application only from the private sector. There may well be occasions when the public sector could take a lead, but that is currently not permitted for the FFG. Some revisions there might help. The timescale can also be a bit difficult to work to at times.

**David Stewart:** So if we got a more user-friendly FFG, the take-up might be better.

**Michael Cairns:** That could work better.

**David Stewart:** In fairness, there have been awards of the waterborne freight grant. I think that a company in Corpach was successful and received £900,000. Mr MacRae will be familiar with that.

However, it concerned the committee when we looked at the records and found no awards of the FFG since 2011. Clearly, something is not working. The chief executive of Montrose Port Authority told us that the company had employed a consultant, who worked through the process and got the grant. That was prior to 2011. I will touch on Europe in my next question, but on domestic grant applications, do any other panel members have experience of the FFG?

**Alex Macaulay:** I have a small point. We have had feedback from the road haulage industry to suggest that it would quite like to shift on to rail freight. However, it finds that, to make the case for rail freight, a relatively long-term business case has to be associated with it. A lot of the business on road freight involves short-term contracts—it is done by phone and so on. It would help if we could get a mechanism to make shifting on to rail easier for that type of business.

**David Stewart:** It is important that we have joined-up government and that we do not say, “We’ve got transport over here and, on the other hand, we’ve got climate change legislation.” If we can get freight off the road and on to rail, we will

do wonders for our climate change targets, which we have not achieved in the past few years. Does anyone have any other experience of the FFG and other grants, before I move on to European funding models?

**Neil MacRae:** I was going to say more but, given the timescale, I am happy for you to move on. Some of the issues have been covered.

**David Stewart:** I will touch on the experience of sourcing other types of funding via the European Union, such as through the trans-European network transport programme, Marco Polo and Interreg. The evidence made a suggestion about the lifting the spirit project. Perhaps Mr MacRae is best placed to talk about that.

**Neil MacRae:** I can kick off on that. Lifting the spirit is a good example of where EU funding has been well applied. We did a whisky logistics study some time ago that identified the requirements for shifting the whisky industry from road to rail. That helped to inform an application for the lifting the spirit project, which received an intervention rate of 65 per cent.

Before getting into the detail of the project, I will just say that there have been other opportunities. Rather than everyone putting their hand up and saying, “We need more money,” it would be good to know that, as a practical mechanism, there was a pot of EU funding that people could apply to when the opportunity arose. Opportunities can arise at any time. We need that flexibility. We have been able to bring in significant external funding and we would like to do that in the future if possible.

**David Stewart:** I will ask about one point. I am enthusiastic about the lifting the spirit project for bulk whisky, and I have a Highlands and Islands regional issue that you could comment on. When I visited Glenmorangie, in Tain, I was told that it is more efficient to ship all the whisky barrels—as the panel will know, they come from the States, because bourbon barrels can be used only once—to Grangemouth. I said, “Why don’t you ship them to Invergordon, which would reduce the amount of road travel?” At present, the barrels all go to Grangemouth and are trucked north to Moray and so on. Have you looked at that aspect of transport? It seems a bit daft that we are shipping the barrels to Grangemouth when we could ship them to a nearby port, and Invergordon port has the facilities.

**Neil MacRae:** I am not certain about the specifics, but there might well be gauge issues if the load was taken from Elgin to Grangemouth via Aberdeen. The practicalities of taking the load on the Elgin to Inverness section might be the crucial factor. If I can supply you with more information on that, I will do so.



**David Stewart:** Does anyone else have experience of European funding?

**Alex Macaulay:** We have been heavily involved with Interreg and mainstream European regional development funding for a number of projects. The key issue is that, if people think that the bureaucracy associated with the rail freight grant is difficult, they should try doing a European project. The amount of bureaucracy involved in European projects is outrageous.

I will give you a prime example. If people go by air to a meeting on a European project, they need to keep the boarding pass—the booking confirmation is not good enough—and take photographs of themselves at the meeting. The amount of bureaucracy in European projects is insulting to professional people.

Anything that the Scottish Government can do to encourage the European Union to simplify its bureaucracy would be a major advantage. In comparison, we have had a very good experience with the bus investment fund, although I know that that is not the subject of this inquiry. The fund also has targets to reach and requires a submission, but its administration by our colleagues in Transport Scotland has been streets ahead of the administration of any European project that we have ever been involved with. I give all credit to the Scottish Government and Transport Scotland people for administering those grants much more efficiently and sensibly than the European Commission.

**David Stewart:** Mr Matthews, have you had any experience of European funding?

**Phil Matthews:** I have nothing to add, really. I was very supportive of the lifting the spirit project, which was excellent and shows what can be done. The points that I would have raised have all been covered.

**Michael Cairns:** As Alex Macaulay said, the bureaucracy is breathtaking at times, especially for what can be quite small sums of money. There are two problems with Europe. One is the match-funding issue, and the other is the programming.

Generally speaking, we get fairly short notice when a funding opportunity arises, so we need to have a scheme that is at the right stage to enable us to apply for the funding. There are other issues. A lot of projects are—rightly—transnational, and we have to find partners in the rest of Europe that also have schemes at the right stage in the right fields. The process can be challenging from that point of view.

**David Stewart:** Has anyone had experience of Marco Polo funding?

**Alex Macaulay:** Some time ago, we were involved in a Marco Polo bid for a service from

Norway to Rosyth to Zeebrugge that would stop at Shetland on the way. We submitted two bids and had to go through a procurement process to get an operator on board at the outset, so considerable up-front investment was involved.

The first bid failed because we did not apply for enough money; the rules were misinterpreted. The second bid failed primarily because the Commission felt that the leg between Rosyth and Zeebrugge would be operating in competition with commercial services. We did not have the opportunity to go for a third bid to solve those problems because our partners in Norway lost interest and people moved on.

The Marco Polo motorways of the sea project work is not easy, but other countries seem to be able to do it much better than the UK does. To be honest, there is much more Government support for bids for such funding in countries such as Spain and Italy, which are much more successful in getting such funding.

**David Stewart:** I am conscious of the time, convener, so I will finish there. That is food for thought and gives the committee something to raise with the minister when he comes to our meeting in a few weeks' time.

**James Dornan (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP):** We have already touched on consolidation centres. Do you have any other comments about the pros and cons of such schemes and how they could be applied in the Scottish context? What do you see as the benefits of, and barriers to, night deliveries, and what would help to remove those barriers?

**Michael Cairns:** The benefits have to be significant. I will quote some figures. Between 7 in the morning and 7 at night, 2,007 commercial vehicles enter Dundee city centre. Those vehicles are not heavy goods vehicles; only 22 of them are articulated vehicles. They are mainly smaller white vans—just under 1,700 of them enter Dundee city centre every day. That sector is growing and many of those vans are not well loaded. The logistics sector is very efficient within individual companies and for individual customers, but across the whole sector there are a lot of lightly loaded vehicles working exclusively for one customer. We see significant scope to reduce the number of vehicles, with consequent benefits in terms of carbon emissions.

**James Dornan:** I do not wish to interrupt you, but that leads me to a question that I was going to ask about collaboration. Do you see any scope for that? Is there any suggestion that people are moving forward on it?

**Michael Cairns:** Collaboration really has to be led by the public sector. Freight is a very competitive business. As we found from our experience of trying to develop consolidation



centres in Perth and Dundee, the private sector is very protective of its own market. We have been through an exercise in which we went out to tender to try to identify a logistics operator to set up a consolidation centre in Perth, but that ultimately failed. That is not an uncommon experience.

In one of the European projects that we have been involved in Camden in London, a consolidation centre was developed for the council's procured goods—it was not open to the market, with retailers and so on. The initial advertisement attracted 15 operators, but when the work was put out to tender, only two tenders were received. That is the sort of market that we work in. One or two operators are very interested in consolidation, but across Europe it is just not attracting operators to invest in or to consider it.

We have taken a different approach. I understand that you have been to the Netherlands to see a Binnenstadservice. Through the European project, we wrote to a Binnenstadservice and had some events in Perth to try to attract entrepreneurs. We hope that we have been successful in that.

We have a social enterprise company based in Dundee that is developing a business plan to introduce consolidation in Dundee and Perth. We have introduced it to other smaller logistics companies. We hope to develop something organically—something fairly local that will not be seen as a threat by the larger operators. We hope that it will grow from fairly small beginnings—five or six shops—to develop in a similar way to the Binnenstadservice in the Netherlands. We see that as the way forward. The experience generally across Europe seems to be that it is difficult to get the established logistics operators interested.

**James Dornan:** My final question is about carbon emissions targets and technology. Technology has, with integration and collaboration, the potential to make freight transport more efficient, less costly and more sustainable. Can you describe your experience in pulling together some of that to make things more sustainable?

11:00

**Alex Macaulay:** I will be brief, convener, I promise.

We have had a couple of fairly significant initiatives on that. As part of one of our European projects, we carried out a review that identified best practice for logistics operators across the UK and Europe. As a result of that review, we produced a set of guidelines for the industry. It is, effectively, a question-and-answer checklist that is targeted at those who procure and operate

logistics. What the two sides of the market can do is different and depends on how the operators operate. The guidelines have been published as part of our European project and are on our website. Again, however, that is a drop in the ocean when compared to the amount of visibility that we need throughout the industry.

One of the areas that was of interest to us, and one of the barriers to shifting to rail and short-sea shipping, is tracking of loads to know where they are at any given time of the day. We can do that with road transport; all we need to do is call the driver on his mobile phone and he will tell us where he is. We have worked with European partners on developing more track and trace, and I know that it exists throughout the industry in various bespoke facilities. That track and trace development would be available on an open platform for all to use.

There is also the development of a multimodal route planner, which would be available on the web throughout the industry. The downside with that initiative is about getting the information for route planning, because a planner is not just about the availability and frequency of services—it is also about prices. Getting that information from operators and putting it on an open platform is very difficult just now.

All the work that we have been doing, including our European project, is aimed at achieving the Government's carbon-reduction targets, which will not be easy for the transport sector.

**James Dornan:** Does anyone else want to comment on that?

**Councillor Stockan:** A lot of work is being done with ferries to get the technology right and to make sure that we achieve carbon reduction. When there is Government intervention and support, we need to make sure that we look to the future and that we go for the lowest-carbon options. There is a fair bit of work to be done there, but we are starting to look at some of the issues.

**Adam Ingram (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP):** What does the panel think is the highest priority for Government spending on infrastructure from the perspective of improving freight logistics in Scotland?

**Alex Macaulay:** My highest priority would be an open platform for information on booking and the comparison of different services for multimodal freight movement. That would not be a major investment for the Government—it could probably be achieved for a lot less than some of the dualling schemes and the road and rail schemes that we would really like. My highest priority is information.

**Adam Ingram:** How much would that cost?



**Alex Macaulay:** The Government has more experience of developing information technology platforms than I do. I ask you the question: how much do you think it would cost? I suggest that it would be a lot cheaper than dualling the A1 all the way down to the north of England.

**Adam Ingram:** Would such a platform answer the question about whether Scotland should have a deep-sea port to do away with all the road haulage going south to the English deep-sea ports?

**Alex Macaulay:** That platform would not do away with the need for other infrastructure investment. It would assist and facilitate multimodal shift—

**Adam Ingram:** Would it give me an answer to my question?

**Alex Macaulay:** No. I also point out that, as all of you will be aware, Babcock has a proposal for a deep-sea container port on the Forth estuary that would have 24-hours-a-day, 365-days-a-year tidal access. Although it has been difficult for Babcock to get to where it is today with the proposal, I am sure that it will achieve that deep-sea port on the Forth; indeed, it has been featured and supported in NPF3 documents.

I am not taking away from the need for a deep-sea port in Scotland. All I am suggesting is that, in the meantime, we could get better information.

**Adam Ingram:** Can we have a quick run round the panel on that question? What is the highest priority?

**Councillor Stockan:** For HITRANS, the highest priority is investment in the modal shift to rail and ensuring that it is accessible for more of the time, that it can take the weight and that it is reliable.

As for deep-sea ports, I should, while I have the chance, point out the opportunity for Scapa Flow if there is a shift to the north-east and north-west passages and they become open to trade more of the time. That is a huge opportunity for Scotland, but if we do not grasp it, it will go to Norway, the Faroes or somewhere else. It actually represents one of the biggest modal shifts, and it would involve a major project with Government support under the Marco Polo and TEN-T programmes. It would be a complete game-changer. It would not involve pinching trade from someone else; it is all about changing the whole European dynamic, and we need to be prepared for it.

We can do all this in clever and unique ways with floating stuff; we do not have to dredge, or build anything. We certainly have to keep our minds open to the possibility, because it would turn the map completely on its head.

**Adam Ingram:** I take the points that you have made, but several witnesses have told us that we need an overhaul of Scottish Government freight policy. We heard earlier that the pattern of ownership in our ports has given us—shall we say?—problems; no more than that. How could freight policy initiatives benefit us?

**Alex Macaulay:** I am tempted to say that we are not short of policies; indeed, there are many national, regional and local policies out there that support freight and different aspects of transport. What we need is a mechanism for implementing them. If you class that as a policy issue, that is fine.

I have also mentioned the need for a neutral platform where freight operators can collaborate without the Office of Fair Trading—or whatever it is now called—accusing them of setting up a cartel, and where they can openly exchange information; in particular, on environmental improvements to freight logistics. We need that because at the moment an individual operator cannot achieve everything in freight logistics that we want collectively to achieve. We need a collaborative approach that does not undermine natural competition. It will not be easy to achieve that aim, but there are examples of its being achieved elsewhere in Europe through various mechanisms. If that is what you call “policy”, I think that that is where we need a major policy review. If it is all about implementation, I think that that is where we need an implementation review.

One of our big retailers, which as you know operate their own freight systems, deliberately came up with a lovely new word—“co-opetition”—for something that you would like to see in the marketplace. Let us try to achieve a situation where we get co-opetition. In other words, operators can co-operate freely and openly, but they can still compete one with the other in their own businesses.

**Adam Ingram:** I presume that your call would be on Transport Scotland or the Scottish Government to initiate that approach.

**Alex Macaulay:** There would certainly be a call on them to support that approach. SEStran is looking to achieve that through the Forth gateway initiatives, for which we are trying to get European funding and so on, but we would also look to the Scottish Government for support. The approach would not work without Scottish Government support.

**Adam Ingram:** I am sorry, but I am having to rush on because of time constraints. My last question is: is the planning system currently working effectively in promoting the freight sector? Maybe Michael Cairns could answer that one.



**Michael Cairns:** That is a difficult question to address. Much of the planning system is reactive—it responds to developers' proposals. If you are trying to promote rail, there is certainly a case for considering a national rail terminal policy. In our region, there are no rail terminals at all. In central Scotland, the approach is perhaps not the best one; Grangemouth has three separate terminals, for example. If you were to start from scratch to create an effective terminal, you would work with one that would be open to various customers, so there is a role for the planning system. The difficulty with freight is that it is so market driven. We can only create the conditions; developers must come forward with proposals.

**Alex Macaulay:** NPF3 is a step in the right direction, as were NPF1 and NPF2. The inclusion in NPF3 of initiatives to get better rail connectivity to the ports is very welcome. As Mike Cairns has said, missing from that are initiatives for better overland connectivity by rail, which does not necessarily mean just the last 50 or 100 miles of connections to ports.

When we compare it with the rest of the UK, we note that Scotland's planning context includes a national planning framework—a national transport strategy and NPF3. Our colleagues south of the border would envy that, although it could be better. As Mike Cairns said regarding development management, when we get down to the detailed nitty-gritty of managing applications, we find that they tend to address local issues.

There is within SEStran a continuing initiative, which came out of the regional planning strategy, for analysis of cross-boundary transport initiatives. Transport Scotland, to its credit, is taking the lead on that, and we are all co-operating with it. That represents recognition that development management and the local planning system tend to deal with local issues, but we need to look beyond local issues and regional boundaries—and, indeed, beyond Scottish boundaries.

As I said, NPF3 is a step in the right direction, and the process is evolving. We hope that NPF4 will address the areas that are missing in NPF3.

**David Stewart:** Could each of the panel members give the committee one example of best practice in Europe for freight infrastructure schemes that have used a mixture of private sector and public sector funding? I will perhaps answer my own question, as I tend to do. When we were in Rotterdam recently, we were told about the dedicated freight rail line that has been set up, which is a fantastic example that is an enhancement for the whole of Europe, with Rotterdam being Europe's largest port.

**Phil Matthews:** The challenge is in the fact that the system here is different in a number of ways

from that which operates in other parts of Europe. Rather than point to a particular example, I will say that it is clear that other parts of Europe, including some central European countries, understand it much better than we do. The infrastructure is there, the balanced appraisal of different options is there, and the thinking across corridors and about integration is there.

Going back to my earlier point about how we look at investment along, say, the A9 corridor, there should be an appraisal system—a way of judging costs and benefits that takes into account a wider economic, social and environmental effects, rather than a focus on individual projects.

The other point to make is that in many other European countries there has been considerable investment over a long period, which has clearly been beneficial to both passenger rail and freight travel.

11:15

**David Stewart:** In simplistic terms, are we more mid-table than winning the championship in freight infrastructure?

**Phil Matthews:** Yes. There are clear pinch points. We have some antiquated infrastructure in the rail freight terminals, and there is a lot of single track and inadequate infrastructure for rail, north and south of the central belt in particular.

I agree that information is very important. As a result of the way in which information technology has moved on, we can overcome the challenges of half-full vehicles charging around producing a lot of emissions and costing a lot economically. As with so many things, however, much comes down to investment in the infrastructure.

The other point to make is that the money is there: a huge amount of money is allocated for transport projects. We argue, however, that the priorities on which we have chosen to spend that money and how we have chosen to spend it are not necessarily the best.

**Alex Macaulay:** I have half a dozen good examples; I will happily pass them to the clerks rather than take up the time of the committee today.

There is an example in Sweden of a dry port in—excuse my pronunciation—Älmhult. One of the things that we found when we analysed dry ports was that it is possible to get the private sector in to develop a dry port if there are huge populations and big movements of freight, and it can work successfully. It is more difficult if the scale is marginal; Scotland generally handles lower volumes of freight. Älmhult is not a big dry port and handles relatively low volumes of freight. It serves the ports of Malmö and Stockholm. It was



developed in partnership with the municipality when Ikea pulled out of the area. Local government provided the required public sector input, so that what was probably a marginal or even a negative business case was able to flip over and become positive so that environmental benefits could start to be achieved in the region.

There are a number of examples of very good co-operation in the private sector—operators in Switzerland, Germany and Italy are in partnership companies of road hauliers, rail operators and freight forwarders. The road hauliers still compete with each other and the rail companies still compete with each other, but the partnership companies bring them together and provide a neutral platform from which to make improvements. I will happily pass that information on to the clerks.

**David Stewart:** That would be very helpful.

**Michael Cairns:** I was impressed by the example of the Norwegian postal service, which is—initially working in Trondheim but spreading throughout the rest of Norway—aiming for largely emissions-free deliveries in city centres. In Trondheim, it has completely replaced its diesel-powered vehicles with a combination of types of vehicles including electric-powered trolleys, so that more deliveries, particularly of larger and bulkier parcels, can be made on foot instead of using vans. The vans that remain in use have all been converted to full electric power and the larger vehicles for bulk loads are hybrids.

The postal service is a Government-owned arm's-length organisation, which is in a similar position to that of the Royal Mail about two years ago. It has required a considerable amount of support for it to make the investment in electric vehicles. There have also been difficulties in sourcing the vehicles; Norway is too far away for Mercedes-Benz, for example, to supply it. The Norwegian post office has, however, gone a long way towards reducing and, in a lot of cases, eliminating carbon emissions and local air pollutants.

**The Convener:** Thank you for that.

**Councillor Stockan:** You have heard about the lifting the spirit project. A really interesting spin-off from that was that other local food producers in the area were backhauling and may continue to do that in the future. The project has involved other groups: there is far more to such projects than we can ever imagine. It was exciting to see that a project can bring other people on board as they collaborate and work with the industry. There can be unexpected results. Neil MacRae may want to add something.

**Neil MacRae:** It comes back to the wider questions about planning policy, how EU

directives are applied and whether state aid or territorial cohesion comes more to the fore in creating a proactive but not interventionist way to facilitate co-operation. That is done better in some Scandinavian countries and elsewhere in Europe.

**David Stewart:** I appreciate that information, thank you.

**The Convener:** I thank all our witnesses for their comprehensive evidence this morning, and Mr Macaulay for the offer of supplementary written evidence on European case studies. The committee will, I am sure, find that invaluable as it takes forward this important work.

11:21

*Meeting suspended.*

11:26

*On resuming—*

**The Convener:** Good morning, we now resume the meeting of the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee with our second panel. I welcome, from Network Rail, Anne MacKenzie, senior route freight manager, and Nigel Wunsch, head of strategy and planning for Scotland.

Network Rail has a clear responsibility for investment and maintenance in the rail network. You are currently working on a Scotland route study that will look at the upgrades and investments that are required for future network growth and economic growth. Can you provide the committee with an update on the work of the study and how it is informing future planning for the rail network in Scotland?

**Nigel Wunsch (Network Rail):** Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to talk to you this morning and to help with your inquiry.

The route study, which is the current part of the long-term planning process that we are working through, is for looking at what the industry needs to invest in over the next 30 years. We are looking at where we want the rail sector to be in 30 years' time—in 2043—across both freight and passenger business.

The work that we are currently doing has been looking at what the demand is likely to be in that timescale and, based on that demand, what train service will be required to be meet it. Inevitably, there will be a significant growth in both passenger and freight business. The number of passengers, the volume of freight and the distances they are travelling are all expected to grow.

Based on that, we need to look at where the pinchpoints are, where the gaps will be in the infrastructure, and how we can best fill those gaps.



We look at what the opportunities are to do that and what we want the network to look like by 2043. We then work back from there by asking, "If that is where we want to be in 2043, what are the steps that we need to take between now and then to deliver it?"

The route study is scheduled to deliver a draft for consultation by the end of 2015. It will go out for wide consultation and, based on previous experience elsewhere in Great Britain, there will be lots of views and comments. Based on those, we will then produce the final route study, which will be published in the middle of 2016. It will be a regulated document, which the Office of Rail Regulation needs to approve.

It will also feed into our initial industry plan for the next five-year control period, which starts in 2019. We will use the plan to bid to the Scottish Government for investment in line with our recommendations for that five-year period.

11:30

**The Convener:** Ms MacKenzie, do you have anything to add?

**Anne MacKenzie (Network Rail):** No.

**The Convener:** I do not know whether you had an opportunity to hear the previous evidence session at which we heard evidence from a number of witnesses that the investment priority should be modal shift from road to rail freight. Do you envisage that being looked at as part of the study?

**Nigel Wunsch:** Absolutely. We believe very strongly that there are many flows for which rail is ideally suited, particularly longer-distance flows and bulk flows; rail is the ideal way to support those sorts of traffic. We anticipate investing in the ability to run longer trains on the network and in improvements to gauge, particularly on the Anglo-Scottish flows, so that bigger containers can be operated on standard rail wagons.

**The Convener:** Clearly, you do not want to pre-empt the outcome of the study, but a number of issues are emerging from this inquiry and the evidence that we have received, and from the wider debate about rail freight in Scotland. You alluded to one of those issues, which is improvements to capacity. We heard from the Rail Freight Group about the lack of long overtaking loops, the fact that so much of the network remains single track, the inadequate length of crossing loops and so on. Are those issues moving up your agenda?

**Nigel Wunsch:** Yes, inevitably. The longer the freight trains we can operate where there is demand, the more efficient that is and the better the use of capacity. Short trains are not a good

use of the limited capacity on the rail network, and the ability to operate longer trains is definitely a benefit.

We have recently done quite a lot of work on the west Highland line, for example. We now run trains on that line that are longer than the loops, with special arrangements so that, when they pass, they pass passenger trains while they are in the loop. That allows longer freight trains to operate, which has improved the viability of those trains for the freight operators.

However, we can run longer trains only where there is demand for them, and on some routes there is not the demand for the volume of traffic that needs the longer trains. There are lots of routes, though, such as the east coast and west coast main lines, where we would like to see longer loops because that would allow more flexible operation. We operate long freight trains on the west coast main line coming up from England via Carlisle to Glasgow, or to Mossend, which is in the Glasgow area. They, too, are longer than a lot of the loops and, again, have to be carefully managed to avoid delaying other services.

**The Convener:** Is it fair to say therefore that, through the study and the bids that you will make for investment from Government, you will seek to address the significant infrastructure capacity issues and pinchpoints that exist on the network?

**Nigel Wunsch:** Yes. Inevitably, the east coast main line will be high on the list of priorities. There are starting to be definite capacity pinchpoints for both passenger and freight between Edinburgh and Berwick and even down as far as Newcastle—obviously, that is outwith the Scottish Government's remit, but that is the section of route that is relevant. In addition, going north from the central belt towards Inverness and Aberdeen, we are currently investing, as part of this control period, in improvements to the Highland main line between Perth and Inverness that are aimed at reducing journey time for passenger trains and increasing capacity for passenger and freight. Some of that will almost certainly include longer loops or longer sections of double track.

**The Convener:** One of the issues that David Spaven of the Rail Freight Group highlighted is the Channel tunnel and the as yet unrealised potential for that route to fulfil our freight requirements. There was a suggestion that that has not happened and is unlikely to do so without proactive support to pump prime an initiative for a freight train from Scotland to the European mainland. Do you have a view on that?

**Nigel Wunsch:** I will let Anne MacKenzie come in on that question because she is perhaps better placed to answer it. Inevitably, if we could



encourage greater use of the Channel tunnel for freight, we could get more freight on to rail. We would have to think carefully about where we are trying to get that freight to and remember that the freight market is a commercial one and that there are risks that, if we start to affect it, we will get into competition and state aid issues.

**Anne MacKenzie:** I agree with Nigel Wunsch, but I also agree with David Spaven that pump priming would sometimes be ideal for a brand-new service. It takes critical mass to get a new train up and running. Sometimes, when there are low volumes to start off with, it does not quite justify a train but, if we pump primed a train to start off with, the volume could follow. There is potentially enough volume to have a train direct from Scotland to Europe via the Channel tunnel. Coming back is the issue. At this time, the service would probably have to go via one of the English terminals to get the volume to come back up to Scotland.

**The Convener:** As an Edinburgh MSP, I have a question about improvements to the network that are already under way. One of them is the electrification of the Edinburgh south suburban line. Can you say anything that would be of interest to people in Edinburgh?

**Nigel Wunsch:** Electrification of the Edinburgh south suburban line would be of benefit to freight. It would ensure that freight traffic can be electric hauled by the east coast main line and across the central belt. At the moment, a lot of that traffic has to be diesel hauled because there is not the capacity through Edinburgh Waverley, which is the only electrified route, for that sort of traffic to operate.

Edinburgh Waverley is full of passenger traffic and we want to avoid freight passing through there. If we electrified the Edinburgh south suburban line, we would be able to operate more electric freight, which is more efficient because it uses longer trains, has better haulage capacity and, generally, has better acceleration.

We proposed that electrification as part of our initial industry plan for control period 5. It was not included in the Scottish Government's priorities for CP5, but we continue to work with the Scottish Government and Transport Scotland and anticipate that it will be part of the priorities for the next control period.

**The Convener:** Is that proposal fully costed?

**Nigel Wunsch:** We continue to do the development work on it to get a final current price that we will include in our initial industry plan for CP6, the next control period.

**David Stewart:** I am enthusiastic about electrification, not least to the Highlands, which

would be vital. The industry is keen on electrification not least because it fits in with climate change targets. I think that the witnesses heard my earlier question on that point. We tend to put transport in a different category when we should be taking an integrated approach and saying that, because we believe in addressing climate change through any policy that we have, electrification makes a lot of sense.

You touched on the point, which I was going to make, that electrification is much better for acceleration. It is also much better for maintenance. I have had several examples of train breakdowns in bad weather at Drumochter, for example. That is less likely to happen on an electrified line, which leads to improved efficiency and reduced maintenance costs. Do you agree with that?

**Nigel Wunsch:** I agree with all of it apart from the last point about electrification over Drumochter, because I have some concerns about making sure that the electrification is robust in the climate that we get up there. Drumochter is very exposed in the winter and, in many ways, overhead line electrification can be quite vulnerable.

I strongly support the position that we should electrify. I am keen for transport to be considered as a whole in relation to climate change. Network Rail and the rail industry have targets imposed on them to reduce carbon emissions. To me, the most efficient way of reducing carbon emissions for the country would be to move more traffic on to rail, but that would increase our carbon emissions because the operators would be running more trains and we would have to invest in more infrastructure, which would create more embedded carbon as we build new bits of railway.

**The Convener:** That is a one-off.

**Nigel Wunsch:** It is a one-off, but it affects our targets. We have targets to reduce our own carbon emissions. I fully support improving the carbon efficiency of how we operate the railway but, nevertheless, the more traffic we haul, the greater the carbon we produce.

**Adam Ingram:** What changes in demand for rail freight are expected over the next few years? For example, we know from the announcement about Longannet, that there will be far fewer coal trains from next year. What action do you need to take to ensure that the Scottish rail network will be meeting more demand in other areas in the future? How are you going to anticipate changes and deal with them?

**Nigel Wunsch:** You are right. As I said earlier, we expect significant growth in other sectors of the market. At the moment, we are not quite sure of the future for coal; the changes at Longannet are



relatively recent news and we are still trying to get our heads around the changes that they will bring to the coal flows across Scotland.

In terms of other markets, we expect the intermodal market, both domestic and international, to grow significantly. Over the next 10 to 15 years, I would expect a 50 or 60 per cent growth in that market. The industry is capable of handling that. We need to invest in certain locations. We talked a bit about that earlier when I was speaking about the route study. I anticipate that we will be looking at what the market needs in the next 30 years and asking how we get there. The market study on freight requirements across the country, as part of the route study process, showed significant growth across a number of sectors.

**Anne MacKenzie:** Coal traffic forms about 62 per cent of all the product that we move on rail in Scotland. Over the next 30 years, intermodal traffic is forecast to grow significantly and the forecast will still give us some growth to 2043 even though by that time coal may have disappeared.

**Adam Ingram:** Forgive me, but you mention 2043 and most of us round this table will be dead by then, so I am more interested in the immediate future. We have a particular focus on the next 10 to 15 years. This morning, we heard from the regional transport partnerships that they are looking for a significant intermodal shift from road to rail haulage. What are your plans and how do you anticipate that?

**Nigel Wunsch:** The significance of the 30-year horizon is that rail infrastructure is a long-life infrastructure and, as we are investing in rail infrastructure, we need to think about the cycle of renewals that we go through. Track, structures and signalling all last 15 years plus, while some of the bridges are probably in a 120-year cycle. We need to have that long-term look.

You are right that we want to get freight on to rail and growing in a much shorter timescale. As I explained earlier, that is part of the route study process—we look at the long term, then draw back and say, “Okay, based on that, what do we need to do in the next five to 10 years?” In the current control period, we are investing in loading gauge improvements to allow bigger containers from the east coast main line across the central belt towards Mossend and Coatbridge, which are the main freight hubs, and up towards Grangemouth. We are looking at how we can get bigger containers going further north towards Aberdeen and Inverness.

Inevitably, given the major infrastructure constraints—the number of tunnels and significant bridges—we need to consider how we can do that without doing things such as cutting bits out of the

cross girders of the Forth bridge, which we could not do because it would not do it any good. That will involve looking at how, as an industry, we can invest in lower-platform wagons. Lower-platform wagons are quite expensive to build and slightly more expensive to operate, but they probably still represent a cheaper way of coping with the volumes of traffic that are likely to be going north of the central belt in Scotland. However, under the current industry and Government structure, the grants that are available are more about investing in fixed infrastructure than about investing in rolling stock to meet that need.

11:45

**Adam Ingram:** So would you like there to be a shift in emphasis away from fixed infrastructure to more operational support?

**Anne MacKenzie:** Both should be looked at.

**Nigel Wunsch:** We need a balance between the two.

**Adam Ingram:** What impact do you anticipate high speed 2 having on the free flow of rail freight to and from Scotland?

**Nigel Wunsch:** The key thing about HS2 is that it is targeted at relieving congestion on the routes out of London, which are already significantly congested. From a Scottish perspective, if we cannot get down to the London area and across London towards the Channel tunnel and towards the major ports of Felixstowe and Southampton, we will be more isolated.

The advantage of HS2 taking significant amounts of passenger traffic off the southern end of the west coast main line south of Preston is that that will free up capacity on that route for local passenger journeys and for greater use of rail freight. If we can get greater use of rail freight on those congested bits of the infrastructure, that will enable rail freight to come further north into the north of England and Scotland.

To allow that to happen, we need to invest in improvements to the infrastructure on what we might call the classic railway north of Preston. In the shorter term—probably up to 2043—it is unlikely that HS2 will get as far north as that. We are looking at providing longer loops on the west coast main line and potentially over the next 10 years some short sections of new route—freight bypasses—that will enable passenger and freight services to be separated, particularly up the steeper hills of Beattock and Shap, thereby allowing passenger trains to overtake slower-running freight trains.

**Adam Ingram:** The outcome of the general election might advance that a little bit, but we will wait and see.



**The Convener:** I am confident that all of us around the table will live long enough at least to see the conclusion of the committee's inquiry.

**Mary Fee:** We have heard about the need for additional capacity on the east coast main line, and we have already talked about longer passing loops and double tracking. You mentioned freight bypasses and improvements to the west Highland line. Are there any other specific parts of the Scottish rail network that are limiting the expansion of rail freight? How can improvements be made to those parts of the network? Where are such improvements on your list of priorities?

**Nigel Wunsch:** You have asked a lot of questions. I will try to work my way through them.

**The Convener:** Mary likes to ask the easy questions.

**Nigel Wunsch:** It keeps the brain going.

You are right—we have already covered a number of the highest priority areas. Are there limitations on the network? Of course there are. The challenge for us is to balance the demands that emerge to ensure that we get best value for money out of the investment that we make.

We have talked about the west coast main line and the east coast main line, which connect us with England, and the lines to Aberdeen, Inverness and Grangemouth, which are among the key freight hubs. Those are critical areas in which we think that investment will produce the biggest return. Going beyond that, one could spend significant sums of money to improve the routes on the west Highland line or the far north line if the demand was there, but it is very difficult to get that balance when the demand is much lighter. We run freight traffic on both the far north line and the west Highland line to meet the demand that is there today. We are not aware of demand being frustrated by a lack of capacity at this stage. We hope that the route study will help to identify where that might be a problem in the longer term.

**Mary Fee:** I suppose that part of the problem is that, if you do the work and improve the network, the traffic will come. People are not using rail for freight because they cannot do that, so they use alternative means of moving freight. It is a bit like saying that, if you build a house, people will come. If you improve the network, the freight will follow.

**Nigel Wunsch:** I wish that that was true. Unfortunately, we have a number of examples in which we have improved the network and the traffic has not come despite the predictions and the forecasts and appraisals that were done. At Raiths Farm in Dyce, just north of Aberdeen, we made a big investment with partners in an improved freight facility in the Aberdeen area. With

hindsight, people can now look back and say, "Oh, but it's in the wrong place", but that is where we were encouraged to put it and where people wanted the freight facility at the time. The volume of traffic that goes through Raiths Farm is very low.

I could quote other examples where we have been encouraged to invest. Gauge clearance to Elgin would be a good thing to do and we would love to see container traffic going up there. There is capacity on the network for it to operate, but the volumes are very small. The lifting the spirit project is the only example that has used it and, successful as that was, it has not been followed up with commercially viable traffic.

**Mary Fee:** Thank you. Anne, is there anything that you want to add?

**Anne MacKenzie:** I think that Nigel Wunsch has covered it.

**Mary Fee:** We have heard in our evidence-taking sessions about the priority that is given to freight. Concerns have been raised that freight has to wait for passenger trains to move through, and the need for longer passing loops is a problem as well. What evidence have you received about the desire to give freight a higher priority? How can you broaden the movements and the times when freight is allowed to move, particularly at the weekend? At present, freight cannot move over Saturday night and into Sunday.

**Nigel Wunsch:** I do not think that I would go as far as to say that we give priority to passengers over freight in the way that you describe. In timetabling terms, we have to reach a balanced timetable for all the operators. There is great pressure on the rail network to reduce journey times for passenger trains.

The best way to run the railway is for all the trains to run at the same average speed. If the freight trains were able to go at the same average speed as the passenger trains, they would all trundle along together. In much the same way as it is helpful to have a dual-carriageway road rather than a single-carriageway road because lighter and faster cars can overtake lorries, if we have more loops it allows passenger trains to overtake freight. However, we develop timetables that allow us to get that balance and to get the journey times that the freight customers desire, or as close as possible to them, while still allowing passenger trains to operate, and where we do not have that capacity, we look at opportunities to invest in more capacity to allow that.

On the point about when traffic can run and the restrictions or otherwise, we also need to find time to maintain the network, and we try to do that at times when it is least in demand. We are a very safety-conscious industry and we do our best to



manage that and to keep trains and people apart. It is not a good thing to have trains and people on the network together. I believe that, in maintaining the network, we are much more safety conscious than the road network, for example. We do not have people wandering about putting out cones or wandering across motorways putting out signs. We have to restrict passenger trains when we do maintenance work.

On most routes, from the passenger perspective, the quietest time is Saturday night into Sunday, and that is when we do maintenance on the network. However, over much of the network, where there is a demand for freight traffic we have looked to balance that, and we focus the maintenance opportunities in spells that are as short as possible. We have already mentioned the Hunterston to Longannet route. Because traffic runs on that route 24 hours a day, six and a half days a week, we have to focus our maintenance of those sections of the network in very short spells. However, we still have to find the time to do that work.

**Mary Fee:** Has there been any study of the impact on freight of restrictions, particularly those on a Saturday night?

**Nigel Wunsch:** Not specifically. You will need to talk to the freight operators about this, but an issue for them is that when we carry out major maintenance on Saturday nights we require trains to support our work by conveying rails, ballast and so on to the sites. Many of the freight operators are involved in that, and they have to balance their own resources in order to find resources for that work.

I am sure that supermarkets want seven-days-a-week, 24-hours-a-day movement, and there is no doubt that that is a benefit of the road network. Bits of that network can be closed when the roads are quiet to allow maintenance to be carried out, but bypasses can still be found for transport. We have some examples of that, but having the capacity to run traffic during maintenance periods is expensive.

**Mike MacKenzie:** You have said that there has been discussion about loading gauge restrictions, but I wonder whether you can be a bit more specific about that. Strategically speaking, are there particular pinch-points that you would prioritise, and do you have any innovative solutions for tackling them other than the use of low wagons, which, of course, makes sense?

**Nigel Wunsch:** Yes. We have done a lot of work to gradually improve the gauge for container traffic. Both the west and east coast main lines have been cleared for most containers; for example, we recently demolished the tunnel at

Carmuir, which is one step along the way to improving the gauge facility to Grangemouth.

Where else could we go? As I have said, it would be nice to go north to Aberdeen and Inverness, but there are a number of structures that it would be very difficult to clear for full gauge. We lower the track as well as raise bridges, but all such measures have a cost. For example, lowering track tends to increase longer-term maintenance costs, because the dip that is created leads to water gathering and draining becoming more of a challenge. We have tried various means of delivering what you have suggested, but we also have to take into account the volumes of traffic that are being moved and the fact that we need the critical mass that Anne MacKenzie mentioned to justify the investment of significant sums of money.

When we introduce electrification, we often have to build new bridges, and those new bridges will generally be for higher gauges not just for electrification purposes but to take bigger containers. Over the next few years, we will be electrifying the gap in the route between Edinburgh and Glasgow via Shotts and, as part of that work, we are starting to raise structures that will in due course give us clearance for bigger containers. Again, however, we are competing with the roads network. Raising existing bridges and building new ones disrupt the roads network, and we have to work very closely with the local authorities to minimise that disruption. After all, from their point of view, the disbenefits from the disruption to the roads network are often more than the benefits of having bigger rail bridges.

**Mike MacKenzie:** You have half-anticipated my next question, which is about electrification. The benefits of electrification are fairly obvious, but what do you think are the priority areas in that respect? Where is it most likely to happen next?

12:00

**Nigel Wunsch:** The current funding fills in Glasgow and Edinburgh via the Edinburgh to Glasgow rail improvement plan, including up to Stirling, Dunblane and Alloa. That will get us to the point at which most of the traffic in central Scotland is electric-hauled. We also have funding for the completion of the Shotts line by 2019.

We are in discussion with Transport Scotland about priorities beyond that. For example, we anticipate that the remaining Glasgow suburban network will probably be the next place that we would like to infill, especially one or two routes such as East Kilbride and Barrhead. That would not be of any great benefit to freight, but it would benefit passenger services.



Beyond that, the discussion is about how we eventually go north from Glasgow and Edinburgh towards Aberdeen and Inverness. Our internal discussion with the industry and Transport Scotland is about the order in which we do that. Until we complete the whole section of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Inverness, which includes all of Fife, the bridges across the Forth and Tay, a significant number of tunnels and the exposed route across the passes on the way up to Inverness, we will not get all the benefits because there will always be some bits of the network where diesel trains will have to run under the wires.

That will be true, unless we get to the bi-mode situation. I know that at least one of the freight operators is investing in bi-mode locomotives, which will allow trains to be hauled electrically when they are under the wires and to use diesel when they go off the electrified bits of the network. There will be benefits there.

Network Rail has been working closely with the industry on looking at independently powered—battery-operated—electric trains. We have done some experimental work in England and have successfully run an independently powered electric unit in passenger traffic on the Harwich branch. The unit can go up to 50km off the electrified network, so it is ideal for short branches that do not have overhead lines because it allows trains to run under the wires when they go on to electrified track.

We are looking at lots of different options. Some of the recent electrification that we have done in Scotland has used innovative ideas. In some places, we have not had to raise some bridges by having short sections where the wires do not carry any power. That also reduces costs.

Conversely, there are cost pressures the other way because of safety considerations. For example, we are now required to raise bridge parapets on electrified lines to improve safety and prevent people from throwing things over. Significant cost is associated with that and it increases the costs of electrification.

**Mike MacKenzie:** That is very interesting. You mentioned that progress northwards will come in the longer term. Can you give us an idea of timescale? Are any of us who are around the table today apt to see that or will it be beyond our lifespans?

**Nigel Wunsch:** I would not have thought that it would be beyond our lifespans, but that depends on how quickly the Government wants to specify it should take. The current control period asks us to electrify about 100 track kilometres per year. Looking forward, I believe that we would complete

electrification to Aberdeen and Inverness by around 2030.

**David Stewart:** Do we need to refresh the Scottish Government freight policy?

**Nigel Wunsch:** All policies need to be reviewed on a rolling basis. I am not a great believer in saying, "Right, we'll go and do that now and then we'll leave it for the next 10 years." We need to keep reviewing such policies as circumstances change. I am sure that there are things in the Scottish Government's freight policy that could be reviewed, and I know that Transport Scotland is reviewing its freight policy at the moment along with other issues. I am not sure of specifics, so Anne MacKenzie might want to comment on that.

**Anne MacKenzie:** I cannot remember when the last freight policy was issued, to be honest.

**Nigel Wunsch:** It was last formally issued in 2006. As I said, I believe that it is being refreshed and I anticipate that it will be published in the next six to 12 months. These things change relatively slowly and I prefer not to have big-bang refreshes. My preference is for changing things as they crop up.

**David Stewart:** This is a very wide question, but do you believe that our current planning policies and systems are efficient and effective as far as rail is concerned?

**Anne MacKenzie:** It was quite disappointing that NPF3 did not contain any projects for rail freight. It mentioned the strategic importance of Grangemouth, Coatbridge and Mossend, but there were no specific projects to take the strategy forward. That is a missed opportunity for rail freight. I hope that NPF4 goes further into rail freight.

**Nigel Wunsch:** Beyond that, the planning world needs to think about the impact of rail beyond the rail network. There are a number of examples in which planning has allowed housing to be built close to rail and then people complain that their house is next to a railway, which makes noise. Greater night-time traffic has been mentioned, but unfortunately most people want it to be quiet at night. If a railway is running for 24 hours or even 18 hours a day, there will be noise during the night from the trains passing for people who live next to the railway. The planning framework needs to take that into account.

**David Stewart:** There is a parallel with road. We have heard lots of good examples regarding the possibility of night-time deliveries, but as Mary Fee and I were discussing, someone who lives on an estate in Glasgow and is next to a large warehouse that now has 24-hour deliveries will not be very happy. Integrated planning is important.



You heard the question that I asked the previous witnesses about best practice in Europe. Can you identify an example of best practice in which you see rail infrastructure as being top of the tree? Is there a fantastic example that we should be monitoring? To refresh your memories, the best practice that I identified was Rotterdam harbour, which developed its own dedicated freight rail line. In a previous meeting, I gave the example of boats that are carrying goods for Italy not stopping in Italy but sailing right past to reach Rotterdam and then using the dedicated rail freight service to get to Italy. That is a fantastic example of what has been developed.

What are your views on that project? Can you identify any other best practice for the committee?

**Nigel Wunsch:** I am not familiar with the exact details of the Rotterdam example. The biggest issue for Rotterdam is that it has huge volumes of container traffic. Nowhere in Britain has that volume of traffic demand. As I understand it, the deep-sea shipping lines want to call at as few ports as possible and to unload as many containers as possible at those locations; they want to do the long haul and get rid of all the containers in one place, then use short-sea shipping or rail to deliver.

From a British point of view, the only ports that those lines come into are Southampton and Felixstowe, but in many ways they would rather just go to Rotterdam, unload there and then use short-sea shipping to get to the ports around the coast of Britain. Grangemouth, for example, does quite well out of that sort of traffic. Equally, that draws away from the rail perspective, because if the ships were using Felixstowe or Southampton, the containers would then generally come by rail from those ports to Scotland. There is a balance. It may be that, overall for the economy of the country and in relation to carbon emissions, the ship option is better. That is not for me to comment on.

In terms of building bits of network specifically for freight, we have a number of freight branches that are dedicated to freight traffic. Grangemouth is a good example in which we go to the port. Very little traffic comes from the port, but we take quite a lot of traffic into Grangemouth from bulk consolidation points in the south of England and goods get distributed from there.

When it comes to learning from Europe, much of the British market is so different—in terms of both the volume and the distances that the freight traffic can go—that there are not that many things that are similar that we can learn from. We talked earlier about high-speed rail, and one of the lessons from Europe has been that there has been investment in high-speed rail where the volume of traffic is such that new railways are needed. The

French and the Germans have seen that they have a capacity issue and have decided to invest in a new railway to relieve that capacity; that then creates capacity on the old railway for more freight. That is a good example.

**David Stewart:** Do you see any examples in Scotland of developing more freight-only lines, or reopening perhaps very short rail lines? We have considerable amounts of ex-railway lines, for example the lines that were closed down following Beeching. I think that Alloa has some direct freight-only lines, but are there other examples?

**Nigel Wunsch:** The Alloa to Kincardine line, going on to Longannet, was opened as a freight line. That largely serves Longannet power station. The question of where we will go is interesting, given the closure of Longannet power station. There is some freight on that line through to Fife; it is a gauge-cleared route into Fife for container traffic, which we did not have previously because of the restrictions on the Forth bridge.

We are always open to opportunities, if the traffic volumes are there. It is a bit of a chicken-and-egg situation: until you have the line, you will not have the traffic, but you need to find locations to build the line so that traffic will appear. We have talked about that.

**Anne MacKenzie:** We have reopened lines in the past, but that has happened mainly for coal traffic, where there is the bulk to justify running a train. I do not have any examples from the recent past, or of lines that we are thinking about opening in the near future.

**David Stewart:** Perhaps the committee can do more work on that, in terms of looking at European examples. Thank you for the answers that you have given us.

**The Convener:** Members have no further questions. Is there anything that you would like to say by way of closing, Mr Wunsch?

**Nigel Wunsch:** We have covered most of the issues that we wanted to address. We welcome the significant investment that the Government has made, particularly through the rail freight investment fund. We are using that over the current control period as efficiently as possible to deliver the improvements that we have talked about. We look forward to similar investment in the future, along the lines that we have discussed.

**The Convener:** Thank you for your evidence. It is greatly appreciated as we take forward our inquiry.

*Meeting closed at 12:12.*



Members who would like a printed copy of the *Official Report* to be forwarded to them should give notice to SPICe.

Members who wish to suggest corrections for the revised e-format edition should e-mail them to [official.report@scottish.parliament.uk](mailto:official.report@scottish.parliament.uk) or send a marked-up printout to the Official Report, Room T2.20.

The deadline for corrections to this edition is:

**Friday 1 May 2015**

---

Published in Edinburgh by APS Group Scotland

All documents are available on  
the Scottish Parliament website at:

[www.scottish.parliament.uk](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk)

For details of documents available to  
order in hard copy format, please contact:  
APS Scottish Parliament Publications on 0131 629 9941.

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact  
Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000  
Textphone: 0800 092 7100  
Email: [sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk](mailto:sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk)

e-format available  
ISBN 978-1-78568-405-0

---

Printed in Scotland by APS Group Scotland



## **Midlothian Local Development Plan – Proposed Plan and Associated Documents**

SEStran welcomes the opportunity to comment on the publication of the Proposed Plan and its associated documents. In the response to the consultation on the Proposed LDP, SEStran supports the identified Transport Policies 1 to 5 under the Promotion of Economic Growth, 4.5 Improving Connectivity section within the Proposed Plan.

Midlothian has the potential to make a significant contribution to the growth of the wider SEStran Region. And in the context of the SEStran Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) *'the South East Scotland is a dynamic and growing area which aspires to become one of northern Europe's leading economic regions. Essential to this is the development of a transport system which enables businesses to function effectively, allows all groups in society to share in the region's success through high quality access to services and opportunities, respects the environment, and contributes to better health.'*

The Regional Transport Strategy has undergone a review and the final version after consultation was approved by the SEStran Partnership Board for submission to Scottish Ministers in March 2015. The review included the incorporation of a number of detailed strategies and guidelines as outlined in section 9.8.1 of the RTS and due cognisance of these should be taken of these in the final SDP.

### **Giving Priority to Sustainable Transport Modes**

The areas where it is anticipated there will be potential transport issues arising from proposed development have been identified. The proposed plan also indicates potential schemes that would go some way to mitigate the anticipated problems in each corridor. SEStran supports these proposals and that the importance of active travel and public transport is continually given appropriate emphasis during any new development.

As an example: As previously identified within the Transport Appraisal of the MLDP development strategy, given the scale of proposed development surrounding the Bush Estate and A701, this corridor will have significant impact on the area. The proposed relief road will go some way to mitigating this impact. SEStran strongly advocates the prioritisation of the existing road for walking, cycling and public transport improvements.

### **Design Principles and Setting Standards**

Design principles are referred to in the design of buildings and places. SEStran would recommend that a similar set of standards should be made to the provision of cycling and walking facilities. The SEStran 'Cycling Infrastructure: Design guidance and Best Practice' document outlines basic design principles and is one example of design principles that could be incorporated and referred to by the proposed plan for active travel infrastructure and set a minimum yet high standard in its design principles.

SEStran would also suggest that the Promotion of Economic Growth sections must pay greater consideration to the Sustainable Transport policies outlined in section 4.5. For



example, under Policy ECON7, it is stated that further education facilities are to be supported by a Sustainable Travel Plan. SEStran fully advocates the adoption of Travel Plans and would like to see reference to measures to monitor the effects of Sustainable Travel Plans in Midlothian, and what processes are in place to ensure they are adhered to.

### **Cross-boundary Transport**

It is understandable that Midlothian will continue to have a close relationship with Edinburgh for employment and services, supported by improvements in transport provision, not least Borders Rail. Under section 4.5.8, reference is made to the cross-boundary transport study commissioned by Transport Scotland; under the auspices of SESplan (as part of the SDP review) and that its results may require additional considerations under the LDP. This study will identify the necessary transport interventions to support development not only in Midlothian and Edinburgh but also in neighbouring authorities like East and West Lothian and further afield. Running in parallel with this study, SEStran has commissioned a study on its Regional Cycle Network. The results of this study are to guide investment in to the strategic network across the SEStran region. SEStran would recommend that as a Stakeholder, Midlothian should pay consideration to its outcomes and incorporate this into the LDP as relevant.

On a technical note, the Orbital Bus Rapid Transit proposals should also be shown on the proposal maps. For example:

- Map 1. Shawfair Park and Ride site to the north of the A60/A720 junction
  - Map 6. Straiton, dedicated link between Straiton and Lothianburn Park and Ride.
- This map should also show the existing Park and Ride at Straiton.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed Local Development Plan for Midlothian provides a clear vision of how the area will grow and develop. It also goes some way in addressing the range of issues facing the area and is focused on promoting and managing achievable sustainable growth. SEStran views this document as a positive step and supports the Proposed Plan and Action Programme. However, SEStran recommends that the Proposed Plan could still go further in supporting the provision of Sustainable and Active Travel, by setting strong design principles and standards that will achieve a greater modal shift towards sustainable travel. Further emphasis could also be made towards the development of Sustainable Travel Plans. Policies on monitoring the impact and adoption of such plans would be useful within the LDP if they are to succeed.

It is hoped that the comments above are of help. SEStran would also be happy to discuss these issues further if needed.

Lisa Freeman  
Strategy Liaison Officer  
SEStran







**Regional Transport Partnerships**

**Joint Chairs meeting**

**Edinburgh, 4<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

**Roads Collaboration**

**1. Background**

- 1.1. At the meeting of the Joint Chairs in Orkney on 4<sup>th</sup> March members were updated on progress regarding the interface between RTPs and the Improvements Service on the subject of Road Maintenance Collaboration. At that meeting SEStran were charged with facilitating agreement between the 7 RTP legal advisers on a joint position paper to be presented to the Roads Collaboration Board outlining the role that RTPs could take in facilitating such collaboration.
- 1.2. Andrew Ferguson, the SEStran legal adviser, subsequently drafted the paper and achieved agreement to it from the legal advisers to the other 6 RTPs. The paper is attached as appendix 1.
- 1.3. A meeting was held at the SPT offices with officers of SEStran, SPT, the Improvements Service and their legal Advisers on 2<sup>nd</sup> April at which the contents of the RTP paper were agreed and Andrew Ferguson was charged with preparing a one page summary of the paper for submission to the Roads Collaboration Board meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April. Unfortunately a combination of election duties and being unable to obtain sign off from the Improvement Service's legal adviser meant that the paper did not go to the 21<sup>st</sup> April meeting. The summary paper is attached as appendix 2.
- 1.4. Both papers have now been formally submitted to the Improvements Service as the final position of the RTPs on the legal position.

**2. Recommendation**

- 2.1. The chairs are asked to note progress on this issue and consider any further action they wish to take.

**Appendix 1 - Regional Transport Partnership's Role in Roads Collaboration and Other Shared Services – a Legal View**

**Appendix 2 - RTP Role in Roads Collaboration and other shared services - executive summary of legal position**

Alex Macaulay

19/05/15



## **Appendix 1**

### **REGIONAL TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIPS' ROLE IN ROADS COLLABORATION AND OTHER SHARED SERVICES – A LEGAL VIEW**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 To assist with the consideration of the role that Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs) could have in the delivery of the shared services agenda in relation to the transportation sector, the RTP legal advisers have compiled this joint opinion, setting out how RTPs could provide a shared services delivery model.

1.2 This note has been agreed by the legal advisers for the following RTPs:-

SEStran,  
tactran,  
HITRANS,  
SPT,  
ZetTrans.

#### **2.0 Background**

2.1 RTPs were set up under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005. Their principal function is to produce, and thereafter monitor the delivery of, a Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) for their area. However, other functions have been directly given to certain RTPs in relation to their region: in particular, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT) has a broad range of powers inherited from SPTE and SPTA, including ownership and operation of major bus stations and the Glasgow Subway; the so called single authority RTPs, being SWESTRANS and ZETTRANS have some concurrent functions with the single local authority which they cover in terms of their regional area, and some which have been transferred to them outright.

2.2 When the RTPs were created in late 2005, the shared services agenda was already a matter of concern to the public sector in Scotland. The RTPs were created, in part, as a policy response to the recognition that 32 local authorities all delivering a slightly different version of transportation functions was not always the best or most efficient means of delivering those functions, and that certain transport strategies and projects would benefit from being delivered on a region wide basis.<sup>1</sup>

2.3 The legislation also reflected the work of voluntary partnerships such as SESTRAN and Nestrans which existed before the legislation came into place, whereby transport strategy and projects in the

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., s.5(2)(g) of the 2005 Act, which requires that each RTS should set out how RTPs 'will seek to influence its constituent councils or council in their performance of their functions relating to transport.' See also para 121 of "Scotland's Transport Future: Guidance on Regional Transport Strategies," March 2006.



area were delivered by a collaboration of local authorities through the voluntary partnership. This was given official status by the then Scottish Executive, who gave grant monies to the local authorities for regional transport projects via the RTP.

### **3.0 Functions and the 2005 Act**

3.1 The Transport Act 2005 conferred some functions, some duties and some powers on the new RTPs. In fact, the powers were quite extensive. They included the power to enter into contracts; to acquire and dispose of land; and the use of powers of compulsory purchase if necessary. There were also two sections of the legislation which contemplated the RTPs expanding their functional and operational capability.

3.2 Section 10 allows RTPs, with Ministerial consent, to promote an order conferring additional functions in relation to transport. The process for doing this is actually relatively streamlined and requires only, in the main, that consultation takes place with the constituent authorities of the RTP.

3.3 Other than those effecting wholesale transfers of functions referred to in paragraph 2.1, section 10 Orders which have been granted so far relate to such matters as provision and maintenance of bus shelters, making of Traffic Regulation Orders relating to road maintenance, regulation of highways by public service vehicles and providing of grants for the provision of transport for disabled people.

3.4 Section 10, therefore, provides a useful legal backing to enable any changes in function required by RTPs to participate in collaborations. The process is straightforward and unlikely to attract objections. The risk of legal challenge to the making of an order is low. The Guidance on Regional Transport Strategies issued in 2006 includes a statement that the 2005 Act “only concerns itself with the conferring of *statutory transport functions* – *that is*, any duty or power placed on or given to, for example, a transport authority *or a roads authority* by legislation.” That wording suggests that the word “transport”, in the context of statutory functions, should be interpreted as including the functions of roads authorities. There is nothing specific in the legislation that prohibits the participation of RTPs in roads functions. The distinction between ‘transport’ and ‘roads’ functions is not clear in terms of the various pieces of legislation.

3.5 Section 14 of the Act provides that a Transport Partnership may enter into “arrangements with the Scottish Ministers, a Council or any other person having statutory functions relating to transport arrangements under which the partnership –

- (a) does on behalf of the Scottish Ministers, the Council or that other person such things relating to transport as are specified in the arrangements;
- (b) provide such services for the purposes of, or in connection with, transport as are so specified.”

It is noteworthy that section 14 does not itself confer functions on RTPs. It simply allows them, in implementation of their existing functions, to enter into arrangements with others such as constituent local authorities to perform transport functions on their behalf. It is also noteworthy that s.14 is not prescriptive about what functions are involved – the only requirement is that the RTP does “things relating to transport.”



3.6 It is clear that the policy behind both of these sections sits well with the shared services agenda. There are clearly benefits of scale in relation to some transport and transport related projects. However, the restrictions under which individual local authorities operate legislatively means that it has been suggested they may not be able to enter into formal arrangements directly with each other to share services without raising issues of procurement law.

#### **4.0 The Section 14 Mechanism**

4.1 Standing the position that section 10 orders to confer additional transport functions on the RTPs are a relatively straight forward process which should not be seen as a block to any form of shared services collaboration, it is considered that section 14 provides a useful model for local authorities to collaborate in selected activities such as, but not limited to, roads maintenance. The Appendix sets out in graphic form the proposed arrangement, whereby the RTP, which is a separate body created by statute and with full powers to create committees as part of its governance framework, would delegate full powers of delivery for a shared service to Activity Collaboration Sub-Committees.

4.2 Such sub-committees (or committees) would consist of local authority elected members for the authority areas which intended to take part in the shared service. Procurement could be carried out by the RTP implementing decisions of each Activity Collaboration Sub-Committee. There would be a “back-to-back” agreement between the RTP and the participating authorities; crucially however, the local authority would retain control of the activity and the budget, and the local authority staff would normally continue to manage delivery, with the RTP acting as a central “hub” for the proposed activity.

#### **5.0 Advantages of the proposed mechanism**

5.1 There are key advantages in carrying out shared service collaborations using RTPs in this way. These are set out in brief in the Appendix.

*(1) Democratic accountability stays with the local authority(ies) concerned rather than creating a new body.* The existing democratic structures which have been created both within local authorities and in the RTP would continue to be the foundation of decision making. Local authority members with the requisite skills and background knowledge would take decisions and be accountable for them in the same way as they are at present. There would be no need for the creation of a new body such as an LLP or a new Joint Committee with different governance structures which members might be less familiar with.

*(2) Control of budget stays with the local authority concerned.* It would be for the local authorities to decide what contribution they need financially to the shared service. It is almost unnecessary to add this is increasingly important in the current financial climate.

*(3) Best qualified staff delivering service continue to do so (no TUPE).* Whilst the service would be shared, the existing expertise of existing staff would continue to be utilised to the full, with no need for complex HR involvement in relation to TUPE, negotiations with unions, etc., and potential disputes relating to, e.g., pension rights.



(4) *No new legal entity and therefore no external legal fees.* The collaboration model proposed would build on existing structures and it is not anticipated, after the initial revision of the RTP governance structure, that there would require to be any requirement for detailed legal involvement – other than in procurement.

(5) *Does not diminish or enhance the role of RTP (facilitator).* The RTP would simply act as facilitator for the share service. Control of the shared service and its delivery would rest in the main with the democratically elected local authorities.

(6) *No additional layers of governance required within the already complex transport governance environment;* The creation of LLPs to deal with specific projects, whilst technically feasible, would add to an already cluttered landscape of public sector bodies. This would seem to run against the policy of successive governments to do away with such clutter. It would utilise the existing RTP structures, building on a sound statutory basis for delivery of the shared service agenda, including offering consistency of governance structures for any additional areas of shared services collaboration in the transport sector.

## **6.0 Procurement**

6.1 Until the development of this model, focus as regards public procurement law has been on the relevance of the “Teckal” model. In a nutshell, this model permits public authorities to make a direct award of a contract for works or services, without any public procurement process, to a body which meets the following requirements:

- (i) The parent authority/authorities must exercise a degree of control over the body in question which is similar to that which they exercise in relation to their own department;
- (ii) The essential part of that body’s activities must consist in delivery of tasks entrusted to it by its parent authority/authorities.

Much effort has been expended on trying to establish how the RTP could fit into this model.

6.2 However, the Teckal model is predicated on the basis that a contract for the provision of works or services is to be awarded to the RTP. It may be worth looking again at the definition of public services contract and public works contracts as expressed in the Public Contracts (Scotland) Regulations 2012:

- A “Public Services Contract” means a contract in writing for consideration under which a contracting authority engages a person to provide services.
- A “Public Works Contract” means a contract in writing for consideration for the carrying out of works for the contracting authority or under which a contracting authority engages a person to procure the carrying out for the contracting authority of a work corresponding to specified requirements.



It is likely that the activities to be carried out in any shared service arrangement such as roads maintenance will fall into one or possibly both of these categories – ie. Works or Services.

- 6.3 The model presented in this note does not propose that the RTP be *engaged* by the participating authority to provide those works or services. The RTP will act more as an administrative hub/facilitator to promote co-operation between the participating authorities. In particular:

- The participating local authorities will retain control of budgets.
- The participating local authorities' staff will manage delivery.
- The model even envisages the possibility that it is the local authorities who will enter into the relevant contracts with the suppliers/contractors.

The RTP may provide the forum by which authorities come together to establish areas of co-operation and, it may even promote and manage a procurement exercise on behalf of those authorities, but it will not, in itself, be providing those services or works to the participating authorities.

- 6.4 The proposed model, therefore, does not appear fall into the Teckal model, but is much closer to the arrangement described in the case of the *Commission of the European Communities – v – Federal Republic of Germany* (C-480/06) – sometimes known as the “Hamburg Case”.

In that case four German local authorities agreed a contract with the City of Hamburg to supply waste to an incinerator owned by the latter. There was no special purpose vehicle created. There was no question of the participating authorities exercising any degree of control or management over the City of Hamburg authority. The court concluded that this arrangement was an example of mutual, inter-municipality co-operation and not just an example of one local authority paying for a service to be delivered by another. The participating authorities were engaging together on the provision of their public service tasks and that co-operation did not involve the participation of the private sector. Essentially the arrangement is no different from where one authority alone carries out the tasks itself. The court was clear in its judgement that there is no legal requirement to create a Teckal company to effect such co-operation. The Hamburg example is sometimes described as a horizontal model as opposed to vertical Teckal model where the contract is awarded downwards to a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary company.

- 6.5 The model proposed in this note bears striking similarities to the arrangement in the Hamburg case:

- The contracts for works and services in connection with delivery of the relevant service will not be awarded to the RTP but rather to the private sector supplier who will be engaged through a normal procurement exercise.
- The RTP will be providing the forum within which participating authorities can come together to identify those areas where co-operation would be mutually beneficial.



- Control of budgets and the management of delivery will remain in the hands of the local authorities as may the actual award of any contracts to private sector suppliers.

6.6 EU Directive 2014/24/ also indicates a way forward for a ‘horizontal’ model of collaboration. Scottish regulations are awaited later this year. In the meantime, Article 12.4 of the Directive gives guidance on what might be considered to be an acceptable collaboration between public authorities:

4. A contract concluded exclusively between two or more contracting authorities shall fall outside the scope of this Directive where all of the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (a) the contract establishes or implements a cooperation between the participating contracting authorities with the aim of ensuring that public services they have to perform are provided with a view to achieving objectives they have in common;
- (b) the implementation of that cooperation is governed solely by considerations relating to the public interest; and
- (c) the participating contracting authorities perform on the open market less than 20 % of the activities concerned by the cooperation.

6.7 It is submitted, therefore, that the proposed model sits fairly comfortably within the Hamburg, “horizontal” model of shared services as now reflected in the recent Directive, and does not present any insurmountable obstacles with regards to public procurement law.

## **7.0 Roads Maintenance**

7.1 This paper has been drafted on the basis of any form of shared services collaboration between local authorities in the transport sector. It is recognised that the current proposed collaboration relates to roads maintenance, and concerns have been expressed that this would not fall within the statutory remit of RTPs as they are regional transport authorities rather than regional roads authorities.

7.2 It is not considered that this offers an irrevocable obstacle to progress. There is no clear delineation between what is a roads matter and a transportation matter in the legislation or indeed in policy. Whilst “roads authorities” can be seen as delivering specific matters relating to roads such as building and thereafter maintaining them, all such activity is ultimately a subset of the wider transportation functions of local authorities, who deal with a much greater range of aspects of transport to and from places within their local authority area. Such matters as street lighting, provision of roads and footpaths, bus, rail and other public transport services, , operating airports and air services, arranging joint ticketing, arrangements between different modes of transport, and so on, are all now seen as inextricably linked.

7.3 It is noteworthy, too, that the 2005 Act consists of three main parts: the first relates to RTPs; the second relates to the creation of the Scottish Road Works Commissioner – Dealing specifically with such matters as penalties for failure by statutory undertakers in relation to ‘road works authorities,’ guidance on resurfacing of roads, and fixed penalties under the Raods (Scotland) Act 1984. Part 3 then reverts to what might be seen as ‘broader’ transport activities.



7.4 That being the case, there is no reason why RTPs should not participate in roads maintenance collaboration. The benefits are described above, and appear consistent with, for example, paragraph 121 of the 2006 Guidance referred to earlier, which states: 'RTPs will also be able to act as agents of some or all of their constituent councils or the Scottish Ministers. This would, for example, enable local authorities to achieve economies of scale in the exercise of certain transport functions

through the RTP without losing direct political control.'



## ALREADY ESTABLISHED LEGAL MECHANISM FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES TO COLLABORATE IN SELECTED ACTIVITIES

### **“14 Arrangements for performance by regional Transport Partnership of certain transport functions etc.**

*A Transport Partnership may enter into arrangements with the Scottish Ministers, a council or any other person having statutory functions relating to transport being arrangements under which the Partnership—*

*(a) does, on behalf of the Scottish Ministers, the council or that other person, such things relating to transport as are specified in the arrangements;*

*(b) provides such services for the purposes of, or in connection with, transport as are so specified.” – Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 (asp12)*

SECTION 14: ARRANGEMENT TO  
TRANSFER PACKAGES FOR  
DELIVERY ON BEHALF OF THE  
COUNCILS

RTP

FULL DELEGATED POWERS OF  
DELIVERY

EXAMPLES of ACTIVITY COLLABORATION SUB COMMITTEES

LOCAL  
AUTHORITY  
ELECTED  
MEMBERS

LOCAL AUTHORITY CONTROL  
OF ACTIVITY & BUDGET

A No. LAs STREET  
LIGHTING

B No. LAs PARKING

C No. LAs RD  
MAINTENANCE

D No. LAs SIGNALS  
MAINTENANCE

LOCAL  
AUTHORITY  
STAFF TO  
MANAGE  
DELIVERY

- (1) Democratic accountability stays with LAs concerned
- (2) Control of Budget stays with LAs concerned
- (3) Best qualified staff delivering service continue to do so (no TUPE)
- (4) No new legal entity and therefore no external legal fees
- (5) Does not diminish or enhance the role of RTP (facilitator)
- (6) No additional layers of governance required within the already complex transport environment and future governance consistency



## **Appendix 2**

### **RTP Role in Roads Collaboration and other shared services - executive summary of legal position**

#### **Introduction**

Discussions have taken place between the Regional Transport Partnership (RTP) and Improvement Service (IS) legal advisers on whether, legally, there are impediments to RTPs participating in shared service arrangements in the transport sector. Such as the Roads Collaboration Programme (RCP).

#### **Legal Basis of RTPs**

RTPs were established under the Transport (Scotland) Act 2005. Their statutory functions relate to the strategic planning and, in certain areas, delivery, of regional transport projects. Their membership comprises, in the main, local authority elected members. Their legal personality includes broad powers to enter into contracts etc.

#### **Extending RTP Functions**

Section 10 of the 2005 Act allows the Scottish Ministers to extend the statutory functions of an RTP. The main requirement for such an order is that the constituent local authorities are consulted. This power could be used to fix any perceived 'gaps' in the RTP's legal powers to carry out shared service activity like the RCP.

Section 14 of the Act allows RTPs to enter into arrangements with local authorities and others to provide services or do other things relating to transport which would be normally done by the other body. This is another useful power in this context.

#### **Collaboration Model**

The other main concern about RTP involvement is in terms of procurement law. However, the proposed model of collaboration between RTPs and local authorities would seem to fall within existing case law such as the *Hamburg* case (C-480/06) and the new Directive 2014/24. The participating RTP may need a section 10 Order, as above, to acquire the relevant functional capability.

In the proposed model, the RTP would act as a 'hub,' co-ordinating the delivery of the shared service and providing support services such as procurement. However, democratic accountability, staff, and budget would remain with the local authorities, who could determine the extent of their involvement in the shared service.

An added advantage would be a relatively simple governance structure which elected members would be familiar with. Under s.14 of the 2005 Act, the participating local authorities would enter into collaboration agreements with each other and the RTPs: the decision making body would be a committee of the RTPs comprising representatives of the participating local authorities; the local authorities having agreed to transfer the relevant decision making powers on operational matters to that committee.



## Low Emission Strategy RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

### 1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

Scotland's Regional Transport Partnerships

**Title** Mr ☒ Ms ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Dr ☐ *Please tick as appropriate*

Surname

Robertson

Forename

Ranald

### 2. Postal Address

c/o Hitrans

7 Ardross Terrace

Inverness

Postcode IV3 5NQ

Phone 01463: 719002

Email [info@hitrans.org.uk](mailto:info@hitrans.org.uk)

### 3. Permissions - I am responding as...

**Individual**

**/ Group/Organisation**

☐

*Please tick as appropriate*

☒

- (a)** Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

*Please tick as appropriate* ☐ Yes ☐ No

- (b)** Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis

*Please tick ONE of the following boxes*

Yes, make my response, name and address all available ☐

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address ☐

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address ☐

- (c)** The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

*Please tick as appropriate* ☒ Yes ☐ No

- d)** We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

*Please tick as appropriate*

☒ Yes



# Low Emission Strategy for Scotland

## Draft Consultation Response

April 2015

The Scottish Government published its Consultation Draft of a Low Emission Strategy (LES) for Scotland in January 2015. A report was considered by the Chairs of Scotland's seven Regional Transport Partnerships at their meeting in Kirkwall on 4 March 2015 and the following comments were approved as a joint response to the consultation.

Scotland's Regional Transport Partnerships are statutory organisations working closely with local authorities and other bodies to provide strategic transport policy and guidance for transport in their regions. Each has an approved, statutory Regional Transport Strategy, which contain policies including those to reduce the effects of transport on climate, noise and air quality and to reduce the environmental impacts of transport, in support of national targets.

The draft Low Emission Strategy recognises the role of Regional Transport Partnerships and the importance of collaborative working, acknowledging the need for strategic and region-wide policies. Reflecting this, RTPs should specifically be included in the Governance arrangements for the LES as illustrated in Figure 1 on page 8. Although RTPs are members of STEP they should also be represented on the Low Emissions Strategy Partnership Group and/or the Transport sub-group of LESPG.

It is noted that the LES is focussed on air quality and that other "co-benefits" are seen as secondary, although recognising that "natural synergies" exist. The Strategy could benefit by being clearer in proposing solutions that contribute to multiple objectives, for example that reducing carbon emissions should be a stated aim through complementary policies, rather than a co-benefit. It should not be assumed that improving air quality will necessarily result in reduced carbon – policies should be developed which contribute widely rather than on a single high level factor in the hope that wider benefits will accrue. One example has been the move to diesel cars, with lower carbon emissions but harmful emissions affecting air quality and human health.



## CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

### **Q1 Do you think the Mission, Vision and Objectives for the Low Emission Strategy are appropriate? If not, what changes would you suggest?**

The Mission “To protect and enhance health, wellbeing, environment, place-making and sustainable economic growth through improved air quality across Scotland” is supported and welcomed.

We would suggest rewording the Vision statement for clarity to read “Scotland’s air quality **will be** amongst the best in Europe”.

The six Objectives on page 4 are supported, although it is suggested that the Transport Objective should be re-ordered and widened to recognise that technology and flexibility may also have a role to play in reducing emissions from transport through more flexible working practices, video-conferencing, online retailing, etc. It is suggested that the Objective should be changed to read “A Scotland that reduces transport emissions through enabling fewer trips; promoting modal shift away from the car; encouraging more efficient and sustainable freight and urban logistics; and supporting the uptake of technology and cleaner fuels, to lower emission alternatives.”

### **Q2 Do you think the proposed actions will deliver the Mission, Vision and Objectives? If not, what changes to the actions would you suggest? Are additional actions required? If so, please suggest what these might be.**

Yes, subject to the following comments.

The Actions on pages 5, 6 and 7 do not correspond to the Actions contained throughout the document. Many of the Actions on pages 22 to 34 lack any target dates for implementation (e.g. a 100% declassification of Local Air Quality Management Areas). The Actions appear to be unfunded and aspirational – the actions should be clearer and should be focussed on what Scottish Government can do working in partnership with others. For example, rather than “Local authorities should ensure...”, the wording should be along the lines “The Scottish Government will work with and support local authorities to...”. Many of the actions are vague and not SMART e.g. Consider, Review, Assess etc.

As a general point of presentation, there are many sections in the document which refer to Local Authorities where RTPs will also have a major role and contribution to make – e.g. in relation to promoting Active Travel, Travel Planning and improving public transport (see specific Action comments below). It is suggested that the term “Transport Authorities” should be used to include both Local Authorities and RTPs.

In its current form, the strategy includes reference to many supporting and related policies and legal obligations which are likely to change over time



resulting in a strategy that will be increasingly outdated. There may be merit in preparing a high level strategy document with a separate action plan(s). This would set broad policy aims which would remain relevant over time, aid clarity of purpose while enabling the action plan(s) to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate a changing policy and regulatory landscape. This also applies to references to various funding streams such as the Green Bus Fund which are currently in place but which may be superseded or ended over time. More generic terms might better apply in the strategy.

**Action 9a** needs to recognise the conflicting demands placed on traffic management. Measures which optimise traffic flow could result in dis-benefits for public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists, potentially undermining efforts to promote Active Travel and more sustainable travel generally. The priority should be to optimise sustainable travel.

**Action 9b** is unclear and is not explained in the supporting narrative on page 25 – presumably this refers to parking policies ?

**Action 10b** should also include reference to RTPs, reflecting the work that all RTPs undertake on promoting cycling and the joint Active Travel officer relationships which most RTPs have with Sustrans.

**Action 10c** should also refer to the statutory Regional Transport Strategies, which are more current and are refreshed periodically – many, non-statutory, Local Transport Strategies have not been updated since their original production some 15 years ago.

**Maximising the role of softer behavioural change measures** should be listed as a specific action under 10 : Active Travel. These can include Travel Plans for existing public and private sector employers, promotion of car-sharing, car clubs etc. Travel awareness raising also ties in effectively with Greener Scotland and air quality awareness.

**Action 11a** should refer to RTPs as well as Local Authorities, reflecting the fact that RTPs are eligible and indeed have bid successfully for Green Bus Fund funding to support bus improvements. This could be covered by simply referring to working with “operators and transport authorities”.

**Action 13a** should recognise that there may be other schemes to address this issue – for example Transport for London intends that the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) should be expanded outside London. There is also an issue with continuing affordability for transport authorities funding ECOstars or similar schemes.

**Action 13b** should include reference to RTPs as a Lead Partner with TS, reflecting the fact that regional FQPs have already been established by the RTPs, as acknowledged on pages 28 and 29.

**Action 14a** should also be considered by SDPAs, linking with Action 14e.

**Action 14e** should include RTPs given the close working which already exists between RTPs and SDPs on integrating strategic transport and land use policy and planning. It is also suggested that HOPS should be involved in taking forward this action.

**Action 14h** should include reference to RTPs as well as LAs – RTPs employ Travel Plan officers who work closely with both the public and private sectors to embed Travel Planning and maximise its effectiveness.



**Action 14j** should include SDPAs and RTPs as partners reflecting the fact that many transport-related emissions relate to cross-boundary travel and solutions which would potentially benefit from the proposed central low-emissions fund will include cross-boundary infrastructure and facilities (e.g. strategic Park & Ride as defined in RTSs and STPR).

Reflecting the above comments the Glossary on page 7 should include RTPs.

**Q3 Does the Setting the Scene section summarise accurately the current policy situation? Please suggest changes if not.**

It is considered that section 5 covers the main issues. Acknowledgement of the role of RTPs and their statutory Regional Transport Strategies on page 14 is welcomed. It is also noted that between 1990 and 2012, Scotland has seen a 59% reduction in particulates, 65% decrease in oxides of nitrogen and a 79% decrease in sulphur dioxide and that air quality in Scotland compares favourably with the rest of the UK and other EU member states. Transport emissions account for 30% of Carbon Monoxide, 38% of NOx and 20% of particulates.

**Q4 Does the Way Forward section give a reasonable outline of what further action is needed to deliver an effective Low Emission Strategy? Please suggest changes if not.**

The LES states that “Central Government cannot deliver improvements to air quality on its own”. However, although this is accepted, Government does need to accept its responsibility and take the lead, working collaboratively and consistently with partners to achieve common aims. Trunk roads carry 38.6% of traffic in Scotland, and many Air Quality Management Areas relate to trunk roads. We would therefore welcome a clearer statement in the strategy on the split of national, regional and local responsibilities.

In addition, it will be crucial that the LES is reflected in wider Scottish and UK Government policy (albeit the Scottish Government cannot dictate the latter). While local actions may improve air quality, decisions taken at a national level may undermine the LES or be contradictory to it. This would include decisions in areas like renewable energy or determinations by Ministers on referred or “called in” planning applications, UK Government decisions on fuel duty etc.

One way of encouraging more sustainable development and with it reducing emissions would be to strengthen current planning policy to ensure that public transport, walking and cycling are given greater priority in planning decisions about housing and other development. Currently, planning applications often fail to embed public transport and walking and cycling as part of the design of new housing, retail developments etc. Indeed many



housing applications are positively hostile to public transport and walking with little opportunity for buses to penetrate housing developments and little by way of walking and cycling routes. Often the only way to easily or realistically access local services is by car.

Related to this is the need to ensure that the whole life costs of decisions about transport but also a range of other government investments are captured and not simply accounted for at the point of delivery. For example, while electrification of the rail network is welcome, this should also reflect the fact that the electricity is derived from a mix of energy sources including fossil fuel.

The Scottish Government needs to ensure that sufficient funding is available to enable implementation of the LES and to enable local authorities to conduct the actions required of them.

The section on Active Travel should provide an opportunity to better influence active travel policy towards achieving the Government's key objectives. For example, proposals contained in the National Planning Framework (NPF3) to develop a national walking network has missed the opportunity to focus where real difference could be achieved, by linking communities and focussing on urban areas – there needs to be an appropriate re-balancing of priorities and resource allocation between the need to improve active travel infrastructure within and between communities with the significant investment which has previously been made in leisure and long-distance networks for recreation. Similarly, funding for cycling should be focussed on providing real change in every day journeys, short trips within urban areas, emphasis on commuter cycling and focussed on communities.

As noted above, there is a need to more effectively define and align the roles and responsibilities of the various national, regional and local agencies and this particularly applies to those involved in promoting and delivering active travel. Regional Transport Partnerships, working with their partner local authorities and other bodies such as Transport Scotland, Sustrans, Cycling Scotland and Paths for All, offer an effective means of developing and managing locally appropriate initiatives and programmes to promote active travel, focussing on the key issues relating to transport and environmental objectives in their regions. The collaboration between RTPs and Sustrans on embedded Active Travel officers, to support the development and implementation of Active Travel strategies and programmes, could usefully be developed to perform a greater role in the development and coordination of national programmes and funds for active travel at a regional level.

The Action to “Consider how statutory Quality Bus Partnerships could be more effective” should be more outcome focussed, along the lines of “Promoting partnerships between bus operators and transport authorities to promote more fuel efficient services and deliver improved services for the



benefit of passengers and the environment”.

References to the potential for changes in the bus regulatory framework which might make it easier to set up SQPs are welcome. Given the level of public investment and subsidy provided to the bus industry, not simply through BSOG, Green Bus Fund and Bus Improvement Fund, but also through supported and schools’ contracts, investment in bus stations, bus stops and shelters, the purchase of vehicles for lease, administration of ticketing products and machines, development of smartcard, investment in road infrastructure including bus boarders and bus laybys, real time bus information systems, quality bus corridors and bus priority signalling,

Given this level of public investment it is essential that bus operators are seen to be proactive in meeting LES objectives. There is scope to strengthen SQP arrangements to encourage and / or require bus operators to green their fleets and to drive improved quality standards generally to encourage modal shift from car.

The action for “All local authorities to ensure that they have a corporate travel plan consistent with any local air quality action plan” should be extended to “**All public sector organisations...**”.

Through their existing role and work on Travel Planning at a regional level, RTPs are well placed to support this and the achievement of national objectives to extend the implementation of Travel Planning contained within RPP2.

The section on Behaviour Change also needs to recognise the number of campaigns and organisations working in this field. There is a need to align and coordinate these to ensure greater collaboration, consistency, efficiency and effectiveness.

Finally, reference to Community Planning is welcome since there are few references or commitments in recent SOAs to air quality targets or indeed transport generally.

## **Q5 What are your views on the proposals for the National Modelling Framework?**

Developing a National Modelling Framework provides the opportunity to ensure a standardised approach in a consistent and meaningful manner. Initial focus on Strategic Development Plan areas could miss an opportunity to involve all relevant local authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships in developing local models and assessments to ensure that all relevant transport interventions are also included. As indicated in the response to Q2 above, RTPs and their strategies have an important role and contribution to make to the proposed LES and should be involved in the development of the proposed modelling framework.



It will be important that the National Modelling Framework is more than simply about representing air quality but should be about testing interventions and scenarios to tackle air quality issues and considering the interplay between air quality modelling and transport modelling. For example, SPT already has the functionality through its policy model to consider the implications of transport scenarios on emissions and air quality which is used to support the development of the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan and it will be important to build on this established framework.

The role of new developments should not be over-emphasised. Existing air quality issues will continue to be generated and influenced by existing land uses. New developments are likely to have a more limited effect on these.

The AQA modelling process should recognise that RTS reviews are increasingly being aligned with the SDP review process and should also incorporate progress/review of relevant STPR proposals.

#### **Q6 What are your views on the proposals for the National Low Emission Zone Framework?**

Low Emission Zones will require a level of consistency and Scottish Government should take the lead in providing consistent guidance and overview. However, it is important that decisions are made locally, including a regional dimension through coordination with neighbouring authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships to be appropriate for local circumstances. It is important that measures are agreed within regional groupings and are in line with national guidelines.

The proposed framework is concerned with new vehicles but consideration should also be given to standards for existing vehicles – e.g. can these be upgraded to Euro VI and, if so, at reasonable cost? Also, with regard to enforcement, Police have withdrawn the national traffic warden service and the wider implications of this also need to be considered.

It is suggested that the timescale in section B1 should be reviewed. The ability of authorities to undertake an LEZ assessment within 12 months of publication of the Strategy will be dependent upon finance and is unduly restrictive. Flexibility may be needed if it is considered that alternative measures are not working or if, for example, at some point in the future a downward trend in pollutants changes and re-consideration of an LEZ may be needed in response..

It will be important to consider how to enforce LEZs e.g. who will control access to LEZs and it will be necessary to work with the DVLA to access vehicle records to link with the ANPR system.



**Q7 What are your views on the proposed Key Performance Indicators? Are any different or additional Indicators required?**

Eight KPIs are proposed. The collection of related data, including for the modal split KPIs, can be costly but it is unclear how the data should be collected, who should collect it and whether funding will be available where this entails new information gathering. It is agreed that to be effective, the LES will require meaningful monitoring to take place, but it is necessary to produce data or to offer funding for data to be collected.

The mean travel to work time indicator may not tie in with reduced emissions as a shift in mode from car to public transport, cycling and walking could increase travel time, while reducing car traffic and alleviating congestion, with a consequent reduction in pollutants. In addition, the mean travel to work time indicator remains broadly constant as improvements in journey time often have the effect of encouraging people to live further afield from their place of work.

The cycle path network density indicator would need careful consideration – i.e. does this refer to on-street cycle lanes or off-street paths? – and how effective, for example, are off street routes that may take longer than on-street routes and be less attractive for non-leisure journeys?

There does appear to be a split of responsibilities here which is quite concerning as local authorities are assigned the KPIs and Scottish Government is assigned the outcomes and objectives. This would appear to place the onus very much on local authorities to deliver without a recognition that success will be driven by external factors, including the need for behavioural change and Scottish Government policy.

Finally, many KPIs are influenced by a host of factors including economic and behavioural that need also to be factored.



**Regional Transport Partnerships Joint Chairs Meeting  
Held in the Ayre Hotel , Kirkwall on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 9.30am**

**Draft Minute of Meeting**

**Present:** Cllr Michael Stout, Chair, ZetTrans (Chair)  
Cllr James Stockan, Chair HITRANS  
Cllr Peter Argyle, Chair Nestrans  
Cllr Russell Imrie, Chair SEStran  
Cllr Will Dawson, Chair Tactran

**In attendance:** Michael Craigie, ZetTrans (MC)  
Ranald Robertson, HITRANS (RR)  
Derick Murray, Nestrans (DM)  
Alex Macaulay, SEStran (AM)  
Eric Guthrie, Tactran (EG)  
Fiona McNally, HITRANS (Minutes)

**Apologies:** Ewen Milligan, Transport Scotland (EM)  
Tom Davy, Transport Scotland (TD)  
George Eckton, CoSLA (GE)  
Kieran Jackson, CoSLA (KJ)  
Cllr Tom McAughtrie, SWestrans  
Harry Thompson, SWestran  
Cllr James Coleman, SPT  
Bruce Kiloh, SPT  
Cllr Ramsay Milne, Nestrans

Item	Action
<p><b>1. Welcome and Apologies</b> Cllr Stout welcomed everyone to Orkney and noted the apologies received above.</p>	
<p><b>2. Presentation by ZetTrans and Orkney Islands Council on Ferry Service Working Group</b></p> <p>A presentation was provided by Michael Craigie and Gavin Barr on the work of the Ferry Service Working Group.</p>	
<p><b>3. Minutes of the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014</b> The minutes were approved.</p>	
<b><u>Matters Arising</u></b>	
<p><b>(i) Roads Collaboaration Board.</b> EG raised RCP letter from Colin Mair and the circulated response from RTP chairs. Tactran have underlying concern regarding mission creep from improvement service. RTP secretariat has been liaising with RCB and RTP's. Discussion at Lead Officers meeting with legal</p>	



advisers was very useful.

RTP Legal advisers are continuing to liaise with each other. The Improvement Service have invited the legal advisers to a meeting in SPT offices on 11<sup>th</sup> March. Both the RTP lead officers and legal advisers agree that a consensus is required before meeting with Improvement Service. Additionally, a RTP representative has been invited to attend the RCB/Improvement Service meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> April.

It was agreed that the meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> March should not go ahead, as the timescale is too tight to enable a consensus being reached. Additionally the RTP lead officers wished to pursue their request from 11<sup>th</sup> Feb that 3 RTP leads attend the meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> April.

MS asked if RTPs could ask RCB legal representatives Burness Paul to provide legal reasons why the RTP model couldn't work?

Additionally questions were asked regarding the Improvement Services end date for this work?

**Action: Secretariat to liaise with RCB to ask questions.**

Moving forward AM has volunteered the SEStran legal representative to lead the discussion between the legal advisers to help reach a consensus between them, while liaising with RTP lead officers.

**Action: AM to liaise with SEStran legal representative**

#### **Items for Discussion/Decision**

#### **4. RTPs/Scottish Government/CoSLA Working Group Paper – Update on Actions (BK/EG)**

EG provided an update to the paper provided to chairs. No update from SG or CoSLA has been provided following the RTP chairs meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> Feb.

EG raised concerns that RTPs need to be recognised as an asset within all teams within Transport Scotland, for example improving links with the Sustainable and Active Travel team to ensure a key role going forward.

RR updated chairs that the Minister for Transport and the Islands, Derek Mackay has been sent the dates of 2015 meetings, and that he could not attend today.

It was agreed that if the minister cannot attend June meeting, a separate meeting date should be requested for RTP Chairs and Leads to meet with the minister to discuss the working group paper, and also to discuss key RTP engagement going forward. Key issues for discussion:



- Funding
- RCP
- Role of RTPs as statutory bodies

**Action: RTP secretariat to liaise with SG to define meeting dates.**

Note: It was highlighted in news that several LA's including Glasgow, Aberdeen, Renfrew and South Lanarkshire have left CoSLA and are setting up their own group. RTPs need to engage with this group going forward, to discuss our role as statutory bodies.

## 5. Active Travel/Behaviour Change Issues

### (i) Smarter Choices Smarter Places (AM)

AM circulated a paper on the outcomes of the SCSP applications. Each LA was provided a nominal sum of money, which required match funding, and was administered via applications to Paths for All. The 31 LA's who applied were successful in receiving funds, subject to the agreement of an action plan and recommended monitoring and evaluation techniques.

Additionally, it is worth noting that not all LA's applied for their full entitlement due to match funding/ budget restrictions, while others indicated that additional monies could be spent for further work. Details of LA's gaining additional funds are still being finalised, dependant on strength of further projects.

As work progressed during 2015, objective is that there will be regional seminars where LA's can provide progress on their work, and the organisation and co-ordination of these events would be through RTP's. To expect this request from PFA.

### RTP/Cycling Scotland Update (EG)

(ii) EG provided a verbal update following attendance at CS board on 24<sup>th</sup> Feb:

- **Pedal for Scotland.** Looking to extend outside Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen. More likely to be future events in 2016.
- **Give me cycle space.** CS looking to engage with secondary schools as well as primary schools. This will result in a different focus on campaign this year.
- **Bikeability level 3.** This will be targeted towards secondary schools.
- **£60k for HGV training.** CS have set up a steering group to take this forward. Essential for training LA HGV staff in the first place. BK invited to attend.
- **Cycle Friendly Communities Fund** has been launched.
- CS conference likely to be around 12<sup>th</sup> November.



- **Action: EG to meet with Keith Irving to discuss CAPS, with specific focus on KPIs and RTP involvement.**

## 6. Rail Issues

### (i) High Speed Rail Report (AM)

AM circulated an update on the current situation on HSR following recent meetings. Currently two outstanding reports. One is with Scottish Govt regarding Edinburgh/Glasgow opportunities, and the other with Westminster Govt. It is worth noting:

-Key messages from meeting with SCDI /SG/ Sir David Higgins:  
3 hr journey time to Scotland would be welcomed.

-Sir David provided a lengthy case for a HS2 line to Scotland, taking into account the delays for any improvement to lines.

-Likely that HS2 Phase 3 would go to Scottish Govt, as a devolved matter. Not likely to be seen as a priority to National Govt.

-HS3 over the Pennines may possibly 'jump the queue' due to the political support for this south of border.

### ECMA Report (AM)

#### (ii) AM provided a verbal update following meeting ECMA meeting:

ECMA has been in a state of flux for several months. Chair of ECMA changed, due to political changes within York City Council, and dependant on May elections this may change again. Suggestions of people who could chair ECMA have been suggested, subject to LG elections.

York City Council have overspent in consultation, due to others' not paying funds into the consultation process. Going forward there are 3 proposals for ECMA budget. All 33 LA have said they would contribute individually, or as part of a partnership, result in just under £59k budget, which is considerably less than the £160k required to continue current work.

For under £65k budget, the question of ECMA continuing has been raised. A further request has been made to each of the 33 authorities to try and reach £70k, which would result in a proportion of an officer's time, and engagement with government and rail industry, rather than commissioning further technical consultancy moving forward.

**Action: AM to agree RTP budget moving forward with other RTPs, which was suggested at £26k if reaching overall target of £160k, £14K if reaching £70k.**

AM

2 subgroups: Technical. This will be disbanded.



Communication and Economics to continue.

AM has arranged to meet Jim Eadie MSP, Chair of Transport and Infrastructure committee in Scottish Govt in March. Cllr Imrie and AM to attend, along with a councillor from northern England.

Do ECMA have a list of up to date Chief Executives within the LA's?

**ALL**

**Action: All to check this within their RTP area.**

## **7. Bus Issues**

### **(i) Note of Chairs meeting with CPT 3<sup>rd</sup> Dec 2014**

EG action regarding Bus Registration is awaiting update, will progress at future meetings.

Meeting notes approved.

## **8. Aviation Issues**

### **(i) Davies Commission /National Connectivity Task Group (DM)**

The task force provided an update to the commission by February deadline. There will be a press event on the 16<sup>th</sup> March in London, hoping to do something in Scotland, to launch report.

Report is backed by a large amount of information and research focusing on legal, economic, finance, and historic details, all with the aim of reinforcing that if a new runway is developed in London that it should improve connectivity to the whole of the UK, including Scotland.

DM highlighted that RTP chairs should be happy with this report, as Scotland is well represented. A STAG analysis has been carried out and DM verbally listed the objectives.

Overall the report suggested that the UK Government looks at current legislation and current conditions, which may allow for a 3<sup>rd</sup> runway in the south of England, which could be at either Heathrow or Gatwick.

**Action: DM to circulate report on 16<sup>th</sup> March to all.**

**DM**

## **9. Low Emission Strategy Consultation Response (DM)**

DM provided a copy of the Low Emission Strategy for Scotland Consultation.



An additional paper was provided in the meeting for members' consideration, which provided Nestrans response, highlighting the cluttered active travel landscape across Scotland. Sustrans are not happy with this response.

Additionally, the article within LTT has raised concern.

EG highlighted a consultation regarding public sector Climate change, and whether there could be a joint response to the Low Emissions Strategy and also the Climate Change consultation.

**Action: EG to circulate details of other consultation.**

EG

Additionally National Walking and Cycling Network due for release on 19<sup>th</sup> March.

**10. AOB**

RR- RCP. Ranald provided a verbal update following communication received via email during Chairs meeting from Improvement Service which was discussed.

**Action: Secretariat to provide a written response on the RTP position, which will be copied to the minister with signatures of all RTP chairs.**

RR

**11. Dates of next Meetings**

2/3<sup>rd</sup> June, HITRANS

WD apologies as in Brussels.

**Items for Noting**

The Chair moved and it was agreed that the papers submitted for the following items be noted.

**12. Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee Freight Inquiry (EG)**

**13. SCA Hydrogen Bus Initiative (RR)**

**14. Highland ITP Project (RR)**