



**Glasgow Airport Rail Link
Murray Street Business Liaison Group
Wednesday 22 March 2006, 2pm
Ramada Jarvis Hotel, Glasgow Airport**

Present

Mae Marshall (MM)	Paisley North Community Council
Jim Cunningham (JC)	Renfrewshire Council Economic Development
Ken Goldie (KG)	Renfrewshire Council Economic Development
Mr McConnechy (M)	McConnechys of Kilmarnock
Kingsley Wood (KW)	Kingsley Wood Solicitors
Adrian Brown (AB)	Scottish Enterprise Renfrewshire
Sandra Black (SB)	Greenhill House B+B
Colin Bruce (CB)	Bike It Motorcycle Training
John McGlynn (JM)	Airlink Group
Chris Gould (CG)	Biwater Treatment Ltd
Cllr Jackie Green (JG)	Renfrewshire Council
John Halliday (JH)	SPT
Douglas Blyth (DB)	SPT
David Gardner (DG)	SPT
Neil Halket (NH)	Faber Maunsell
David Sawyer (DS)	Weber Shandwick

Apologies

Wendy Alexander MSP
Cllr Tommy Williams, Renfrewshire Council
Andrew MacDuff, Renfrewshire Chamber of Commerce

ACTION

1. Introductions and Apologies

JH opened the meeting, and introductions were made.

Apologies were noted from Wendy Alexander MSP and cllr Tommy Williams.

2. Presentation on BLG Remit and Status of GARL

JH led a short presentation on the objectives and the remit of the BLG, and the status of the Glasgow Airport Rail Link (GARL) project.

3. Overview and progress of GARL

JH explained the parliamentary process to the group, and advised that the Bill Committee had its first meeting on 14 March.

4. Forthcoming Work on GARL

JH advised that the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) was available on the GARL project website. As a living document, it would be updated continually and then be placed before the Bill Committee. The BLG would have a role in feeding into this document. The intention is that the CoCP would only be finalised when construction contracts were being prepared and that there would be ample time to incorporate amendments between now and then.

Hard copies of the Code of Construction Practice will be sent to all BLG members with the minutes of the first meeting.

WS

5. Issues Arising and Questions

Legal Challenges

JG asked, if MSPs give the go ahead to the project, whether there is any legal challenge that can be mounted against the scheme, such was the case with the M74. DB confirmed that a legal challenge could be mounted. SB asked what would happen in the Bill didn't get the go ahead. JH explained that it would not be progressed.

Liaising with Businesses

JC made the point that Renfrewshire Council will be working closely with businesses that could be affected by the building of GARL, specifically in locating alternative premises. He urged businesses to keep in close contact with the council and SPT over the coming months. JM said he was delighted to hear that Renfrewshire Council had set up a unit to help affected businesses. JH said that SPT would continue to work closely

with Renfrewshire Council and affected businesses to find suitable premises for relocation.

Minutes

CB said he had not received minutes of previous meetings with SPT and requested that minutes of all meetings with BLGs and CLGs be made available. DS said that all Liaison Group minutes would be available on the GARL website and minutes of previous meetings were contained in the formal consultation report and March-December 2005 consultation report, available to view at www.spt.co.uk/garl

Group Remit

SB questioned why different Community Liaison Groups had been set up and wondered whether this was an attempt to "divide and rule". SB also queried why she had not been invited to the BLG. DS said that different groups had been set up to tackle different issues e.g. what may be of interest to playing field users may not be of interest to businesses. DS also said that those invited to the CLGs/BLGs were a representative cross-section of the target group - including the heads of community councils - and not everyone in the local community was invited. SB said that she was a member of the local community council and as a local business would have liked to have been invited. **(SB's name has been added to the invitation list for future BLGs).**

Objection Period

JC asked whether the end of the objection period was 3 April and did people need to object before then. JH confirmed that this was the case. AB asked what would constitute a valid objection to the Bill. DB replied that the validity of objections is determined by the Parliamentary Committee and would be anyone whose interests are adversely affected by the Bill. SB said it was "ridiculous" that people had to pay £20 to object. DB confirmed that this was a matter for the Scottish Parliament.

Communication with Businesses

KW said he could not fault the quality of the information provided by SPT but maintained that some businesses in the room did not know what was going to happen to them. KW said there had been no movement by SPT to say how the organisation was going to deal with affected businesses. DB

said that SPT had undertaken a rigorous consultation, involving a series of one-to-one meetings with many businesses present in the room and said that SPT was continuing to speak to all the businesses concerned. He went on to say that SPT remained available to investigate the impacts with businesses. CB said he had had various communication problems with SPT. He added that his staff were worried that they were not going to have a job. JH said he appreciated CB's concerns and SPT would continue to work closely with CB throughout the process.

Use of Public Money

JM asked whether it was SPT's policy to work in a positive manner to find solutions and save public money. JM asked whether SPT was able to enter into conditional agreements with different companies prior to the link being given the go ahead. JH said that SPT had a range of options and that this was one the organisation was investigating. CB questioned whether JH thought the rail link would make money and be successful. JH replied in the affirmative but added GARL would be subsidised and that many railways in the UK are subsidised to a certain extent because railways are seen as something that the economy should afford.

Crossrail

AB asked about the status of Crossrail. JH explained that Crossrail is an SPT "committed project" but it was impossible at this stage to say when or if it would be delivered. He added that a decision is expected in summer 2006.

The future

SB asked what would happen if GARL is not given the go ahead by MSPs. Would SPT reapply in say two years? JH said that he doubted whether the scheme would be promoted again for another 10 years.

EARL

AB asked if EARL would proceed, due to its funding. JH and DB noted that it was Introduced on Friday 17 March and if the scheme were given the go ahead, it would be funded by the Scottish Executive.

Flats on Greenhill Road

SB asked if SPT could establish if any tests had been undertaken on the Greenhill Road flats near her business and home. SB also asked what would happen if the flats had to be demolished. DB said that SPT would revert to SB with clarification. NH added that noise and vibration had been looked at in some detail in the Environmental Statement, available on the GARL website.

SPT/WS

Roads

CB asked about disruption to surrounding roads and asked whether roads would be closed off during construction. JH said that the Bill contained provision for closing the A726 and that the Construction Code of Practice contains more details about these provisions.

Next Meeting

The Group consensus was that BLG meeting be held every two to three months but only when there is an update. CB requested that "What Happens Next and When" and "Compensation" be added to the next agenda and that an agenda be circulated in advance of the next meeting and people be invited to suggest topics.

SPT/WS

6. AOCB

No issues were raised.