



**Glasgow Airport Rail Link
St James Community Liaison Group
Draft Minutes
Thursday 15 March, 6.30pm
Beechwood Community Centre, Paisley**

Present

Archie Anderson	Paisley North Community Council
Archie Berry	Paisley North Community Council
Alan Hopkirk	Paisley North Community Council / Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development
Gordon Craig	Paisley North Community Council / Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development
Don Marshall	St James Residents Association
Robert Traquair	Strathclyders Against Detrimental Development
Elaine Smith	Local resident
George Thomson	Local resident
Sharon Thomson	Local resident
David Gardner	SPT
Charlie Francis	Atkins
Ross Hornsey	Weber Shandwick
Brian Kerr	District Valuers

Apologies

ACTION

1. Introductions and Apologies

Apologies were given for Mae Marshall.

DM raised the fact that members had not received agendas for the meeting in adequate time. **WS**

DG also introduced Brian Kerr of the District Valuers who would speak to the group about compensation issues.

2. Approval of Previous Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting on 9 November 2006 were approved. It was agreed to put safety and security on the next agenda and the possibility of inviting along a community police officer would be looked into. **WS**

3. Project Update

3.1 Parliamentary update

DG informed that the project had received Royal Assent and was now progressing to the implementation stages. Atkins would be leading the design phases and currently seeking RIBA stage D approval from the local authority.

The project is being split into distinct parts with the mainline section and all rail associated works project managed by Network Rail whilst the branch line civils contract will be project managed by SPT.

DG further informed that SPT would also soon be engaging construction contractors and that there was likely to be a tender process starting in August with the contract awarded early in 2008.

AA asked whether it was still likely that construction would start next March. DG confirmed that this was still the intended start date but would depend on how soon the construction contractor is appointed.

DM raised the issue of the relocation of the tank farm and who would be responsible for its demolition and the remediation of surrounding land. He said he was concerned about whether this work could have a significant affect on the costs and timescales for the project.

DG confirmed that BAA would be project managing the fuel farm contract and that SPT would be doing the branch civil engineering contract however the there was an interface between the two work streams in terms of the demolition of the existing fuel farm.

3.2 Cost of project

AH raised the issue of costs, what would happen if the project went over budget and who, politically, was responsible for the whole funding of the project. He further enquired whether, once construction begins, there is any likelihood that it would be left unfinished due to lack of funds?

DG informed that the Bill had set out a budget of £170-210m and that Atkins was currently validating design and costs of the project. The range in the budget is required to allow for changing timescales and inflation during the project and the Scottish Executive used four major cost consultants to forward plan the projects costs. DG confirmed that there is a potential to seek funding from other funding sources but agreed to clarify the provision and process for monitoring and controlling expenditure. **SPT**

3.3 Further Consultation

AB asked SPT to clarify the requirements for further consultation during the design and build process and whether local residents could expect to be involved.

DG replied that consultation would go ahead as required by the Construction Code of Practise, but agreed to come back to the group with further details. In addition, DG informed that the CLGs would continue. **SPT**

3.4 Football Pitches

DG informed that there was currently a tender out for off site pitches to replace those lost during the construction phase. All off site pitches would be supplied with new changing facilities, parking, improved drainage and surfacing, and goal posts.

AB asked what would happen to the temporary changing facilities once they were no longer needed and suggested they be donated to local clubs.

DG informed that at this stage nothing could be decided about the final ownership of the facilities but AB's suggestions would be considered for the future. **SPT**

3.5 Scale Model

DG stated that there was no record with SPT of a model for the project and CF explained that, in any case, a model would not necessarily be suitable for the project.

3.6 Visualisations of Viaduct

DM questioned what was new about the visualizations as he thought they were the same as the last meeting. DG explained that these were not the 180 degree panorama type images shown at the last CLG, but conventional discrete images as agreed. Since these were issued in December, refined visualizations had been sent to Mrs. Marshall on behalf of the PNCC because of specific queries. Copies of the revised images were circulated to the meeting.

DG also advised that further to comments at the previous meeting a number of visualisations showed a view taken from 3 or 4 doors from Mary Gildea's house. It is hoped that this will give an acceptable impression of what the scheme may look like from her home

DM claimed the photomontages were inaccurate and cited the reference of a 6m lamp post to prove they weren't to scale. DG noted that this was why the images had been amended since being issued in December, and that Renfrewshire Council's Lighting Department had confirmed the heights of lamp posts in McFarlane Street to be 8m.

- 3.7** AH asked whether the viaduct bridge could be painted a better colour, such as grey, to make it less intrusive. GM was concerned about graffiti on the bridge and asked whether special coatings could be applied to prevent this.

Train Times

AA raised the issues of the timetable being extended but DG confirmed there would be no change to the current 5.30am to 11.45pm timetable.

4. Geotechnical & Design

4.1 Ground Investigations

CF reported that ground investigations had been carried out which showed alluvial soils under the proposed route of the branch line ranging from a few metres to around 40 metres at its deepest. This depth would be overcome through a pile foundation that would be socketed into the bedrock.

DM asked for clarification that all foundations would be piled to bedrock. DG confirmed that this was the case.

ES informed that she didn't think the GIs went close enough to the proposed line of the viaduct and AA thought there had only been 4 tests done where the actual line would run. DM confirmed that the GIs had been conducted away from the 19 points specified by the LLAU.

DG informed that this had to be done to avoid football pitches and that further GIs would occur throughout the project.

AB asked whether driven piles would be used for the viaduct piers. CF informed that bored piles would be used along the whole length of the spur.

4.2 Damage from GIs

AA tabled photos of tracks churned up on the playing fields by geotechnical investigation works.

DM informed that the council had denied the contractors using a 35 ton vehicle on the pitches. He informed that they were a safety hazard and that someone had already broken their arm. CF said he would look into why these had not been repaired. [post meeting note – RC and Atkins confirmed that ground will be repaired once weather conditions improve]

ATKINS

4.3 Drainage

AA asked when the eastern pitches would be drained as water would flood into the western side unless this happened.

AB informed that the drain on Greenock road currently doesn't run properly after heavy rain and it was suggested that the airport takes precedence for run off and drainage during extreme wet weather.

DM asked whether drainage would be provided across the whole park.

DG said the western half would be reconfigured not drained but would check what the assessor report for the exact details. **SPT**

4.4 Entrance to the Park and Parking

DM recalled that during the assessor hearings there was talk of traffic lights and this would be opposite the McFarlane St junction. DG thought this would be as per the existing junction but that the entrance into the park would be off Goudie Street before it connected to Greenock Rd. DG agreed to come back to the group to confirm. **SPT**

AH asked for clarification for parking during construction, noting that the blaes area (60 cars approx) would be in the compound area and that the car park at the existing pavilion would be built on for the new pavilion. DG informed that the parking requirements would be less as there are fewer playing fields, but that it would be a matter of staging, which will be looked into by Atkins. **ATKINS**

Members also asked whether a parking solution could be found at the west end of the playing fields under the A737 viaducts, and suggested that this had been discussed with Renfrewshire Council several years ago. ES asked whether consideration had also been given to placing the car park for the pavilion under the A737 overpass to the west of the playing fields. DG said he would look into both issues. **SPT**

AH suggested that the planting area behind the Ground Staff's accommodation be used for parking rather than planting.

AA informed that on street parking for matches often damaged the verges and asked whether a barrier could be provided alongside Greenock Rd to protect it. CF and DG agreed to look into the available options. **SPT/ ATKINS**

4.5 Screening

CF then tabled drawings, visualizations and plans of the proposed viaduct through St James. He emphasized they had been based on the earlier drawings in the Environmental Statement, but had been amended to be clearer and easier to read.

He outlined the current provision of trees around the viaduct and informed Atkins was looking at providing much more screening adjacent to Greenock Road. The containment mitigation against the road interchange was largely unchanged for the time being, however.

The drawings illustrated the trees at time of planting (4 to 5m high) and at 'design year' 10-15yrs post planting - this is the period that the trees will have reached what can be considered a their full height and spread. Most planting will be a mixture of deciduous trees and tall evergreens for screening throughout the year as well as everyday shrubs at a lower level.

AA asked how long the trees would be maintained as he was worried about them being neglected. CF informed that the maintenance period had yet to be formalised with the Local Authority.

CF suggested a parks representative could be brought to the next meeting to help clarify the issue.

WS/SPT

ES asked whether consideration had been given to replacing trees and greenery that would be lost through the construction. CF informed that the contractor has a responsibility to replace anything lost or damaged that can be directly attributable to his works (excluding vandalism).

RT was worried about mounds adjacent to motorway creating safety and security issues. Fencing must be put in place to prevent access to roads and the proximity of Kibble School must be taken into account.

DG said that it may be that the council would not want to have the mounds, but they were still to be consulted.

SPT

AB asked there would be a ball fence retained along Greenock Road. CF replied that it would not likely be necessary because of the pitch configuration; however, he would look into its retention.

ATKINS

AH questioned what mitigation will be provided for the south side of the park. CF said it was not provided for in the current drawings but could be introduced - current plans are drawn from the ES which did not include screening to the south.

4.6 Pest Control

ES asked about pest control during construction. CF informed that the contractor will be responsible for ensuring appropriate health and safety measures during the construction period.

ATKINS

5. Compensation

BK noted that the District Valuer was in partnership with GVA Grimley in supplying property services to the project which included administering compensation for land.

BK informed that claims for compensation could be covered by part 1 claims in the 1973 Land Compensation Act. This would provide compensation for depreciation in the value of land caused by the physical factors outlined in the act through the operation of the development and the deadline earliest date for claiming was one year after completion - likely to be 2011.

The local authority will pay for a surveyor to carry out a valuation on homes affected but surveyors would probably consider now to be too early to carry out such an assessment.

AA asked whether current noise vibration levels from various points could be monitored. DG agreed to come back to the group with this information.

SPT

BK informed this compensation covered depreciation in value from noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke and artificial lighting and the discharge on to the land in respect of which the claim is made of any solid or liquid substance, but noted that if this was an electrified line – fumes were unlikely to be generated. Compensation for the construction process can also be applied for if the contract breaks the code of construction practice. BK advised the group to keep a diary of any problems they experienced.

BK outlined the McCarthy rules for claiming compensation for blighting of property. Virtually no properties are eligible for this and it is considered a risk of ownership.

There are 4 rules, all of which must be satisfied for the possibility of compensation.

6. AOCB

None to report

7. Confirmation of next meeting date

It was agreed the date of the next meeting would be agreed with members of the group in due course.

Noted