



**Glasgow Airport Rail Link
St James Community Liaison Group
Draft Minutes
Tuesday 23 October 2007
Beechwood Community Centre**

Present

Alan Hopkirk	Paisley North Community Council
Archie Berry	Paisley North Community Council
Archie Anderson	Paisley North Community Council
Robert Traquair	Local resident
Mary Gildea	Local resident
Gordon Craig	Paisley North Community Council
Christine Sinclair	Local resident

Insp. Alistair Armour Strathclyde Police

David Gardner	SPT
Colin Macdiarmid	Atkins
Ross Hornsey	Weber Shandwick

Apologies

ACTION

1. Introductions and Apologies

Apologies were received from Alan Hopkirk, Mae and Don Marshall and Stephen Bacon from Atkins.

Inspector Alistair Armour was introduced to the group to speak about community safety.

2. Approval of Previous Minutes

2.1 Parking

RT questioned why the Scottish Government would be unwilling to see parking provided under the new viaduct as cars are currently allowed to park under the M8 White Cart viaduct.

2.2 Geotechnical

Group members raised what they believed to be an error in the minutes in section 4 - Geotechnical & Environmental Design. The group thought SPT representatives had given the impression that once the borehole works were completed, the affected pitches would remain fenced off and out of use until the full construction works began next year.

DG assured them that this was a misunderstanding. He noted that at the previous meeting SPT had advised that whilst the affected pitches would remain out of use during the works, the contract documents required the ground to be reinstated after investigations at St James were complete. DG added that the borehole locations would be remediated as soon as possible and stressed that it was never in SPT's interest to have areas fenced off for long periods of time after completion. In addition provision for access to all land under the investigation contract at St James Park would be subject to approved method statements agreed with Renfrewshire Council.

DG apologised if a different impression was inadvertently given to the group.

3. Community Safety

AA opened by saying that the group members were concerned that large construction projects like GARL can result in an increase in petty crime against residences. It was thought those looking to steal from the site could be frustrated by the security and instead turn their attention on local homes.

AA asked whether SPT could fund extra police officers for the period during construction.

AlAr did not think there would be a demonstrable link of crime displacement from the civil engineering site to the surrounding community.

Some group members provided anecdotal accounts of petty crime increasing during the construction of the A737. They asked whether some analysis of crime figures could be done on a similar construction site to find if there was any potential link. AlAr agreed to try to organise some crime figure research and analysis on the issue but informed it could take some time. **AlAr**

AlAr informed that it was very unlikely that extra police officers could be provided even if they were funded by SPT. This is due to the costs of training and keeping officers extending well beyond the GARL project's lifetime.

AlAr offered to organise site surveys to assess security once construction was under way. Community safety officers could also advise local residents on how to improve their security.

RT asked whether there was any possibility of organising additional vehicle patrols, even if there wasn't a possibility of extra officers on the beat. AlAr said that he wasn't able to commit additional police resources himself, but would pass the group's requests up to his commander. He did think it made sense to at least increase the visibility of patrols in the area during the construction period. **AlAr**

AB asked whether additional investment in security cameras could be viable. AlAr advised that there was a 12 to 18 month lead time on the installation of CCTV security cameras. He also informed that the nearby cameras at Mill St were not operated by the police but by a private board set up by the community.

4. Geotechnical & Environmental Design

DG informed that discussions were still being undertaken with Renfrewshire Council regarding the reinstatement of pitches lost during the borehole investigations.

Group members were concerned that there would be a repeat of the damage left on the pitches by the last set of geotechnical works. It was planned to use heavy duty tracking of the highest grade to reduce and damage caused to the pitches by the vehicles and machinery.

There is some scope to adjust the bore hole locations and realign the pitches to reduce the number that are put out of commission by the works.

Access was possible from both the north and the south and the contractors would assess the least damaging method of carrying out the works, which would also be agreed with Renfrewshire Council.

AlAr asked if this would cause any significant traffic impact but was assured that no sustained problems were predicted as a result of the works.

AA asked how many pitches would be out of action at a time. DG was not able to confirm a precise number at this stage but CM informed that work would last 4 to 5 days on each hole and up to 4 rigs would be working on the site.

CM also informed that different tests were required at different locations which may affect the timing and duration of the works. The group suggested works could take place over the Christmas period. SPT agreed to look into this. **SPT**

The group were informed that there was no hindrance to beginning the tree and shrub planting phase of the project early. Stephen Bacon of Atkins was working on this aspect of the project and would be able to give an update at a future meeting. **Atkins**

- 5. AOCB**
None.

- 7. Confirmation of next meeting date**
The next meeting was suggested for some time in mid December after a contractor was appointed to carry out the initial geotechnical works. **WS to organise**