AIRDRIE-BATHGATE RAILWAY AND LINKED IMPROVEMENTS BILL
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INTRODUCTION

1. This document relates to the Airdrie-Bathgate Railway and Linked Improvements Bill introduced in the Scottish Parliament on 30 May 2006. It has been prepared by the Promoter, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (“Network Rail”), to satisfy Rule 9A.2.3(b) of the Parliament’s Standing Orders. The contents are entirely the responsibility of the Promoter and have not been endorsed by the Parliament.

2. Explanatory Notes and other accompanying documents published by the Parliament are available separately as SP Bill 64–EN. That document contains details of the accompanying documents published by the Promoter, and where those documents may be inspected or purchased.

3. This Promoter’s Memorandum sets out the objectives of the Bill, the background to the Airdrie Bathgate project, and the necessity for the project to be promoted by means of a Private Bill in the Scottish Parliament. The Memorandum also sets out the policy context for the project and any alternatives that have been considered by the Promoter. Finally, it sets out the consultation that has been undertaken on the proposals to date.

POLICY OBJECTIVES OF THE BILL

4. The purpose of the Bill is to seek and obtain all necessary powers to construct and reopen the rail link between Airdrie and Bathgate with an electrified double track railway that would generally follow the solum of the old railway line. The Bill also provides for linked improvements to existing railway lines to provide for an electrified double track railway between west of Glasgow and Edinburgh via Airdrie and Bathgate. This involves works on and adjacent to sections of the existing railway lines at Airdrie to Drumgelloch, and Bathgate to Edinburgh. Additional stations are proposed for Caldercruix and Armadale and relocated stations at Drumgelloch and Bathgate. The existing cycle path on the former railway solum will be relocated. The Bill will also remove any doubts that some of the existing railways that are affected by the proposals may not have been constructed in the precise locations provided by the original authorising Acts. ¹

5. The objectives of such a railway are:

- to improve direct access to labour markets in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and West Lothian for people living in the Airdrie to Uphall corridor.
- to stimulate economic growth of the Airdrie to Uphall corridor by improving the connectivity of the area.
- to assist in the delivery of social inclusion to communities in the Airdrie to Uphall corridor by providing enhanced public transport opportunities to those without access to private cars.

¹ Section 42 of the Bill will apply to all the railways authorised by all the identified enactments, which also authorised other railways that are unrelated to the Bill proposals.
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- to contribute towards increasing the number of people using public transport in Central Scotland and provide these communities with improved access into the national rail network.
- to offer a public transport alternative to the M8 thus helping to reduce the rise in road congestion and subsequent environmental impacts.
- to construct a rail link that will allow for existing services on the Glasgow North electrics to operate as through services to Edinburgh providing an alternative to the Edinburgh - Glasgow main line service, thus assisting in reducing congestion at peak times.

6. Delivery of the Airdrie - Bathgate rail link is a key aim of national, regional and local transport and planning policy.

BACKGROUND

7. The Glasgow to Airdrie route was first opened between Glasgow (College) and Sunnyside Junction in 1871. The Monklands Railway Company's "New Line" from Airdrie to Bathgate opened in 1862 and the Bathgate to Edinburgh Line opened in 1849, which together completed a through route from Glasgow to Edinburgh Waverley.

8. The route was built piecemeal by the different railway companies and it was not double tracked until 1904. Timetabled passenger services took considerably longer than the Edinburgh Glasgow railway route via Falkirk, partly because of the steep gradients and tight curves on the route, and also the requirement to stop at the high number of stations along the route. The line relied mainly on coal freight to sustain its existence, and as the coalfields were worked out and the mines closed, so the line became a likely candidate for closure. As competition from other transport modes increased, through passenger services between Airdrie and Edinburgh were withdrawn in 1956.

9. In the early 1960’s electrification and re-signalling work was completed on the double track Glasgow - Airdrie Line.

10. In 1979 the Airdrie to Bathgate section of line was reduced to single track and in 1982 the section of line between Clarkston (near Drumgelloch) and Bathgate closed to all traffic. The tracks were lifted shortly thereafter and from the mid-1980’s a surfaced cycle path was constructed on the solum between Drumgelloch and Bathgate. Freight services continued between Airdie and Clarkston until 1987.

11. Although the Airdrie to Bathgate section of the line closed in 1982, demand for rail services continued to grow in the remaining operational parts of the railway between Glasgow and Airdrie, in the west, and Bathgate and Edinburgh in the east.

12. In 1986, Bathgate regained its current half-hourly passenger service to and from Edinburgh via Livingston North and Uphall. This service has been highly successful and the platforms were extended to cater for 6 car units in 2004. Additional car parking was also provided at Livingston North. The Bathgate service is, however, limited in capacity as the
existing passenger services use only the single track line between Bathgate and Newbridge 
junction.

13. In 1989, the existing section of railway from Airdrie to Drumgelloch was upgraded. The 
upgrading was carried out pursuant to permitted development rights, which derive from the 
precursor to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 
1992 (“Permitted Development Order”). These are types of development, which can be carried 
out without the need to secure planning consent, as this is deemed to be granted.

14. For the purposes of carrying out its duties as a statutory undertaker with responsibility for 
the railway infrastructure, Network Rail has the benefit of, and regularly uses, two particular 
Classes of the Permitted Development Order, although there are other general Classes, which 
may be relevant from time to time.

15. Class 11 permits development authorised by Acts of Parliament, which designate 
specifically the nature of the development authorised and the land upon which it may be carried 
out. Certain works, such as the erection, construction or alteration of a building, bridge or access 
to a highway, requires the specific prior approval of the local planning authority.

16. The majority of authorising Acts relating to Scotland incorporate section 16 of the 
Railways Clauses Consolidation (Scotland) Act 1845. It is section 16 of this Act, which enables 
alterations and repairs to be carried out, from time to time, to works authorised by the enabling 
Act, and to substitute others to replace or update them.

17. The existing railway was authorised by the various Acts listed in Schedule 9 of the Bill, 
most of which incorporate section 16 as referred to above, and the remainder contain their own 
similar provisions.

18. In addition, Class 13 of the Permitted Development Order is development permitted by 
railway undertakers and their lessees on their operational land required in connection with the 
movement of traffic by rail. This is the second part of the Permitted Development Order, which 
permits development, and is used by Network Rail and its lessees, although this Part specifically 
excludes the construction of a railway, railway station or bridge.

19. The closure of the original Airdrie to Bathgate section of the line removed what later 
proved to be an important public transport link to parts of North Lanarkshire and West Lothian. 
This has left areas in North Lanarkshire and West Lothian without sufficient access to public 
transport, making access to sources of employment and education in Edinburgh and Glasgow 
difficult. The problem is particularly acute for residents without access to private cars.

20. The proposal to re-open the Airdrie Bathgate rail link arose from the Scottish Executive’s 
2002 Central Scotland Transport Corridor Study (Corridor Study) as a potential mitigation 
measure to alleviate traffic pressure on the M8 east-west motorway route and enhance public 
transport through Central Scotland. The Corridor Study is discussed in greater detail in 
paragraphs 66 to 78 of this Memorandum.
21. In January 2003, Scottish Ministers accepted the recommendations of the Corridor Study seeking to re-open the Airdrie to Bathgate rail link as part of a frequent service from west of Glasgow to Edinburgh and committed to provide funding for the development of the project. The detailed routing and engineering feasibility of the rail link was assessed by the project’s consultants, Jacobs Babtie, in an Initial Technical Feasibility Study completed in June 2004.

22. Network Rail accepted the invitation to act as Promoter of the scheme, in principle, in May 2005 and formally took on this role on 1st October 2005. The Promoter has worked with Jacobs Babtie, Transport Scotland and other key stakeholders to develop the details of the scheme including engineering design, public and stakeholder consultation, timetable modelling and station location selection, leading to the preparation of the Bill documents.

NECESSITY FOR A PRIVATE BILL

23. The construction of re-opened rail infrastructure requires specific statutory authorisation. Before devolution, railways in Scotland were authorised by means of provisional Orders made under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act 1936, which confers functions on the Secretary of State and the UK Parliament. The Scotland Act 1998 (Modifications of Schedule 5) Order 2002 had the effect of devolving to the Scottish Parliament functions connected with “the promotion and construction of railways which start, end, and remain in Scotland”. The 1936 Act therefore no longer applies to railways that fall within this description. Such railways must now be authorised by a Private Bill in the Scottish Parliament.

24. In deciding how best to procure the railway, three options were considered by the Promoter, namely: (1) utilising any existing powers which Network Rail might have; (2) negotiating the purchase of affected land from the individual landowners and going through normal planning procedures; (3) the Private Bill process.

25. The route of the proposed railway generally follows the route of a former railway line, which closed in 1982 and subsequently became the route of a national cycle path. There are approximately 70 Private Acts affecting some aspect of the former railway. These Acts authorised the construction, maintenance and alteration of the former railway and also contained compulsory purchase powers, rights of access, and similar powers. Since closing, the railway has legally ceased to exist and (although not specifically repealed) none of the authorising Acts still has effect. This existing legislation therefore cannot be used by the Promoter to construct the proposed section of railway between Drumgelloch and Bathgate.

26. For the section between Drumgelloch and Bathgate the only other option to a Private Bill would be to proceed by way of voluntary purchase and to obtain planning permission. This has the fundamental problem that in the absence of a Bill seeking statutory powers there could not be certainty of being able to acquire the necessary land. Even if the owners of all the relevant property interests were prepared to sell, without compulsory purchase powers there would be no way of preventing them from demanding prices in excess of a fair market value, effectively demanding a premium for the scheme. Without compulsory purchase powers there would therefore be no certainty that the scheme could be provided within a reasonable time period and budget.
27. The Promoter does have existing statutory powers and the Permitted Development Rights, described in paragraphs 13 to 18 of this Memorandum, relate to existing operational rail lines, such as those west of Drungelloch and between Bathgate and Edinburgh. These rights are sufficient to enable Network Rail to operate, maintain, renew and enhance these sections of the existing operational railway, provided the works are contained within the existing limits of land owned by Network Rail and fall within the ambit of the Permitted Development Order. As an example, the installation of the overhead electrification equipment can be undertaken through Network Rail’s existing statutory powers. However these rights do not cover works on land, which is not owned by Network Rail. As a result, certain works, such as rebuilding of road and footbridges over these existing railway lines to give sufficient height clearance for the new electrification equipment, have been included in the Bill as Linked Improvements. The powers being sought in the Bill and Linked Improvements, in conjunction with the Promoter’s existing statutory powers and Permitted Development Rights, will permit all of the works required to provide an electrified double track railway between Glasgow and Edinburgh via Airdrie and Bathgate.

28. Furthermore, there are parcels of land adjacent to the existing railway where the Promoter does not own the land required. The Promoter does not have powers of compulsory purchase over such land. In the absence of such powers, a single landowner could frustrate the whole project. Accordingly, a Private Bill needs to provide for powers of compulsory purchase over such land.

29. In summary, a Private Bill is the only practicable way through which the new railway and linked improvements can be provided.

30. The Bill includes provision for the compulsory acquisition of land for the scheme and powers to temporarily occupy land for the purpose of constructing the scheme. The Bill also provides for the closure and / or diversion of some roads and footpaths that currently cross the route to avoid potential road / rail incursions, and the construction of various ancillary works along the route as necessary to accommodate the railway.

31. The Bill, when passed, will effectively grant outline planning permission for the works it authorises. The legal basis for this is contained in article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 (S.I. 1992/223), which grants planning permission for the classes of development specified in Schedule 1 to the Order. Class 29 in Part 11 specifies development authorised by (among other legislative instruments) an Act of the Scottish Parliament. The extent of the permission granted is restricted in the ways described in class 29, which are more particularly described in sections 214 and 215 of the Explanatory Notes accompanying the Bill.

32. Authorisation to undertake the electrification upgrade of the operational railway between Haymarket and Waverley station is not being sought under this Bill, as these works will be undertaken as part of the Edinburgh Waverley Redevelopment Phase 1 project.
DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED RAILWAY SCHEME

33. The scheme as proposed by the Promoter would reopen the link between Drumgelloch and Bathgate with an electrified double track railway that would generally follow the solum of the old railway line along which National Cycle Route 75 currently runs. The cycle path would be re-routed. New stations would be provided at Caldercruix and Armadale. The existing stations at Bathgate and Drumgelloch would be re-located.

34. Linked improvements will also be required to sections of the existing operational railway between Airdrie and Drumgelloch and between Bathgate and Edinburgh because the works fall outwith Network Rail’s permitted development rights, as explained more fully in paragraphs 13 – 18 of this Memorandum. For example, 29 bridges require to be replaced or have works carried out on them to provide clearances for electric trains and a higher standard of parapet. On the north side of the M8 at Uphall an additional car park will be provided, which will be linked by a footbridge over the M8, creating a direct and accessible link between the car park and the station.

35. Car parking would be provided at both new station locations, as well as the two relocated stations. Alterations will be made to existing parking at Airdrie and Livingston North stations. Enhanced parking will be provided at Uphall station. Works will be required to almost all of the bridges between Airdrie and Edinburgh, except those of most recent construction. Some bridges will require re-decking or demolition and rebuilding to modern standards. Earthworks will include improvements to cuttings and embankments and abandoned mine workings will require to be stabilised.

36. The following diagram shows the proposed railway:

37. In addition to the construction of the rail link and the stations, the Bill will authorise the construction of a light maintenance depot at Bathgate on the site of a rail served car storage yard. It will also authorise the construction of a replacement rail served car storage yard at Boghall, east of Bathgate.

38. The completed rail link would form a new public transport link between west of Glasgow and Edinburgh. The railway over most of the reopened section will have a line speed of 80mph to support the operation of four passenger trains per hour in each direction when utilised by modern Electric Multiple Unit rolling stock.
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39. The scheme would reintroduce the former railway between Drumgelloch and Bathgate and restore a public transport link that has been lacking since the original rail link was closed. It will significantly improve public transport opportunities for the large population residing in the suburbs of the major cities and communities along the route. For the residents of these communities, the scheme will enhance accessibility to Glasgow and Edinburgh, as well as other major employment locations along the route, such as Edinburgh Park, Bathgate, Livingston and Airdrie.

40. Improving direct access to Glasgow and Edinburgh from West Lothian and North Lanarkshire respectively will deliver enhanced public transport opportunities to those without access to private cars. In addition, increasing the frequency and reliability of the existing train service on the Bathgate to Edinburgh line will increase the attractiveness of public transport alternatives to car use.

STAG APPRAISAL

41. The proposed scheme has undergone an extensive Design Development Appraisal to test its robustness against the principles of planning and appraisal described in Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG). The purpose of a STAG appraisal is threefold:

- it demonstrates whether a proposal is socially, environmentally and economically deliverable and is technically and financially feasible;
- it reveals the extent to which a proposal fulfils the planning objectives set; and
- it demonstrates the full set of likely impacts of the proposal against the Scottish Executive’s five objectives of environment, safety, economy, integration and accessibility. It should also demonstrate the distribution of these impacts across social and spatial groups.

42. The Design Development Appraisal made the following findings in relation to the compliance of the project with five key objectives: - environment, safety, economy, integration and accessibility:

- Environment - by building the railway generally on the solum of the original railway line, the impact of construction on the environment is less than the alternative alignments as described in paragraphs 79 to 101 of this Memorandum. The benefits of having the enhanced passenger services outweigh the local and mostly short-term adverse impacts of the scheme and the Environmental Statement provides for mitigation measures. Each chapter in the Environmental Statement contains an assessment of impacts section where further information can be found.

- Safety – the proposed scheme would provide a new alternative to car trips along the M8 corridor and by inference would reduce accident potential to some degree. Each railway station would be designed in accordance with rail industry safety standards to minimise risk to the public, passengers and staff. No level crossings will be provided along the route.

- Economy – the proposed scheme would help to support sustainable economic activity by significantly extending the public transport network and opening up sustainable travel choice. As part of the Design Development Appraisal and in line
with STAG guidance, a transport economic efficiency analysis was undertaken and the scheme was found to represent value for money by having a cost benefit ratio of 1.81 and an estimated Net Present Value of £303m. This means that for every £1 spent on the project there is an estimated benefit of £1.81. As a consequence, the total economic benefits of the Airdrie – Bathgate Railway and Linked Improvements are estimated to outweigh the total costs by £303m over the 60 year assessment period.

- Integration – the scheme would provide additional travel choice to towns and surrounding communities along the route through the choice of station locations and the provision of bus access, cycle and pedestrian links and enhanced car parking. The scheme would also help to facilitate longer distance trips by public transport by reducing journey times to the main hub stations in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

- Accessibility – the scheme would provide a fast and frequent public transport alternative in areas where existing public transport access is limited. This would promote a sustainable travel alternative and access to wider employment areas.

43. The Design Development Appraisal demonstrated that the scheme meets all key STAG objectives.

POLICY CONTEXT

Transport Policy

44. The scheme is entirely in line with, and is explicitly supported by, national, regional and local transport policy.

45. The Scottish Executive’s transport policy document, “Scotland’s Transport: Delivering Improvements” (March 2002) highlights priority projects to reduce road vehicle usage and encourage sustainable transport choice. The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link is included as one of the key projects flowing from the M8/A8 corridor study, which will contribute towards these objectives.

46. The Scottish Executive White Paper “Scotland’s Transport Future” (June 2004) sets out five transport policy objectives:

- Promote economic growth by enhancing transport services and infrastructure.
- Promote social inclusion by connecting remote and disadvantaged communities.
- Protect the environment by investing in public transport.
- Improve safety of journeys.
- Improve integration between different forms of transport.

47. The White Paper identifies the delivery of new rail infrastructure as being one of the most important means to open new opportunities to use public transport and to reduce reliance on the private car. The Airdrie-Bathgate rail link is specifically identified in the White Paper as one of the main rail projects which will meet Scottish Executive transport policy objectives:
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“By reinstating the railway between Airdrie and Bathgate, we will create a new route between Glasgow and Edinburgh that will increase travel choices and open new opportunities for employment, education and recreation to communities in North Lanarkshire and West Lothian.”

48. The Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 establishes Regional Transport Partnerships and requires these bodies to prepare transport strategies. Enhancing rail infrastructure to improve internal and external connections is one of the four actions identified as the core of the draft Joint Transport Strategy for West of Scotland to 2025. The Airdrie Bathgate rail line is identified within the draft strategy as a nationally important project, which will help meet this objective.

49. The Finalised Regional Transport Strategy for the South East Scotland Transport Partnership has, amongst its objectives, maximising public transport provision and achieving public transport integration and intermodality. The strategy identifies the Airdrie - Bathgate project as one of the most significant transport schemes, which have funding in place. The Strategy considers that the Airdrie Bathgate rail link is regionally very important and clearly linked to the Strategy’s objectives.

50. “Travel Choices for Scotland: the Scottish Integrated Transport White Paper” encourages each local authority to produce a local transport strategy. The North Lanarkshire Local Transport Strategy “Delivering Tomorrow – Partnerships for Transportation in North Lanarkshire” 2000, sets out the local transport strategy for the North Lanarkshire area. North Lanarkshire’s Local Transport Strategy, notes that the delivery of public transport in the area is fragmented with rail links to Edinburgh and the East being limited. The re-opening of the Airdrie - Bathgate Rail Link is cited as an important future development in the Local Transport Strategy and fully supports the aims of the North Lanarkshire Local Transport Strategy.

51. The Local Transport Strategy for West Lothian (October 2000) states that the re-opening of the line between Bathgate and Airdrie would provide a service for passengers wishing to go from Bathgate to Airdrie and Glasgow and in the other direction from Airdrie, to Bathgate, Livingston and Edinburgh. It further states that the relatively short length of the line and the existing services via the main stations at either end of the line, make it a serious contender for reopening. The reopening of the Airdrie to Bathgate rail link is directly in line with the aims and objectives of the West Lothian Local Transport Strategy.

52. The Local Transport Strategy for Edinburgh 2004-2007 focuses on tackling congestion and ensuring that attractive alternatives to the car are available for the widest possible range of journeys. The objective of the Council’s public transport policies is to ensure a public transport system of the highest quality, which conveniently meets all major medium and longer distance movement demands to and from Edinburgh. The reopening of the Airdrie-Bathgate line would further the aims of Edinburgh’s Local Transport Strategy to reduce congestion in Edinburgh. The new direct link either introduces (in the case of those travelling to and from the city from parts of North Lanarkshire) or improves (in the case of those travelling to and from the Bathgate area) the alternative that rail travel offers to travel into Edinburgh by car.
National Planning Policy

53. The Bill is supported by national planning policy. Scotland’s first National Planning Framework is a non-statutory document published by the Scottish Executive in 2004. It is a key element in the Scottish Executive’s package of measures to modernise and reform the planning system. The National Planning Framework looks at Scotland from a spatial perspective and identifies key strategic infrastructure needs in order to guide development into the right places in Scotland to 2025.

54. The National Planning Framework identifies the Airdrie to Bathgate rail link as a key committed transport infrastructure project in the period to 2010. The rail link is therefore supported by the National Planning Framework.

55. In line with Scottish Planning Policy 1 (SPP1) “The Planning System”, the rail route will help to improve integrated transport in North Lanarkshire and West Lothian and will address the issues of sustainability, economic development and competitiveness and an enhanced built environment. The rail route re-opening proposals also support Scottish Planning Policy 2 (SPP2) “Economic Development” by improving public transport and the re-use of brownfield land such as at Caldercruix and the relocated Drumgelloch and Bathgate stations.

56. The Airdrie Bathgate Rail Link fully supports the principles established in Scottish Planning Policy 17 (SPP17) “Transport and Planning” by improving the transport system and supporting economic growth. The provision of additional rail services between Edinburgh and Glasgow will address the issues of public transport integration, sustainable travel, a more inclusive society and better protection of the environment. Furthermore, the rail route will provide integrated transport serving the economy and communities in North Lanarkshire and West Lothian, promote a genuine choice of transport mode, facilitate a reduction in car use and support public transport.

57. The project will comply with guidelines contained in National Planning Policy Guideline 5 (NPPG5) “Archaeology and Planning” and National Planning Policy Guideline 18 (NPPG18) “Planning and the Historic Environment”.

58. The scheme includes two telecommunications masts, one at Blackridge and one at Caldercruix, both of which are necessary for train communications and will be used solely for rail purposes. The Railway Communications System is the first unified national system for safety communications on the railways. The location and design of the masts has followed the guidance in National Planning Policy Guideline 19 (NPPG 19) “Radio Telecommunications” and Planning Advice Note 62 (PAN62) “Radio Telecommunications”.

59. In respect of Scottish Planning Policy 7 (SPP7) “Planning and Flooding”, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency has identified sites considered to be at risk of flooding. Flood risk assessments will be carried out at the detailed design stage at these locations. Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement provides full detail as regards the sites identified by the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency and the assessments to be carried out at these sites.
60. In line with the policy objectives contained in National Planning Policy Guideline 14 (NPPG14) “Natural Heritage”, the construction of the Airdrie - Bathgate Rail Link will provide an opportunity to improve the route corridor’s natural heritage through restoration, landscape works and habitat creation. Chapter 18 of the Environmental Statement provides detail on the railway corridor landscape design.

**Structure Plan Policy**

61. The new railway crosses two Structure Plan areas - Glasgow and Clyde Valley and Edinburgh and the Lothians. It is supported by Structure Plan policy in each area.

62. Within the area covered by the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan 2000:

- The construction of the Airdrie Bathgate Rail Route supports the implementation of the Structure Plan’s Strategic Policy 1 “Strategic Development Locations”, by way of supporting public transport and encouraging investment in listed Rural Investment Areas. Both Plains and Caldercruix are listed in Schedule 1(d) as being Rural Investment Areas.

- In terms of transportation policies, the Airdrie Bathgate Rail Route scheme is in full accordance with Strategic Policy 3 Strategic Management of Travel Demands by providing an external transport link from North Lanarkshire to the Lothians. This external link is listed in Schedule 3(b) as being a Strategic Transportation Corridor within the Priority Corridors for Management.

- Although the railway will run through areas of North Lanarkshire, which are covered by Countryside and Green Belt designations, where there are restrictions on development, the Structure Plan recognises that there is a locational requirement for the railway to run through the North Lanarkshire Countryside.

- The reopening of the Airdrie Bathgate rail route also supports Strategic Policy 5 Competitive Economic Framework by providing a new link to Airdrie, which is listed as an area of Core Economic Development.

- The proposed rail route scheme complies with Strategic Policy 9 Assessment of Development Proposals in that it will address the issues of promoting sustainable transport; contribute towards the promotion of urban regeneration, and the safeguarding and promotion of the viability of town centres.

63. Structure Plan backing for the Airdrie Bathgate project is considerably enhanced by the draft Finalised Alteration 2005 to the Joint Structure Plan 2000 (the 2005 Plan). The Airdrie Bathgate Rail link is now identified as a Joint Transport Priority to which the structure plan authority is committed to delivering. The 2005 plan also allocates significant additional housing to the Airdrie and Coatbridge housing sub-market area. The Strategic Overview of the Technical Report 6/06 ‘Assessment of Potential Areas for Urban Development’, supporting the 2005 Plan, makes clear at paragraph 30 that the Airdrie Bathgate Rail link is key to providing sustainable public transport provision for these new houses.

64. Within the area covered by the Edinburgh and the Lothians Structure Plan 2004 the following are key points:
The reopening of the Airdrie Bathgate Rail link is specifically identified in Policy TRA1 “Safeguardings for Transport Schemes”, which states that Local Plans should safeguard land for these proposals.

The reopening of the line is a key element in the plan’s development strategy, which allocates significant new housing and business in central West Lothian. The proposed rail link will provide sustainable public transport for these new communities in line with national and structure plan policy.

Although the railway will run through areas of West Lothian, which are covered by Countryside and Green Belt designations where there are restrictions on development, the Structure Plan recognises that there is a locational requirement for the reopened railway to run through the Lothian countryside.

The Structure Plan also identifies the need to safeguard land at Newbridge for a railway station. The creation of a railway station at Newbridge does not form part of this Project as it was not identified as a requirement from either the Corridor Study or initial feasibility studies. However, the Bill does not seek any powers that will conflict with this Policy.

Local Plan Policy

65. The section of railway that is the subject of the Bill would run through the areas of three local planning authorities – North Lanarkshire, West Lothian and City of Edinburgh. Reopening the line between Airdrie and Bathgate together with new stations and car parking is supported by local plan policy within North Lanarkshire and West Lothian. The impact of electrification of the line from Airdrie to Edinburgh has been assessed in the Environmental Statement and is considered to be compatible with the route running through Green Belt, countryside and (with particular reference to central Edinburgh) the historic environment. The compatibility of the proposed scheme with local plan policy is considered in detail in the Environmental Statement.

CONSIDERATION OF PREFERRED SCHEME AND ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

Alternatives to a Rail link between Airdrie and Bathgate

66. The 2002 Central Scotland Transport Corridor Study (Corridor Study) commissioned by the Scottish Executive identified that the trunk road and local road networks in the M8 corridor suffer from traffic congestion. The A8/M8 is a key part of the National Trunk Road Network providing east-west connections between the two major Scottish cities. The route is also an important radial link serving Glasgow and a through-traffic route past Airdrie, Coatbridge and Bellshill. The current rail system west of Airdrie is operating towards full capacity. There are no timetable slots available or proposed to improve train frequency beyond six trains per hour at peak times west of Airdrie and four trains per hour at off peak times. In the east, at Newbridge junction, where the route joins with the Glasgow - Edinburgh main line, there are capacity constraints, which will only allow for the provision of an extra two trains per hour in each direction on the Airdrie Bathgate line, providing a four trains per hour service in each direction. There is a lack of alternative local and inter-urban travel modes, which exacerbates car use. The Corridor Study noted that:

“Most striking is the significant movement between North Lanarkshire to West Lothian which is predominantly (95%) by car. This demonstrates that the public transport system
does not serve the routes and journeys that commuters from areas outwith city centres are making and therefore people have little choice but to use the car.”

67. The Corridor Study investigated the constraints and opportunities for reducing congestion and improving public transport accessibility. Suitable projects were considered and ranked using STAG analysis to determine priorities and value for money. Further detail on STAG analysis is given in paragraphs 41-43 of this Memorandum.

68. Amongst the public transport service measures assessed by the Corridor Study were:

- Enhanced bus services between Edinburgh, Livingston and Glasgow;
- Additional passenger capacity on the Edinburgh to Glasgow train service via Falkirk;
- Enhanced rail service between Edinburgh and Glasgow via Shotts;
- Rail infrastructure enhancement between Carfin and Mid Calder junction to facilitate enhanced rail services;
- Introduction of a Glasgow - Edinburgh rail service via double tracked Airdrie - Bathgate; and
- Re-routing and enhancement of the existing rail service between Glasgow and Whifflet.

69. All interventions identified by the Corridor Study were subject to STAG 1 appraisal, the purpose of which was to ensure that the projects:

- Conform to the planning (or study) objectives.
- Have no insurmountable implementation difficulties.
- Conform to the Scottish Executive’s five criteria of accessibility, economy, environment, integration and safety.

70. Reinstatement of the Airdrie-Bathgate rail line was identified in the Corridor Study as one of the key public transport interventions that could have a direct impact on the M8 Corridor. The initial STAG 1 appraisal found that the Airdrie Bathgate proposal had merit for inclusion within the 2010 Plan. The proposals were then subject to further assessment as part of a package of rail enhancement measures against the following criteria:

- Impact on reducing road traffic growth to meet the environmental, safety and economic objectives of the corridor.
- Contribution to improving the competitiveness of the public transport network and hence the achievement of the accessibility and integration objectives.

71. The Corridor Study found that the rail enhancement measures package enhanced the competitive position of public transport and hence met the accessibility and integration objectives of STAG analysis.
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72. For the A8/M8 corridor, two alternative measures were identified for enhancing public transport. One was the restoration of the Airdrie Bathgate rail link. The other was the implementation of a series of bus/coach interchanges in the M8/A8 Corridor. The Corridor Study found that:

“The Express Bus Package, with Park-and-Ride, has already been shown to increase road traffic on the M8 Corridor. The results [in Table 11.16 of the Corridor Study] also show that investment in this option would be to the detriment of rail patronage, which is already supported by public funds.”

73. The Airdrie Bathgate proposal on the other hand would provide a significant alternative to car use and provide significant accessibility benefits to non-car travellers for communities in the M8 Corridor.

74. As a possible alternative to the reinstatement of the Airdrie-Bathgate line, the Corridor Study also considered potential enhancement of the Edinburgh-Glasgow line via Shotts. However, analysis of detailed patronage figures found that an improved service on the Shotts line would have very little impact other than on the approaches to Glasgow. The Corridor Study found that very little of the projected patronage using the proposed service via Airdrie and Bathgate is abstracted from the Shotts line. Accordingly, the Corridor Study found that enhancement of the Shotts line would not assist in addressing the problems in the A8/M8 corridor.

75. The proposed elements of the 2010 M8 Corridor Plan were subjected to STAG Part 2 appraisal. In respect of the Airdrie-Bathgate Rail Link the Part 2 appraisal found that:

- The new rail service would remove car journeys from the A8/M8 through the provision of a fast frequent rail service.
- No technical feasibility issues were identified.
- There would be significant reductions in public transport journey times, principally from parts of North Lanarkshire travelling east and from the Bathgate area travelling west.
- There would be a reduction in the need for interchange.
- The new service would provide a significant improvement in accessibility.
- The creation of this service would assist in countering social exclusion by increasing the attractiveness of public transport to less mobile groups.
- The project would represent very good value for money.

76. Accordingly, the Corridor Study recommended that the Airdrie-Bathgate Rail Link be included in the 2010 Plan in the following terms:

‘A 15-minute service should be introduced between Edinburgh and Glasgow via Airdrie and Bathgate. This would require the reinstatement and electrification of the rail line between Airdrie (Drumgelloch) and Bathgate, with services along a route from

---
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Helensburgh / Balloch in the west to Edinburgh in the east, and with intermediate stops at suburban centres (e.g. Easterhouse) and key employment areas (e.g. Livingston and Edinburgh Park).

77. In January 2003, Scottish Ministers accepted the recommendation of the Corridor Study and confirmed that they would provide funding for development of the Airdrie Bathgate rail line as a double-track line with frequent services from west of Glasgow through to Edinburgh.

78. The possible mechanisms for enhancing public transport competitiveness in the M8 corridor were thoroughly examined by the Corridor Study using STAG analysis. It is clear from the Corridor Study that reopening the Airdrie to Bathgate rail link best meets this objective in a cost-effective manner and also meets the requirements of STAG.

The Preferred Alignment and Alternative Alignments

79. In 2003, Jacobs Babtie was commissioned by West Lothian Council to carry out an Initial Technical Feasibility Study (Feasibility Study) for the reopening of the Airdrie to Bathgate line. As explained later in this Memorandum, the preparation of the Feasibility Study was overseen by a Steering Group consisting of representatives from the Scottish Executive, North Lanarkshire Council, West Lothian Council and Strathclyde Passenger Transport.

80. The brief for the Feasibility Study was to investigate the engineering requirements and cost for the reopening of the line for four trains per hour in each direction operating at a line speed of 100 mph with no new intermediate stations. It was considered that such a rail scheme would maximise strategic accessibility in terms of enabling residents in the suburbs of Glasgow and Edinburgh, as well as the residents of North Lanarkshire and West Lothian, to reach employment locations on the other side of the country by means of a fast and frequent train service. The final Feasibility Study was presented in June 2004.

81. As part of the Feasibility Study, possible alignments for the re-opened rail link between Airdrie and Bathgate were investigated. For reasons given below it was determined by Jacobs Babtie that by using the existing route of the original railway, additional land take would be minimised and would therefore have less of an environmental impact than an entirely new route.

82. Additionally, alternative route alignments were considered for certain sections of the line where following the original solum might give rise to negative environmental impacts. Accordingly, five alternative route alignments were considered in the Feasibility Study. These comprised:

- Realigning the route along the existing solum to achieve 100 mph line speed;
- Alternative proposed route across Bathgate Golf Course, route 1;
- New alignment to the south of Hillend Loch, route 2;
- New alignment to the south of Hillend Loch, route 3; and
- New alignment to the south of Armadale, route 4.
Revising the Alignment to Achieve 100 mph Line Speed

83. The initial proposed permanent way route was to follow the existing solum for as much of the route as possible. This allowed the route to go through or close to the communities of Drumgelloch, Plains, Caldercruix, Blackridge and Armadale, before connecting with the existing operational line at Bathgate.

84. To achieve a 100 mph line speed, more than half the route length between Drumgelloch and Bathgate would have required to be realigned from its former alignment because of the need to improve the existing curves. Many of the existing curves would have required increased radii such that there would have been over 60 metre displacements from the original solum. Almost all of the existing over and under bridges would have required to be replaced and the original bridges and structures taken down or infilled.

85. Major earthworks would have been required, as much of the route would have been completely new. A major investment in ground investigation for the new route would have been necessary to confirm ground conditions and it would have been likely in some areas around Hillend Loch and Armadale that major rock cuttings would have been required. Additional land purchases would also have been required over approximately eight miles of the re-opened route. The additional land take and rock cutting work would have had significant environmental impacts.

86. The Feasibility Study found that without intermediate stops, realigning the solum for a 100 mph line speed would have achieved a 3% reduction in journey time compared to an 80 mph line speed which would generally be constructed on the original solum. The additional costs and land-take necessary for a 100 mph line speed could not be justified by this journey time improvement. Accordingly, the Feasibility Study recommended that the route of the original solum should be followed with a 80 mph line speed. As it is now proposed to have two additional stops on the route, this would further reduce the impact of any journey time improvement, which would have been gained from a 100 mph alignment. There is therefore, no justification for this higher line speed realignment.

Alternative Route 1 – Bathgate Golf Course

87. This route would have generally followed the existing solum to Bathgate where it then leaves the original solum at Paulville on a longer radius curve across Bathgate Golf Course before rejoining the existing solum west of Bathgate Castle.

88. This option facilitated the desire of the local authority planners to gravitate Bathgate town centre towards the south.

89. An engineering review identified that the proposed route across the golf course would have been feasible but would have required a cutting of 3 to 4 metres deep and lead to a railway land corridor of approximately 30 metres width.
90. An alignment through the golf course would also have detrimentally impacted upon a proposed residential and retail development to the north of the golf course by effectively splitting it in two.

91. Given that it was proposed for all trains to stop at Bathgate station there was no journey time improvement to be gained from this faster curve through the golf course.

92. The Feasibility Study therefore concluded that there was no benefit to be gained from further development of this option.

**New Alignments to the South of Hillend Loch, Route 2 and Route 3**

93. The preferred route on the original solum passes through Plains and Caldercruix and continues along the south shore of Hillend Loch. Routing the railway through Plains and Caldercruix presents certain engineering challenges where it runs close to residences and involves the replacement of at-grade road crossings with alternative access. In relation to Hillend Loch, environmental concerns were raised that noise and vibration effects might detrimentally affect angling on the loch. Concerns were also raised with regard to potential impacts on the water quality of Hillend Loch which could be caused through spillages and run off from the network into minor streams and burns that pass under the existing railway solum. Consideration was therefore given to whether an alternative alignment of the railway at this location might be preferable in engineering and environmental terms.

94. To gain an understanding of relocating the railway route from the former alignment and to assess its mitigation effect on the environment an alternative new route to the south of the A89 was assessed. Route 2 would have left the existing solum at Plains and ran along the south of the A89, joining the existing solum west of Blackridge. Route 3 would have left the existing solum at Plains and ran further to the south of the A89. This proposed route would have joined with proposed permanent way route 2 at Granary Hill and then rejoined the existing solum west of Blackridge.

95. Both permanent way route options 2 and 3 took a more direct route from west to east, by-passing the villages of Plains, Caldercruix and the hamlet of Forrestfield, as well as Hillend Loch. There would have been a reduction in the overall length of railway of approximately 600 metres because of its straighter alignment. The line speeds could therefore have been increased due to the removal of speed constraints around curves.

96. Both options 2 and 3 would have required massive excavations to achieve an acceptable track vertical alignment involving approximately 600,000 cubic metres, in cuttings of up to 25 metres in depth. There would therefore have been significant engineering and environmental impacts associated with these options. The excavations would have been almost entirely in rock, which would have had a major cost implication on the project.

97. The high additional cost and environmental impact of the alternative routes rendered these options unsupportable.
New Alignment South of Armadale, Route 4

98. Proposed permanent way route 4 would have left the existing solum at Blackridge and followed an almost straight path to the south of Armadale, rejoining the existing solum to the west of Bathgate.

99. This option was considered because the proposed realignment would have removed curve geometry constraints enabling an increased design line speed. Additionally, there are the remains of a designed landscape at Boghead House and policies south east of Armadale. The area was also considered to be of local importance as a setting for both Bathgate and Armadale. These environmental issues meant it was appropriate to investigate whether an alternative alignment would have a lesser environmental impact.

100. Extensive excavations and civil engineering work would have been required for this option with major cost and environmental effects during construction. The option would also have moved the railway further away from Armadale where significant new housing is proposed. The railway would have been too remote from Armadale and the planned new housing for a station location to be viable.

101. The high additional cost and environmental impact of the alternative route rendered this option unsupportable.

Deviations from Existing Solum

102. The alternative alignments examined in the Feasibility Study were found to be unviable as against generally following the existing solum between Drumgelloch and Bathgate. The Feasibility Study recommended that an alignment occupying the existing solum should be taken forward to the next stage of the project. This alignment provides an opportunity to lessen the environmental impact of the project throughout the route and is therefore the solution proposed by the Bill.

103. Whilst the route proposed in the Bill generally follows the solum of the former railway line, it has been necessary to deviate from it in several areas.

104. The solum of the former Airdrie to Bathgate railway line was originally constructed for an average line speed of 45 mph and without overhead line electrification clearances. The new alignment is positioned close to the centreline of the existing solum and within the former railway boundary fence, where possible. However in order to retain the option of an 80 mph line speed in the curves immediately to the east and west of Armadale, and to deal with adverse ground conditions, it would be necessary to take the alignment outside the former boundary by 10 to 15 metres on the inside of these curves.

105. The alignment will join the existing operational railway approximately 300 metres east of the existing terminus at Bathgate Station. The tie in point is near to the site of the relocated Bathgate station. The short length of track serving the current terminus station will be removed, along with the existing station.
106. The vertical profile of the new track has been developed to follow the existing solum formation as closely as possible. The main constraints for the vertical alignment are at overbridges, many of which require reconstruction or replacement in order to provide the clearances required to accommodate overhead line electrification equipment.

Station Alternatives

107. The Feasibility Study identified that works would be required at existing stations at Airdrie, Drumgelloch, Bathgate, Livingston North and Uphall. At Airdrie, Drumgelloch, Livingston North and Uphall, second platforms would be required. There would be a requirement for alterations to existing car parking at Airdrie and Livingston North stations and enhanced car parking provided at Drumgelloch, Bathgate, and Uphall stations. The Feasibility Study suggested that the level of works required at Drumgelloch meant that consideration might be given to relocation of the station to a more suitable and accessible site.

108. The existing station at Bathgate is a terminus station and would require to be relocated on the new rail alignment to serve the re-opened railway. Three options were considered for the relocated station, at Edinburgh Road, Boghall, and Whitburn Road, Bathgate. Whilst Whitburn Road would serve future residential developments well, pedestrian access from existing residential areas and the town centre would not be good. The site is dependent on the realignment of the track across Bathgate Golf Course, which has been rejected as an option. The Boghall location would have good road access but is remote from the existing town centre station location and has limited connections to pedestrian areas. The Edinburgh Road site is readily accessible to the existing town centre, allows for the provision of adequate car parking and bus access, and has no major operational difficulties. Accordingly, the Feasibility Study recommended that the Edinburgh Road site was the most appropriate site for the relocated Bathgate Station.

109. The initial proposal in the Corridor Study did not envisage any new stations being constructed on the route. The remit of the Feasibility Study was therefore to report on the technical feasibility of reopening the line between Airdrie and Bathgate with no new intermediate stations. However, consultation with key stakeholders revealed widespread support for additional stations on the route. The Feasibility Study therefore investigated potential station locations and reported on possible locations at Plains, Caldercruix, Blackridge and Armadale. The Feasibility Study also suggested that consideration could be given to moving the existing Drumgelloch station. The Feasibility Study, however, made no recommendations on providing new intermediate stops.

110. As outlined in paragraph 41 of this Memorandum, the Design Development Appraisal subjected the Airdrie - Bathgate scheme to a STAG appraisal which tested it against the following:

- Environmental - to protect the natural and built environment and, in particular, to protect the existing populations from the intrusive effects of traffic.
- Safety – to improve safety, in particular, to reduce conflicts between traffic on the A8/M8 corridor.
- Economy – to support economic activity and get good value for money.
• Integration – to improve the integration of the transport system.
• Accessibility – to improve access to facilities to those without a car.

111. The station options have been refined and selected through application of a sequential test to each site and option. The test was applied to each of the intermediate station location options identified and assessed each station against the following criteria:

• Was it technically feasible to provide a station at the site?
• What was the environmental impact of providing a station at that site and what could it accommodate in terms of car parking and public transport interchange facilities?
• What was the impact of a station on the surrounding road network, potential traffic generation and how would traffic flow in the station areas?
• What could the site provide in accessibility terms for pedestrians, cyclists, car and bus users?
• What was the likely patronage, which could be generated by a station at that site and the impact on patronage on the route as a whole, taking account of existing and planned growth of the communities?

112. Each location or option was considered against the first four objective criteria in the STAG. Those locations or options, which demonstrated compliance with these first four criteria, were then assessed against the fifth criterion, potential patronage figures.

Drumgelloch

113. The Design Development Appraisal considered the current Drumgelloch station and three relocation options. The alternatives considered were:

• Option 1 – station would be located in the south-west corner of Katherine Park with a station car park adjacent to the north platform. A secondary car park would be provided to the south of the line.
• Option 2 – station would be located west of Towers Road, with car parking in the vacant land to the south of the rail line.
• Option 3 - station would be located in the Clarkston area to the west of Towers Road, and 400 metres east of the existing Drumgelloch station, with a car park on the north side of the station.

114. After application of the first four assessment criteria as set out in paragraph 111, the following options were ruled out:

• The existing Drumgelloch station site was ruled out because it is particularly constrained and cannot provide an appropriate level of parking provision.
• Option 1 was ruled out because the distance between Drumgelloch and Katherine Park would restrict pedestrian access. Access to the station car park and the intersection with Station Road would not be possible to achieve, geometrically, in
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accordance with road guidelines. The option would also remove a section of Katherine Park, which is the only major area of public open space east of the A73.

- Option 2 was also ruled out because of restricted pedestrian access. Access to the car park would be very difficult to achieve geometrically. The access would also exacerbate an already congested intersection.

115. Option 3 was the only option, which met the first four criteria as set out in paragraph 111. The assessment of Option 3 reported that a station at this location would be preferable as it could provide more appropriate facilities, better access, and better integration opportunities than the existing station. Option 3 was then assessed against the fifth criterion; the likely patronage, which could be generated by a station at that site. The Design Development Appraisal assessed that Option 3 would generate approximately 500 additional boardings per day. Accordingly, the Design Development Appraisal recommended that the existing Drumgelloch Station be replaced by Drumgelloch relocated Option 3.

**New Station Locations**

116. The potential new station locations considered by the Design Development Appraisal were:

- Plains
- Caldercruix
- Blackridge
- Armadale

At Caldercruix, the Design Development Appraisal considered the original Caldercruix station location and three alternatives:

- Option 1 – station would be located at the western edge of Caldercruix, on land forming part of the Caldercruix lagoons.
- Option 2 – the station would be located at Caldercruix Station Road, immediately west of Calder Avenue.
- Option 3 – the station would be located adjacent to the sewage works, west of Caldercruix.

117. After application of the first four of the five criteria, as set out in paragraph 111, the following options were ruled out:

- Plains was ruled out because the only realistic potential station site is located on the southern edge of town on a constrained site between residential properties on the Main Street and the Country Park. Even the provision of a basic rail halt would have had significant environmental impacts on the adjacent residential properties. To have provided facilities such as car parking and a bus drop off point would make the impact even worse. For a small community such as Plains the negative environmental impacts of a station significantly detracted from the limited potential benefits of providing a railway station in the village. The lack of car parking capacity
at a station in Plains would limit its contribution towards reducing car trips on the A8 corridor. In addition, the site restrictions would also limit space for drop off facilities and bus interchange facilities, which in turn would reduce opportunity for integration of transport modes.

- The original Caldercruix station site was ruled out on the grounds of not being technically feasible as it would be on too steep a slope and so would not meet current rail industry standards and HM Railway Inspectorate requirements. Also, the site could not provide sufficient car parking spaces to accommodate the potential demand for use of the station and would be unlikely to attract potential car trips from the M8 corridor.

- Caldercruix West Options 2 and 3 were also ruled out because of difficulties with pedestrian and vehicular access.

118. The results in relation to the analysis of Drumgelloch and the new station locations against the first four of the five criteria, in paragraph 111, are summarised in the following table:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Technically Feasible</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Traffic Operations</th>
<th>Station Site Accessibility</th>
<th>Reason for Rejecting Station Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch (existing site)</td>
<td>Yes, though existing station would need to be demolished / rebuilt</td>
<td>Can only provide 30 (+4) spaces</td>
<td>No drop-off facilities possible, does not integrate with bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Parking Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch (relocated) Option 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>214 (+13) spaces</td>
<td>Poor access road, would require extensive improvements, probably up to and including the A89 junction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch (relocated) Option 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>188 (+12) spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch (relocated) Option 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>336 (+17) spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>Yes, though remains of original station would need to be cleared</td>
<td>Can only provide 27 (+3) spaces, circulation restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient Parking Provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix (Original Site)</td>
<td>No, acceptable gradient cannot be achieved</td>
<td>62 (+5) spaces</td>
<td>Bus access is through car park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technically infeasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix West Option 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>165 (+12) spaces</td>
<td>Bus access is through car park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix West Option 2a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200 (+12) spaces on north of rail line</td>
<td>Car park is separate from station</td>
<td>Station Site Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix West Option 2b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200 (+12) spaces on north of rail line</td>
<td>Car park is separate from station</td>
<td></td>
<td>Station Site Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix West Option 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200 (+12) spaces on north of rail line</td>
<td>The site cannot be accessed by bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Station Site Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Yes, though is divorced from current user base</td>
<td>48 (+5) spaces</td>
<td>Bus access would require extensive diversion of existing services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Yes, though is divorced from current user base</td>
<td>188 (+11) spaces</td>
<td>Access arrangement to be clarified. Drop-off area to the south</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: in the “Parking” column the figure in brackets denotes the number of disabled spaces included in the total number of car parking spaces.

**Patronage**

119. Following this initial assessment, three new station options were left:
   - Caldercruix West Option 1.
   - Blackridge.
   - Armadale.

120. These three remaining station options were then reviewed in terms of potential patronage. Although it did not meet the first four criteria, for completeness, Plains was also assessed against this fifth criterion. The Design Development Appraisal demonstrated that additional station
121. The Design Development Appraisal examined the potential station catchments, park and ride potential, and projected patronage figures for Caldercruix, Blackridge, Armadale, and Plains for completeness, based on population projections. Of the four options, Armadale was found to have by far the largest potential for additional patronage from park and ride catchments. This potential is predicted to further increase, as Armadale is a Core Development Area in terms of the Finalised West Lothian Local Plan. The station also has the advantage of being adjacent to the proposed expansion of that settlement. The strongest case for a new intermediate station was therefore found by the Design Development Appraisal to be Armadale. The outline station design for Armadale includes bus turning facilities.

122. Armadale has the additional advantage of being able to draw upon the park and ride and public transport catchment from Blackridge. There are currently three bus services per hour in each direction between Armadale and Blackridge with a journey time of four to five minutes.

123. Accepting that the case for Armadale is strongest, the cases for the remaining stations were assessed. The cases for the three remaining locations were considered to be limited in terms of patronage.

124. The Design Development Appraisal modelled the effect of adding in more than one new intermediate station into the projected patronage figures. It found that if a station was built at Caldercruix in addition to Armadale then there would be a small gain in the overall patronage on the line. However, if either Plains or Blackridge were added to Armadale then the additional passengers gained from that station would be outweighed by an overall loss of passengers elsewhere along the route, due to the additional journey time created by the additional stop. Adding an additional station at Plains or Blackridge would therefore reduce overall patronage, whereas adding the station at Caldercruix increases patronage. The reason for this is that the station location on the west edge of Caldercruix is close enough to Plains that it would attract passengers from the catchment area for Plains. There is currently a regular bus service between Plains and Caldercruix with a journey time of 6 to 10 minutes, and further, the bus already stops adjacent to the proposed new Caldercruix station entrance. A similarly regular bus service runs between Plains and Drumsallagh (relocated), with a journey time of 6 to 8 minutes.

125. The Design Development Appraisal also considered the effect on patronage figures of adding a third new station onto the route. Adding a third new station at either Blackridge or Plains would reduce overall patronage. This is because the very marginal patronage gain at Blackridge or Plains is greatly outweighed by the overall reduction in patronage throughout the whole route that a third stop would cause. Adding a fourth new station would reduce overall patronage still further.

126. Based on the work undertaken on the Design Development Appraisal, it is clear that the combination of new stations, which maximises patronage, is Armadale and Caldercruix.
Transport Economic Efficiency

127. The potential combination of new station and service configurations were also subject to Transport Economic Efficiency appraisal. Five basic scenarios were tested including building no new intermediate stations, building two intermediate stations and building all four intermediate stations. All scenarios involved the running of four trains per hour in each direction. These scenarios were as follows (X denoting a station stop):

- **Test AB1:** This is the base case with no new stations and Drumgelloch is relocated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airdrie</th>
<th>Drumgelloch (relocated)</th>
<th>Caldercrui West</th>
<th>Armadale</th>
<th>Bathgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Test AB2:** All four new stations are opened and Drumgelloch is relocated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airdrie</th>
<th>Drumgelloch (relocated)</th>
<th>Plains</th>
<th>Caldercrui West</th>
<th>Blackridge</th>
<th>Armadale</th>
<th>Bathgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Test AB3:** Two new stations are opened at Caldercruix and Armadale, each with 4 trains per hour, and Drumgelloch is relocated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airdrie</th>
<th>Drumgelloch (relocated)</th>
<th>Caldercrui West</th>
<th>Armadale</th>
<th>Bathgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **Test AB4**: Two new stations are opened at Caldercruix and Armadale and Drumgelloch is not relocated. There would be two stops per hour at Caldercruix and Armadale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Airdrie</th>
<th>Drumgelloch (existing)</th>
<th>Caldercruix West</th>
<th>Armadale</th>
<th>Bathgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Test AB5**: Two new stations are opened at Caldercruix and Armadale and Drumgelloch is relocated. There will be two stops per hour at Caldercruix and Armadale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Airdrie</th>
<th>Drumgelloch (relocated)</th>
<th>Caldercruix West</th>
<th>Armadale</th>
<th>Bathgate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility**

128. The Design Development Appraisal assessed each of scenarios AB1 to AB5 in terms of their ability to improve accessibility. The STAG test criteria ‘improving accessibility’ requires a balance to be reached between strategic accessibility and corridor accessibility.

129. For the purposes of this project, strategic accessibility examined the ability of users of the route being able to reach employment locations out with the Airdrie Bathgate section of the route by means of a fast and frequent public transport service. If there is a third or fourth new station along the route, where the trains stop, the journey time increases and this makes the service less attractive to people travelling between these destinations.

130. Corridor accessibility relates to the ability of residents within the Airdrie Bathgate corridor being able to reach employment locations within that corridor.

131. The Design Development Appraisal undertook an accessibility analysis, the results of which are shown on the table contained within paragraph 137 of this Memorandum. The option that provides the worst level of accessibility was found to be the opening of two new
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intermediate stations with all trains stopping at them (Test AB3). Both corridor and strategic accessibility were found to be poorest due to the longer journey times involved.

132. The Design Development Appraisal found that strategic accessibility was best achieved with no new intermediate stations (Test AB1). However, this is at the expense of corridor accessibility. Delivering corridor accessibility is one of the central objectives of the proposed rail link, which is to address social exclusion in terms of accessibility to employment locations, in the Airdrie Bathgate corridor. The option of providing no new intermediate stations was therefore not considered to be acceptable by the Promoter, as it would not deliver a sufficient level of corridor accessibility.

133. The Design Development Appraisal also found that the option of opening all four intermediate stations (Test AB2) resulted in longer journey times at the expense of strategic accessibility. The Appraisal also found that the provision of four intermediate stations did not provide as great a level of corridor accessibility as the provision of two intermediate stations (Tests AB4 and AB5). The provision of four intermediate stations therefore cannot be justified in terms of accessibility.

134. The Design Development Appraisal found that the provision of two new intermediate stations but with trains making only a single additional stop at each one (tests AB4 and AB5) provided the highest level of corridor accessibility. Although this scenario does not give as great a level of strategic accessibility as the option of building no new stations (Test AB1), it is considered to give the best balance between strategic and corridor accessibility.

Value for Money

135. Options AB1 to AB5 were tested using the standard analysis of benefit-cost ratios (BCR). The option of having no intermediate stations (AB1), which had already been discounted on accessibility grounds, was found to represent poorest value for money. The option of opening two intermediate stations together with the existing Drumgelloch station (AB4) and then the option of opening all intermediate stations (AB2) were found, respectively, to have the next poorest value for money results.

136. The two options which represented best value for money were both ones with two new intermediate stations at Armadale and Caldercruix, and a relocated station at Drumgelloch. In the first, all trains stopped at Caldercruix and Armadale and two trains per hour stopped at the relocated Drumgelloch station (AB3). Whilst this returned the highest benefit to cost ratio, it also provided the poorest strategic and corridor accessibility of all the options. By reducing the trains stopping at Caldercruix to only two per hour (AB5) the benefit to cost ratio reduced slightly but was still second highest out of all the options modelled. Moreover, this stopping pattern produced the best patronage figures from all the options considered.

137. The results of the testing carried out in relation to Tests AB1 to AB5 are summarised in the following table (✓ denotes the relative ranking of the options as compared to each other):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AB1</th>
<th>AB2</th>
<th>AB3</th>
<th>AB4</th>
<th>AB5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 hour additional boardings</td>
<td>11,908</td>
<td>11,861</td>
<td>12,607</td>
<td>12,158</td>
<td>12,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCR</strong></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present value of benefits over 60 year assessment period (£m)</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present value of costs over 60 year assessment period (£m)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on “strategic” accessibility</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on “corridor” accessibility</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident benefits</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction costs (£m, in opt bias)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs (annual £m)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sensitivity Testing**

138. Following the second phase of public consultation in January and February 2006, the Promoter commissioned additional testing. A further seven scenarios were assessed for value for money and impact on train boardings. Some of the scenarios were commissioned as a result of representations made by the communities of Plains and Blackridge, and some were undertaken to test the robustness of test AB5. These additional scenarios were:

- **Abs1** – relocated Drungelloch and new stations at Plains, Caldercruix, Blackridge and Armadale, all receiving four trains per hour
- **Abs2** – as per test AB5, with an additional 1 minute added to journey times between Airdrie and Bathgate
- **Abs3** – relocated Drungelloch and new stations at Blackridge and Armadale, all receiving two trains per hour
- **Abs4** – as per test AB5, but this test assumed that bus fares on competing bus services along the corridor were reduced by 50%
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- **Abs5** – as per test AB5, but this test assumed that there was no population growth from 2001 levels in Armadale, Blackridge, Caldercruix and Plains.

- **Abs6** – relocated Drumgelloch and new stations at Caldercruix, Blackridge and Armadale, all stations except Armadale receive two trains per hour (skip stopping), with Armadale receiving four trains per hour.

- **Abs7** – relocated Drumgelloch and new stations at Caldercruix, Blackridge and Armadale, all stations receiving two trains per hour.

139. Tests Abs 2, 4 and 5 considered how the preferred scenario (AB5) would be affected by various factors. In test Abs2, an extra minute was added to the journey time. In test Abs4, a scenario was run whereby bus operators reacted to competition from the train by reducing their fares by 50%. In both tests, the patronage levels and benefit to cost ratios fell slightly.

140. Test Abs5 assumed that there was no population growth from 2001 levels in Armadale, Caldercruix, Blackridge or Armadale. Although this resulted in a small reduction in patronage, the benefit to cost ratio remained the same.

141. The remaining tests (Abs1, Abs3, Abs6 and Abs7) considered various scenarios for introducing additional stations at Blackridge and Plains in response to representations made by these communities. None of these scenarios have as good patronage figures or constitute as good value for money as test AB5. Test Abs7, for example, modelled new stations at Drumgelloch, Caldercruix, Blackridge and Armadale, all stations receiving two trains per hour. The predicted 12 hour additional boardings were 12,165 as opposed to 12,678 under Test AB5. The benefit to cost ratio was 1.74 as opposed to 1.81 for Test AB5 indicating that Abs7 represented poorer value for money.

142. The results of the sensitivity testing are summarised in the following table:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abs1</th>
<th>Abs2</th>
<th>Abs3</th>
<th>Abs4</th>
<th>Abs5</th>
<th>Abs6</th>
<th>Abs7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 hour additional boardings</td>
<td>11,221</td>
<td>12,332</td>
<td>12,584</td>
<td>11,802</td>
<td>12,333</td>
<td>11,878</td>
<td>12,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCR</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Value of Benefits</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 60 year assessment period (£m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Value of Costs</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 60 year assessment period (£m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction costs (£m) (inc</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimism bias)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional operating costs</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(£m) (annual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion on Station Options**

143. Extensive consideration has been given to the introduction of new intermediate stations between Airdrie and Bathgate. The promoter has responded to the desire for additional stations through the provision of new stations at Caldercruix and Armadale whilst seeking to balance this with the strategic need for a fast and frequent train service.

144. Armadale is the site, which would provide the greatest predicted level of patronage on the line. The only other additional station location, which would not reduce patronage, is Caldercruix. A new station at Plains is not practicable because the only realistic site is too constrained to provide sufficient car parking and the environmental impacts involved in providing a station outweigh the limited benefits. Plains is well connected in terms of public transport by a fast and frequent bus service to Caldercruix and Drungelloch. Likewise, Blackridge is well connected to Armadale by a fast and frequent public transport bus service which is capable of being integrated into the proposed new station location. The close proximity of Plains and Blackridge to other proposed station locations cannot therefore be justified in economic or transport terms. However, the settlements will still benefit from the new rail service through the existence of bus services which will link them to the new station locations with short journey times.

145. It has been demonstrated through the Design Development Appraisal that the option of providing additional stations at Plains and Blackridge is not supportable as they provide poorest strategic and corridor accessibility due to the greater journey times that would result.
The Design Development Appraisal found that the recommended option of new stations at Armadale and Caldercruix, together with a relocated station at Drumgelloch:

- Provides good value for money
- Maximises patronage on the new line
- Balances corridor and strategic accessibility gains
- Makes the most cost effective and efficient use of park and ride for communities in the corridor
- Integrates well with existing public transport to serve other communities in the corridor

Light Maintenance Depot

Operation of the new railway line will require additional rolling stock that needs to be serviced, stabled and cleaned at a light maintenance depot.

Use of facilities at the existing depots at Shields and Cokerhill in Glasgow was initially examined but neither had capacity to service the additional rolling stock. Neither site is currently large enough to provide the additional sidings and facilities required to accommodate the new rolling stock. Additionally, it is difficult to access Shields depot from the stations north of the River Clyde where services would require to terminate at night.

Haymarket Depot in Edinburgh is presently near to full capacity and it only maintains diesel powered rolling stock. Substantial works to install the infrastructure would be necessary to accommodate Electric Multiple Units. Eastfield Depot in Glasgow was also discounted because it required significant overhead electrification works in order to accommodate Electric Multiple Units, both in the depot and the route to the depot. Millerhill Freight Depot in Edinburgh was discounted because it required an extensive signalling upgrade in order to provide the capacity to accommodate the number of movements in and out of a new depot in this locale each evening. The site location was also considered to be too far east given the concentration of services west of Edinburgh.

Upgrading of the existing freight sidings at Cadder, near Lenzie, was discounted as it, and the route to it, is not electrified. Slateford Yard in Edinburgh was also discounted because it is not electrified and is required and operated as a track maintenance storage yard.

Finally, the option of stabling and cleaning of the rolling stock at the terminus stations of Helensburgh and Edinburgh Waverley was examined and discounted because there are not enough spare platforms to accommodate the new rolling stock.

The conclusion of this review was therefore that a light maintenance depot should be provided along the line of the new Airdrie Bathgate route. In order to effectively utilise staff resources and minimise operating costs, it is preferable for such a depot to be located near to a train crew changeover location. For services running on the reopened Airdrie - Bathgate railway, the crew change location would be either Airdrie or Bathgate.
153. Bathgate was chosen as the search area for the new light maintenance depot. Bathgate has significant areas of at grade open space industrial land available adjacent to the proposed train crew changeover point at Bathgate station. Airdrie does not have any such significant areas adjacent or near to its station. The location of Bathgate between Glasgow and Edinburgh also means that it provides flexibility for services in either direction.

154. Two options within Bathgate have been considered as potential light maintenance depot sites. First, a site at Boghall was considered, which is identified in the Bathgate Local Plan and Finalised West Lothian Local Plan as a site for a future station. As explained in paragraph 108, the option of using Boghall as a station location has been considered in consultation with West Lothian Council and ruled out. Given that the site is already recognised in planning terms as being appropriate for railway use, it was considered acceptable for alternative rail use as the light maintenance depot. However, the option for using this site as the light maintenance depot was dismissed because of its outlying location from the town and the new Bathgate station. Further, initial design layout considerations determined that the light maintenance depot would be difficult to operate efficiently at this location.

155. The second option is a site in Bathgate just to the south of the existing railway line, which is currently used as a car storage yard for transfer of vehicles from rail to road. This yard will require either to be moved or substantially reduced in operating capability to accommodate the rail configuration of the Airdrie Bathgate project. As the site is already rail connected, it is considered to be a suitable location for the light maintenance depot. The Bathgate site at this locale will provide light maintenance depot facilities adjacent to an operating station, allowing efficient operation and ease of access for train crews.

156. It is estimated that the new light maintenance depot will provide between twenty and fifty new jobs. Consequently, West Lothian Council supports the location of this facility in Bathgate.

157. The new light maintenance depot facilities planned for Bathgate will be designed to cater for a minimum of a 3-car Electric Multiple Unit. The light maintenance depot will have train wash, toilet discharge, and carriage cleaning facilities.

**Relocation of STVA UK Limited Vehicle Storage Yard**

158. An existing area of land with rail access to the south west of Bathgate station is owned by English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited and operated by STVA UK Limited as a road rail facility for the transfer of new cars from rail to road. The site receives 1 to 2 trains per day, which are split into 2x 250m lengths for stabling and off loading. Cars are stored on site awaiting transfer to road vehicles for distribution throughout Scotland.

159. The construction of the relocated Bathgate station and associated track work means the remaining area of land would be too small to carry out a viable car transfer facility. It is therefore necessary for the yard to be re-located. However, in doing so, it frees up sufficient space to accommodate the new light maintenance depot.

160. To relocate the STVA UK Limited vehicle storage yard to a new location, five options were considered:
Clydesdale steel works at Holytown
Mossend Euroterminal
Millerhill Yard, Edinburgh
Cadder sidings near Lenzie
Boghall, east of Bathgate

161. Clydesdale steel works at Holytown was discounted because of the significant work required to reopen rail access to this site. This and an alternative site at Mossend Euroterminal were discounted by STVA UK Limited because they wanted to retain a site in the east of Scotland where their main business exists.

162. Millerhill Yard in Edinburgh was discounted because it is too remote in relation to the current STVA UK Limited market. Utilising Millerhill Yard would add one hour to road vehicle journey times when delivering new vehicles from the Depot. Cadder sidings, near Lenzie, was discounted because it would add additional traffic to an already constrained main line route.

163. The fifth option for relocation was at Boghall, east of Bathgate. The Boghall site is safeguarded as a site for a station in the Bathgate Local Plan. However, as explained earlier in paragraphs 108 and 154 of this Memorandum, the Boghall site has already been considered and ruled out as a location for the relocated Bathgate station and the new light maintenance depot. The site is immediately adjacent to the existing railway and close to the current STVA UK Limited car transfer facility. It is therefore considered to be the most appropriate site for the relocated car storage yard.

164. The proposed facility will have a new rail connection constructed together with rail sidings, internal roads, car parking for approximately 1000 cars and security fencing. The facility would replicate existing facilities and have a new road connection to an existing business park road, giving access to the A7066 and the trunk road network. Direct road access from the yard to the A7066 will also have the benefit that vehicle movements to and from the yard will not require to pass through the centre of Bathgate as they do at present.

165. Relocation of this facility to the Boghall site is supported by West Lothian Council, and has involved detailed discussions with both English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited and STVA UK Limited.

Relocation of Cycle Path

166. National Cycle Network Route 75 is located on the former railway alignment between Drungelloch and Bathgate. When the Airdrie to Bathgate railway was closed and later converted to a cycle path, this was on the understanding that the rail solum would be preserved and not be developed in such a way that would preclude its reopening for public rail use. The Environmental Statement identifies the loss of the cycle path as a significant environmental impact and recommends its replacement. The replacement of the cycle path is integral to the railway scheme and funding is provided for the new route as part of the Bill.
167. The new cycle path has been developed in consultation with Sustrans, Railway Paths Ltd, and the land access officers of North Lanarkshire Council and West Lothian Council. During the preparation of the Initial Technical Feasibility Study, two principal options were identified for the cycle path. The first option would follow the railway as closely as possible. The second option would follow the A89. Consultation with key stakeholders on the Initial Technical Feasibility Study confirmed a preference to follow the railway route.

168. Efforts have been made to provide a route of similar quality in order to maintain its desirability and the alignment principles previously agreed through the Initial Technical Feasibility Study. The design has developed through the consultation process including landowner discussions and many changes have been made, particularly in relation to intermediate station access and approaches to bridge structures.

169. The proposed alignment utilises on-road, remote tracks and limited lengths of shared public/private accesses as well as new build sections. The corridor of land required for the new build sections of the cycleway is generally between 10 and 14 metres wide. This provides enough space for a 3 metre wide cycleway carriageway, surface water drainage, verges and earthworks to reflect the varying topography. It was also important to the stakeholder group that users of the new cycleway did not feel penned in by boundary fencing immediately to each side of the carriageway. However, at a number of constrained sections, the corridor width has been reduced to 6 metres. Additional land has been identified where landscaping and screening is beneficial.

170. The route generally follows the proposed railway either on the north or the south side, connected by cycleway bridges. Where road structures are to be replaced on their current alignment they are designed to retain their existing cross section and headroom where possible in order to minimise land take. Where this is not possible or structures are to be re-aligned they have been widened to accommodate a shared cycle path/footway. Locations where the cycle path must cross roads at-grade have been kept to a minimum to retain a safe high quality and flowing alignment. At five locations where at-grade crossings are necessary over busier roads, Toucan crossings will be provided. A detailed report has been prepared and issued to all of the parties involved in the relocated cycle path appraisal which explains the approach taken, alternatives considered, details of consultation and the finalised recommended route.

171. To allow for construction of the new railway, it will be necessary to close the existing cycle route between Drumgelloch and Bathgate in order to construct the railway. Although it will not be possible to maintain a continuous cycle route at all times during the construction period, every effort will be made to minimise impact on cycle access by considering how such access can continue to be provided over as much of the route as possible. The new cycle route will generally be built adjacent to the railway and so construction works on the railway will unavoidably affect the new cycle route. In the interests of safety and in order to ensure no interface occurs between cyclists and construction works, it will not be possible for the whole of the new cycle route to be open prior to the existing route being closed. The Promoter has given consideration as to whether a temporary cycle route could be provided during the construction of the railway. However this would not be cost-effective and would create an environmental impact, which cannot be justified for such a short-term measure.
CONSULTATION

Methodology

172. Consultation on the re-opening of the Airdrie - Bathgate Railway with linked improvements started in October 2003 during the Initial Technical Feasibility Study work, which reported in June 2004.

173. Jacobs Babtie, the then project managers and design consultants for the scheme, engaged several organisations as sub consultants to support the consultation process, namely:
   - Harrison Cowley to manage the public and stakeholder consultation, including providing assistance with objector management.
   - Brodies and Miller & Bryce to undertake all land referencing input.
   - Ironside Farrar to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment and preparation of the Environmental Statement as part of the Environmental Consultation.
   - IDP Architects to undertake Station and access outline design.

174. Communication and regular meetings have been held with the following bodies:
   - Stakeholders - politicians, local authorities, technical bodies, transport operators, utilities and regulators.
   - Environmental and conservation groups.
   - The general public
   - Local interests - particularly those residents, businesses and landowners who may be affected by the proposals through potential land take or access requirements, road diversions and those living in properties adjacent to the proposed railways in terms of noise and vibration.

175. The methods of communication used during the consultation process were as follows:
   - Through a dedicated website – www.airdriebathgateraillink.co.uk
   - Through a dedicated helpline – 0131 556 1515.
   - Individual and group meetings / presentations where required and on request.
   - Via a number of public meetings and exhibitions.
   - Through media relations and press activity.
   - Consultation letters.

Stakeholder Consultation

176. Stakeholder involvement has been an integral part of the project since its inception. In October 2003, a Steering Group was established by the Scottish Executive to oversee development of the project with representatives from:
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- Scottish Executive
- North Lanarkshire Council
- West Lothian Council
- Jacobs Babtie
- Strathclyde Passenger Transport
- Transport Initiatives Edinburgh, who attended on an advisory basis.

177. The Steering Group identified the following issues:

- The study should investigate what improvements would be necessary for a 100 mph rail link.
- For the scheme to be viable, a fast and efficient service is necessary.
- There was a need for consultation with MPs, MSPs and local Councillors.
- There was a need for a public relations campaign to raise public awareness of the project and to organise consultation with the public.
- The proposals for the Edinburgh Airport Rail Link should be taken into account.
- The desired frequency of service was four trains per hour in each direction.
- Intermediate stations should be considered for a possible half hourly service if this was feasible.
- Possible alternative routing options should be investigated.

178. Separate regular Technical Meetings were held with representatives from Jacobs Babtie, North Lanarkshire Council and West Lothian Council, thereby involving key stakeholders in the engineering development of the scheme. These meetings discussed:

- The potential for a 100 mph line speed
- Design of the new railway
- Consultation strategy
- Bridge assessments
- Potential station and car park locations

179. A further initial series of meetings was held for the purposes of the Cycle Path Study Review, which involved separate meetings with North Lanarkshire Council, West Lothian Council and SUSTRANS. Detailed comments were also received on the cycle route from the Central Scotland Forest Trust. At this stage, there were two principal options for a re-aligned route. The first option was for the cycle path to follow the railway as closely as possible. The second option was to move the cycle path away from the railway and for it to follow the A89. All of the consultees mentioned in this paragraph were of the view that, subject to detailed alterations to the proposed route, the better option was to generally follow the railway.
180. Constituency MSPs, MPs and local authority Councillors for the area covering the route were contacted by letter, advising them of the nature of the project and offering them an opportunity to find out more about the project and to feed into the project any comments or concerns that they might have. Meetings were held with elected members from North Lanarkshire Council and West Lothian Council, as well as MSPs and MPs.

181. A common theme, which came out of these meetings, was the local desire for the railway to serve intermediate communities with new stations. The Initial Technical Feasibility Study brief was to investigate the operational and engineering feasibility of reopening a railway between Airdrie and Bathgate with no intermediate stops, which would provide a fast service with a 15 minute frequency between Edinburgh and Glasgow. The view taken from the meetings was that the railway should also serve and link to some of the adjacent communities in West Lothian and North Lanarkshire.

182. It was not part of the Initial Technical Feasibility Study remit to recommend whether or not there should be new stations between Airdrie and Bathgate but the study did consider and report on the likely engineering and operational implications of new stations. As explained earlier at paragraphs 107 to 146 of this Memorandum, two new intermediate stations are now proposed as part of the scheme.

183. During 2004 a variety of public bodies were contacted by letter, advising them of the proposals, and offering an opportunity to meet and discuss the project, including:

- Health and Safety Executive
- Scottish Water
- Scottish Executive
- West Lothian Council
- North Lanarkshire Council
- Scot Ways
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Historic Scotland
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Transco
- HM Railway Inspectorate
- Office of the Rail Regulator
- RSPB Scotland
- NFU Scotland
- ECO Countryside Services
- English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited
- National Grid
184. Detailed submissions were received from Scottish Natural Heritage, Historic Scotland and the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency. Various meetings were also held with the local authorities in relation to the need for an Environmental Statement. This consultation is reported in paragraphs 203 to 214 of this Memorandum.

185. Meetings were also held with:
- ScotRail
- Strategic Rail Authority
- Network Rail
- English Welsh & Scottish Railway Limited
- British Railways Board Residuary Ltd

186. Although, no particular concerns arose from these meetings about the principle or engineering feasibility of re-opening the Airdrie - Bathgate line, it was considered that further work would be required to develop a timetable, which would not impact on network performance, particularly on the services connecting into and through Glasgow Queen Street and services in and out of Edinburgh. It was noted that English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited own land to the south of the existing railway at Bathgate which is used by STVA UK Limited as a car storage yard. This site subsequently became identified as the preferred site for a light maintenance depot.

187. The outputs from the Technical Meetings, Cycle Path Study Review and consultation were fed back to the Steering Group. The Initial Technical Feasibility Study was prepared from the extensive work carried out over this period. A draft report was discussed by the Steering Group on 21 May 2004 and the finalised report approved on 8 June 2004.

188. A second phase of stakeholder consultation started in April 2005 and has continued since then. As with the first phase of consultation, key stakeholders have been involved in the detailed development of the scheme. The key stakeholders were identified as:
- Scottish Executive
- Network Rail
- Strathclyde Passenger Transport
- First ScotRail
- North Lanarkshire Council
- West Lothian Council.
189. On 25 April 2005, an initial project planning workshop was held with representatives from the key stakeholders. The purpose of this meeting was to establish a project team and stakeholders group, provide an understanding of the project and determine key issues for the project. Key issues identified at the workshop were consultation strategy, delivery programme, parliamentary process, station locations and train operations.

190. Regular meetings were held with the key stakeholders to review progress on the project and discuss any issues arising. Separate technical meetings were held with appropriate key stakeholders to discuss:

- Design development appraisal, including station locations.
- Advance works such as doubling Newbridge junction and Waverley Station interface.
- Timetable and operations (including light maintenance depot location).

191. By involving key stakeholders in this way, issues raised by them have been considered and addressed during the scope design of the project. The main issues which emerged from the stakeholder meetings were:

- There was a requirement for the choice of station locations to be clearly justified.
- North Lanarkshire Council had concerns about ensuring provision of access to the proposed relocated Drumgelloch station, from the south.
- SPT had concerns over the impact of the proposals on existing services west of Airdrie.
- West Lothian Council were concerned that parking spaces would be lost at Uphall station to accommodate a bridge from the station crossing the railway and the M8. The Council saw Uphall as a major interchange station and they suggested that consideration should be given to providing a car park on the north side of the M8 with a link to the station.
- The design of the railway should not hinder the inclusion of a station at Blackridge at a later stage.
- It was suggested that Great Crested Newts may be present at a location in Plains.
- Impact of considering a new station at Caldercruix on the Caldercruix Lagoons Site of Importance to Nature Conservation needed to be assessed further.
- Consideration needed to be given to integrating cycle paths into stations.
- Ownership of car parking and structures post construction required to be resolved.

192. The justification for new station locations at Caldercruix and Armadale, together with the relocation of Drumgelloch and Bathgate, is set out earlier in this Memorandum at paragraphs 107 to 146. Although it is not considered that a station at Blackridge can be justified in terms of the objectives for the project, the route of the railway does not prevent such a station being constructed at a later date if a robust business case can be made and funding found for it. Car parking has been increased at Uphall Station in consultation with West Lothian Council to meet the demand forecasts of the business case. Concerns about station access and cycle links to
stations have been addressed, where reasonably practicable, such as the provision of a new footpath creating a southside access to the relocated Drumgelloch station. Issues raised by North Lanarkshire Council regarding the presence of Great Crested Newts and Caldercruix Lagoons Site of Importance to Nature Conservation have been assessed in the Environmental Statement. The concerns raised by SPT in respect of the impact on existing services continue to be assessed by the timetable and operations group. Discussions on the ownership of new bridge structures post-completion are continuing.

193. In April 2005, Jacobs Babtie wrote to all local constituency MSPs, local authority councillors and community councillors whose constituencies would be affected by the project updating them on progress and inviting them to a meeting to discuss the proposal. Meetings were held with a number of MSPs on 4 August 2005 and 7 November 2005. The MSPs questioned whether elements of the operational route could be upgraded before re-opening the section between Drumgelloch and Bathgate. This issue was addressed by setting up an advance works group with key stakeholders. The extent of any advanced works is limited to that which can be delivered using Network Rail’s Permitted Development Rights. The scope of the advanced works was subsequently agreed as that required to improve the existing operational railway between Bathgate and Newbridge Junction. The works involve doubling the track in this area and improving the signalling system. Design is now being progressed with work expected to commence on site in spring 2007. Other issues were raised with regard to access and parking arrangements at proposed station locations and these have been addressed. MSPs requested a greater number of public meetings to discuss the proposals. The number of public meetings was increased from four to seven.

194. Separate meetings were held with elected members from North Lanarkshire and West Lothian Councils, where overall support was expressed for re-opening the railway. Although disappointment was expressed that no stations were proposed for Plains or Blackridge, the members acknowledged the importance of reopening the line.

195. A meeting took place with elected members from City of Edinburgh Council on 1 March 2006. Members expressed support for the scheme and were particularly pleased that the service to Edinburgh Park would be increased to 4 trains per hour serving this route. Members did, however, seek reassurance that the scheme would not prejudice the construction of a new station at Newbridge to serve new development planned for that location. Whilst the construction of a new station at Newbridge does not form part of this project, the Bill does not seek any powers that would preclude the construction of a station at Newbridge in relation to another project or at a future date.

196. In October 2005, the following range of other public bodies, organisations and businesses whose interests may be affected by the project were contacted by letter, advising them of the extent of the proposals and offering a meeting to discuss them:

- British Telecommunications plc
- Cable and Wireless
- Central Scotland Forest Trust
- Civil Aviation Authority
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- City of Edinburgh Council
- Coal Authority
- English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited
- First ScotRail
- Her Majesty’s Railway Inspectorate
- Historic Scotland
- JC Decaux Limited
- Lothian Buses
- Lothian and Borders Fire Brigade
- Lothian and Borders Police
- Maiden Outdoor Advertising Limited
- Murphy Pipeline
- National Grid Transco
- North Lanarkshire Council
- NTL Telecom Services Limited
- Orange Ltd
- O2 Plc
- Royal Mail Group Plc
- Scotland Gas Network (formally known as Transco)
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Scottish Executive
- Scottish Fisheries Protection Agency
- Scottish National Heritage
- Scottish Water
- Scottish Power Plc
- Strathclyde Fire and Rescue
- Strathclyde Police Board
- STVA UK Limited
- Sustrans Scotland
- T-Mobile Facilities Management
- Telewest Communications
- Three Hutchison, 3G
- Thus
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- West of Scotland Archaeology service
- West Lothian Council
- Vodafone UK

197. Meetings were held with the following bodies between April 2005 and May 2006:
- Access West Lothian
- British Transport Police
- British Waterways
- City of Edinburgh Council
- Coal Authority
- English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited
- First ScotRail
- Historic Scotland
- HMRI
- Lothian and Borders Police
- Network Rail
- Murphy Pipeline
- National Grid Transco
- North Lanarkshire Council
- RTP West (now Strathclyde Partnership for Transport
- Scotland Gas Network (formerly known as Transco)
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Scottish Executive
- SPT (Strathclyde Passenger Transport)
- STVA UK Limited
- Sustrans Scotland
- Transport Scotland
- West of Scotland Archaeology service
- West Lothian Council

198. Relevant stakeholders in the rail and transport industries have been extensively consulted in the development of the project through the stakeholders group and individual meetings. Transport Scotland, as funders of the scheme, have been extensively involved in all key stages and decisions relating to the scheme leading up to Bill submission. First ScotRail Limited has been consulted in respect of all key stages with the scheme’s development in relation to matters
that might be relevant to them, including the light maintenance depot location, stations and timetable modelling. A further meeting took place on 19 May 2006 with First ScotRail Limited at which discussions took place regarding operating capabilities and detailed station/depot layouts. Discussions are ongoing and further dialogue is planned. SPT has been regularly updated and support the principles of the scheme. A joint remit was agreed in November 2005 between the Promoter, Transport Scotland, and SPT for the timetable modelling consultants, Corus, to further develop the timetable modelling, and this work is on-going.

199. English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited and STVA UK Limited have been consulted in relation to the proposed relocation of the car storage yard to Boghall and in relation to the operating layout of the yard. Both have indicated they are content with this proposal in principle. Detailed design of the yard will require to be developed in consultation with these bodies and further meetings with English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited and STVA UK Limited will be scheduled in this regard.

200. There has been extensive discussion with SUSTRAINS, the access officers of North Lanarkshire and West Lothian Councils and Cycling Scotland on the relocation of the cycle route. Concerns were raised on the lack of linkage between the realigned cycle route and the proposed new stations. These linkages have now been proposed. Various amendments to the route were also discussed with consultees and have been incorporated to address any concerns addressed.

201. Meetings have taken place with utilities undertakers to establish the presence of utilities apparatus and these have been factored into the project.

202. Further meetings have taken place between the Promoter, Transport Scotland and the Chief Executives of North Lanarkshire Council and West Lothian Council. These meetings (and further proposed meetings) are to address, amongst other things, the extent of future local authority contributions to the project and ownership of parts of the new infrastructure post-completion, such as the cycle path.

Environmental Consultation

203. Consultation on the Environmental Statement has taken place in phases. The first major phase of formal consultation took place in November 2003. As part of the work carried out for the Initial Technical Feasibility Study, a Scoping Report was prepared for an Environmental Statement, detailing the likely significant environmental effects of the project and how it was intended that these would be assessed. In accordance with good practice, the views of planning authorities and environmental agencies were sought on the scope of the Environmental Statement. At this stage, however, the Environmental Statement scope was limited to considering re-opening of the Airdrie-Bathgate line and did not include any works within the City of Edinburgh. Formal scoping opinions were therefore sought from West Lothian Council and North Lanarkshire Council, but not from City of Edinburgh Council.

204. West Lothian Council and North Lanarkshire Council provided scoping opinions on 25 February 2004 and 24 March 2004 respectively. Details of these scoping opinions are included in the Environmental Statement.
205. In addition to the planning authorities, the views of other agencies on the scope of the Environmental Statement were sought. A table listing the agencies consulted and the issues raised by them is included within the Environmental Statement.

206. The views of consultees received from the November 2003 consultation exercise helped the environmental consultants to identify the issues, which required to be addressed by the Environmental Statement. A scoping matrix was formed of the environmental issues, which were likely to be significantly affected by the project and appropriate levels of assessment undertaken.

207. There has been continuing dialogue with environmental agencies on the project where particular environmental issues have emerged. In September 2005, the environmental consultants met with Scottish Natural Heritage to provide details of the work in progress. The main issues raised by Scottish Natural Heritage were:

- Scottish Natural Heritage had no problems with the Environmental Statement work undertaken to date.
- All access points to the railway should be included in the Environmental Statement.
- Further information should be included on otter holts in Hillend Reservoir.
- Consideration should be given to protective measures on overhead lines against bird strike.
- Scottish Natural Heritage did not consider that an “appropriate assessment” would be required in terms of the Habitats Directive.
- Justification will be required for the diversion of any watercourse.

208. The environmental consultants met with the Scottish Environment Protection Agency in November 2005. The main issues raised by the Scottish Environment Protection Agency were:

- Need to review potential impacts of the relocated Drumgelloch station on Lilly Loch feeder burn and North Calder Water, which might impact on angling interests.
- Details required of the reclamation works at Hillend Loch
- Pollution levels in Caldercruix lagoons were probably low but any contaminated material would be controlled waste.
- Diversion of North Calder Water would require a Scottish Environment Protection Agency license. It would be best to avoid this through a new bridge alignment.
- There will be a requirement for certain activities to be consented under the Controlled Activities Regulations.
- Only the construction phase is likely to represent a significant risk of impact. Key areas were accidental spillage and storm events.

209. The Environmental Statement was refined to take into account the issues raised by the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage in these consultation meetings. In particular, diversion of North Calder Water has been avoided through bridge alignment as requested by the Scottish Environment Protection Agency.
West Lothian Council identified in July 2005 that the potential impact of the project on Bathgate Castle, which is a scheduled ancient monument, required to be addressed. The environmental consultants met with Historic Scotland in September 2005 and discussed this issue. Historic Scotland was anxious to ensure that the alignment of a new access road would not directly impact on the monument. The design was developed to address these concerns and Historic Scotland have confirmed their satisfaction.

Rule 9A.2.3(c)(iii) of the Scottish Parliament’s Standing Orders require Promoters of Private Bills to consult with designated consultees on the Environmental Statement for the project before the Bill is lodged with the Parliament. The mandatory consultees for this project are:

- West Lothian Council
- North Lanarkshire Council
- City of Edinburgh Council
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Historic Scotland

In December 2005, the environmental consultants wrote to all mandatory consultees, enclosing copies of relevant Chapters of the draft Environmental Statement, and giving them an opportunity to comment. Consultees were advised that formal consultation would take place in January 2006 when the updated draft ES was available. No comments were received from mandatory consultees from this exercise.

On 24 January 2006 drafts of the Environmental Statement were sent to mandatory consultees in accordance with Rule 9A.2.3 (c) (iii) of the Parliament’s Standing Orders and consultees were formally asked for their views. Meetings were held in February 2006 with all mandatory consultees to obtain feedback on the draft Environmental Statement and written comments were subsequently received. Details of the issues raised by the mandatory consultees are set out in Appendix 1 to this Memorandum. Wherever possible, the views of consultees have been reflected in the finalised Environmental Statement and this is summarised in Appendix 1.

On 15 March 2006, a further period of mandatory consultation was triggered as a material change was made to the scheme. It was previously proposed to re-locate the Airdrie and District Angling Club’s clubhouse at Hillend Loch. However, access arrangements to the existing clubhouse have now been refined so that relocation is no longer necessary. The mandatory consultees confirmed their acceptance of the revised proposals and this is now incorporated into the Bill.

**Consultation – General Public**

**Strategy**

Throughout the public consultation of this project, a strategy has been applied to ensure the following:
Information was provided to all those identified as being directly affected by the project. The alignment options were presented with the recommendation for a preferred alignment generally following the existing solum.

Members of the general public had the opportunity to enter into communication with the project team and voice their opinion on the re-opening of the rail link.

Feedback from the general public was taken into consideration and where viable in technical, economic and environmental terms, resulted in changes to the design proposal.

Public consultation was a continuous process from the public launch of the project to the Bill submission and beyond.

216. Two formal periods of public consultation took place during the project in 2004 and pre-Bill submission in 2006. The alignment options were presented with the recommendation for a preferred alignment generally following the existing solum.

Public launch

217. On 20th February 2004, the Airdrie Bathgate Rail link project was launched to all key local and national audiences through a specially tailored press release and photo call. The media targeted by the press release included:

- Edinburgh Evening News
- The Scotsman
- The Herald
- Glasgow Evening Times
- West Lothian Courier
- Airdrie and Coatbridge Advertiser
- West Lothian News
- Herald and Post Series
- BBC TV Scotland
- Scottish Television
- River FM
- Real Radio
- Radio Forth
- BBC Radio Scotland
- West FM
- Radio Clyde
Website and Information Helpline

218. A website [www.airdriebathgateraillink.co.uk](http://www.airdriebathgateraillink.co.uk) has been used throughout the consultation both to provide information and also allow opportunity for the general public to comment on the project. The website currently provides the following:

- Background and history of the project.
- Public benefits of the project.
- Line of route map and outline station plans/details of the proposed line.
- Question and answer section (including areas such as construction; safety; environmental).
- News section, listing all press releases and completed studies/reports.
- Plain English guide to compensation procedures.
- Initial Technical Feasibility Study.
- Details of all public meetings and exhibitions.
- Contact details and opportunity to email views/queries.

219. As the project progressed and information became available to share with the general public, the consultation team updated the website. Since the launch of the website on 24th February 2004 until 28 April 2006, there have been 32,414 hits.

220. The public information telephone line is staffed between 9am and 5.30pm every weekday. Additionally it has a 24-hour answering system, which allows callers to leave messages out of office hours.

221. The public information telephone line provides the public with the opportunity to talk to a member of the Airdrie Bathgate Project Consultation team. The team are trained and fully briefed on the range of aspects relating to the project and have answered a variety of questions such as the Bill submission process; rail link route; cycle path location and route; personal property matters; project timescales and station locations.

222. Since the launch of the public information helpline there have been, as at 28 April 2006, 314 calls from a number of audiences including the general public, MSPs, local councillors, community councillors, media and council representatives.

223. The aim has been for every website, e-mail and telephone query received to either be responded to immediately or if more information is required, forwarded to the project managers. Once in receipt of this information, a member of the consultation team will respond to the enquirer as soon as possible. On average, the time taken to respond was five days if further information was required from the project managers.

224. Each stage of the enquiry and response process is logged within the Consultation Database. An audit trail of all correspondence has been recorded along with the details of the outcome of the enquiry/comment.
Advertising of Meetings and Exhibitions

225. Exhibitions and public meetings were held during the two formal phases of public consultation in 2004 and 2006. Prior to exhibitions and meetings, adverts were placed in local media and a press release was issued. Details of the meetings and exhibitions were also placed on the project website.

226. In addition, posters were distributed throughout the communities in which exhibitions and meetings were to take place in locations such as; community centres, post offices, health centres/surgeries, libraries, leisure centres, schools, local shops and supermarkets. A number of posters were also sent to each of the local councils; North Lanarkshire and West Lothian.

227. In 2004, a range of information materials relating to the launch of the public consultation was produced including material for the exhibition boards such as logos, maps, photographs and press releases.

228. In addition, the information leaflets had a tear-off, free post feedback form, enabling members of the public to voice their opinion and request additional information. To date the consultation team have received, logged and responded to 114 leaflet feedback forms.

229. 3,000 leaflets were distributed during the second phase of public meetings and exhibitions. As many of the leaflets were handed to families/couples/local councillors/wardens, these leaflets will have reached a much wider audience.

230. The consultation team continue to distribute leaflets on request (i.e. community councillors, requests from the general public via the website and information helpline).

Public Exhibitions

231. Public exhibitions were held in Airdrie and Livingston during the first phase of the public consultation:

- Airdrie – Safeway store, 27th, 28th, 29th February and 1st March 2004
- Livingston – Almondvale shopping centre, 5th and 6th March 2004

232. The venues (Safeway store in Airdrie and Almondvale shopping centre in Livingston) and dates were chosen to maximise public awareness as they provided a large footfall of traffic within the key target areas (Airdrie and Bathgate).

233. It was also important to get into the heart of the main communities likely to have the biggest level of interest in the project, but also ensuring that surrounding communities could also participate in the consultation. The exhibitions were positioned in central areas within each shopping centre, and prior to each of the public meetings. 1100 people stopped and asked specific questions with many hundreds more viewing the exhibitions over the six-day period.
During the second phase of public consultation, exhibitions were held at each community along the proposed route as follows:

- Blackridge - Craig Inn Community Centre, 10th January 2006
- Plains - Community Hall, 11th January 2006
- Caldercruix - Community Centre, 12th January 2006
- Airdrie - Airdrie Academy, 16th January 2006
- Airdrie - Gartlea Community Centre, 17th January 2006
- Bathgate - Bathgate Academy, 19th January 2006
- Bathgate - Community Centre, 20th January 2006
- Livingston - Almondvale Shopping Centre, 21st January 2006
- Livingston - Almondvale Shopping Centre, 22nd January 2006
- Armadale - Armadale Academy, 23rd January 2006
- Edinburgh - Waverley Station, 24th January 2006
- Glasgow - Queen Street Station, 26th January 2006
- Uphall Station – Uphall Station Institute, 14th February 2006

At each exhibition, seven exhibition boards demonstrated the following information:

- Background information to the project
- Project proposals
- Anticipated timescales of the project
- Proposed Airdrie and relocated Drungelloch station plans and details
- Proposed Caldercruix and Armadale station plans and details
- Proposed Bathgate, Livingston North and Uphall station plans and details
- Contact details for the project

Venues were chosen for their capacity and location within each of the key communities. In total, 1214 people attended the above exhibitions. These included members of the general public, local MSPs, council representatives, local councillors, community councillors, community wardens, community access groups and interested groups.

A wider audience was reached by leaving leaflets in all of the community centres and stations as well as through the community councillors and wardens who took large numbers of leaflets away with them to distribute within the communities.

**Public Meetings**

A series of public meetings were held during the two main periods of public consultation in 2004 and 2006. At each public meeting, the public exhibition materials were displayed.
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239. Four public meetings were held during 2004 within the local communities:
   - Airdrie - John Wilson Town Hall, 4th March 2004
   - Bathgate - Community Centre, 10th March 2004
   - Plains - Community Hall, 20th April 2004
   - Caldercruix - Community Centre, 22nd April 2004

240. These meetings provided the project managers with the opportunity to explain the initial plans for re-establishing rail links between the two towns (Airdrie and Bathgate), while also providing community audiences with the opportunity to register their opinion. These formed part of the initial consultation process.

241. The top table consisted of representatives from Jacobs Babbit, Scottish Executive, local councillors and the relevant local MSP. Harrison Cowley (consultation team) chaired the meeting. A total of 250 people attended the meetings.

242. In general, the overwhelming majority of people consulted during the first formal phase of the consultation process were supportive of the railway re-opening. However, concerns and questions were raised on a number of issues. The most frequent observations from the meetings can be found below:
   - Just under a fifth of questions (18.5%) were related to the route (including the proposed route, electrification and double tracking).
   - Approximately 17.5% of questions were regarding stations (including location; justification; access; facilities; servicing and car parking/cycle facilities).
   - Just under a fifth (16%) of questions were regarding the consultation itself (including lack of awareness and requests for further information).
   - 13% of questions were residential or business property related (including effects; compensation; compulsory purchase and access).
   - Just under a tenth of all questions (9%) were relating to the cycle track (including relocation).
   - 7% of questions related to the cost of the project and the source of project funding.
   - A number of questions (5.5%) related to the environment (including noise) and safety of the proposed rail link.
   - A number of questions (5.5%) were regarding the timescales of the project (including completion date; service running date; Bill submission and process).
   - 3.5% of questions were transport related (including interlinked bus services; traffic flow and junction issues; congestion and suggested improvements to existing transport).
   - 2.5% of questions came under the miscellaneous category (including queries about other rail link projects).
1% of questions were objections to certain elements of the project (including line proximity to property and lack of proposed stations).

243. Following the first formal stage of consultation, the following action was taken:

- In response to the desire for new intermediate stations, additional stations have been proposed for Caldercruix and Armadale, as well as a relocated station at Drumgelloch. The justification for the choice of new station locations is set out in paragraphs 107-146 of this Memorandum.
- A Design Development Assessment has been produced to demonstrate the financial viability of the proposals.
- The requirement for station car parking has been assessed and incorporated into the scheme.
- The environmental impact of the scheme (including noise) has been assessed in the Environmental Statement. Mitigation has been proposed where appropriate.
- Additional information on the scheme was provided to those who requested it.

244. In 2006, the Promoter led seven public meetings within communities along the proposed route:

- Blackridge - Craig Inn Community Centre, 10th January 2006.
- Plains - Community Hall, 11th January 2006.
- Caldercruix - Community Centre, 12th January 2006.
- Airdrie - Airdrie Academy, 16th January 2006.
- Bathgate - Bathgate Academy, 19th January 2006.
- Armadale - Armadale Academy, 23rd January 2006.
- Uphall Station – Uphall Station Institute, 14th February 2006.

245. A total of 384 people attended these meetings, including members of the general public, local MSPs, council representatives, local councillors, community councillors, community wardens, community access groups and interested groups.

246. The top table consisted of representatives from Network Rail (main speaker), Jacobs Babtie, Transport Scotland, local councillors, the relevant local MSP and the Harrison Cowley consultation team.

247. The public meeting presentation provided background information on the project (including benefits, timescales etc), announced the latest project proposals (rail route, cycle route and station locations) and provided information on the consultation and Bill submission processes. A PowerPoint presentation was prepared to underpin the above information.

248. In addition to general questions about the project, members of the project team were on hand to answer specific questions, i.e. compensation and property issues (Network Rail); station
layout design (IDP architects); stakeholder issues (Jacobs Babtie); additional transport proposals (local councils); procedures and scope (Transport Scotland) and community support (local Councillor and/or MSP).

249. All meetings were tape-recorded in order to have a formal record of this phase of the consultation. The main themes of questions raised during the public meetings and exhibitions were justification of station locations; individual property enquiries; timescales; cycle track location and rail link route; the Bill submission process; safety; environmental issues, car parking; congestion; access to stations; and compensation issues.

250. During the second formal phase of the consultation, it was found that the public support for the principle of reopening the rail route between Airdrie and Bathgate and linked improvements was consistently high. However, a number of detailed questions were raised in relation to the project. The most frequent observations from the meetings can be found below.

- Almost a fifth (19%) of questions were residential / business property related (including effects; compensation; compulsory purchase and access).
- 25% were regarding stations (including location; justification; access; facilities; servicing and car park/cycle facilities).
- Just under 16% of questions asked related to the route of the railway (including operations; frequency; journey times; existing line and fares).
- 7% were concerns about environmental and safety issues (including noise; vibrations; screening; safety of line and surrounding areas).
- 6.5% were transport related (including interlinked bus services; traffic flow and junction issues; congestion and suggested improvements).
- 6.5% were relating to the consultation itself (including lack of awareness or requests for further information).
- 6% of questions related to the cost of the project and the source of project funding.
- 4% of questions were regarding the timescales of the project (including completion date; service running date; Bill submission and process).
- 4% were objections to specific elements of the project (including line proximity to property and lack of proposed stations); though no questions specifically indicated an objection to the project as a whole.
- 3% were asked regarding the cycle track (including relocation and access during construction).
- 2% came under the miscellaneous category (including other rail link project questions).
- 1% of questions were regarding the land referencing exercise (including queries over maps; confusion over questionnaire and information not received).
- During the Blackridge public meeting, 41% of questions raised were regarding the justification for a station at Blackridge and at Plains a fifth (21%) were concerned about not getting a station.
• During the Caldercruix public meeting, opposition was expressed to the car park proposed to the north of the railway line.

• During the Uphall Station public meeting opposition was expressed to expansion of the existing station car park on the south of the railway. The Promoter was also asked to consider alternatives to ramps to facilitate access to the new bridge, which would cross the M8 to link the station with the new car park on the north side of the M8.

251. Throughout the consultation period the following additional information was gathered via the website / helpline and leaflet feedback:

• Over a quarter (26.5%) of the comments received were relating to property enquiries (residential and business).

• Just under a fifth (19.5%) of the comments received specifically voiced their support of the project.

• Just over a tenth (11.5%) of comments / queries were station related.

• 14% were specific to the route (including operations; frequency; journey times; existing line and fares).

252. In terms of the issues raised in the second phase of consultation, the desire for a station at every settlement is understood. Again however, paragraphs 107 to 146 of this Memorandum explain the rationale for the choice of station locations. The Promoter has carefully considered the representations made but does not support a change to the recommendations in this regard. Environmental concerns have been assessed in the Environmental Statement and mitigation proposed where appropriate. A Design Development Appraisal has been produced to demonstrate the financial viability of the proposals.

253. In direct response to concerns raised at the public meetings about car parking provision at stations, the proposal for the Caldercruix station north side car park and expansion of the existing Uphall Station south side car park have been dropped by the Promoter.

254. The concerns raised at the Uphall Station public meeting about the visual impact of the proposed access ramps for the new bridge over the M8 have been considered by the Promoter. The Promoter has discussed the issues in detail with Access West Lothian who represent the interests of disabled people in that area and it has been agreed to review options for providing access to the station for mobility impaired passengers during the design phase of the project. Provision of such access is a requirement of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. It is not practicable to provide lifts because Uphall station is unstaffed and therefore a delay risk is present due to the time it would take to respond to an emergency call in the event of a lift failure.

255. With the development of the detail of the scheme at the second stage of consultation, the impact of the scheme on other property has become much clearer. In response to concerns expressed about property and environmental impact, the Promoter has offered to meet affected parties to establish whether it is possible to make modifications to the scheme. The Promoter has examined the engineering design to reduce in places the land take required for the scheme. The land take for forming embankments and cuttings has, for example, been reduced by introducing
retaining structures. This has resulted in the reduction of permanent land take. It has also been possible, in some cases, to reduce the land take for temporary occupation of the land concerned during the construction period. Inevitably, however, land does need to be acquired either on a temporary or permanent basis. The extent of modifications made to the scheme in response to issues raised during consultation is set out in Appendix 2 to this Memorandum.

Consultation - Local Interests

256. The identity of parties who may be affected by the proposal has emerged through land referencing, stakeholder consultation and issues raised at public meetings. In the first phase of consultation which led up to publication of the Initial Technical Feasibility Study, where specific issues were identified which affected the interests of a particular person or body then they were contacted by letter and a meeting was offered.

257. One of the main issues, which emerged at this stage, was the potential impact of the project on existing accesses or on access for proposed developments. Meetings were held with Easter Moffat Golf Club, Airdrie and District Angling Club and Bathgate Golf Club, as well as the representatives of several prospective developments with a view to exploring the need or otherwise to securing alternative access as part of the rail reopening project. Wherever possible, alternative access was proposed. The Angling Club also raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on fishing in Hillend Loch. These concerns were later investigated and resolved as part of the Environmental Statement. It has been confirmed that the running of trains will not have a detrimental impact on fishing. Pontoons will be provided to allow fishing to continue where the railway runs close to the shoreline.

258. During the second stage of consultation from April 2005 to date, the extent of the project on householders, businesses and landowners has become clearer as the route has been refined. Following the production of Issue One of the Maps Plans and Sections in December 2005, the Promoter has undertaken a detailed programme of consultation with residents and landowners.

259. Approximately 110 landowners and residents were identified as potentially directly affected by the project design largely in terms of land take and contact has been made by letter or telephone inviting each party to attend a face to face meeting with the Project Team to engage in consultation prior to the submission of the Bill.

260. As a result, a total of around 85 affected parties have been met directly. All requests for meetings have been honoured, and responses provided either by telephone or in writing to any additional individual enquiries received via the Airdrie Bathgate Helpline.

261. The Project Team attended a number of group meetings both instigated by the Team and upon request from affected parties. For example, meetings were held with residents of Millstream Crescent Caldercruix, residents of Main Street Plains, and the Committees of Hillend Sailing Club and Monkland & District Angling Club.

262. Representatives from Network Rail and Jacobs Babtie attended every meeting, at which the aims and timescales of the project were outlined and an explanation of the Bill process was given. Draft plans were tabled illustrating the proposals specifically relating to each property and
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the impacts of the project on that property were explained to the affected party. Information regarding compulsory purchase procedures was provided and Compensation Leaflets were widely distributed.

263. Minutes were taken for every meeting with all issues recorded. The main areas of concern included:

- compensation regarding property;
- noise and vibration issues;
- impact on property during the construction period;
- the effect of the relocation of the cycle path.

264. Throughout this consultation process, the opportunity has been taken where possible to address the concerns of individual landowners regarding the impact of the physical works on their property and the scheme proposals have been changed in several instances. Details of changes made as a direct result of the consultation process are listed in Appendix 2.

CONCLUSION

265. This Memorandum has been prepared by the Promoter, Network Rail to satisfy rule 9A.2.3(b) of the Scottish Parliament’s Standing Orders. It sets out the policy objectives of the Bill (see paragraphs 4-6) and identifies and assesses the alternative ways of meeting those objectives and confirms why the approach taken in the Bill was adopted (see paragraphs 66 - 171). It also describes the consultation undertaken by Network Rail in relation to those objectives, on the ways of meeting them, on the detail of the Bill, and provides a summary of that consultation exercise (see paragraphs172 - 264).

266. A rail link would contribute significantly to improving direct access to labour markets in Glasgow & Edinburgh for people living in the Airdrie to Uphall corridor as well as stimulating economic growth of the Airdrie to Uphall corridor by improving the connectivity of the area.

267. The Promoter also believes that this rail line will assist in the delivery of social inclusion to communities in the Airdrie to Uphall corridor by providing enhanced public transport opportunities to those without access to private cars. In addition it will contribute towards increasing the number of people using public transport in Central Scotland and provide these communities with improved access into the national rail network.

268. The Promoter recognises the importance that the Scottish Executive places on tackling traffic congestion in central Scotland and believes that the rail link will offer a real public transport alternative to the M8 thus helping to reduce the rise in road congestion and subsequent environmental impacts.

269. In addition, the Bill gives powers to construct a rail link that will enable the existing services on the Glasgow North electrics to operate as through services to Edinburgh providing an alternative to the Edinburgh - Glasgow main line service, thus assisting in reducing congestion at peak times.
270. Network Rail and the consultants have consulted on the policy objectives of the Bill and on the detail of the Bill within the core stakeholder group, and with a range of other important interested parties. They include mandatory consultees, local residents, the general public, stakeholders, the business community, the rail industry and rail users as explained in paragraphs 172 to 264. Where practical, design changes have been incorporated to reduce impacts as a result of discussion with local residents. The overall outcome of the consultation exercise is overwhelming public support for the principle of a rail link between Airdrie and Bathgate as well as the linked improvements.
APPENDIX 1 - MANDATORY CONSULTATION

This Appendix provides additional detail on the consultation process undertaken by the Promoter in respect of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td>Nature Conservation, European Sites</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ian Bray Area Officer (East)              | • Blawhorn Moss: Unlikely that the proposals will have a significant effect either directly or indirectly  
                                      | • Firth of Forth Special Protection Area: Currently insufficient information to determine whether proposal is likely to have significant effect on the site. As a result details as to whether or not any direct or indirect impacts on the River Almond could occur from the proposed upgrading/electrification works should be included. 
                                      | • It should be noted that Blawhorn Moss and Black Loch Moss are now fully designated Special Areas of Conservation. Blawhorn Moss is also an National Nature Reserve and not East Kirkton Quarry. (see Table 10.1 Chapter 10) Firth of Forth Special Protected Area should also be mentioned | Special Protection Area issue addressed in Chapter 15 Water Quality and Chapter 16 Disruption due to Construction – Bridge Assessment. Table 10.1 amended to record accurately the designations applicable to each site. |
| Gail Foster Area Officer (West)           | European Protected Species                                                          |                                                                            |
|                                           | • Otter: Otters have been recorded at Hillend Reservoir 
                                      | Insufficient emphasis is placed on potential disturbance to otter and any proposed mitigation 
<pre><code>                                  | • Bats: Limited observation of bats were recorded. A method, timescale and any remedial mitigation issues should be highlighted within final Environmental Statement | Impact on otter is addressed in 10.4.7 and mitigation measures specified in 10.5.2 |
</code></pre>
<p>|                                           | Protected Species                                                                   |                                                                            |
|                                           | • Badgers: Badgers noted to be present alongside disused railway line. Further details and consideration of appropriate mitigation should be provided within | Badger survey carried out by JDC Ecology Limited and reported in Chapter 10. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Statement</td>
<td>• Water Vole: No records of water vole recorded during surveys. However further surveys may be required and contact should be made with Scottish Natural Heritage if evidence of water vole found</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>• Further consideration of how the railway may impact upon locally designated sites of importance for wildlife is required.</td>
<td>Impact of railway on sites of local biodiversity interest addressed in the Environmental Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Further consideration should be given to assessment on soil conservation. This should be considered through-out the lifespan of the project. Such a soil conservation strategy should also be used to inform final restoration details</td>
<td>The impacts associated with soils are not significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater consideration is required in terms of both a biodiversity strategy and also a landscape strategy as to how to maximise the potential for increasing biodiversity/and or landscaping and their future management and maintenance</td>
<td>Chapter 18 recommends careful stripping and storage of soils with desirable grassland cover for re-spreading for natural grassland regeneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full cognisance has been made of legal obligations in addition to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, Network Rail Biodiversity Plan and all relevant Local Biodiversity Action Plans. The landscape reinstatement proposals address the requirements of the Network Rail Biodiversity Action Plan and the Vegetation Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</td>
<td>• There is opportunity to consider further landscaping and visual impact issues regarding the proposed major infrastructure projects such as the new stations, car parking and over bridges.</td>
<td>Landscape works are proposed for all major elements of the scheme to minimise visual impacts and integrate the scheme with the local landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Careful consideration should be given to landscaping around news stations and associated car parks and also to landscaping in the open countryside</td>
<td>Habitat Management Plan (chapter 10) and Landscape Maintenance Plan (Chapter 18) recommended as mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Essential that a detailed Landscape and Habitat Management Plan is drawn up to ensure the above are dealt with adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document relates to the Airdrie-Bathgate Railway and Linked Improvements Bill (SP Bill 64) as introduced in the Scottish Parliament on 30 May 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sustrans Route: Scottish Natural Heritage welcomes the approach taken in relation to realignment of the route and recommends that this continues to ensure best final route is selected</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Access: Consideration should be given to the views of the Local Access Forums where severance of exiting access is proposed</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>A series of general recommendations have also been put forward for the final Environmental Statement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Annex 1 includes legislative requirements for European Sites and European Protected Species – Otter</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scottish Natural Heritage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Further consultation on access to Airdrie and District Angling Club:</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Confirmation that otters are a European Protected Species and a statement on illegal activities</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Requirement for licence to undertake works along southern edge of Hillend reservoir.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Requirement for consideration of vehicle and cycle management, and details of reclamation and reinstatement of shore edge during and after construction.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Need for consideration of footbridge to ensure ‘fit’ with landscape and visual mitigation plan, including any landscaping and planting requirements.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Recommendation for further consultation with the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage and Scottish Executive</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Scotland</strong></td>
<td><strong>Historic Scotland are content that the reopening of the railway line itself raises no significant issues for any statutory elements of the historic</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linge</td>
<td>environment</td>
<td>Summary amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Historic Scotland continued | **Detailed Comments on Chapter**  
**Summary**: Needs to make clearer that there will be no direct impacts on Edinburgh Castle and significant additional impacts on its setting.  
**Table 11.3**: Does not currently make clear what specific levels of impact are considered significant for the purpose of this Environmental Impact Assessment  
**Section 11.3.3**: Perhaps make clear there will be no significant impacts on the scheduled monuments and listed buildings in the tables  
**Section 11.9.3**: Need to make clear there will be no impact on scheduled area of Edinburgh Castle. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act does not “advocate a policy of minimal intervention.”  
Scottish Ministers responsible for granting Scheduled Monument Consent, not Historic Scotland. Omit phrase “which could result in prosecution”  
Paragraph could be irrelevant, except as background, as there are no direct impacts on scheduled monuments.  
**Designed Landscapes**: If reference to the GDPO is to be retained it needs to be corrected to Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992.  
**World Heritage Sites**: The main documents referred to here should be UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, the Management Plan for the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site and National Planning Policy Guidline 18 para 15  
**Section 11.11**: Needs to be updated following recent consultation meeting  
**Section 11.12**: Second paragraph particularly vague as regards actual impact.  
**Appendix 1**: Not particularly helpful in understanding the nature of impacts | Summary amended accordingly. |
| | Table 11.1 added to set out criteria for rating archaeological and cultural heritage sensitivity. |
| | Text amended accordingly. |
| | Text amended accordingly. |
| | Noted. |
| | Text amended accordingly. |
| | Text amended accordingly. |
| | Text amended accordingly. |
| | Text amended accordingly. |
| | Second to fourth paragraphs revised to reflect actual impact. |
| | Noted. |
| | Entry revised accordingly. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entry for Edinburgh Castle should be amended as, impacts will not be very significant <strong>Listed Building Consent</strong>: No objection in principle with the issue of Listed Building Consent for the attachment of overhead lines to the B listed Birdsmill Viaduct and new overhead lines within listed area of Edinburgh Waverly Station</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Environmental Protection Agency Contacts: Janine Young Area Officer (East) Tom McKenzie Area Officer (West)</td>
<td><strong>Water Environment</strong>: Where the proposed maintenance or engineering works may impact upon the water environment, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency will need to discuss individual project methods and designs with the developer. Where deterioration in the quality of the water environment is likely then these bodies of work must be fully justified. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency has concerns over the proposed culverting and will require all of the alternatives to culverting to be fully investigated and justified and culverting should be a last resort for crossing watercourses. Designs of watercourse crossings should maintain wildlife corridors on the banks and within the watercourses. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency have serious concerns over the proposed culverting of the following structures:  - Barbauchlaw at Blackridge  - Hillend Reservoir outlet  - Bog Burn at Bathgate</td>
<td>Noted. Issue will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency withdrew erroneous references to culverting at Barbauchlaw and Hillend Reservoir. The Environmental Statement recognises that the Bog Burn culvert would need to be licensed A under Controlled Activities Regulations, with full justification of the need for the culvert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Surface Water Drainage</strong>: Requested that surface water drainage is treated in accordance with the principles of Planning Advice Note 61 (Planning and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems). Work must be phased to ensure minimum risk as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems may be susceptible to damage because of mud and silt generated during site preparation</td>
<td>Noted. Issue will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This document relates to the Airdrie-Bathgate Railway and Linked Improvements Bill (SP Bill 64) as introduced in the Scottish Parliament on 30 May 2006</td>
<td>and temporary silt traps or slit lagoons should be provided where necessary</td>
<td>Flood risk information supplied by the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency incorporated into Chapter 15 Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Flood Risk:</strong> The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency have provided a list of sites to be at risk from flooding based on data from the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology and the Strathclyde Regional Council Water Services Committee. Sites not shown on Centre for Ecology and Hydrology maps but adjacent to watercourses are also listed. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency is of the opinion that further information is required to determine the degree of flood risk and scoping/mitigation in the form of a Flood Risk Assessment. In terms of designing for Flood Conditions, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency recommends that the proposed design flood protection should take account of the 1:200 year return period plus an allowance for climate change in accordance with Scottish Planning Policy 7. Embankments of the railway need to be above the 1 in 200 year flood levels. Existing culverts should to 1:200 year design level. Construction proposals should not worsen the risk of flooding to the agricultural landowners. The integrity of Hillend Reservoir and the new embankments should be documented</td>
<td>Flood risk assessments are considered essential at those sites listed as being at risk of flooding, and shall include reference to the new generation flood mapping to be published later in 2006. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency recommendations noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Contaminated Land:</strong> The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency request any proposed treatment of contaminated soils be agreed with them. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency would also wish to see a robust methodology statement relating to encountering contamination during</td>
<td>Noted. Issue will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Issue will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Issue will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction activities, covering the discovery of solid, mobile and dissolved phase contaminants</td>
<td>Comment noted and appropriate caveat included in paragraph of 15.4.3 of Chapter 15, Water Quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hydrogeology:</strong> In relation to Table 15.5, it should be noted that trial pits are not appropriate for groundwater monitoring and samples collected in this way do not provide a reliable representation of the groundwater quality. This information should only be used as preliminary information which assists in the design of subsequent groundwater monitoring programme, if such a programme is required. Mitigation of the effects on groundwater in the bedrock should be considered on a site by site basis taking into account the results of the site investigation, risk assessment and in accordance with hydrogeological regime.</td>
<td>The Environmental Statement acknowledges that the residual effects involve small-scale, long-term damage to the Hillend Reservoir Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Biodiversity:</strong> It is unclear from the Statement which species and aquatic communities may be affected by the construction phase at the reservoir. The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency have concerns about the permanent loss of shoreline habitat, the effect of which have not fully been fully assessed. The significance of the loss of littoral habitat in the context of the loch shoreline should be detailed by a Lake Habitat Survey.</td>
<td>The recommendation for a Lake Habitat Survey is noted and shall be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sustainable Waste Management:</strong> &lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency recommends that energy and resource conservation should be embodied throughout the development and used as a demonstration of good practice, particularly new structures.&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;The developer should be aware that space for segregation and collection of recyclates will be required within the development site. The Scottish</td>
<td>Noted. All of the issues raised under the heading Sustainable Waste Management will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency encourages the reuse of materials on site, sustainable remediation options and segregation and collection of recyclates generated during the construction and life of the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The selection, transportation and sourcing of all construction materials should try and achieve the most sustainable option. Scottish Environmental Protection Agency recommends that an assessment based on the waste hierarchy is undertaken to reduce the quantities of soils and construction materials to be disposed to landfill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where waste is either imported to or exported from a site, applicants and their contractors should be fully aware of the relevant requirements relating to the: 1. Transport of controlled waste by registered carriers 2. Correct classification of the material, particularly prior of landfill disposal 3. Furnishing and keeping of duty of care waste transfer notes the generic statements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• From the Statement the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency is unclear whether wastes from off-site activities/secondary aggregates would be used within this development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Prevention:</td>
<td>Noted. All of the issues raised under the heading Pollution Prevention will be addressed through provision in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment, which will be issued to both design and implementation contractors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Civil engineering works associated with the construction of the track, embankments, buildings and landscaping should conform to Scottish Environmental Protection Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Method Statements showing how potentially contaminated construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scottish Environmental Protection Agency                              | **Further consultation on Access to Airdrie and District Angling Club:**  
  - Risk of pollution from amendment would be no more harmful to the water environmental than original proposal.  
  - No further comments or recommendations                          | **Noted. Promoter will continue to seek the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency’s advice on any issues which may arise which are likely to concern the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency.**                                                                 |
| Scottish Environmental Protection Agency Contacts:                  | **Airdrie Station is within a Conservation Area and therefore the design and materials should be carefully chosen to protect the character of the area. Visual Impact of the car parking structure on the Central Airdrie Area should be carefully assessed along with appropriate mitigation measures** |                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Angela Burke Planning Liaison Officer                                | **Requirement for Transport Assessments for Airdrie, New Drumgelloch and Caldercruix Stations**                                                                                                                      | **Noted. The promoter has specified that the designer for the station facilities along the route must employ an architect with appropriate experience of transport facilities. Multi-storey car park structure now deleted from the scheme.** |
| North Lanarkshire Council                                           | **What are the proposals for the existing Drumgelloch Station**                                                                                                                                                       | **Transport Assessments commissioned for each of the stations. The outputs will feed into the detailed design process. The designer will be responsible for developing a design and implementation methodology for approval by Network Rail and the local authority. The existing Drumgelloch Station will be demolished and the site subject to landscape** |
| David Baxter Planning Officer                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issues also raised for sites at Carlisle Road Bridge; Construction Compound 093, 239, 304A, 377 and 407; Crowwood Drive Bridge; Towers Road Bridge; Katherine Park and north of Wester Moffat Farm.</td>
<td>reinstatement. For bridges and construction compounds, the designer will be responsible for developing a design and implementation methodology for approval by Network Rail and the local authority. Where required, site specific TAs will be commissioned by the designer to prove the robustness of their methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plains: Introduction of the rail line will cut direct links to the country park and, despite the proposed bridge, it is considered may have a detrimental affect. The proposal also involves permanent acquisition of part of the park. What proposals are there to compensate for this loss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a possible issue with junction spacing between the new access road and Main Street at Plains.</td>
<td>Cyclepath now re-routed around the north of Katherine Park and will be designed to avoid impact on the mature trees. The re-routed cyclepath also now avoids the Wester Moffat Farm cottages. All parts of the park not required to facilitate the new footbridge, its approaches and the new access to Ford Forge will be reinstated and returned upon completion of construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is potential for adverse impact on protected habitat and species along the North Calder Water. There is also a potential issue of flooding that would need to be checked.</td>
<td>This issue will be the subject of further discussion with North Lanarkshire Council’s Transportation Department. The designer will ensure that appropriate flood protection is incorporated into the cyclepath design to meet the requirements of the approving body. Baseline information in the Environmental Statement will inform the Code of Construction Practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### From

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Demolition of three properties at east end of Plains could help reduce the visual impact of the adjacent cycle bridge.</td>
<td>The cycle bridge at the east end of Plains now deleted from the scheme, with cyclists using the new footbridge adjacent to Station Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suggestion of permanent use of the temporary realignment of the A89 at 367 Main Street.</td>
<td>Railway embankment height, topography, road layout and bridge clearance heights preclude this suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caldercruix: Alternative access routes to the North Station Car Park suggested due to the potential adverse impact the current access will have on pedestrians and road users</td>
<td>Car park to north of station now deleted as a result of the mandatory and public consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design and materials used in the construction of the car park and associated landscaping would be important in this rural location.</td>
<td>The landscape design for the proposed station at Caldercruix will be determined at detailed design stage. The car parking area and access road will be planted, particularly where close to residential properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The access to the south car park at the station will require to be altered in line with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Will the North Calder Water be crossed by a bridge?</td>
<td>The designer will be required to ensure that the access and bridge over the North Calder Water will be designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, and will be the subject of further discussion with North Lanarkshire Council’s Transportation Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concern expressed over the temporary re-opening of the road between Main Street and the A89. Impact of the development should also be considered on junction with the A89.</td>
<td>These issues will be addressed in the Transport Assessment commissioned for Caldercruix Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If Millstream Crescent redeveloped then it would be an alternative construction compound subject to confirmation of</td>
<td>The scheme requires the acquisition of five properties at Millstream Crescent, so option to use the site as construction compound now discounted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traffic flows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreed that public art sited along existing cycle path would be relocated to the new path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary storage compound in area 304A is quite prominent. Consideration should be given to screening from the A89 and landscaping on completion of the works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on the loch and recreational uses on the south bank is potentially significant. Details of the material to be used and methodology of infill are key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on the bridge at compound area 377 from construction traffic needs to be assessed and any remedial action taken before being brought into use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reconstruction of the bridge on Woodlands Road, Forestfield could improve the alignment vertically and horizontally. If not to be realigned then why is it a permanent acquisition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction compound 407 is in quite a prominent location. Consideration should be given to screening from the A89 and landscaping on completion. The presence of a drainage ditch should be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If possible, the temporary realignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | of the A89 at Bedlormie Toll should be made permanent.  
Conservation and Greening Section comments:  
  - The development takes in 45% of the Bleachfield Marsh and North Calder Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and is adjacent to a number of other Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. The only other area of note directly affected is the complex of Site of Importance for Nature Conservation at Hillend Reservoir where some incursion appears inevitable.  
  - Copies of any species surveys undertaken are requested to enhance the Council’s database of biological information.  
  - Essential that any loss of scrubby habitats and species rich grassland is made good and, where possible, opportunities taken to develop and enhance opportunities for biodiversity. Appropriate landscaping will provide visual amenity and create habitats to maximise biodiversity. Species-rich hedges should be planted wherever possible to provide a wildlife corridor.  
  - Compensation for loss of Caldercruix Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation must include a ring-fenced sum for survey and management of other Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation in compensation.  
  - Comprehensive Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be provided. | Councils as road authorities.  
All species survey information, apart from Badger, is included in Appendix 4 of the Environmental Statement.  
Chapter 18 Railway Corridor Landscape Design of the Environmental Statement fully addresses the landscape reinstatement and biodiversity enhancement of the route corridor.  
The loss of the Caldercruix Site of Importance for Nature Conservation will be the subject of further discussion between the promoter and the local authority.  
All the major built facilities will have integral Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. All storm water discharges will be subject to approval by the Scottish... |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| West Lothian Council  
Contact: Chris Norman  
Head of Planning | These should include attenuation ponds, landscaped for wildlife. Permeable car parking should be considered. Storm water should not discharge into Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation or burns, unless treated to Scottish Environmental Protection Agency specifications. Green roof technology should be considered for Caldercruix station.  
- Japanese Knotweed should be eradicated.  
Response received by West Lothian Council focus site specific issues rather than comments on draft Environmental Statement. Each comment is based on the A3 maps set out in the draft ‘Maps, Plans and Sections’ document and include the following:  
- At a number of locations specification is required for the reinstatement of land to facilitate the new bridge works and road alignment. Such works should specify landscaping details for new embankments to formed including the species, method of protection, height and method of planting trees, together with details of the maintenance work to be carried out in the established period  
- Concerns raised about the use of land to form a construction compound to the north of the solum in an area characterised by birch scrub. Preference for land to be deleted from scheme. If not possible full reinstatement of land to birch woodland should form part of the environmental case (from Sheet 22) | Environmental Protection Agency.  
The eradication and disposal of Japanese Knotweed is fully addressed in Chapter 10 Ecology.  
Chapter 18 Railway Corridor Landscape Design of the Environmental Statement fully addresses the landscape reinstatement and biodiversity enhancement of the route corridor.  
The construction compound is retained south west of Blackridge. Chapter 18 establishes the principle of site reinstatement to its existing condition, subject to the operational requirements of the railway as dictated by the Network Rail Biodiversity Action Plan and the landscape management requirements of the Vegetation Management Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reasons and justification of the site for the lattice tower needs to be set out, along with alternative locations. The mast should be a green colour and not a galvanised finish</td>
<td>Justification for the GSM-R mast is set out in Appendix 10 of the Environmental Statement. The specification of a green colour for the mast will be included in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment and will be subject to further discussion with the local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The design of the replacement bridge at Harthill Road lends an opportunity to create an enhanced focal point in this part of the village and the Environmental Impact Statement should make a commitment towards achieving this.</td>
<td>The design of the bridge will be addressed in the detailed design phase, and will be the subject of further consultation with West Lothian Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns raised with regards to construction compounds and their close proximity to houses at such areas as Station Road, Whiteside and Waverley Crescent. Working times should be restricted to day time work only with floodlighting carefully sited.</td>
<td>Chapter 16 Disruption due to Construction states that the working period will be 8am to 7pm Monday to Friday, and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays. These times will be included in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At a number of construction areas specification is required setting out the means of reinstatement, including the stripping and storage of soils and their reinstatement. Landscaping is particularly important in these areas, while road cleanliness should be handled with particular care in others.</td>
<td>The issues of site preparation, landscape reinstatement and road cleanliness at construction sites will all be specified in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Environmental Statement should specify quantity of material to be taken off site to facilitate the works at Livingston North Station and Uphall Station</td>
<td>The volume of material to be removed off site at Livingston North and Uphall Stations is not currently known. This will be addressed at the detailed design stage and will be the subject of further discussion with the local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong reservations expressed about use</td>
<td>The use of plot 932 at Dechmont Moss Wood has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| City of Edinburgh Council Contact: Keith Miller Principal Planning Officer | • The Council continues to support the principle of the upgrading of the railway line.  
• Although it is not anticipated that electrification equipment will have a significant adverse impact on the World Heritage Site, the Council reserves its position until the detailed design at which stage the impact should be clearer  
• Council would like to see a statement as to the impact upon the setting of the Castle well house, especially from Princes Street Gardens. The Council seeks to avoid large pylons obscuring this important medieval tower.  
• Raise the point that no new station at Newbridge is a missed opportunity and the main issue of concern is the fact that the proposed scheme does not include any new station at Newbridge | Noted.  
The visual impact of the scheme in the Castle and well house is addressed in Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Impacts in Table 9.6 Ref. No. 30.  
The scheme as promoted does not preclude the opportunity of the provision of an intermediate station at Newbridge at an appropriate point in the future. |
| Scottish Executive Environment Group Contact: Richard Hastings | • Developers should show that relevant wildlife legislation and guidance has been clearly identified and considered at earliest stage  
• It needs to be categorically established which species are present and where before the application is considered for planning consent. | The relevant wildlife legislation and guidance is clearly set out in Chapter 10 Ecology, Nature Conservation and Biodiversity, paragraph 10.1.1.  
Species present along the route are set out in Chapter 10, paragraphs 10.2.2.5 and 10.8.3. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of Schedule 1 Birds and European Protected Species must be included as part of detailed survey work as part of the planning application process and not at a later stage</td>
<td>European Protected Species are identified in Chapter 10, paragraphs 10.2.2.5 and 10.8.3, namely Otter, Great Crested Newt, Bat and Water Vole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the presence of otter and suitable amphibian breeding habitat have been identified within the development it is requested that future surveys are undertaken</td>
<td>Further surveying for otter and other amphibians to be undertaken prior to construction will be specified in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where possible construction work should avoid wild birds breeding season (March to June)</td>
<td>The avoidance of construction works during the wild birds breeding season (March to June) will be specified in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should water voles be discovered during the course of works Scottish Natural Heritage should be contacted</td>
<td>Consultation with Scottish Natural Heritage if water voles are identified during the construction period will be specified in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The developer must apply to Scottish Natural Heritage for a development licence if any disturbance to badgers or their setts is required during the course of operations. Appropriate mitigation measures should be included</td>
<td>Application to Scottish Natural Heritage for a development licence if any disturbance to badgers or their setts is required during the construction period will be specified in Network Rail’s Contract Conditions: Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 – CHANGES MADE AS A RESULT OF CONSULTATION

The following table summarises the changes that have been made to the proposal following issues raised in consultation with affected persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airdrie</td>
<td>Remove provision of multi-storey car park</td>
<td>Transport Scotland</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Removal of multi-storey car park from Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airdrie</td>
<td>Reduction in plot size to avoid impact on residential property</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch</td>
<td>Movement of cycle path location at Bankhead Avenue.</td>
<td>North Lanarkshire Council/Sustrans</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Cycle path relocated to Torrance Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch</td>
<td>Movement of location of access path to New Drumgelloch Station.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions with landowner over access path location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgelloch</td>
<td>Movement of cycle path location at Katherine Park.</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Cycle path moved to north side of Katherine Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wester Moffat Farm</td>
<td>Reduction of landtake for road works at Wester Moffat Farm overbridge.</td>
<td>Landowner/Residents</td>
<td>Change made to plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wester Moffat Farm</td>
<td>Movement of location of cycle path.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>Removal cycle path bridge to avoid visual impact on residential properties and loss of farmland at Ford Farm.</td>
<td>Landowner/Residents</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Provision for bridge removed from Bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix</td>
<td>Realignment of access road to station south car park.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Station access road realigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix</td>
<td>Drainage change at former paper mill lagoons.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix</td>
<td>Remove provision of station north car park.</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Removal of north car park from Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix</td>
<td>Movement of cycle path location at Braefoot Court.</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Cycle path relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldercruix</td>
<td>Reduce landtake at Limelands development site.</td>
<td>North Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>Change made to plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillend Angling Club</td>
<td>Add provision of pontoons onto project to reduce loss of fishing areas.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Land for pontoons included in Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillend Sailing Club</td>
<td>Revise location of cycle path.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Cycle path routed to rear of Clubhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillend</td>
<td>Remove proposed site compound.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrestfield</td>
<td>Remove Limit of Deviation encroaching into residential gardens.</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Track alignment moved northwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosshouse Farm</td>
<td>Reinstate rather than demolish accommodation overbridge.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Overbridge to be reinstated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Remove proposed new footbridge and include West Lothian Council footpath in Bill.</td>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Proposed footbridge removed and provision for new footpath included in Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Remove encroachment by Limits of Deviation into residential properties</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Limits of Deviation moved to avoid potential land take.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Remove temporary road alignment at Harthill Road underbridge.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Temporary Road removed to prevent impact on new housing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Move location of construction compound at Treesbank Farm</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Proposed site compound moved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Revise location of cycle path at Wester Torrance Farm</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Discussions with Landowner ongoing over final location of the cycle path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Revise footpath alignment at former branch line to Woodend Colliery.</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>Footbridge alignment revised to avoid conflict with proposed industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackridge</td>
<td>Reduction in size of Construction Compound at Woodend Junction to avoid conflict with development</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Provision of accommodation overbridge at Standhill Farm</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Farm accommodation overbridge added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Provision of new footpath.</td>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Change made to plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadale</td>
<td>Upgrade Armadale station car park access road.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Spurs included in station access road to accommodate future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathgate</td>
<td>Bigger turning hammerhead for Whiteside Cottage</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Hammerhead made larger at residents request to accommodate heating oil tankers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>Reduce Limit of Deviation encroachment into gardens.</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Engineering solution developed to reduce landtake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Suggested Change</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathgate</td>
<td>Reduction of permanent landtake at Bathgate Golf Club.</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Railway alignment selected which reduces impact on golf club land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathgate</td>
<td>Reduce landtake at Bathgate Castle.</td>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
<td>Railway alignment adjusted to avoid impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathgate</td>
<td>Location of Light Maintenance Depot.</td>
<td>First ScotRail/English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited</td>
<td>Selection of Light Maintenance Depot undertaken in consultation with English Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited, First ScotRail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathgate</td>
<td>Accommodation Crossing added at Whiteside Farm</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Change made to Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boghall</td>
<td>Movement of location of construction compound.</td>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Site compound reduced in size to minimise impact on woodland area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Reduce impact of project on Castle Rock Development.</td>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Proposed construction compound reduced in size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Move construction compound near Knightsbridge overbridge.</td>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>Change made to plans. Proposed construction compound moved to avoid impact on Woodland Trust land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uphall</td>
<td>Alter car park provision to remove the station south car park extension</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Change made to plan. Car park removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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