The Committee will meet at 10.00 am in Committee Room 5.

1. **Consideration of new petitions:** The Committee will consider—

   **PE1506** by Alison C Tait, on behalf of the Robert Burns World Federation Ltd, on renaming Glasgow Prestwick Airport to "Robert Burns International Airport"

   and take evidence from—

   Alison C Tait, Chief Executive, Jane Brown, President, and Jim Thomson, Senior Vice President, Robert Burns World Federation Ltd;

   and will then consider—

   **PE1509** by Lee Wright on Aberdeen to Inverness rail travel improvement.

2. **Consideration of current petitions:** The Committee will consider—

   **PE1446** by Dr Liza Morton, on behalf of Scottish adult congenital heart patients, on Scottish standards for the care of adult congenital heart patients;
   **PE1480** by Amanda Kopel, on behalf of the Frank Kopel Alzheimer's Awareness Campaign, on Alzheimer's and dementia awareness;
   **PE1482** by John Womersley on isolation in single room hospitals;
   **PE1497** by Ellie Harrison, on behalf of Say No to Tesco, on supermarket expansion on local high streets;
   **PE1500** by Stuart Housden OBE, on behalf of RSPB Scotland, on the golden eagle as the national bird of Scotland.
The following papers are attached for this meeting—

**Agenda item 1**

PE1506  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/1
PE1509  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/2

**Agenda item 2**

PE1446  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/3
Scottish Government Letter of 25 September 2013  PE1446/Q
Scottish Government Letter of 21 February 2014  PE1446/R
Petitioner Letter of 6 March 2014  PE1446/S
PE1480  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/4
Scottish Government Letter of 10 March 2014  PE1480/D
PE1482  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/5
Scottish Government Letter of 19 March 2014  PE1482/E
Petitioner Email of 25 March 2014  PE1482/F
PE1497  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/6
Glasgow City Council Letter of 24 February 2014  PE1497/B
Stirling Council Letter of 25 February 2014  PE1497/C
South Lanarkshire Council Letter of 25 February 2014  PE1497/D
Falkirk Council Letter of 25 February 2014  PE1497/E
South Ayrshire Council Letter of 27 February 2014  PE1497/F
Scottish Government Letter of 27 February 2014  PE1497/G
Federation of Small Businesses Letter of 3 March 2014  PE1497/H
Petitioner Letter of 23 March 2014  PE1497/I
PE1500  Note by the Clerk  PPC/S4/14/7/7
Scottish Natural Heritage Letter of 19 February 2014  PE1500/A
Scottish Raptor Study Group Email of 23 February 2014  PE1500/B
Scottish Government Letter of 13 March 2014  PE1500/C
Petitioner Letter of 24 March 2014  PE1500/D
PE1506 on renaming Glasgow Prestwick Airport to “Robert Burns International Airport”

Note by the Clerk

PE1506 – Lodged 22 February 2014
Petition by Alison C Tait, on behalf of the Robert Burns World Federation Ltd, calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to rename Glasgow Prestwick International Airport to ‘Robert Burns International Airport’.

Link to petition webpage

Purpose

1. This is a new petition that the Committee is invited to consider and agree what action it wishes to take. The Committee has invited the petitioner to speak to the petition.

Background – the following information is taken from the SPICe briefing

2. Glasgow Prestwick Airport is located 1.2 miles northeast of the town of Prestwick in South Ayrshire. The airport is wholly owned by Scottish Ministers, who purchased it from previous owners Infratil (Prestwick Aviation Holdings Ltd) on 23 November 2013. Scottish Ministers established a holding company, TS Prestwick HoldCo Ltd, to purchase the shares in Prestwick Aviation Holdings Ltd.

3. All external and most internal “Pure Dead Brilliant” branding has been removed from the airport and its website. Any decision on renaming Glasgow Prestwick Airport is a matter for Scottish Ministers and the HoldCo.

4. Glasgow Prestwick Airport is Scotland’s fourth busiest, handling 1,067,000 passengers during 2012, a considerable fall from a peak of 2,421,000 passengers in 2007. Glasgow Prestwick Airport handled 10,314 tonnes of air freight during 2012, again a considerable fall from the 31,517 tonnes handled in 2007. Glasgow Prestwick Airport is currently served by one scheduled airline, Ryanair, with routes to 25 destinations. Oska Travel has announced that they will operate a limited number of charter flights between Prestwick and Antalya during March 2014.

5. Every international airport has a three letter code associated with it, issued by the International Air Transport Association (IATA). These can be seen on the baggage tags attached to passenger hold luggage. Glasgow Prestwick Airport’s IATA code is PIK. A change in airport name does not usually require a change in the IATA code. The assignment of these codes is governed by IATA Resolution 763, and it is administered by IATA headquarters in Montreal. The codes are
published in the IATA Airline Coding Directory, which is updated every six months.

Scottish Government Action

6. The Scottish Government currently has no plans to rename Glasgow Prestwick Airport.

Scottish Parliament Action

7. The Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee held an evidence session on Prestwick Airport with the Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities and representatives from Transport Scotland at its meeting on 19 March 2014.

8. During the evidence session, Adam Ingram MSP asked about the possibility of the airport being rebranded as Robert Burns International. The Cabinet Secretary stated that any decision on this issue “has to be based on what we think gives the airport the best chance of growing its business and returning to profit.”

9. A senior adviser was appointed on 11 February 2014 to undertake work that will inform the holding company board and ministers on the future business development. The adviser will also be required to make recommendations on the strategic business development options for repositioning the airport.

10. An extract from the Official Report of the above meeting can be viewed in the annexe to this paper.

Action

11. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take on the petition. In light of the views expressed by the Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities at the meeting of the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee on 19 March 2014, the Committee may wish to defer consideration of the petition to await any relevant recommendations that may be made on this issue to the holding company board and ministers by its recently appointed senior adviser.
Annexe

Extract from the Official Report of the meeting of the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee on 19 March 2014

Adam Ingram: I thank the Deputy First Minister and the Scottish Government for riding to the rescue of Prestwick airport. As she rightly pointed out, the airport is a central feature of the local economy in Ayrshire, and it would have been a disaster if it had been allowed to fall out of economic use.

The Deputy First Minister spoke about the next financial year’s investment in the airport. Obviously, we are undertaking a makeover of the terminal and, thankfully, we have got rid of the “Pure dead brilliant” branding. We are sitting in the Burns room in the Parliament. Is there any chance of rebranding the airport as Robert Burns international? The Deputy First Minister, as an Ayrshire girl herself, will know that that has been a long-term ambition of local people.

Nicola Sturgeon: This is probably the furthest that I have ever got into a discussion of Prestwick airport without that question being asked of me, so congratulations. [Laughter.]

As the member will know from his local knowledge, the “Pure dead brilliant” signage has gone. I was happy to see that when I visited a couple of weeks ago. On the rebranding, the further stages of our investment in, marketing of and positioning on the airport depend on the recommendations that come to us, and it is important that we do not pre-empt that detailed work, which we are doing for a good reason.

To put my cards on the table, I am a resident of and an MSP from the city of Glasgow, but I grew up in Ayrshire, so I am not unmoved by the representations on rebranding the airport as Robert Burns international. To be honest, I have heard different opinions on that. I hear the Ayrshire opinion that it would be the right thing to do because it would recognise the local importance of the airport. I have also heard the opposite opinion, which is that we need to market the airport to those outside Scotland and, although everybody across the world knows about Robert Burns, they might not necessarily know where in Scotland an airport called Robert Burns international is. There are differences of opinion on the name Glasgow Prestwick, but it clearly puts the airport in a geographical location and makes it easier for passengers or companies from outside Scotland to know where they are flying to. Those are the different opinions on that.

We have taken no decisions on the issue. It is right that we proceed carefully, as with every other decision on the future of the airport. Whatever my Ayrshire loyalties and sentiments, it is important that we do not take such decisions on the basis of sentiment. The decision has to be based on what we think gives the airport the best chance of growing its business and returning to profit. If that means calling it the Robert Burns international airport, and if we have evidence and recommendations that the name will help us to do that, that is fine. If, on the other hand, the view is that that might be a sentimental move that would make it harder to market the airport, we would have to listen to that. Therefore, at this stage, I am staying agnostic on where we might get to.
Adam Ingram: So you have not ruled that out.

Nicola Sturgeon: We have not ruled it out.

Adam Ingram: Would a recommendation on the branding of the airport come through the second-stage business plan that you are currently working up?

Nicola Sturgeon: That may well be something that Romain Py recommends. I will not commit him to making a recommendation. He is not Scottish and he may not want to go into the Ayrshire politics of recommending what the airport would be called. I am being slightly flippant, but I do not want to underestimate the importance of getting the branding of the airport right. That is absolutely vital, but we need to ensure that we think about the person who will potentially fly into Scotland and what would help them to recognise the identity and location of Prestwick airport. Those things require to be considered. Romain Py may well have something to say about that in his report.
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PE1509 on Aberdeen to Inverness rail travel improvement

Note by the Clerk

PE1509 – Lodged 14 March 2014
Petition by Lee Wright Calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to improve the safety, frequency and standards of rail transportation between Aberdeen and Inverness. The North East of Scotland and the two most northerly cities in the UK deserve a better rail service.

Purpose

1. This is a new petition that the Committee is invited to consider and agree what action it wishes to take. The Committee invited the petitioner to speak to the petition but the petitioner declined the invitation.

Background – the following information is taken from the SPICe briefing

2. The Aberdeen-Inverness railway is approximately 108 miles (174 km) long, serving 10 intermediate stations. The railway is mostly single track with passing loops, which constrain the current timetable and future development opportunities.

3. This route mainly carries ScotRail passenger services and occasional freight traffic beyond the Raiths Farm/Kittybrewster Freight Terminal on the northern outskirts of Aberdeen, where most freight services from the south terminate.

4. ScotRail passenger journey times are presently in the range of two hours 12 minutes to two hours 28 minutes. ScotRail passenger services are provided by Class 158 diesel multiple units, which operate in multiples of two cars, have a maximum speed of 90mph and were built by BREL at Derby between 1989 and 1992.

Scottish Government Action

5. Transport Scotland, working with Network Rail, has developed a long term plan for the improvement of the Inverness-Aberdeen railway. Options currently under consideration are set out in the Network Rail map attached to the SPICe briefing.

6. The project aims to deliver:
   • A two hour journey time;
   • An hourly service;
   • Enhanced commuter services into Aberdeen and Inverness; and
• New stations at Kintore in Aberdeenshire and Dalcross, near Inverness airport.

7. The project, which is estimated to cost between £250 million and £500 million, will be delivered in phases. The whole project is due to be completed by 2030. Phase one of the scheme aims to deliver enhanced commuter services into Inverness and Aberdeen and new stations at Kintore and Dalcross by 2019.

Scottish Parliament Action

8. The Scottish Parliament has not considered the improvement of the Inverness-Aberdeen railway.

Action

9. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take in respect of the petition. The Committee may wish to write to Transport Scotland and Network Rail to request their views on what the petition seeks.
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PE1446 on Scottish standards for the care of adult congenital heart patients

Note by the Clerk

PE1446 – Lodged 20 October 2012
Petition by Dr Liza Morton, on behalf of Scottish adult congenital heart patients, calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to mandate National Standards for the care of Adult Congenital Heart Patients and to adequately resource the Scottish Adult Congenital Cardiac Service (SACCS).

Link to petition webpage

Purpose

1. The Committee last considered this petition on 25 June 2013 and agreed to defer its consideration until 2014 and seek an update from the Scottish Congenital Cardiac Network at that stage. Updates on progress from the Scottish Government and the petitioner have been received. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take on the petition.

Background

2. The petition seeks the introduction of national standards for care of adults with congenital heart conditions in Scotland, similar to the national standards for care for England that are under review by the Department of Health.

National Standards for Services to Adults with Congenital Heart Disease (England)

3. The Department of Health produced a guide for service commissioners working with young people and adults with congenital heart disease. This set out expected service levels to be provided by the NHS in England for the care of adults with Congenital Heart Disease (CHD), both during the important transition from children’s services and throughout adult life.

4. In May 2012, NHS Specialised Services (England) published a review report inviting views on NHS services for adults with CHD. Accompanying the report was a further document from NHS Specialised Services focusing specifically on the proposed model of care and draft designation standards.

5. Due to the extensive feedback received during the engagement period in summer 2012, a number of changes have been made to the proposed model of care and draft designation standards. Further views were sought early in 2013.

---

Provision for adults with CHD in Scotland

6. The Scottish Government report Better Heart Disease and Stroke Care Action Plan states that NHS National Services Division and the Golden Jubilee Hospital should work towards achievement of the Department of Health commissioning guidelines for adult congenital heart disease, including awareness raising, development of referral pathways and data collection.

Committee Consideration

7. The Committee considered this petition for the first time at on 27 November 2012 and wrote to a number of stakeholders. There was strong support in the responses for implementing national standards for the care of adult congenital heart patients in Scotland.

8. The Scottish Government referred to the review by the Department for Health, advising that it was sensible to await updated standards against which to develop standards appropriate for the Scottish Adult Congenital Cardiac Service.

9. The Committee considered the petition again on 5 February 2013 and 16 April 2013, both times agreeing to write to the Scottish Government. In its responses, the Scottish Government stated that the Scottish Congenital Cardiac Network (SCCN), which was launched on 1 April 2013, would be asked to look at appropriate standards of care for CHD, and that the National Services Division had “increased its funding for SACCS by 60% in recent years”.

10. The petition was last considered by the Committee on 25 June 2013. At that meeting, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the petition until 2014 and seek an update from SCCN on the progress to developing national standards for the care of adult congenital heart patients in Scotland at that stage.

11. Since that meeting, the Committee has received two letters from the Scottish Government, as well as a response from the petitioner.

12. In its earlier letter, the Scottish Government outlines the support provided by SACCS in the delivery of care to people living with congenital heart disease in Scotland. It also details the involvement SCCN has sought from patient representatives in undertaking its work.

13. In its more recent update of 21 February 2014, the Scottish Government highlights SCCN’s progress on the development of national standards of care. The Adults Standards Group has agreed that Scotland should adopt the English standards “unless there is good reason not to”. The NHS National Specialist and Screening Services Directorate (NSD) expects the work to develop standards suitable for Scotland to be completed within 12 months.

14. The petitioner feels the establishment of the working group, on which she sits, to develop Scottish Standards for ACHD is a “very positive step forward”. She has requested that the Committee maintain a watching brief on the progress towards the development and implementation of these national standards.
Parliamentary Questions

15. Since the Committee last considered the petition, a number of Parliamentary questions have been lodged, and answered, on this issue. In his responses, the Minister for Public Health has highlighted the work being undertaken by SCCN.

Action

16. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take in relation to the petition. Options include—

(1) To defer consideration of the petition until the end of 2014 and to maintain a watching brief on progress towards the development and implementation of national standards for the care of adult congenital heart patients in Scotland;

(2) To take any other action which the Committee considers appropriate.
Public Petitions Committee
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PE1480 on Alzheimer’s and dementia awareness

Note by the Clerk

PE1480 – Lodged 22 June 2013
Petition by Amanda Kopel, on behalf of the Frank Kopel Alzheimer’s Awareness Campaign, calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to raise awareness of the daily issues suffered by people with Alzheimer’s and dementia and to ensure that free personal care is made available for all sufferers of this illness regardless of age.

Link to petition webpage

Purpose

1. This petition was last considered by the Committee on 28 January. At that meeting the Committee agreed to write to the Scottish Government asking how it was proposing to address the issue. A response has been received from the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing and the Committee is invited to agree what action it now wishes to take on the petition.

Background

2. The petitioner raises two main issues for consideration. The first relates to raising awareness of the issues faced by those with Alzheimer’s and dementia. The second is a call for free personal care to be extended to all those with dementia regardless of age.

Alzheimer’s disease and dementia in Scotland

3. In its latest statistical release\(^1\) for 2014, Alzheimer Scotland estimates that approximately 88,000 people have dementia in Scotland, of which 3,200 are under the age of 65. Other publications\(^2\) by Alzheimer’s Scotland note that whilst there are many different illnesses that cause dementia, Alzheimer’s disease is the most common. It estimates that 55% of those who have dementia will have Alzheimer’s disease.

Free personal care

4. Free Personal and Nursing Care (FPNC) was introduced on 1 July 2002 through the Community Care and Health (Scotland) Act 2002 (the 2002 Act) and associated regulations, and is available for everyone aged 65 and over who have been assessed by the local authority as needing it.

---

\(^1\) Alzheimer Scotland (2014) Statistics: Number of people with dementia in Scotland 2014. This statistical release also provides estimate by local authority area in Scotland.

Scottish Government Action

*Raising awareness of Alzheimer’s disease and dementia*

5. The Scottish Government made dementia a national priority in 2007. It set a national target on improving diagnosis rates in 2008 and published an initial 3-year [National Dementia Strategy](#) in 2010. Following a period of engagement with stakeholders that began in 2012, the Scottish Government developed a second strategy, published in 2013, which sought to build upon the first.

*Free Personal Care for those aged under 65*

6. The most significant review of the FPNC policy that has been undertaken since the inception of the policy was that by Lord Sutherland, who reported in April 2008. It made no recommendations to extend the policy to other care groups.

Scottish Parliament Action

7. The issue of Free Personal Care for those aged under 65 was raised during the then Health Committee’s Care Inquiry, which reported in June 2006. In its response, the then Scottish Executive noted the Committee’s comments, but also referred to a policy review that was to take place. The Scottish Government has advised that an [Evaluation of the Operation and Impact of Free Personal Care](#) was commissioned by the then Scottish Executive, and was published in February 2007. There was no mention of extending the policy to other groups.

Committee consideration

8. The Committee considered this petition for the first time on 17 September 2013 and heard evidence from the petitioner. It agreed to write to the Scottish Government and Alzheimer Scotland seeking their views on the petition.

9. The Scottish Government advised that the current 3-year National Dementia Strategy was considering how to improve care pathways for those with early onset dementia. As part of implementing the strategy more would be done to identify what further actions are required in key areas.

10. The Scottish Government has no plans to lower the eligibility criteria for Free Personal and Nursing Care. It wants to ensure “fair, consistent and transparent charging policies for community care services” and stresses the importance of local authorities having the autonomy to set their own charges.

11. At its meeting on 26 November 2013 the Committee agreed to write to Alzheimer Scotland and COSLA for their views on the petition.

---

6. Online copy unavailable. However, paper copies are available from the Clerks.  
7. Personal communication 23 August 2013
12. Alzheimer Scotland supported the aims of the petitioner to increase awareness of dementia. In its view, extending free personal care to those with dementia under age 65 would discriminate against people with other conditions and many would still be charged for services. Alzheimer Scotland supports the national dementia strategy but the petition highlights the “substantial work” that remains to be done.

13. In its submission, COSLA advised the Committee that local authorities provide non-residential care services within different local circumstances that result in differences in cost. It is currently working with a wide range of stakeholders, including Alzheimer Scotland, on delivering a review of the charging guidance to achieve greater consistency and less variation in charges.

14. At its meeting on 28 January 2014, the Committee agreed to write again to the Scottish Government asking what action it is taking to address the inequalities that appear to exist in relation to the care of younger Alzheimer and dementia sufferers and to what timeframe the Scottish Government is working.

15. The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing wrote to the Committee on 10 March indicating that he intended to make a statement on residential and NHS continuing care to Parliament shortly. As part of this statement the Cabinet Secretary intended to address a number of issues raised by the petition and would write again to the Committee after his statement.

Action

16. The Committee is invited to agree what action it wishes to take. Options include:

(1) to consider the petition again after the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing has made his statement to Parliament and writes again to the Committee on this matter.

(2) to take any other action which the Committee considers appropriate.
Public Petitions Committee
7th Meeting, 2014 (Session 4), Tuesday 1 April 2014

PE1482 on isolation in single room hospitals

Note by the Clerk

**PE1482 – Lodged 15 June 2013**
Petition by John Womersley calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to ensure that patients in new-build hospitals are given a choice to share a multi-bedded room with other patients or offered a single room; and to subject all the evidence on the single room policy to independent scrutiny.

[Link to petition webpage](#)

**Purpose**

1. The Committee last considered this petition on **28 January 2014**. At that meeting, the Committee agreed to write to the Scottish Government requesting that any review of the policy on single room provision take into account the views of the public and patients. The Committee also asked for information on the comparable costs of a new-build hospital with 100% single rooms and one with a mix of single and multi-bedded rooms. The Scottish Government has responded and the Committee is invited to agree what action it wishes to take on the petition.

**Background**

2. The petitioner is concerned about the apparent lack of evidence and public support for the policy of ensuring that new-build hospital accommodation and hospital refurbishment provides single-room accommodation for all in-patients. The petition asserts that the evidence base for such a policy is not robust and that a balance between single and shared accommodation in four-bedded bays would be the optimum option for necessary infection control and patient choice, as well as allowing better scope for future internal structural modifications.

3. Research and evidence pertaining to single-room provision is available in the Appendix to the SPICE briefing.

**Scottish Government Action**

*Single Room Provision Steering Group*

4. It was decided, given the significant capital investment programme underway in Scotland, that the **Hospital Wards Configuration report (2004)** should be peer reviewed. The peer review was sponsored and facilitated by the Scottish Executive and NHS Education for Scotland. One of the review recommendations was to establish a steering group whose remit was to consider single room provision.
5. Members of the steering group were drawn from those who participated at a Peer Review event, with the Health Department providing the Chair. Members were selected from a range of professional interests. The Group considered the matter of single room provision under the headings of Control of Infection, the Patient Environment, Operational Issues and Financial Issues.

6. On 21 February 2007, an interim statement was issued to health boards, based on the principles and recommendations of the EuPHN report above. The Steering group report contains a collation of documents, including a report on single room provision published on behalf of the Executive Nurse Directors' Group.

Further consultation and recommendations
7. In November 2008, the Chief Nursing Officer issued a Chief Executive's Letter (CEL 48) to all health boards setting out the conclusions drawn from the Report. It states that for all new-build facilities 'there should be a presumption that all patients will be accommodated in single rooms, unless there are clinical reasons for multi-bedded rooms to be available.'

8. It also states that ‘in developing proposals for substantially refurbishing healthcare facilities NHS Boards should seek to provide the maximum number of single rooms consistent with the approach for new-build.

9. A further CEL was issued in July 2010, CEL 27 2010. This followed an expert Delphi consultation exercise drawing on experts from the Chief Medical Officer’s clinical specialities advisers, and this letter states that:

‘the current provision of single room accommodation is not sufficient across NHS Scotland and 100% single room provision is clinically appropriate in most clinical settings.’ It goes on to instruct that if there are clinical reasons for not adhering to this, then a Business Case is to be made in each circumstance.

Scottish Parliament Action
10. There have been a number of Parliamentary Questions on the provision of single rooms, and about hospital acquired infections in relation to single rooms which can be found here.

Committee consideration
11. The Committee first considered this petition at its meeting on 17 September 2013 and heard evidence from the petitioner. The Committee then wrote to the Scottish Government about the extent of patient choice and additional costs.

12. The Scottish Government advised that the existing policy has a “presumption” for 100% single rooms in new builds, but decisions on the use of single or multi-bedded rooms are made on a clinical basis, and “the policy is being applied as

1 See here for explanation of Delphi method.
intended”. The Scottish Government stated that it will be review research over the next year to test the assumptions within the current policy.

13. The Scottish Health Council advised that a proposal for a single room policy would have benefited from public engagement and consultation, and encouraged the Scottish Government to seek public views for its proposed review.

14. Following the meeting on 28 January 2014, the Committee wrote to the Scottish Government requesting that the review of the policy on single room provision include consultation with the public and patients. The Committee also asked for information on the comparable costs of a new-build hospital with 100% single rooms and one with a mix of single and multi-bedded wards.

15. The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing replied to the Committee on 19 March 2014 but did not acknowledge or address the Committee’s request that the views of users and patients be taken into account as part of the review.

16. The Cabinet Secretary’s letter states that the financial impact of the policy is estimated at “between 2-2.75% on capital expenditure” and references page 24 of the Single Room Steering Group report of October 2008\(^2\). However, this figure refers to the estimated revenue costs (on page 25). In terms of additional capital costs, the paper refers, among other things, to a Northern Irish study which found that an increase in single rooms from 50% to 100% would increase costs by between 2% and 4%, depending on the size of hospitals, with higher additional costs occurring on projects for larger hospitals (page 24).

17. The petitioner is disappointed with the Cabinet Secretary’s response and asks the Committee to ensure that views of patients and the public are taken into account of any review of the policy and that more evidence on whether single rooms are cost effective is sought.

**Action**

18. The Committee is invited to agree what action it wishes to take. Options include:

- (1) to write to the Scottish Government to ask it to confirm that patient and public views are sought to inform the proposed review and to ask whether the Government has undertaken a cost benefit analysis of 100% single rooms as opposed to 50% over the course of a hospital’s lifetime and, if so, to share that information with the Committee;

- (2) to take any other action that the Committee considers appropriate.

---
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PE1497 on supermarket expansion on local high streets

Note by the Clerk

PE1497 – Lodged 7 December 2013
Petition by Ellie Harrison, on behalf of Say No to Tesco, calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to give local councils and communities the power to stop unwanted supermarket expansion on their local high streets. Link to petition webpage

Purpose

1. The Committee first considered this petition at its meeting on 28 January 2014 and agreed to seek views from a number of organisations. Responses have been received and the Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take on the petition.

Background

2. Currently, anyone wishing to build a new shop or substantially change the use of a premise to that of a shop (e.g. from a bank to a shop) has to obtain planning permission prior to doing so. However, anyone wishing to change the nature of the goods and/or services provided from an existing shop does not need planning permission for that change of use under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Scotland) Order 1997 (the Order), as amended. The Order sets out a number of Use Classes (e.g. Shops, Food and Drink, Hotels and Hostels, Houses, etc.), and under what circumstances planning permission is required for the use of premises to change from one class to another. Planning permission, however, may still be required for changes within a class if there is, for example, changes to the frontage of a shop.

3. Another part of the planning process is a Retail Impact Assessment (RIA). An RIA is generally undertaken when a proposed development is of a sufficient scale to have a significant impact on other retail centres. Normally an RIA is required for a proposed retail development of 2,500 m² gross retail floor space, although RIAs may be required for smaller developments. The Committee may wish to note that RIAs can only be required for proposals that require planning permission.

Scottish Parliament Action

4. The Scottish Parliament has not considered the Use Classes Order.
Committee consideration

5. All responses sought have been received as follows.

   PE1497/A: Scottish Retail Consortium
   PE1497/B: Glasgow City Council
   PE1497/C: Stirling Council
   PE1497/D: South Lanarkshire Council
   PE1497/E: Falkirk Council
   PE1497/F: South Ayrshire Council
   PE1497/G: Scottish Government
   PE1497/H: Federation of Small Businesses in Scotland
   PE1497/I: Petitioner

Planning system

6. The petitioners suggested that the cumulative floor space of shops owned by a single company should be taken into account when considering whether a new shop required planning permission. The petitioners also suggested that large chain stores should fall into a Use Class of their own, which would mean that if a large chain store wished to open a store it would be subject to planning permission regardless of size.

7. Many respondents noted that the planning system as currently drawn does not allow for the owner of a potential store to be a relevant factor when deciding whether planning permission is required. The Scottish Government stated that the Order is a “de-regulatory mechanism that is intended to permit and not restrict compatible land uses”. The Scottish Government has no specific plans to review the Order at present.

8. It quoted from guidance noting that the planning system “does not exist to protect the interests of one person or business against the activities of another.” South Lanarkshire Council questioned whether any control measures based on the identity of the retail operators would be compliant with EU competition law.

9. The Scottish Government also noted that the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), which is currently being reviewed, states that RIAs may be required for retail proposals which are below the 2,500m² threshold that may have a significant impact on “vitality and viability”.

Impact of small-scale supermarkets

10. The petitioner provided qualitative evidence of a number of shops in west Glasgow that claim to have suffered from the competition created by small supermarkets, including some that had either closed or were considering closure. The petitioners provided a few examples of where it was felt supermarkets were given preferential treatment when applying for alcohol licenses. Other submissions recognised the importance of a variety of shops on high streets and the difficult and changing market conditions for independent retailers.
11. Glasgow City Council provided information on occupancy rates in the areas the petitioners were specifically concerned about. That data did not conclusively show that small supermarkets impacted on occupancy rates in the Byres Road, Hyndland, St George’s Cross and Kelvinbridge areas of Glasgow.

12. Several respondents agreed with the Scottish Retail Consortium’s view that small supermarkets on high streets could have a beneficial effect on the local shopping area by attracting more shoppers to the area.

13. Falkirk City Council passed on the views of its Business Improvement District company’s Town Centre Manager who gave three possible benefits of having a small supermarket in a town centre: that it is preferable to a vacant property and will attract shoppers to the area; it will decrease car use of those who live in town centres; and later opening hours of a small supermarket could encourage other stores to open later creating an ‘evening economy’.

14. The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) argued that the benefits of a small supermarket entering a particular market will depend on the location. “They may be a positive move for depressed town centres but less so for vibrant areas that the petitioner cites.” The FSB noted that there was a lack of data on what effect small supermarkets have on the retail market in town centres but pointed out that the size of the supermarket chains enabled them to absorb costs in ways that smaller businesses could not. Specifically, the FSB invited the Committee to explore the methodology used to rate various types of businesses on the high street and whether particular types of businesses gain an advantage as a result.

15. Glasgow City Council suggested rate relief or improvement grants as possible ways to assist independent traders. It also suggested that there is a case for referring concerns about small supermarkets to the Competition Commission. Members will be aware that rate relief is available under the Small Business Bonus Scheme, for example, and that competition law is reserved.

Action

16. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take in relation to the petition. Options include—

(1) To write to the Scottish Government to ask how business rate relief is used to support small and medium sized businesses, specifically for those small and medium sized businesses that operate on high streets.

(2) Alternatively, the Committee may consider that as the issues at the heart of this petition are primarily related to competition, that the petitioners be invited to direct their concerns to the Competition Commission and that the petition is closed.
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PE1500 – Lodged 7 December 2013
Petition by Stuart Housden OBE, on behalf of RSPB Scotland, calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to formally declare the Golden Eagle, Aquila chrysaetos, as the national bird of Scotland. This could be done either through legislation, or through a parliamentary motion.
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Purpose

1. The Committee considered this petition for the first time on 28 January 2014 and sought the views of several stakeholders. Responses have been received and the Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take on the petition.

Background

2. The Golden Eagle is an iconic species for the environment, conservation and culture in many countries. The UK population is approximately 5% of the total European population and ecologically is considered to be very significant as it comprises about a quarter of the population in the mountainous, Atlantic-influenced North West of Europe; hence it contributes significantly to the maintenance of the Golden Eagle’s range.

Scottish Government Action

3. As part of the Year of Natural Scotland, a campaign called Scotland’s Big 5 ran from spring until the end of October 2013. This asked people to vote for their favourite from the following species – Golden Eagle, Harbour Seal, Otter, Red Deer and Red Squirrel. The Golden Eagle received 38% of the 12,000 votes cast, and was 18 points ahead of the next nearest, the Red Squirrel.

Scottish Parliament Action

4. A previous petition (PE783) was submitted on the same subject in 2004 by Mr James Reynolds after a poll in the Scotsman newspaper voted the Golden Eagle the country’s most loved bird. The petition was referred to the Enterprise and Culture Committee, which was unable to identify a formal process to create national symbols for Scotland.

Committee Consideration

5. The Committee considered this petition for the first time on 28 January 2014 and agreed to seek the views of the Scottish Government, Scottish Natural Heritage
(SNH) and the Scottish Raptor Study Group (SRSG). Letters have been received from these three organisations, as well as a response from the petitioner.

6. The SRSG supports the call to designate the Golden Eagle as Scotland’s national bird. SNH acknowledges there are other species which are also worthy of consideration should the concept of a national bird be pursued.

7. In his response, the Minister for Environment and Climate Change states that he is “not yet convinced that there are compelling arguments in support of having a national bird”, and that “the Scottish Parliament might wish to reflect on the value, purpose and means of choosing further national symbols.”

8. The petitioner supports the suggestion by the Minister to consult with other committees on this issue, and offers the assistance of RSPB Scotland in supporting the Public Petitions Committee’s consideration of the petition.

Action

9. The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take in relation to the petition. In light of the response from the Minister for Environment and Climate Change, the Committee may wish to accept the offer of assistance from RSPB Scotland and suggest that it undertakes further work, possibly through a public consultation, to enable it to demonstrate that there is widespread support for the concept of a national bird, and for the Golden Eagle over other bird species that may be worthy of consideration.