

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o "Kilallan", Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

B Darracott
Director of Planning and Transport
Renfrewshire Council HQ
South Building
Cotton Street
Paisley
PA1 1LL

6 August 2007

Dear Mr Darracott,

Planning Application (Ref 06/1065/PP) – Construction of a Motorway Junction

Please find enclosed Bishopton Action Group's response to the above application.

Yours faithfully,

Stewart Ferguson
Chairman Bishopton Action Group

cc:

Mr John Swinney, MSP

Mr Stewart Stevenson, MSP

Miss Annabel Goldie, MSP

Mr Ross Finnie, MSP

Mr. Bill Wilson, MSP

Mr Iain Nicolson, Convenor, Planning and Policy Development Board, Renfrewshire Council

Mr Bruce McFee, Depute Convenor, Planning and Policy Development Board, Renfrewshire Council

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o “Kilallan”, Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

Response to
Planning Application
for
Construction of a Motorway Junction
Bishopton
Ref: 06/1065/PP

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o “Kilallan”, Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Extract from EIP Statement by Donald Chisholm.....	6
2.1	M8 MOTORWAY KINGSTON BRIDGE.....	6
2.2	M8 MOTORWAY ERSKINE TO ARKLESTON.....	6
	Appendix A.....	8
	Appendix B	

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o “Kilallan”, Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

1 Introduction

Bishopton Action Group objects to the planning application for construction of a motorway junction (Ref 06/1065/PP) on the following grounds:

- The M8 motorway is already congested between junctions 26 and 30;
- Proposed motorway junction at Bishopton will exacerbate the existing congestion on M8;
- Transport Assessment has not taken into account the housing developments in Inverclyde and hence the increase in traffic from Inverclyde;
- Data used in Transport Assessment is out of date and does not accurately reflect the current traffic load on M8 motorway;
- AM rush hour tailbacks on M8 from St James to proposed Bishopton junction are likely to compromise safety of the junction. (We believe that the general increase in traffic plus the extra traffic generated by Bishopton and Inverclyde developments will effectively take up one motorway lane. The effects of losing one lane were demonstrated by the recent roadworks on M8. Tailbacks on the M8 from St James to proposed junction at Bishopton were a regular occurrence. We have video evidence on our website at <http://www.bishoptonactiongroup.org.uk/documents/163.html>)

We have based our objection on advice received from our independent advisor, Mr Donald Chisholm, who recently appeared as an expert witness at the Examination in Public (EiP) regarding the Alteration to the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan 2006. An extract from his EiP statement in section 2 of this report elaborates on the points raised in our objection.

In Appendix A of this report we have included Transport Scotland’s EiP statement on motorway capacity which

- confirms our statement that the M8 is already congested.
- confirms our statement that the increased traffic on motorway from proposed development will exacerbate the situation
- predicts that by 2011 without any development at Bishopton the level of service at certain junctions on J25 – J30 section of M8 at peak times is rated as level F (Forced or breakdown flow - worst possible rating)

We are also concerned that:

- The planning application has been submitted **before** the STAG 2 process has been completed.
 - The STAG 2 process is assessing three motorway junction options (One of which is a hybrid). Therefore we do not understand how Renfrewshire Council can accept a planning application for a specific junction when the best option has yet to be determined by the Scottish Executive.

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o “Kilallan”, Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

- While the STAG 1 process has been completed, this process was merely a sifting operation to determine the options which should be taken forward to the detailed appraisal stage. The options selected could still be rejected at the STAG 2 appraisal stage therefore it was premature of Renfrewshire Council to accept the application for a motorway junction in 2006.
- There was no public consultation on the initial STAG 1 appraisal, where various options for dealing with traffic from the proposed development were considered. According to the STAG 1 report the only Bishopton resident to be consulted was a community councillor, who was a member of the Bishopton Working Group¹. However that individual was bound by confidentiality and was not able to discuss the matter with members of the public. This can hardly be called “public consultation”.
- Given that there is a general presumption against new motorway accesses and it is Executive policy to resist new trunk road accesses, it would seem utter folly to grant planning permission for a junction onto a motorway which is already congested.
- If the M8 motorway system within Renfrewshire continues to decline, this will surely have an impact on the economic competitiveness of the area.

It was evident at the recent EiP that proper consideration has not been given to the motorway congestion problems. It was suggested by officials that one solution would be to have “hard shoulder running” at peak times. However as Bishopton Action Group pointed out, there is no hard shoulder on the flyover at Glasgow Airport. Therefore this solution was clearly not viable.

In Appendix B we have included a letter dated 20th June 2007 from Miss Annabel Goldie to the Directorate for Planning and Environmental Appeals. We draw your attention to paragraph 3 which supports our objection as follows:

- It highlights the current problem of overload of capacity on an already congested M8
- It suggests that this problem will be further exacerbated by development at Inverclyde and the additional vehicle usage that this will generate
- It poses the question of what happens to other local roads infrastructure if there is obstruction on the motorway caused by maintenance, repair or road traffic accident

With reference to this last point, it is obvious that a new motorway junction at Bishopton will cause extra traffic through the village, especially as Ms. Goldie has pointed out, at times of motorway road works, traffic accidents etc. At the recent EiP it was highlighted that our local roads are already substandard and do not conform to Renfrewshire Council’s own “Guidelines for Development Roads”. The creation of *any* additional traffic will render our local roads network unsafe. If the development and the motorway junction are allowed, there would have to be considerable investment in the roads

¹ The Bishopton Working Group was set up to investigate the development options for the ROF site.

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o "Kilallan", Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

infrastructure to bring our local roads up to the required standards. We question whether the Council and the developers are prepared to commit to this massive level of spending to ensure that public health and safety is not further compromised.

2 Extract from EIP Statement by Donald Chisholm

2.1 M8 MOTORWAY KINGSTON BRIDGE

The M8 currently suffers congestion and significant tail backs for eastbound traffic to Glasgow on the approach to the Kingston Bridge. The proposed development would increase congestion at this point to the detriment of the operation of the M8.

2.2 M8 MOTORWAY ERSKINE TO ARKLESTON

Capacity of motorway

Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Vol 5 Sect 1, Part 3 TA 46/97

$$\text{Capacity} = [A - B * Pk \% H]$$

A = 2300 for motorways

B = 25 for motorways

Pk% H = Percentage of HGV's

$$\text{Maximum capacity of one lane} = 2300 - 25 * 10$$

$$= 2050$$

Capacity	M8 Erskine – St James (2 lane)	= 4100 vehicle per hour
	St James – Arkleston (3 lane) (White Cart Viaduct)	= 6150 vehicles per hour

Planned Inverclyde Housing Developments

The Inverclyde Council Housing Land Supply document (Table A.1.1) indicates a residential potential for 5379 units. This does not include approximately 1000 council houses currently empty which will be demolished and replaced.

Given that the Bishopton development will generate 1215 AM peak trips towards St James with 514 trips continuing onwards toward Glasgow, Renfrew and Braehead (TA Table 4.26), it is likely that the proposed Inverclyde developments, being of approximately double the size, will generate a proportionally greater demand i.e. at least twice, 2430 and 1028 trips respectively.

<u>LINK</u>	<u>EXISTING FLOW</u> (AM peak)	<u>FROM INVERCLYDE</u> <u>DEVELOPMENTS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u> (maximum)
-------------	-----------------------------------	---	--------------	------------------------------

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o "Kilallan", Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

Erskine - St James	3569*	2430	5999	4100
St James - Arkleston	**	1028		6150

The link currently has a spare capacity of $(4100 - 3569) = 531$ vehicles.

Therefore only 531 vehicles from the planned Inverclyde developments can be accommodated on the M8 in the AM peak.

This means that 1890 vehicles $(2430 - 531)$ will not be able to be accommodated.

The options to accommodate these Inverclyde trips are

1. Widen the M8
2. Commuters make these trips on other modes of transport i.e. trains or buses.

Given that the above table shows that the M8 eastbound does not have the capacity over the Erskine to St James link to accommodate additional trips generated by the planned Inverclyde developments, it is difficult to envisage how the existing motorway network could accommodate any additional traffic generated by the Bishopton development.

Taking into consideration the Bishopton development this road link would have to run at 175% of capacity. $(5999 + 1215)/4100$

* Traffic count 20 March 2007 7.30am – 8.30am (3569 vehicles)

** Awaiting count figures.

BISHOPTON ACTION GROUP

c/o “Kilallan”, Sachelcourt Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5AA

Appendix A