

**Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (MACS)
Main Committee meeting**

**Minutes of meeting held on Monday 18 January 2016
Conference Room 2, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh**

Present:

Anne MacLean, Convener
John Ballantine (JB)
Bob Benson (BB)
Marsali Craig (MC)
Heather Fiskien (HF)
Sheila Fletcher (SF)
Jane Horsburgh (JH)
David Hunter (DH)
Hussein Patwa (HP)
Keith Robertson (KR)
Jane Steven (JS)
Hillary Stubbs (HS)
John Whitfield (JW)

Secretariat:

Jill Mulholland (JM) – MACS Sponsor
Aysha Miah (AM) - Secretary
Aga Lysak (AL) – Assistant Secretary
Robert Wyllie (RW) – Transport Scotland

In attendance:

Eilis Murray – Palantypist

Apologies:

Margaret Follon (MF)
Cecil Meiklejohn (CM)

Agenda Item 1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

- 1.1 The Convener welcomed those present to this MACS meeting. She noted apologies from Margaret Follon (MF) and Cecil Meiklejohn (CM).
- 1.2. The Convenor introduced and welcomed Aysha Miah who will be taking over from Robert Wyllie as secretary.

Agenda Item 2. Minutes of the previous meeting, matters arising and action points

Item 2a: minutes of previous meeting on 20 October 2015

- 2.1 The minutes of the Committee meeting held on 20 October 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

ACTION 1 - Secretariat to publish minutes on website
--

- 2.2 No matters arose from the previous meeting which were not to be covered in the action points.

Item 2b: action points from previous MACS meetings

- 2.3 The action points document was circulated. Of the continued actions arising from the meeting on 21 July 2015 the following points were made and actions agreed:

- a) Continued action point 8 required MACS workstreams to reflect on to what extent they might use BB consultation and engagement paper. KR noted this was an excellent paper. BB said the paper was designed to be generic. The Committee decided that the paper would be circulated to all workstreams using the MACS logo for future work.

ACTION 2 – Secretariat, in consultation with BB, to circulate consultation and engagement paper to all workstreams
--

- b) Continued Action Point 9 required JS to contact ScotRail to ask if proposed AT200 toilet doors have separate close and lock buttons. The Committee noted the reply from ScotRail and the action was closed.
 - c) Continued Action Points 12 and 13 focused on Waverley. The action points required the rail workstream to continue to engage with Network Rail and City of Edinburgh Council. The Committee heard an update on this under agenda item 6.
- 2.4 Of the actions arising from the meeting of 20 October 2015, the following points were made and actions agreed:
- a) Action point 1 required Brian Nisbet to inform the Committee about findings on models in Short Life Working Group and the extent to which transport features in local health and social care integration. His written response had been previously circulated, so this action point could be closed. Members discussed how to take forward future work on transport accessibility implications of integration. Members thought the bus and community transport workstream might usefully deal with the matter, with HP suggesting a regional approach. The Convener noted the workstream lead was not present, so asked she be alerted with a view to having discussions on how best this might be taken forward.

ACTION 3 – Secretariat to inform MF of Committee's discussion concerning arranging work on transport accessibility impacts of integration

- b) Action point 2 required JS to forward to secretariat information about Transport in North Northumberland. This having been done, no further action was required. That said, the secretariat would pass on the details it had

received to MF, for the information of the bus and community transport workstream.

ACTION 4 – Secretariat to pass on details of Transport in North Northumberland to MF for information

- c) Action point 3 required the secretariat to publish minutes on website. The Committee noted this has been done and no further action was required.
- d) Action point 4 required the Convenor to raise integration of health and social care as context to be borne in mind for the National Transport Strategy refresh. This having been done, no further action was required.
- e) Action point 5 required the Secretariat to circulate Stakeholder Advisory Panel minutes and a list of Panel members. The Committee noted this has been done and no further action was required.
- f) Action point 6 required the convenor to redraft a letter to Phil Verster on the Committee's position in respect of the ScotRail Stakeholder Advisory Panel and Waverley station. This having been done, no further action was required.
- g) Action point 7 required the convenor to feed back to Equality Unit comments on Scottish Government's draft Disability Delivery Plan. This having been done, no further action was required.
- h) Action point 8 required the convenor to send a note to COSLA with comments on their draft Disability Delivery Plan. This having been done, no further action was required.
- i) Action point 9 required the Rail workstream to take forward discussions with train operating companies (TOCs) and SRAF about HP's report on social media. This had been done and initial responses received from TOCs. The rail workstream now proposed to pursue this via the marketing sections of TOCs. HP noted that TOCs are heavily marketing the Delay Repay scheme to all passengers and if accessibility messages were similarly delivered there would be a substantial improvement in awareness.

ACTION 5 – Rail workstream to pursue discussions with TOCs about report on social media

- j) Action point 10 required the Secretariat to investigate whether DPPP revisions were forthcoming. A revision to the ScotRail DPPP was indeed forthcoming, and JS and BB intend to submit a draft consultation response by April 2016 for the Convener to check.

ACTION 6 – JS and BB to submit draft ScotRail DPPP consultation response by April 2016 to convener for approval

- k) Action point 11 required HP (with Andrew Holmes) to send a summary of Edinburgh Gateway issues to JM, who will contact Rail Directorate. HP spoke to this item later in the agenda.
- l) Action point 12 required the Convener to write to City of Edinburgh Council licensing committee over taxi rank accessibility specifically with regards to proposals at Haymarket. The Convener advised that this has been dealt with via another route and was currently the subject of work by the roads and active travel workstream on Roseburn-Leith streetscape proposals so the action point could be closed.
- m) Action point 13 required JH to report back to roads workstream about possible tactile paving changes in Scotland. The issue could be closed as the workstream was now aware of the current position.
- n) Action point 14 required the rail workstream to pursue issues concerning Borders Railway with Transport Scotland through SRAF. JS spoke to this item, suggesting an alternative course of action, later in the agenda.
- o) Action Point 15 required the secretariat to re-circulate the external reports template to members. The Committee noted this has been done and no further action was required.

Agenda Item 3. Convenor Update and Liaison Report

3.1 The Convenor reported on her work over the last quarter. She had previously circulated papers and reports of meetings of the Transport Accessibility Steering Group, where work by subgroups to develop an action plan continued, and meetings of the National Transport Strategy Refresh Stakeholder Group. This Stakeholder Group had now completed its work and on 21 January 2016, the convener will be attending the launch of the refreshed National Transport Strategy by the Minister for Transport and Islands. The convener stated a full review was recommended in the next Parliamentary term, depending on the results of the election on 5 May 2016. Other activity was less pronounced over the last period, although a meeting of the Bus Stakeholder Group had been called and the Committee was content HP should go in the convener's place.

3.2 The Convener went on to advise the following in respect of appointments:

- There will be a total of five member vacancies arising in 2016. JB, BB and JH will be leaving the Committee in 2016. A further two vacancies will be arising in 2017 when HF and JS leave and these vacancies will be advertised this year.
- The Convenor's post will also be vacant this year. Members are actively encouraged to apply as this is a separate appointment which lasts up to 8 years. The only stipulation is that the candidate must have a disability.
- If a member of MACS has served 8 years in service then there must be a year's gap before re-application.

3.3 In discussion the following points were made:

- a) BB commented that health and social care integration would prove to be key in the context of any National Transport Strategy. Ensuring integration of the value cultures of local government and NHS Boards would prove to be especially challenging. JS agreed, noting that the outcome of the Audit Scotland report into transport for health and social care was unclear. This could be a substantial area of future work for the Committee.
- b) In this context, members commented on the local/regional/national split of responsibilities in terms of transport for health and social care. The role of national decision-makers was more limited than in other transport contexts. JM noted the work of some Regional Transport Partnerships to co-ordinate transport and health operations, and local pilot projects to test new models. SF noted one pilot – in the Lochaber area – had lost its funding, which proved to be a particularly bitter blow in light of expansion plans.
- c) KR expressed concern at the possibility of fragmentation in this area, particularly in respect of cross-border issues. RTP areas were not necessarily contiguous with NHS Boards, leading to problems in the context of integration authorities. There was therefore some need for national direction to avoid poor outcomes for users.

3.4 Summing up the discussion, the Convener agreed with the comments of members about ensuring focus on integration of health and social care. She suggested the Committee take up the offer of meeting with officials from Transport Scotland to discuss the regional role in this respect, and invited members to consider how this might be integrated into future work. Notwithstanding earlier discussions about the bus and community transport workstream taking the lead, it may be possible for a new workstream to be created to cover this issue, should members wish.

ACTION 7 – Secretariat to pursue meeting with Transport Scotland officials and MACS members on integration

Agenda Item 4. Annual report and future work

Annual Report

4.1 The Convenor advised all members that:

- Contributions must be submitted by workstreams on time. These should discuss actions resulting from recommendations of last year's report that were addressed to MACS; if there are any queries on this then members are to telephone her as soon as queries arise.
- The annual report is principally a factual report for the Minister which members of the public can access too. The extent to which members may make recommendations of Ministers depends on whether prior discussion has

been had on the relevant issue. JM underlined this point, noting it would be inappropriate to only advise Ministers of issues on which MACS recommended their action for the first time in the annual report.

- All workstreams are responsible for providing draft contributions of their section of the report to the secretariat by 30 April 2016. This is with a view to submitting the report by July 2016. Between these times, a draft of the full report will be circulated for members' consideration and the final sign-off will be by the convener.

4.2 The Convenor highlighted the positive impact of the report in highlighting accessibility issues, for example on rail accessibility where MSPs on the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee had picked up the points MACS made.

4.3 There then followed some discussion on individual recommendations from last year's annual report. In particular, there was discussion on recommendation 18 concerning local bus registration, and a general issue was raised by JB that maybe with the passage of time, some recommendations were out of date. SF agreed that in the case of this specific recommendation, she would raise it with MF as workstream lead to ascertain the current position.

ACTION 8 – SF to inform MF of discussion around recommendation 18 of last year's annual report

Future Work

4.4 The Convenor turned to discuss the forward work programme. There had been previously circulated last year's plans which were compiled by all workstreams in tabular form, as designed by the secretariat. The Convenor invited workstreams to reflect on these and move to plan their work for the coming year, with draft plans to be provided to the secretariat in order that they may be discussed at the April Main Committee meeting.

ACTION 9 – All workstreams to provide forward work programmes for consideration at April Main Committee meeting

4.5 JS informed the meeting that the rail workstream had already completed its work programme as a result of a meeting of workstream members immediately before this Main Committee meeting, and would forward the same to the secretariat.

Agenda Item 5. Secretariat Update

5.1 The Committee had before it a written secretariat update to which JM spoke. Further to the mention in the paper about the Transport Accessibility Steering Group, JM mentioned a policy group of Transport Scotland officials shadows this steering group. Policy Group members who have input into the secretariat update have been advised of the importance of providing full contributions to the update, so that the Committee can be fully informed on areas where its contribution might be useful. She also highlighted that as sponsor of the Committee, she works closely with the

public appointments team and she encouraged members to contact herself or the Convener regarding forthcoming appointment round. Word of mouth would be important as a method of informing people about the round.

5.2 In discussion the following points were made:

- a) KR noted the discussion on High Speed Rail at paragraph 17, and JM confirmed the text in the paper had been overtaken by events in light of a Ministerial statement about when HSR would be delivered in Scotland.
- b) JH highlighted the terminology used when the report discussed progress on the Access for All scheme. She asked if Hamilton station was, as suggested in the paper, “fully accessible” when the focus of the scheme was to make stations step-free. JB noted that there may be a risk that ScotRail and Network Rail perceive accessibility in terms of mobility, with a focus on making stations step-free. The Convener suggested this might be raised by the rail workstream via SRAF.

ACTION 10 – Rail workstream to raise importance of “full accessibility” as opposed to “step-free” via SRAF.

- c) HS noted there was a risk of a similar approach in terms of ferries. Although ostensibly step-free, often the incline of the ramp/gradient is such that assistance is required in some cases e.g. on the Ullapool/Stornoway ferry. Also worth noting is that most people alight ferries via vehicles and only a minority of passengers alight directly. MC indicated this may be something the ferries workstream may wish to take forward in its work programme for the coming period, so as to make sure that operators and prospective operators understand the full breadth of accessibility requirements.
- d) DH regretted no mention was made in the update of the legislative change to require single-deck buses to be wheelchair accessible. He noted there was nothing up-to-date for operators in terms of guidance about the relevant regulations and BB suggested this might be for the Equality and Human Rights Commission. The Convener noted the risk that smaller bus companies will simply withdraw routes instead of provide compliant buses. Also, regulations do not extend to buses with fewer than 22 seats and in some cases only coaches are provided as an option. Coaches are not suitable for non-wheelchair passengers with mobility difficulties. In any event, as there is still some time to go for coaches to be compliant with wheelchair accessibility regulations, a lot of coaches are not accessible to wheelchair users. JS noted that practice differed in the case of rail, where passengers who cannot access a train because of inaccessible infrastructure are provided with a taxi to reach the nearest accessible station. The Convener indicated the issues raised here might be addressed via the Bus Stakeholder Group.

ACTION 11 – Convener to raise accessibility issues with bus operators via Bus Stakeholder Group.

Agenda Item 6. Workstream Reports and Oral Updates

6.1 The Convener noted seven written updates from workstreams about their work in the previous quarter. She invited members to speak to these papers.

Item 6a: Roads Expo

6.2 DH spoke to his report on the Roads Expo held on 4 November 2015 and sought to highlight a future conference on Intelligent Transport Systems in Glasgow which a Committee member might like to attend. The Committee agreed this would be a matter for the relevant workstream to decide and report back on.

ACTION 12 – Roads and Active Travel workstream to consider attendance at ITS conference

6.3 JH noted the point in the written report about signalled crossing facilities and undertook to pass on to DH relevant information about a new product being introduced to market.

ACTION 13 – JH to send information about signalled crossing facilities to DH.

Item 6b: Rail conference call

6.4 JS spoke to her report on a conference call the rail workstream held on 23 November 2015 to discuss current topics of interest and plan future work. She thought it might be helpful for members to gain an insight into current thinking.

6.5 In discussion, KR noted the discussion on taxis and stressed that black cabs are not normally accessible for people in wheelchairs, and that much depends on individual needs. He was concerned that choice is left out increasingly as a principle when booking taxis, meaning people could not necessarily pick a vehicle type that suited them. JB concurred, noting that DPTAC was continuing to urge the UK Department for Transport to implement the report of the Law Commission of England and Wales, which included quota measures on the taxi fleet.

Item 6c: Scottish Road Works Commissioner review

6.6 KR spoke to his report of a meeting on 1 December 2015 and sought to underline the complexity of the matters discussed as part of the review. He highlighted the MACS response to the reviewer's consultation included reference to the need for the Road Works Commissioner to become better known, and for improvements to be made to the accessibility of the online version of the Scottish Road Works Register. Recognising the breadth of the SRWC role, there was perhaps a need for something to exist between the Commissioner's strategic function and local authorities' strictly local function to regulate roadworks.

6.7 In discussion, the Convener and JS highlighted the problem of poorly executed roadworks signage, and the importance of using every available mechanism – including contracts – to provide greater accessibility. DH noted that statutory guidance on safety (including of disabled road users) is issued, but

examples of poor practice are readily available, notwithstanding that contravention of the guidance is a criminal offence.

6.8 The Convener suggested an initial letter to COSLA might be appropriate to highlight the problems, although SF noted utility companies are often responsible for roadworks. JM suggested a meeting with Transport Scotland officials about the review and the broader issues, and this was agreed to by the Committee.

ACTION 14 – JM and KR to speak with a view to meeting Transport Scotland officials about SWRC review and roadworks issues

Item 6d: Waverley meeting

6.9 JS spoke to her report on a meeting with Network Rail and City of Edinburgh Council on Waverley station developments, held on 17 December 2015. She highlighted the forthcoming extension of platforms and improvement of taxi and drop-off accessibility on the New Street car park. The hope was that these improvements would make for an easier Passenger Assist experience at the station curtilage.

6.10 In discussion, KR expressed concern at the use of stair-climbers when lifts break down. Such instruments were very bad where the centre of balance was low on a person's hips. JS indicated the rail workstream would continue to monitor Waverley developments, and would revert to the station manager on the specific point raised, to ask whether the lifts have auxiliary back-up.

ACTION 15 – Rail workstream to monitor Waverley developments and report back as necessary, including on whether lifts have auxiliary back-up
--

Item 6e: Edinburgh Gateway meeting

6.11 HP spoke to the report prepared by JS on this meeting, held on the same day as the Waverley meeting. Although the meeting was useful in clarifying some issues, and the engagement Network Rail is undertaking is welcome, a number of points remain, in particular with respect to the tram/train crossover and the extent to which Passenger Assist will serve both modes.

6.12 In discussion, KR underlined the importance of ensuring Passenger Assist throughout the station, and also noted the discussion in the report on tactile paving. He suggested a greater than 50% tonal contrast in dry and wet conditions. JH suggested that in this context, the revisions by the Department for Transport to the guidance on tactile paving should be looked at by Network Rail.

6.13 JS echoed the comments of HP in respect of areas requiring clarification. She added concerns over drop-off for cars, trolleys and timetabling. She proposed, and the Committee accepted, that HP draft a letter for the convener's signature addressed to Network Rail seeking information.

ACTION 16 – HP to draft letter for convener's signature on Edinburgh Gateway for submission to Network Rail

Item 6f: Bus and Community Transport workstream report

6.14 A paper prepared by MF on the work of the workstream had been circulated. No discussion arose on this item.

Item 6g: DPTAC

6.15 JB spoke to his paper on the above meeting held on 14 January 2016. He noted that much of the work programme for DPTAC hinges on a forthcoming revision to the Department for Transport Accessibility Action Plan, in which DPTAC had been involved. The intention was to have a draft for discussion at the April meeting on DPTAC.

6.16 In discussion, the following points were made:

- a) SF noted the discussion on use of data in transport and questioned the extent to which this would be achievable in isolated areas. JB noted this point and accepted it was likely urban transport would be easier to extract data on.
- b) HF asked about the nature of the research proposed in paragraph 5 of the written report, and the extent to which it encompassed Scotland. JB imagined it would be possible for Scottish interests to influence DfT research should they contact the Department. He also noted research by DPTAC members was ongoing, and he would report on this as further information arose. HF noted the introduction of the DRILL project, hosted by Inclusion Scotland, as another aspect of ongoing research the Committee should be aware of.

Other updates

6.17 JS spoke to the work of the rail workstream in the previous period. In addition to work on Waverley, Edinburgh Gateway and the ScotRail DPPP discussed above, this included:

- Work on Haymarket to ascertain the impacts on Passenger Assist of current proposals to move the taxi rank.
- Work on Queen Street station redevelopment, with which MC was involved. It was noted the National Rail Timetables made no mention of the closure of the station this summer.
- Work on Dundee station to further reflect on toilet provision, which is not as accessible as one might wish for – although the workstream decided to take no further action at this time
- Work with SRAF, as previously discussed, to raise the paper prepared by HP on social media use. This work will now incorporate the disparity between step-free and fully accessible, as the Committee decided earlier.

- Work to raise possible issues with websites: difficulties in booking Passenger Assistance on TOC websites, and inaccuracies on Stations Made Easy on the National Rail website
- Work to support ScotRail in designing toilets for new trains
- Work to develop the paper prepared by BB on engagement and consultation, and to develop a further paper on lessons learned from engagement with major railway station accessibility issues
- Further work on the National Rail Passenger Survey, in consultation with Transport Focus

6.18 There was one further aspect of work JS requested the Main Committee give consideration to at this juncture. Operation of the Borders Railway gave the workstream cause for concern in a number of respects, including toilet provision, overcrowding, changes to timetables and visibility of signage. She proposed that the rail workstream draft a letter for the Convener to send to Phil Verster. This was agreed.

ACTION 17 – Rail workstream to draft letter for convener’s signature on Borders Railway

6.19 MC spoke on the work of the ferries workstream. Although there was a good deal taking place, there was not much that was finalised and ready for a report. The workstream was focusing on the Clyde and Hebrides Ferry Services (CHFS) contract where MC represented MACS on the Independent Procurement Reference Panel. In this context, some progress had been achieved in amending the wording of the draft contracts to reflect more up-to-date information. Work also continued on the Ferries Accessibility Fund, which was deferred by Transport Scotland recently.

6.20 KR spoke about a recent meeting the roads and active travel workstream held with the City of Edinburgh Council on Roseburn-Leith Cycle Scheme proposals, which were something of a national innovation. A report on that meeting will be forthcoming, as will be a draft response to the scheme consultation for final approval by the convener.

ACTION 18 – Roads and active travel to provide response to Roseburn-Leith Cycle Scheme

Agenda Item 7. Any Other Business

7.1 The convener confirmed guidance to members around propriety in the context of Scottish parliamentary elections will be circulated when available.

7.2 The Convenor asked all members to consider the position of the DPTAC representation from MACS. The Convenor hoped that JB’s successor would be able to job shadow him. She was willing to discuss the role with anyone interested

pending a decision on a successor at the April meeting. JB indicated he was also happy to have a telephone chat, if it helps.

ACTION 19 – Members to consider the appointment of a replacement MACS member to DPTAC

Agenda Item 8. Date of Next Meeting

8.1 It was confirmed the next meeting would be on Tuesday 19 April.

Secretariat
January 2016