

Statement to the Communities, Transport & Environment Panel, Bath & North East Somerset, consideration of the arrangements for the Public Consultation on options for an east-of-Bath Park & Ride scheme, and the "Bathampton Parkway" rail-based Park & Ride scheme, referred to as "Option H" in the March 2013 report by Halcrow.

**Statement by Dorian Baker,
25 Sion Road, Bath BA1 5SH**

14th September 2015

During 2003 I began to develop the engineering design for a new railway station with a part-underground car park for up to 2800 private cars, including a link road to the Batheaston Bypass, in land between the railway to London and the railway to Trowbridge, at Bathampton Junction.

In February 2011 I produced a short paper (22 pages) describing the proposal and circulated this among a number of people in the City of Bath.

In September 2012 my group of engineering and transport consultancy was asked by B&NES to prepare a feasibility study for the "Bathampton Parkway" proposal, in accordance with railway industry standard "GRIP 2" (Guidance for Railway Investment Projects, level 2) for a proposal to construct and operate the scheme. This report was completed and submitted to the Council in February 2013, and a slightly modified final edition dated September 2013.

Our work was being carried out at the same time as a study by Halcrow that made a comparative assessment of 8 options for Park & Ride schemes intended to serve traffic approaching Bath from the east. Their report, dated March 2013, considered a Bathampton railway station-based scheme as their "Option H".

Because the two studies were being carried out for the same officer, the Group Transport Manager, I was asked by him whether I would be prepared to share information from the work carried out by my group with the Halcrow team. I agreed to do so and was told that Halcrow would get in touch. Halcrow did not contact me at all during the period September 2012 to March 2013 when our work overlapped.

The Halcrow report chapter discussing "Option H" makes a series of references to me by name. But their commentary is based only on my February 2011 discussion paper. As a result the Halcrow assessment was based on a series of flawed assumptions they had added about matters including train operations, drainage, track layout, earthworks and the business case that were very different from the findings in our February 2013 report; indeed the approach that Halcrow took to the development of a railway scheme design and operating plan was directly contrary to the requirements set out in the railway industry standard GRIP. Although my group was preparing a detailed report at the time of their study and we had been asked by our client to provide them with detailed information about the proposal, they did not make contact with us.

This means that if the choice of Options for an East-of-Bath Park & Ride scheme being published for public consultation in September 2015 is based only on the Halcrow report of March 2013, the data used as the basis for the exclusion of "Option H" was already 2 years old at that time and Halcrow had disregarded advice from the Group Transport Manager to talk to my team about the current state of development of the scheme. In short, the Halcrow March 2013 assessment of Option H disregarded the best information available to Bath & North East Somerset at that time and we therefore suggest that the exclusion of Option H from the current public consultation is not soundly based.

The final report on the Bathampton Parkway proposal dated September 2013 is available from the Group Transport Manager, Bath & North East Somerset Council.