

Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee

5th Meeting, 2024 (Session 6), Wednesday
20 March 2024

PE1906: Investigate options for removing and reducing the impact of the central Glasgow section of the M8

Lodged on 25 October 2021

Petitioner Peter Kelly on behalf of @ReplacetheM8

**Petition
summary** Calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to commission an independent feasibility study to investigate scenarios for reducing the impact of the M8 between the M74 and Glasgow Cathedral including, specifically, complete removal and repurposing of the land.

Webpage <https://petitions.parliament.scot/petitions/PE1906>

Introduction

1. The Committee last considered this petition at its meeting on [31 May 2023](#). At that meeting, the Committee agreed to write to Glasgow City Council.
2. A petition summary briefing can be found at **Annexe A** and the Official Report of the Committee's last consideration of this petition is at **Annexe B**.
3. The Committee has received new responses from the Petitioner and Councillor Angus Millar which are set out at **Annexe C**.
4. Glasgow City Council considered an update on work to reduce the impact of the M8 in September 2023. An extract of the update is at **Annexe D**.
5. Written submissions received prior to the Committee's last consideration can be found on the [petition's webpage](#).

6. Further background information about this petition can be found in the [SPICe briefing](#) for this petition.
7. The Scottish Government's initial position on this petition can be found on the [petition's webpage](#).
8. Every petition collects signatures while it remains under consideration. At the time of writing, 1,745 signatures have been received on this petition.

Action

The Committee is invited to consider what action it wishes to take.

Clerks to the Committee

Annexe A

PE1906: Investigate options for removing and reducing the impact of the central Glasgow section of the M8

Petitioner

Peter Kelly of @ReplacetheM8

Date Lodged

25 October 2021

Petition summary

Calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to commission an independent feasibility study to investigate scenarios for reducing the impact of the M8 between the M74 and Glasgow Cathedral including, specifically, complete removal and repurposing of the land.

Previous action

We have contacted Paul Sweeney MSP and he has suggested that the petition should go ahead.

Background information

It is not clear whether the commitment to ongoing maintenance of the elevated M8 has been evaluated in light of the new cooperation agreement between the SNP and Green Party which states "we will not build road infrastructure to cater for unconstrained increases in traffic".

It is not clear if full removal of the central section has been considered by Glasgow Council or Scottish Government or Scottish Highways as a way of addressing GCC's Regeneration Framework Objectives which states:

- Reinforce the city centre's economic competitiveness;
- Re-populate the city centre;
- Reconnect the City centre with surrounding communities and its riverside;
- Reduce traffic dominance and car dependency;
- Green the city centre and make it climate resilient;
- Repair, restore and enhance the urban fabric.

Evidence is plentiful showing removal of similar roads around the world does not have anticipated negative impacts and brings economic, social and environmental benefits (<https://www.cnu.org/our-projects/highways-boulevards>)

Annexe B

Extract from the Official Report of last consideration of PE1906 on 31 May 2024

The Convener: PE1906, which was lodged by Peter Kelly on behalf of Replace the M8, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to commission an independent feasibility study to investigate scenarios for reducing the impact of the M8 between the M74 and Glasgow cathedral, including, specifically, complete removal and repurposing of the land.

Like the ghost of Christmas past, we are joined by our former colleague Paul Sweeney, who spoke in support of the petition when he was a member of the committee. Welcome back, Paul—it is nice to see you. We have missed your independent analysis in our considerations. I have been following with interest your public campaign in relation to the matters raised in the petition, about which we will, no doubt, hear more in a moment.

We previously considered the petition on 23 November and, since then, we have received a response from the Scottish Government stating that Transport Scotland is “happy to work” with Glasgow City Council to ensure that “all the necessary stakeholders” are included in any assessment. The submission states that no funding has been allocated by the Scottish Government towards an assessment and that, as discussions on the scope of any work have not taken place,

“it would not be appropriate to discuss funding at this time.”

On that note, I am happy to ask Mr Sweeney whether he has any comments or suggestions as to how the committee might advance the interests of the petition.

Paul Sweeney (Glasgow) (Lab): It is a pleasure to be back at the committee. I miss coming along, so it is great to be able to come back.

As you are aware, the committee last looked at the petition in November and, since then, there have been some positive developments, most notably that, at a recent full council meeting, Glasgow City Council agreed a motion to look at the future of the M8 and investigate options for mitigating its impact.

Some colleagues might think that the statement about removing the M8 in its entirety is quite provocative, but it is merely a provocation to a wider discussion. We are talking about a large piece of land in the centre of Glasgow that incorporates the equivalent of the entirety of Inverness city centre, and it can still be used as a road for its primary function. However, the purpose of the petition is to investigate how we reduce the rather obnoxious design of the road to address its spatial and environmental impacts on the city centre.

A substantial amount of work has already been done on that. Most notably, a levelling-up fund bid was submitted to cap the section of motorway in front of the

Mitchell library, between Bath Street and Sauchiehall Street. Unfortunately, that bid was unsuccessful, but it may well be revisited in a future round of the fund.

Furthermore, work on district regeneration frameworks was commissioned in 2016. That has produced a series of district regeneration frameworks for the entirety of the city centre. It highlighted interventions, particularly on the west flank of the M8 inner ring road, that could be enabled to reduce the impacts of the road, such as removing certain slip roads; capping and decking over sections of the motorway where it is in cutting; and restoring areas such as Anderston Cross, which is completely engulfed by a kind of spaghetti junction.

There is a large cloverleaf junction at Townhead, which was overengineered—it was designed for the east flank of the outer ring road, which was never actually built. The junction was built by Strathclyde Regional Council in the early 1990s to serve a motorway that was never built. Therefore, it is around one third greater in size than it should be. It incorporates a huge amount of land, which disconnects Royston, Springburn and Sighthill from the city centre.

There are options that, while maintaining the fundamental purpose of the road, could significantly reduce the impact in the short, medium and longer term. Although it is good that there is an indicative proposal from the Scottish Government to work with Glasgow City Council, we need a bit more. Significant public money has already been spent on studies, feasibility and specific interventions. Hundreds of millions of pounds are being spent on repairing the Woodside viaducts—probably the biggest infrastructure spend in the city—which is a reactionary spend that has been subject to no public consultation. It is a reaction to the road physically crumbling apart.

The Convener: I suppose that that would be of some reassurance if you were driving over it.

Paul Sweeney: Indeed. The road there has been reduced to four lanes for some time now, and has had a speed restriction placed on it. Nonetheless, that demonstrates that the road, structurally, is reaching the end of its natural lifespan and requires significant further investment. We are reaching a crux point where the Government really ought to be more thoroughly engaged, and the Parliament has a role in overseeing that. Through the petition, the committee has an important position in exercising that role.

I urge the committee to consider inviting key stakeholders from Transport Scotland, the Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council to present their views on existing studies, such as the MVRDV district regeneration frameworks, which were commissioned at significant expense five years ago; the levelling-up fund bid; and how we progress the projects that are shovel ready, to borrow a phrase from John Swinney.

The Convener: Thank you. I must say that I find the petition quite intriguing. I should say that I was at school with the son of the man who designed the road at the time. I do not think that that associates me with any personal blame for it, but I remember watching with quiet fascination it all being constructed in the early 1970s, when I was at school. Prior to its construction, it was quite a long journey. It was then quite a

short journey, and then it became a very long journey again as traffic volumes increased and people became familiar with the road.

I noted with interest your most recent online campaign on the reconstruction of Charing Cross and the original buildings, which, I think, were demolished, and on the part of the road that runs along the front of the Mitchell library, which is potentially open to being capped. Is that correct?

Paul Sweeney: Yes. In the case of Charing Cross, the Grand hotel and a number of tenements and retail arcades were demolished to create the cutting for the M8. In that instance, an area was decked over, but it was quite small. The rotating doors that you go through in Cafe Gandolfi in the Merchant City are actually the original doors from the Grand hotel in Charing Cross, which were salvaged.

The key point is that there is an opportunity to further improve the environment without damaging the fundamental utility of the road. That is the question now, half a century on from its first commissioning. We have international examples such as Boston's big dig project. There are other examples around the world such as in Paris and numerous other cities worldwide. There is a big opportunity to enhance the city centre.

I would also argue that there is potential to realise a positive capital net receipt for the public, because it is Government-owned land. The land was all compulsorily purchased by the Scottish Office at the time to construct the road. Therefore, by utilising the airspace over it, where possible, there is potential for development that could return a positive net receipt to the public funds. That would not only enhance the city centre amenity but be financially sustainable. It is not a quixotic idea about an urban planning utopia; it is about a serious and credible intervention based on international best practice.

The Convener: I understand. In fact, just a couple of weeks ago, I was on a visit to the Jewish archive at Garnethill. When you are up at that height and trying to leave, you are aware that the brutal truncation of a lot of the infrastructure around there, which persists, had a detrimental effect on the heart of that area of the city. At one time, it was quite central to Glasgow, and now it is almost peripheral to it, with the centre having shifted much further in the other direction. The road really brutalised what was a significant part of the city at the time.

This is a fascinating conversation, but I will move on.

Fergus Ewing: I want to comment on the process, having listened carefully to what Paul Sweeney said and respecting his considerable interest in the matter and the work that he has done on it. He suggests that we should take evidence but, given that he also states that Glasgow City Council is looking at options, the practical option for the committee may be to wait to see the results of that work by the council in order to hear its view as the local authority. After all, alongside other representatives, it is well placed to voice the views of Glasgow. If we first see what it recommends, that will give us a clearer thesis on which to proceed. If that is procedurally an appropriate way to proceed—I am not making any judgments on the merits—we could perhaps keep the petition open pro tem until that work is done.

Mr Sweeney might be able to tell us how long that work will take. It could take three months or three years—who knows? I wonder whether Mr Sweeney feels that, rather than shut the petition now, we should keep it open to see what the local authority has to say about the options. As he said, the council is looking at a variety of options, and this year, I am sure, is absolutely not straightforward by any means.

Paul Sweeney: That is a fair comment. It was merely a motion that was passed by councillors, so the detailed timeline or sequence of activities subsequent to that by officers has not yet been fully articulated. Furthermore, as the convener said, although Transport Scotland is interested in working in principle, there is no resource to exercise that activity. I therefore have concerns about how that will be expedited, which is where the committee has a role.

Perhaps it is slightly premature to invite everyone together to present a pathway to carry out the changes. Perhaps the committee ought to consider writing to Transport Scotland and Glasgow City Council to ask for an indication of when they will have produced a firm plan, so that we might have an opportunity to talk about it or scrutinise it to an extent, and so that Parliament has a role in overseeing the stakeholders working together. I detect a bit of animosity between Transport Scotland and Glasgow City Council with respect to the policy and how it evolves. Transport Scotland is very much programmed to the road being a trunk road—it just wants to operate a trunk road. It is not really interested in its aesthetic value, whereas there are wider considerations with respect to Glasgow City Council and our parliamentary representatives.

Alexander Stewart: Mr Sweeney makes valid points about where this could go. There is an issue about timescale and the resource that may be required. We acknowledge that, but we need to get clarity as to where and how. It would be useful to know that plan Glasgow City Council and Transport Scotland have in mind so that we can ascertain exactly where we are. There is real merit in some of this for the location that has been identified. That should be examined, and more time should be given for us to get clarity. It might give us more options if there are other proposals on the table as to timescales, resource implications and what might happen in the location.

As Mr Sweeney identified, the life expectancy of the road will have to be managed in some way, shape or form. It is as well to look at all options rather than just put something through systematically. That could achieve a lot more and make something of the location. As a committee, we certainly have an opportunity to develop that through the petition.

The Convener: I take Mr Sweeney's point that, in some ways, the petition is there to provoke some sort of wider progress. Some of the issues that it raises are quite intriguing. From small seeds, big outcomes can follow, if we show an interest and a commitment.

I suggest that we write to Glasgow City Council saying that we are interested in the aims of the petition and are minded at some stage to facilitate a wider discussion but that it would be useful at this first phase if it fleshed out its ideas as to what might

follow. I suggest that we indicate that we do not necessarily require an immediate timescale, because we recognise that the council might have to do a little bit of thinking before it comes back to us. That would allow us to have a better idea of how we might advance the aims of the petition. Does the committee agree?

Members *indicated agreement.*

The Convener: That is great. We will keep the petition open on that basis. Thank you very much for joining us, Mr Sweeney.

Annexe C

Petitioner submission of 1 June 2023

PE1906/F: Investigate options for removing and reducing the impact of the central Glasgow section of the M8

Since the petition was submitted we have continued to discuss it and our suggestions with various individuals and groups. One avenue of conversation was with the Scottish and Glasgow Greens who included in their local manifesto during campaigning for Glasgow's council elections, a commitment to ask for an options study for the M8. The Greens are now in a partnership with the SNP to run Glasgow council and have kept their manifesto pledge. Bailie Christy Mearns and colleagues with involvement from SNP Bailie Angus Millar drafted the following motion which was taken to council on 30th March 2023 and called for the City Convener for Climate, Glasgow Green Deal, Transport and City Centre Recovery to

" (1) write to the Scottish Transport Minister to: - formally request Transport Scotland's involvement in and a funding contribution towards Glasgow City Council's research into reducing the impact of the M8 on Glasgow city centre; - formally request a 6-month trial of 30mph speed limits on city centre sections of the M8; and - request a review of powers to extend the Low Emission Zone to motorway roads; and (2) bring a report on existing air quality monitoring taking place along the motorway to the relevant city policy committee within six months."

<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/councillorsandcommittees/submissiondocuments.asp?submissionid=108190>

This motion was passed by 80 councillors to 2 who voted for an amendment.

In conjunction, Bailie Angus Millar has written a letter to the Minister for Transport Jenny Gilruth before the recent reshuffle, asking for dialogue between Transport Scotland and Glasgow Council to investigate options, referring to existing local policy such as the City Centre Transport Plan

which also calls for investigation of options. This local policy itself reflected the consultation feedback by our group to include this position.

The actions we would like the committee to follow up on, if these are appropriate are:

1. For a study to be commissioned which looks into options for the city centre stretch of the M8 - The study should be carried out by an independent (planning urbanism and movement/transport consultancy with Transport Scotland, Glasgow Council, Glasgow University, experienced/international experts and ideally people involved with the Replace the M8 campaign, Glasgow University (which has potential funding to contribute to this project) and the MSPs and Councillors who have been involved (including Paul Sweeney, Angus Millar and Christy Mearns), as stakeholders, amongst numerous others who have an interest.

Replace the M8 (which is not yet registered as a community group but is a twitter based group of friends who are interested in the subject) would like to be involved in writing/editing the brief for the consultants.

2. For a clear response from Mairi MacAllan and/or Kevin Stewart to Angus Millar's letter (if that hasn't already happened) which acknowledges the recent vote at Glasgow Council and agrees to the study and to funding for it.
3. For the petitions committee to suggest a clear way forward which brings together Glasgow's Councillors and MSPs with MSPs for Net Zero Transition and Transport in a cross party working group, if that is appropriate.

Councillor Angus Millar submission of 18 July 2023

PE1906/G: Investigate options for removing and reducing the impact of the central Glasgow section of the M8

Further to your letter of 6 June 2023, I am writing on behalf of Glasgow City Council to confirm our position with regard to the future of the M8,

the critical role of Transport Scotland and the need for funding and other supports to be provided.

The details of our original letter and motion have outlined Glasgow City Council's position and intended approach which can be summarised as follows:

In our recent letter to you we stated:

- We recognise that the construction and continued presence of the city centre stretch of the M8 has had a profound impact on placemaking and the quality of the environment in central Glasgow, while acting as an important regional and national transport corridor in recent decades.
- We very much welcome the consideration of the Scottish Parliament's Citizen Participation and Public Petitions Committee of this issue. It is Glasgow City Council's view that this is timely, and that further engagement and research is required, involving national and local government, to further explore the future of the Glasgow city centre stretch of the M8.
- Glasgow City Council looks forward to further engagement with the Scottish Government and other stakeholders to further consider what actions can be taken over the short term to mitigate the impact on the city centre of the M8; as well as medium- and longer-term exploration of the potential for more fundamental transformation of the city centre stretch with a view to reducing severance, supporting regeneration, and promoting sustainable transport.
- We realise that any longer-term radical change to this infrastructure would require detailed research to explore technical feasibility of any options, business case development and economic impact assessment, as well as transport modelling to ensure that any change is consistent with our national and city-level car km reduction objectives. While the civic conversation over the future of the M8 is a nascent one, we would appreciate early and continued engagement with all relevant partners with a view to securing a more detailed exploratory work in the coming months and years.

We have gratefully received your response, noted as follows:

At this point, the Committee is keen to further understand Glasgow City Council's plans to progress this work following the passing of the relevant motion on 30 March 2023. In particular, the Committee would like to know when the council intends to have a plan in place to progress work on this issue so that it can inform the Committee's consideration of the petition.

Our existing response, outlines our critical strategic and operational approach as far as the current local authority powers allow:

- Glasgow's Strategic Plan 2022-2027 to reduce the impact of the M8 on the city centre and to explore longer-term replacement options
- Glasgow's City Centre Transport Plan to achieve a 30-40% reduction in peak-hour private car traffic in the city centre by 2030 as part of wider commitments in the Glasgow Transport Strategy to reduce car vehicle kilometres in the city by at least 30% and to "offer a more liveable, people friendly urban environment [which] uses its space and streets differently".
- The significant investment, through the Glasgow City Region Deal, to begin that culture change toward people-friendly environments, such as the Avenues programme, and the new Sighthill Bridge which seeks to repair the connection between that area and the City Centre, and to provide safe, easy and sustainable access across the M8.
- Further to this Glasgow City Council prepared a Levelling Up Transport bid to cap the M8 at Charing cross which focussed on the potential benefits of such a project. The bid highlighted the benefits to Regeneration, through place-making, place -mending, revitalising the area, creation of a new community asset, and stimulating the local economy.
- A committee paper will be brought forward in September 2023 setting out progress and specific actions, as well as identifying next steps.

Critically, recognising the M8 is a national asset, our approach from the outset has to be supported by Scottish Government and Transport Scotland as well as local government. We would therefore reiterate the

following asks made of the Scottish Government by Glasgow City Council to underpin a collaboratively developed programme of actions:

- Consideration of short-term mitigations to address carbon emissions and air pollution within the city centre M8 corridor and consideration of a trial of lower speed limits within the city centre stretch of the M8;
- Scottish Government participation in and funding support for research over the M8's future in the short term, with commitment to more detailed transport modelling and business case development over the medium term;
- Transport Scotland support for transport modelling, business case development and identification of funding opportunities for the potential transformation of existing heavy roads infrastructure.
- Scottish Government support for an intensification of air quality monitoring within the M8 corridor.

On behalf of Glasgow City Council, the Council's Convener for Climate, Glasgow Green Deal, Transport and City Centre Recovery recently issued correspondence to Scottish Ministers, seeking to take forward a wide-ranging conversation over the future of the M8. This correspondence sought engagement to scope out actions which could be taken forward over the short, medium and longer terms to address the impact of the city centre stretch of the M8 and support its future transformation.

Return correspondence was recently received by the Council from the then-Minister for Transport, Kevin Stewart MSP, confirming his willingness for Transport Scotland officials and Glasgow City Council officers to hold initial dialogue with a view to scoping out any future discussion on this agenda. The Council now plans to engage further with Transport Scotland and the new Minister for Transport in order to reiterate the asks made of the Scottish Government and to take forward such a discussion

Further to this, in the matter of funding, the Council notes that repair works and the propping up of the Woodside Viaduct alone will cost

upwards of £100 million and last until at least the end of 2024 - one year and £65 million over original estimates.

Recent Freedom of Information requests have revealed that Transport Scotland are currently not assessing all immediate mitigation measures, including lower speed limits, which could address traffic volumes, air and noise pollution, as well as the number and cost of collisions.

Therefore, we would suggest that the committee consider the current expenditure on the M8 repairs, in line with the asks above and seeks to consider if this should be balanced with investment in the necessary feasibility studies for the future of the M8.

Subject to further engagement with the Scottish Government, Glasgow City Council will produce a paper in the coming months, to be considered by a Council committee, setting out progress on this broad dialogue with Scottish Government and identifying next steps and actions.

In conclusion, Glasgow City Council recognises the pivotal role it can play in committing to address the impact of the M8 on Glasgow city centre. We wish to stress our desire to work in partnership with Scottish Government and galvanise the efforts of all stakeholders, in particular Transport Scotland, as the owner of the asset. With their endorsement, funding and expertise; meaningful interim and long-term interventions can be tested, planned and delivered to the benefit of our residents and the broader population of Scotland.

I hope that the Committee will find this response helpful in their further consideration of the Petition.

Annexe D

Extract from Glasgow City Council update on reducing the impact of the M8 on Glasgow City Centre

Progress

In March 2023, a formal request was made in writing on behalf of Glasgow City Council by the City Convener for Climate, Glasgow Green Deal, Transport and City Centre Recovery to the Transport Minister, to begin engagement with the Scottish Government at both political and officer level on the scoping of actions to rethink the role of the M8 motorway, including its relationship with Glasgow City Centre.

This correspondence sought engagement with the Scottish Government on the future of the city centre stretch of the M8 over the short, medium and long term. In the shorter term, Glasgow City Council are seeking dialogue and consideration of the following:

- Exploration of mitigations which could be introduced to address carbon emissions and air pollution arising from the M8, including the provision of green infrastructure such as green walls and barriers in the M8's immediate vicinity;
- Support for intensification of air quality monitoring for the city centre M8 corridor;
- Scottish Government participation in, and funding support for, research to explore M8 with alternative and more people-friendly roads infrastructure in its place, with such research possibly involving academic input and/or civic society expertise;
- Early engagement with Glasgow City Council officers on our various regeneration frameworks and plans for the areas surrounding the city centre stretch of the M8, including active identification and progression of opportunities to improve cross-connectivity by walking, wheeling and cycling;
- Trialling a lower mandatory speed limit on the city centre stretch of the M8 to address amenity impacts including noise and air pollution

Over the medium term, Glasgow City Council is seeking to explore:

- Potential rationalisation of junctions and sliproads, some of which may be over-engineered, in order to reduce the impact of the motorway on surrounding communities;
- Commencement of detailed transport modelling on options for the future of the M8, including exploration of opportunities to re-engineer and downgrade the city centre stretch of the motorway to a lower-speed boulevard-style road with active uses alongside;
- Transport Scotland support for development of Glasgow City Council's proposed M8 garden cap project at Charing Cross, including consideration of funding opportunities and models, as part of a wider set of medium-term interventions to mitigate the impact of the M8 on the city centre;
- Transport Scotland support for transport modelling, business case development and identification of funding opportunities for the transformation of existing heavy roads infrastructure in Glasgow such as at Shieldhall and the Clydeside Expressway;

Over the longer term, Glasgow City Council is seeking:

- Subject to the outcome of early research and more detailed business case and transport modelling outputs, re-engineering and/or replacement of city centre stretch of the M8 with an alternative, lower-speed non-motorway road in its place which can better contribute to Glasgow's placemaking, regeneration and sustainable transport objectives

It is recognised that a radical re-engineering of city centre motorway infrastructure is a longer-term prospect that would likely lie beyond the timeframe of the existing Glasgow Transport Strategy. However, the Council's position is to help facilitate a discussion on this vision now, to encourage the major feasibility, modelling and business case development work that would likely be required for such a transformation

to take place in the interim, and to identify early actions to reduce the impact of the M8 on the city centre.

In May 2023, Glasgow City Council received a formal response to this request from the then Minister for Transport, Kevin Stewart, which recognised the Council's aspirations for the future of the city centre and the stretch of the M8 motorway adjacent. The Minister acknowledged the stated aims of the proposal for the M8 and the scale of the challenge as well as the potential benefits in carrying out interventions. The Minister for Transport expressed his support for Scottish Government officials to have initial discussions with the Council on the potential shared benefits and impacts of the specific points raised.

A meeting between Glasgow City Council and Transport Scotland officers to discuss aspirations for the M8 was held on Wednesday 23rd August 2023. This was a positive discussion, with alignment of aspirations to reduce car vehicle kilometres. Within this there was recognition of the desire to re-mode, reduce, re-route or re-time traffic that use the M8 over the long-term. It was also agreed that research and evidence gathering was required however, to fully understand the problem and the nature of journeys being made currently on the M8, including by businesses.

Transport Scotland indicated that some of the issues raised by Glasgow City Council on the M8 could be explored via the Business Case work for the Strategic Transport Strategic Review (STPR2) project recommendation 14 on Managed Motorways. This Review provides an overview of transport investment, mainly infrastructure and other behaviour change recommendations, that are required to deliver the National Transport Strategy priorities and objectives. It is a 20 year plan and does not specifically include any recommendations on the M8 as per the Glasgow City Council aspiration, though there was agreement this work could be explored via STPR2 intervention 14 Managed Motorways.

The issues around requests for greening, a reduced speed limit and opportunities for joint working were all noted and Transport Scotland agreed to come back on these requests in due course.

It has been noted that there is academic interest around re-purposing of the M8 and discussions took place at the meeting on how this could be properly captured and utilised in any evidence gathering. A meeting is planned with academics who have approached Glasgow City Council on this topic, involving both Glasgow City Council and Transport Scotland.

It was agreed to hold an annual progress meeting between senior Glasgow City Council and Transport Scotland Officers to discuss updates around the M8, over and above any interim discussions on actions above.

Following discussion within Glasgow City Council officers, it is proposed that an Action Plan for short, medium and long term aspirations should be prepared to cover all the Council's projects that interact with the M8 between junctions 15 and 22, clearly identifying the role of Transport Scotland in these interventions to help facilitate collaboration and progress.