

Respondent Information Form and Questions

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

Title **Mr** **Ms** **Mrs** **Miss** **Dr** *Please tick as appropriate*

Surname

Forename

2. Postal Address

Cret William		
CRIEFF		
Perthshire		
PH7 4JY	01764-6709045	archiebc@cantab.net

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual	/	Group/Organisation
yes		<i>Please tick as appropriate</i>

- (a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?
- (b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis
Please tick ONE of the following boxes
- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Yes, make my response, name and address all available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- (c) The name and address of your organisation ***will be*** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site). Are you content for your ***response*** to be made available?
- Please tick as appropriate*** **Yes**
No
- | |
|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> |

Yes, make my response
and name available, but
not my address

(d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Individual;

Please tick as appropriate

y Yes

No

Consultation Questions answered :-

Q15 - 19 Scottish Train Services. Any new franchise should be on the basis of "Demand (passenger)" driven, rather than "Supply" (operator)" driven. For example, a request to First Scotrail to consider stopping every second Aberdeen/Glasgow at Gleneagles (where there is a 5 hour period during the day when there are no trains at all) got the response that they couldn't because "these trains already load well". In other words, implicitly, we don't need the passengers, so it doesn't matter that the passengers need the trains! Wrong way round!

Q20 Rail Fares. There is scope for further simplification, as the average person does not understand. The BASIC FARE should be much more related to distance, as it used to be, and should be the regulated fare. (Current basic fares are some of the most expensive in Europe). Historical anomalies should be removed: for instance Gleneagles to Glasgow or Edinburgh fares are up to twice those from Dunblane to Glasgow/Edinburgh. This artificially boosts use of the over crowded Dunblane station, and reduces usage of the under utilised Gleneagles station (which would be more convenient for many people - if and when it had an adequate train service!). Basic fares should then be supplemented by walk on "Saver (and Supersaver)" fares - a simple, popular and logical fare largely withdrawn by TOCs. TOCs could then use Apex fares to adjust demand. There would therefore only be BASIC (regulated), SAVER, (both walk on) and APEX fares

Q29, Q30.

CROSS BORDER SERVICES should continue to go north of Edinburgh. Not to do so would be a contradiction to the "ambition" (Executive Summary clause 6.) for a "passenger-centric ..." railway. It would be ludicrous and counterproductive to make passengers change trains, just to reduce the subsidy to Scotrail! (What a Little Englander/Scotlander approach!) It would be flying in the face of all historical precedent, and would drive people (including me) to use the car or to fly. I will amplify in three points :-

1. It is well established that the availability of a through train (or in the old days carriage) is often the determining factor in deciding whether to travel by train or not, particularly, but not exclusively for older people. To many people this is more important than a short journey time. Having to change trains in Edinburgh increases stress (through worry about missing connections, disruption in middle of journey, and need to handle baggage). I regularly travel from Gleneagles to either York or

London KX, using the East Coast "Highland Chieftain", with its superior rolling stock, catering facilities, availability of First Class, convenience and speed. If I had to use a Scotrail basic 156 or 158 train to Edinburgh and change there, I would NEVER use rail, but instead use car (which to York only takes fractionally longer than the Highland Chieftain).

2. Far from terminating Cross Border services at Edinburgh, there is scope for increasing them again. When the former BR "Clansman" service, which operated from Inverness to London via the West Coast Main Line (initially via Motherwell, and latterly via Edinburgh and Carstairs) ceased operating, many people stopped using the railway, as they lost the ability to connect to Carlisle and all North West England cities, Wales, and the West Country via Birmingham.

It is presumably barely a faint hope that Eurostar trains would run to and from Scotland, as originally planned. The excellent Eurostar service to Brussels and Paris opens up so many European rail opportunities, that it is a great pity we in Scotland are largely cut off from it because of the extra day needed to get to London - so we have to fly)

3. Cross Border train services, whether Scotrail likes it or not, provide higher quality train services within Scotland. Again, the East Coast "Highland Chieftain" provides increased comfort and facilities from Inverness to Edinburgh, with its HST Mark 3 rolling stock (still the best in Britain despite its 35 years age) greatly superior to Scotrail's trains. I regularly use it from Gleneagles to Edinburgh for business meetings or other day trips, where, if the alternative was a Scotrail Class 158 Sprinter I would drive by car.

In summary, terminating cross border train services at Edinburgh and making passengers change into connecting services there would be **THE MOST BACKWARD LOOKING STEP TO BE TAKEN ON SCOTLAND'S RAILWAYS FOR A CENTURY**, and would condemn any government that countenanced it to ridicule.

Q37, Q38 and Q39 CALEDONIAN SLEEPER

1. There would seem to be a case for sleeper services to be contracted separately from the main Scotrail franchise. It would seem to fit better with a long distance cross border operator such as East Coast, or there could be economies of scale and ideas being in the same franchise as the Great Western Sleepers. (Scotrail is basically a suburban railway operating multiple units, with some low quality long distance multiple unit services added on. Sleepers are long haul, high quality, loco hauled) It would probably be in the national interest to add MotorRail services again, at a cost equivalent to the marginal cost of driving a car. An innovative franchisee might look at this. (As First Great Western did at one time). There are complex cost implications, as platform length at Euston might necessitate running cars in a separate train, or a third sleeper train, but it should be looked at.

2. The current Sleeper network should be maintained as a minimum. It is important to maintain the Highland Sleepers, where the greater distances mean less competition from faster day time services. The idea of taking one of the Sleeper trains (or a third one) via Birmingham would open up connections to Wales and the west of England.

3. BUT quality needs updating! By this I do not mean superficial decor, but much more comfortable bunks/beds. which have deteriorated in comfort even from British Rail days with the same rolling stock, as the bunks are too hard with replacement of sprung bases by solid plywood, cheap sheets which are too short etc. etc.) (so I have given up using the sleepers.) I don't think en suite is essential. But comparison could be made with VIA RAIL's "The Canadian" to see how even 1950s rolling stock can have comfortable bunks, or the much more modern Deutsche Bahn "City Nightline". Accommodation, if it could be fitted into the UK loading gauge, of the calibre of the latter would justify charging hotel equivalent fares, perhaps with a cheaper option as well.