

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

Dennistoun Community Council

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

Surname

Birrell

Forename

Stephen

2. Postal Address

45 Broompark Drive

Dennistoun

Glasgow

Postcode G31 2JB

Phone 07767 821696

Email

sdbirrell@yahoo.com

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual / Group/Organisation

Please tick as appropriate

(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)?

Please tick as appropriate Yes No

(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

or

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

or

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

(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

(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?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes

No

Consultation Questions

The answer boxes will expand as you type.

Procuring rail passenger services

1. What are the merits of offering the ScotRail franchise as a dual focus franchise and what services should be covered by the economic rail element, and what by the social rail element?

Q1 comments: No comment.

2. What should be the length of the contract for future franchises, and what factors lead you to this view?

Q2 comments: No comment.

3. What risk support mechanism should be reflected within the franchise?

Q3 comments: No comment.

4. What, if any, profit share mechanism should apply within the franchise?

Q4 comments: No comment.

5. Under what terms should third parties be involved in the operation of passenger rail services?

Q5 comments: No comment.

6. What is the best way to structure and incentivise the achievement of outcome measures whilst ensuring value for money?

Q6 comments: No comment.

7. What level of performance bond and/or parent company guarantees are appropriate?

Q7 comments: No comment.

8. What sanctions should be used to ensure the franchisee fulfils its franchise commitments?

Q8 comments: No comment.

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

9. Under the franchise, should we incentivise good performance or only penalise poor performance?

Q9 comments: No comment.

10. Should the performance regime be aligned with actual routes or service groups, or should there be one system for the whole of Scotland?

Q10 comments: No comment.

11. How can we make the performance regime more aligned with passenger issues?

Q11 comments: No comment.

12. What should the balance be between journey times and performance?

Q12 comments: No comment.

13. Is a Service Quality Incentive Regime required? And if so should it cover all aspects of stations and service delivery, or just those being managed through the franchise?

Q13 comments: No comment.

14. What other mechanisms could be used for assessing train and station quality?

Q14 comments: No comment.

Scottish train services

15. Can better use be made of existing train capacity, such as increasing the permitted standing time beyond the limit of 10 minutes or increasing the capacity limit? What is an acceptable limit for standing times on rail services?

Q15 comments: No comment.

16. Should the number of services making use of interchange stations (both rail to rail and rail to other modes) be increased to reduce the number of direct services? What would be the opportunities and challenges of this?

Q16 comments: No comment.

17. Should Government direct aspects of service provision such as frequency and journey time, or would these be better determined by the franchisee based on customer demand?

Q17 comments: No comment.

18. What level of contract specification should we use the for the next ScotRail franchise?

Q18 comments: No comment.

19. How should the contract incentivise the franchisee to be innovative in the provision of services?

Q19 comments: No comment.

Scottish rail fares

20. What should be the rationale for, and purpose of, our fares policy?

Q20 comments: No comment.

21. What fares should be regulated by government and what should be set on a commercial basis? Do your recommendations change by geographic area (the Strathclyde area example), or by type of journey (for example suburban or intercity)?

Q21 comments: No comment.

22. How should we achieve a balance between the taxpayer subsidy and passenger revenue contributions in funding the Scottish rail network? At what rate should fares be increased, and how feasible would it be to apply higher increases to Sections of the network which have recently been enhanced?

Q22 comments: No comment.

23. What should the difference be between peak and off-peak fares? Will this help encourage people to switch to travelling in the off-peak?

Q23 comments: No comment.

Scottish stations

24. How should we determine what rail stations are required and where, including whether a station should be closed?

Q24 comments: The network of rail stations within Glasgow City Council area is largely fit for purpose. However, there has been significant concern expressed within the Dennistoun Community Council (DCC) area in relation to the inclusion of Duke Street station on a list of stations identified as being located within a mile of each other. The general understanding is that these stations are being highlighted as somehow at risk of closure. Attached to this response is a detailed rationale of why DCC members, and residents across the wider area, are strongly opposed to any suggestion that Duke Street station is at risk of closure.

In determining the viability or otherwise of rail stations cognisance must be given to the following:

- area served (including potential for expansion linked to regeneration),
- station quality and availability of amenities (including accessibility),
- linkage with other forms of public transport, and
- some assessment of passenger usage trends.

On all of the above grounds Duke Street station cannot be seen as anything other than needed and thriving.

25. What are the merits or issues that arise from a third party (such as a local authority or local business) being able to propose, promote and fund a station or service?

Q25 comments: No comment.

26. Should only one organisation be responsible for the management and maintenance of stations? If this was the franchisee how should that responsibility be structured in terms of leasing, investment, and issues relating to residual capital value?

Q26 comments: No comment.

27. How can local communities be encouraged to support their local station?

Q27 comments: No comment.

28. What categories of station should be designated and what facilities should be available at each category of station?

Q28 comments: No comment.

Cross-border services

29. Should cross-border services continue to go north of Edinburgh? In operating alongside ScotRail services, how do cross-border services benefit passengers and taxpayers? And who should specify these services, the Department of Transport or the Scottish Ministers?

Q29 comments: No comment.

30. Or should the cross-border services terminate at Edinburgh Waverley, allowing opportunities for Scottish connections? And if so, what additional benefits would accrue from having an Edinburgh Hub?

Q30 comments: No comment.

Rolling stock

31. What alternative strategies or mechanisms could be used to reduce the cost of the provision of rolling stock?

Q31 comments: No comment.

32. What facilities should be present on a train and to what extent should these facilities vary according to the route served?

Q32 comments: No comment.

Passengers – information, security and services

33. How should we prioritise investment for mobile phone provision and / or Wi-Fi type high-bandwidth services?

Q33 comments: No comment.

34. How should we balance the need for additional seating capacity and retain the flexibility of a franchisee to offer first-class services if commercially viable?

Q34 comments: No comment.

35. What issues and evidence should be considered prior to determining whether or not to ban the consumption of alcohol on trains?

Q35 comments: No comment.

36. How can the provision of travel information for passengers be further improved?

Q36 comments: No comment.

Caledonian Sleeper

37. Should we continue to specify sleeper services, or should this be a purely commercial matter for a train operating company?

Q37 comments: No comment.

38. Should the Caledonian Sleeper services be contracted for separately from the main ScotRail franchise? Or should it be an option for within the main ScotRail franchise?

Q38 comments: No comment.

39. We would be interested in your views in the level and type of service that the Caledonian Sleeper Services should provide. Including:

- What is the appeal of the Caledonian Sleeper Service, and if there were more early and late trains would the appeal of the sleeper services change?
- What is the value of sleeper services to Fort William, Inverness and Aberdeen and are these the correct destinations, for example would Oban provide better connectivity?
- What facilities should the sleeper services provide and would you pay more for better facilities?

Q39 comments: No comment.

Environmental issues

40. What environmental key performance indicators should we consider for inclusion in the franchise agreement or the High Level Output Specification?

Q40 comments: No comment.



Dennistoun Community Council

email : hello@dennistouncc.org.uk www.DennistounCC.org.uk

15/2/10

Dear Sir or Madam,

Dennistoun Community Council's Response to Rail 2014 Consultation

We are writing on behalf of the Dennistoun community with regard to your Rail 2014 consultation. Your strictly tailored form doesn't provide the opportunity to address the points we want to raise. We would suggest that a consultation considering the possibility of station closure without the response form permitting discussion of the merits of individual stations does not represent a valid accounting of people's views.

This response has been drafted after consulting Dennistoun residents via a widely used community website to ensure the comments are as representative as possible.

Local councillors have been assured that there are no definite plans to close any station in Glasgow, yet the consultation paper lists the savings to be made by the closure of stations located less than a mile from other stations. The Fact Sheet issued a month after the consultation document lists Duke Street Station as one of those located within a mile of other stations.

We would be opposed to the closure of Duke Street Station for the reasons enumerated below.

1. Selecting stations for possible closure on the basis that they're located less than a mile from another station seems flawed to us. In densely populated areas such as Dennistoun this could surely be considered desirable and necessary. Your document listing stations located less than a mile from another station neglects to mention numerous other Glasgow stations located less than a mile from others Queen Street and Central among them. Would you seriously consider closing either of those on that basis?

2. Averaging the £208,000 annual savings among the 11 Glasgow stations noted as being located less than a mile from another station works out at just under £19,000 per station. The money spent upgrading Duke Street station for disability compliance in recent years is far greater than several years worth of proposed savings.

3. Duke Street is the only station in an area with a population in excess of 15,000 that is disability compliant.

4. The costs involved in rendering another Dennistoun station disability compliant would dwarf the annual savings figure.

5. Your own figures show that over 74,000 people now use Duke Street station every year, a figure that has increased by 50% over the past five years and is still increasing.

6. Since the Spring 2011 price rises people in Dennistoun pay a disproportionately high bus fare for a single journey into the city or back, so it's likely that passenger numbers for 2011 will show another significant increase.
7. Duke Street station is the nearest station in the area to Parkhead Forge shopping centre, and less than a quarter of a mile from the massive new Tesco store in Dennistoun.
8. Figures show that over 60% of Dennistoun's population don't have a car, so closing the station would target the people that need it most.
9. Dividing the £19,000 that closing Duke Street Station would save among the 74,000 people that use the station gives a figure of marginally over 25p per passenger per year. Is even considering closing a station for this sum really justifiable?
10. Your consultation document is titled *Rail 2014*, and 2014 is when the Commonwealth Games take place in venues largely less than a mile from Duke Street Station. While the games are brief in duration, it would not only be local residents inconvenienced by closing the station prior to the event.
11. Any closure of Duke Street station would appear to be at odds with the recent City Plan consultation, which mentioned the possible future construction of a line linking Duke Street with Carntyne station.
12. The possible closure does not take into account the potential future development of an area currently undergoing significant change.

Yours sincerely,
Dennistoun Community Council