

Appendix 1 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

Glasgow & Clyde Valley Strategic Development Planning Authority

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

Surname

Buchan

Forename

Grahame

2. Postal Address

125 West Regent Street (lower ground floor)

GLASGOW

Postcode G2 2SA Phone 0141 229 7731 Email gmb@gcvsdpa.gov.uk

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

(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).

(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

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q2 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q3 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q4 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q5 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q6 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q7 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q8 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

Achieving reliability, performance and service quality

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

Q9 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q11 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q12 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q14 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: If sustainable development, sustainable economic growth, climate change mitigation targets, growing metropolitan economies and lowering the unit cost of priority infrastructure remain at the heart of Scottish Government policy, as they should, then modal shift from private to public transport must lie at the heart of policy. Frequency and journey time are key aspects of attractiveness on the rail network (as are fare levels - refer question 20 below, as are the quality of access through rail halts and stations - refer question 28). Therefore in order to achieve wider national economic, social and environmental goals, the Scottish Government, as part of its franchise/contract specification, in common with many EU and international competitors, should include frequency, journey times and fare levels as fundamental components of the franchise.

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

Q18 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q19 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

Scottish rail fares

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

Q20 comments: If sustainable development, sustainable economic growth, climate change mitigation targets, growing metropolitan economies and lowering the unit cost of priority infrastructure remain at the heart of Scottish Government policy, as they should, then modal shift from private to public transport must lie at the heart of policy. Fares, inter alia, are directly related to the probability of modal shift and should therefore be used as a key tool in enabling that shift. Reduction in fares or structuring of fares to encourage modal shift need to be considered on the basis that revenue lost from fare reduction will be replaced by higher patronage levels - comparable to the turnover v. margin approach. The primary rationale, therefore, and the key purpose of fares must therefore be growth in rail patronage, attracted from private transport.

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: Fares policy (refer question 20 response) provides a clear opportunity to influence modal shift from private transport to the rail network, but fares need to be set at levels which are understood, are clear, consistent and not subject to volatile change. The primary opportunity for effective substantive scale modal shift is in journey-to-work trips, the majority of which are suburban in nature, although a reasonable minority are also inter-city. Scotland's metropolitan areas – the key economic 'engines' of the country – are substantially dominated by suburban – core journey-to-work trips – and therefore in terms of scale of potential modal shift, these journeys need to be maximised. The attractiveness of rail travel in this context needs regulated fares set at levels that are more attractive than the costs of private travel. Again, if the policy is successful in achieving shift, then any revenues lost from attractively priced regulated fares, are likely to be replaced by higher volumes of rail travellers.

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

Scottish stations

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

Q24 comments: The statutory planning system - comprises Strategic Development Plans (SDP) and Local Development Plans (LDP) - set out the long-term geographical distribution of development to support the three pillars of sustainable economic growth - economy, society and environment. The former category of SDPs require formal Ministerial Approval and therefore set out the pattern of development that will require to be supported in the short, medium and longer-terms by the provision of both existing and future public transport networks. These documents clearly define how the rail network should support development and the geography of that development. At the heart of the GCVSDP, is a vision of a sustainable future supported by even greater access to and usage of the rail network to effect a 'step-change' in public transport. Future expansion and growth of development, as well as the pattern of existing development, are predicated on rail access - for example, thirteen (13) different Community Growth Areas (CGAs) have been defined to capitalise on rail corridors. At the same time, the reinforcement of existing urban communities, and the requirement to maximise modal shift, need additional investment in further rail halts.

New strategically significant rail halts which could address new planned development are :

Kilmardinny, East Dunbartonshire

Woodilee, Lenzie, East Dunbartonshire

Robroyston/Millerston, Glasgow

New strategically significant rail halts needed to widen access to the rail network from existing communities are :

Westerhill, East Dunbartonshire

Auchenback, Barrhead, East Renfrewshire

Parkhead Forge, Glasgow

Ravenscraig, Motherwell, North Lanarkshire

Other potential or aspirational stations/halts have been identified within individual local development plan documents. These are essentially local in focus but serve to increase access to rail public transport for extensive sitting urban communities with currently limited access. These further stations and halts are listed in an Appendix to this questionnaire.

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q27 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q28 comments: Categorisation of stations seems a sterile approach. All stations, if modal shift is a primary aim, require levels of facilities that will attract patronage or at least not deter attraction to the rail network. The judgement as to what constitutes attractive stations/halts may require to be measured by survey methods.

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

Rolling stock

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

Q31 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q32 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q35 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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

Q36 comments: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: Not relevant to remit of GCVSDPA

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: This question seems to betray a very limited view of the environmental issue and the potential for rail travel to reduce transport emissions from private transport. But with that focus, suggest - emissions reduction from private transport associated with each additional rail user.

Appendix 1 – List of Aspirational Rail Stations and Halts across the Glasgow and Clyde Valley City-region

GLASGOW CITY

Drumchapel (West)

Jordanhill (West)

Ibrox

Parkhead Forge

Blochairn/Garngad

Germiston

West Street (Crossrail)

Gorbals (Crossrail)

Glasgow Cross (Crossrail)

Relocated High Street (Crossrail)

NORTH LANARKSHIRE

Abronhill, Cumbernauld

Plains

**GLASGOW AND THE CLYDE VALLEY
STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AUTHORITY**

JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING

12th December 2011

Item	Rail 2014 – Public Consultation
-------------	--

Introduction

1. On the 15 November, 2011, the Scottish Government launched a public consultation on the future of Rail in Scotland post-2014, entitled “Rail 2014”. The current franchise for passenger services will expire and financial arrangements for Network Rail in Scotland will come up for renewal in 2014. The deadline for responses to the consultation is February 20, 2012.

The GCVSDPA Strategic Development Plan and the Rail Network to 2035

2. Members will be conscious that the Strategic Development Plan, as submitted to the Scottish Ministers on October 31, 2011, with its direction towards a low-carbon sustainable economy, had a ‘step-change’ in sustainable public transport as a key aim, with growth in rail travel as a key focus within its Development Strategy. Currently, some 63.9% of all rail journeys in Scotland are undertaken within the west of Scotland, illustrating the fundamental importance of rail as a sustainable form of travel within Scotland’s primary metropolitan city-region. Based on the Scottish Government’s own data, that volume of travel, in the first half of the SDP period, is projected to grow by between 24% and 38%.
3. The SDP, in terms of its spatial geography of future development, views rail travel as a key alternative to the private car if its Development Strategy of sustainable development and growth is to be achieved. Therefore, the SDP anticipated a future focus on an extended rail network serving growth communities, on enhanced capacity and service frequencies on key routes, on measures to secure modal shift, as well as measures to sustain and grow the capacity of the rail network to accommodate rail freight.

Rail 2014 - The Consultation

4. The consultation document runs to eight-six (86) pages and anticipated responses are structured around a specific response form and forty (40) separate questions (Appendix 1).

General Comment on the Consultation Document

5. The Consultation document disappoints in its concentrated short-term focus on franchise operational issues - questions 1 to 8
 - performance regime – questions 9 to 14
 - services operations – questions 15 to 19
 - fares structure – 20 to 23
 - management and maintenance regimes -
 - cross-border services – questions 29 and 30
 - rolling stock issues – 31 and 32
 - passenger information and security – questions 33 to 36
 - sleeper services – 37 to 39
 -
6. Therefore, in terms of the Authority's strategic planning interests as highlighted in paragraph 2 - the rail network's ability to service future development, develop freight flows and related hub infrastructure and address environmental issues - the document pays scant attention.
7. Indeed, of the forty questions posed, only six or seven questions can be mooted to relate directly to longer-term planning and environmental issues and thus have relevance to the Authority's mandate -
 - Number 17 – service frequencies and journey times and Governmental direction
 - Number 20 – fares rationale
 - Number 21 – regulated and non-regulated fares
 - Numbers 24 and 28 – stations
 - Number 40 – environmental performance measures

It is worth noting that Question 28 focuses on the categorisation of stations and their facilities and question 40 is intimately tied into the details of franchise and output specifications rather than the broader strategic need to address sustainable development, including the Scottish Government's own much-vaunted rhetoric of a low carbon future.

8. As such, only really **question 24** relates to the Planning focus, with Questions 17, 20, 21 and 28 potentially significant to the **modal shift** issue of sustainable transport, but the bulk of the document disappointingly lies outwith the Authority's strategic development planning mandate and focuses heavily on short-term financial and managerial issues.

Modal Shift

Question 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?”

Question 20 – “What should be the rationale for, and purpose of, fares policy?”

Question 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)?”

Question 28 – “What categories of station should be designated and what facilities should be available at each category of station?”

9. The rationale behind answering each of the four above questions lies in the need to accelerate modal shift from private car trips to more sustainable public transport at the metropolitan level and particularly in respect of the journey-to-work and other urban-focused trips. If road congestion is to be addressed to secure environmental benefits, to tackle greenhouse gas emissions and to free up space for strategic trips, then modal shift will be a pre-requisite to achieving these aims. The Scottish Government has the dual strategic objectives of sustainable economic growth towards a low-carbon economy and meeting mandatory climate change reduction targets. If these are the over-riding national targets, and it has been established that some 25% of greenhouse gas emissions in the Glasgow city-region emanate from transport, then modal shift needs to be a national priority.
10. Modal shift requires passengers to regard the train journey as a viable alternative to private transport. Therefore, rail transport needs to meet that perception and that reality – of comfort, reliability, punctuality and value-for-money.
11. Therefore, in terms of question 17, government should be specifying high levels of service frequency and punctuality with minimal journey times rather than leave such to be offered by the franchisee. This approach would be consistent with European operating standards and the high-quality services operated throughout many European city-regions, which comprise our key economic competitors. In terms of question 20, fares policy should be designed to offer the public a high level of service and sustainable travel options so to achieve the desired levels of modal shift, as a priority.
12. At the metropolitan scale, such as in Glasgow city-region, the density and the mobility of development, population and economic activity is high. If sustainable economic growth and a low-carbon future are to be achieved, then a high-quality sustainable public transport system needs to be assured in order to avoid road congestion, lost business hours and strategic traffic disrupted in local car traffic. As such, rail fares need to be regulated so as to ensure that rail travel is more attractive than personal car travel and to ensure that high levels of modal shift are achieved.
13. In terms of question 28, categorising stations appears an artificial construct. All stations, particularly in respect of inter-city and suburban trips, should provide for close integration and interchange, in terms of ‘smart-ticketing’ and timetables, with other public transport modes, and with private transport, the latter through park-and-

ride facilities which offer a safe and secure alternative to utilising the vehicle for the total trip.

Geography of development

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

14. The statutory Development Plan system – Strategic Development Plans (SDP) and Local Development Plans (LDP) in Scotland’s city-regions – and Development Plans outwith the four city-regions, provide the appropriate long-term context for decisions regarding rail stations. In the Glasgow city-region, the inaugural SDP 2011 is currently before Scottish Ministers for Approval. It sets a clear ‘direction of travel’ towards a low-carbon sustainable development future, aligned to Scottish Government policies and a ‘step-change’ in sustainable public transport is a key and necessary aspiration of the Strategy. The rail network is a key component of that ‘step-change’.
15. The SDP clearly identifies the spatial shape of development to 2035 for Scotland’s pre-eminent metropolitan region, based upon regeneration, renewal and planned growth, all designed to maximise access via the rail network (copy enclosed). Significant components of the SDP Strategy are already integral to the Scottish Government’s own National Planning Framework (2), which provides a national planning context for inter-city and inter-regional rail investments. Existing stations will require investment as part of the GCVSDPA’s Development Strategy whilst a limited number of new stations/halts will be required to service planned development and secure sustainable development and economic growth during the period of the Plan to 2035. In order to reinforce the importance of investment in existing rail halts and in new rail halts to the delivery of the Development Strategy, it may be appropriate to include within the Authority’s response to the consultation, a list of priority rail halts which fall within these two categories.

Conclusions

16. The consultation document released by the Scottish Government on the future of Scotland’s railway beyond 2014, despite the Scottish Government’s oft-rehearsed commitment to sustainable economic growth and a low carbon future is firmly focused on short-term financial and operational issues, with little spatial content and little sustainable development thinking. As such, the document has little pertinence to the mandate of the GCVSDPA and this report consequently has addressed a limited range of consultation questions which may be considered to relate to that mandate.

Recommendations

17. It is recommended that the Authority

- a) agree the report and
- b) delegate to the Strategic Development Plan Manager Authority completion of the Consultation Questionnaire based upon this paper as the Authority's formal response to the consultation.

Dr. Grahame Buchan
Strategic Development Plan Manager

