

Ref: MON/BMcC/ HC/1201113

13 February 2012

Rail2014  
Transport Scotland  
Buchanan House  
58 Port Dundas Road  
Glasgow G4 0HF

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **RAIL 2014 - PUBLIC CONSULTATION NITSHILL STATION**

Glasgow Life manages the city's cultural and sporting facilities, museums, galleries, libraries and community centres on behalf of Glasgow City Council, and provides a range of community-based cultural and sporting opportunities. It is in this capacity that we are responding to the consultation on the future of Scotland's rail services in relation to proposals to close train stations that serve venues.

Glasgow Life's stated vision is "To inspire Glasgow's citizens and visitors to lead richer and more active lives through culture and sport." As an organisation we believe that proposals to close stations would have a detrimental effect on citizens of Glasgow and beyond accessing our services.

A potent example of this would be following through on the proposal to close Nitshill station, the local station for the world renowned Glasgow Museums Resource Centre (GMRC). GMRC is the main storage facility for Glasgow Museums collections. Opened in 2003 and extended in 2009 it is home to over 1.2 million objects including fine and decorative arts, arms & armour, natural history, transport & technology, archaeology, Scottish history, social history and world cultures. Much of the collection is recognised as being of local, national and international importance. A well as offering guided tours and resources for professional and private researchers the facility offers a range of formal and informal learning opportunities as well as a full schools programme for both primary and secondary students. There are c. 150 staff based at GMRC and we welcome in the region 11,500 visitors per annum.

Point 14 of the Executive summary of the proposals states "we do not intend to reduce the number of stations on the network. We are however considering the possibility of attuning the number and location of stations..." This is at odds with section 7.10 on Scottish stations declaring that "In the Glasgow commuter area, there are 11 stations located less than one mile from another rail station offering similar services. The lease costs associated with these 11 stations total £208,000." The suggestion of savings is confused further by 7.11 asserting that "We do not intend to reduce the size of the Scottish rail Network, or reduce the number of stations, but we are considering whether it would be possible to re-configure the network by reviewing the location of stations."

/....



Monday, 13 February 2012

The location of the station in Nitshill does not need altering. The Office of Rail Regulation figures show that Nitshill station has seen an increase in traffic of over 25% in two years and 50% in five years. At a time of increased fuel prices and a push to get commuters out of their cars and on to public transport Transport for Scotland/Scotrail proposal to close stations would appear to be a retrograde step. This part of Glasgow is poorly served by public transport – no Sunday rail service and a bus service that has recently been truncated further (number 45 buses on shortened route) – and the train station is unmanned and does not have step-free access on the south-bound platform. Quite the opposite from closure, at this time Nitshill station would benefit from investment, particularly with regards to making it more accessible. Furthermore, the area of wasteland (part-owned by Scotrail) that sits beside the station that is used by visitors to GMRC as the main pedestrian route to the centre should receive urgent attention.

Glasgow City Council's Development & Regeneration Services have launched a Nitshill Development Framework Consultation - [www.nitshill.org/](http://www.nitshill.org/) - and closure of the train station in Nitshill would be a hammer blow to the regeneration of Nitshill and to those trying to access the world class Glasgow Museums' facilities at Glasgow Museums Resource Centre. I ask that this be taken in to consideration when determining what rail stations are required and their location, including whether stations should be closed.

I hope this information is useful and should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact my colleague, Helen Maclean (Senior Policy and Research Officer), [helen.maclean@glasgowlife.org.uk](mailto:helen.maclean@glasgowlife.org.uk) Telephone number -0141 287 8951 who will be happy to assist.

Yours sincerely



Dr Bridget McConnell  
**Chief Executive**

## Rail 2014 - Public Consultation

[Contents](#) [« Previous](#) [Next »](#)

Publication Date:  
15/11/2011

### Rail 2014 - Public Consultation

#### The Consultation Process

##### Sending responses

We welcome your views on the issues raised in this documents. All of the questions are set out again on the Respondent Information Form in Annex D, and please feel free to provide other information that you consider may assist us.

Please complete the Respondent Information Form to submit your answers. An electronic version of the form is on the website, and we would really appreciate it if you could complete the form electronically as it will assist with the collation of responses.

The form is on the website at: [www.transportscotland.gov.uk/rail2014](http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/rail2014)

Please make sure you complete the boxes on the front of the form to tell us how you would like us to use your form. We can publish your response on the Transport Scotland website if you wish. You can tell us if you would like us to publish your name and address, or just your name, or you can remain anonymous. If you ask us not to publish your response, we will still take your views into account for the franchising of rail passenger services and the High Level Output Specification.

If you do not fill in the part of the form called Permissions, we will assume you do not want us to publish your comments on the website. We will still read what you say and take it into account.

The form should be returned to us at:  
[Rail2014@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Rail2014@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk)

Postal submissions should be sent to:

*Rail2014  
Transport Scotland  
Buchanan House  
58 Port Dundas Road  
Glasgow G4 0HF*

##### Closing date

The closing date for responses is **20 February 2012**.

##### Further discussion



We have a range of events and activities planned over the consultation period in which we will be discussing the consultation further. Further details can be found on our web pages:

[www.transportscotland.gov.uk/rail2014](http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/rail2014)

### **Assessing the impacts**

Alongside the consultation we are conducting a full equalities impact assessment. We are also determining the level of environmental impact assessment that we need to carry out.

We do not currently consider that a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) will need to be conducted but will make a final determination after the consultation is concluded. We are however carrying out an environmental screening of the options in this document and will be formally consulting the Consultation Authorities to seek their views prior to making a determination about undertaking an SEA.

### **What happens next**

The responses from this consultation along with our ongoing research and modelling work, responses to previous consultations, and discussions with key stakeholders, will be used to help us determine how to fund and contract for rail passenger services. The responses will inform our inputs to the rail industry processes which are ongoing as part of the periodic review of funding for Network Rail.

We intend to publish our Franchising Policy Statement in the spring of 2012 and an outcomes report on this consultation later in that year. Our High Level Outputs Specification will be published in July 2012 and details of the future contract(s) for rail passenger services will be published towards the end of 2012.

[Contents](#) [« Previous](#) [Next »](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Terms and Conditions](#)

[Subscribe to Newsletter](#)

[Crown Copyright](#)

An agency of



**The Scottish Government**

## 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 Life

Title Mr ☐ Ms ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Dr ☒ Please tick as appropriate

#### Surname

McConnell

#### Forename

Bridget

### 2. Postal Address

20 Trongate

Glasgow

Postcode  
G1 5ES

Phone 0141  
287 8951

Email  
bridget.mcconnell@glasgowlife.org.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

- (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:

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

Q2 comments:

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

Q3 comments:

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

Q4 comments:

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

Q5 comments:

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

Q6 comments:

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

Q7 comments:

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



Q8 comments:

### **Achieving reliability, performance and service quality**

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

Q9 comments:

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:

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

Q11 comments:

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

Q12 comments:

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:

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

Q14 comments:

### **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:

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:

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:

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

Q18 comments:

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

Q19 comments:

### **Scottish rail fares**

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

Q20 comments:

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:

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:

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:



## Scottish stations

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

Glasgow Life's stated vision is "To inspire Glasgow's citizens and visitors to lead richer and more active lives through culture and sport." As an organisation we believe that proposals to close stations would have a detrimental effect on citizens of Glasgow and beyond accessing our services.

A potent example of this would be following through on the proposal to close Nitshill station, the local station for the world renowned Glasgow Museums Resource Centre (GMRC). GMRC is the main storage facility for Glasgow Museums collections. Opened in 2003 and extended in 2009 it is home to over 1.2 million objects including fine and decorative arts, arms & armour, natural history, transport & technology, archaeology, Scottish history, social history and world cultures. Much of the collection is recognised as being of local, national and international importance. As well as offering guided tours and resources for professional and private researchers the facility offers a range of formal and informal learning opportunities as well as a full schools programme for both primary and secondary students. There are c. 150 staff based at GMRC and we welcome in the region 11,500 visitors per annum.

Point 14 of the Executive summary of the proposals states "we do not intend to reduce the number of stations on the network. We are however considering the possibility of attuning the number and location of stations..." This is at odds with section 7.10 on Scottish stations declaring that "In the Glasgow commuter area, there are 11 stations located less than one mile from another rail station offering similar services. The lease costs associated with these 11 stations total £208,000." The suggestion of savings is confused further by 7.11 asserting that "We do not intend to reduce the size of the Scottish rail Network, or reduce the number of stations, but we are considering whether it would be possible to re-configure the network by reviewing the location of stations."

The location of the station in Nitshill does not need altering. The Office of Rail Regulation figures show that Nitshill station has seen an increase in traffic of over 25% in two years and 50% in five years. At a time of increased fuel prices and a push to get commuters out of their cars and on to public transport Transport for Scotland/Scotrail proposal to close stations would appear to be a retrograde step. This part of Glasgow is poorly served by public transport – no Sunday rail service and a bus service that has recently been truncated further (number 45 bus on shortened route) – and the train station is unmanned and does not have step-free access on the south-bound platform. Quite the opposite from closure, at this time Nitshill station would benefit from investment, particularly with regards to making it more accessible. Furthermore, the area of wasteland (part-owned by Scotrail) that sits beside the station that is used by visitors to GMRC as the main pedestrian route to the centre should receive urgent attention.

Glasgow City Council's Development & Regeneration Services have launched a Nitshill Development Framework Consultation - [www.nitshill.org/](http://www.nitshill.org/) - and

closure of the train station in Nitshill would be a hammer blow to the regeneration of Nitshill and to those trying to access the world class Glasgow Museums' facilities at Glasgow Museums Resource Centre. I ask that this be taken in to consideration when determining what rail stations are required and their location, including whether stations should be closed.

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:

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:

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

Q27 comments:

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

Q28 comments:

### **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:

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:



## **Rolling stock**

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

Q31 comments:

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

Q32 comments:

## **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:

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:

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

Q35 comments:

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

Q36 comments:

## **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:

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:

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:

#### **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: