

# **TAY ESTUARY RAIL STUDY**

## **Planning Objectives and Appraisal Framework**

### **Working Paper A**

**October 2002**

Prepared for:

Dundee City Council  
Tayside House  
Crichton Street  
DUNDEE  
DD1 3RB

Prepared by:

Steer Davies Gleave  
Reception House  
Lansdowne Crescent  
Edinburgh  
EH12 5EH

[t] +(44) 131 535 1101  
[i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

## Introduction

- 1.1 Great emphasis is placed in STAG (Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance) on the derivation of planning objectives to support any transport planning exercise. There are many reasons for devoting proper attention to planning objectives but they can be summarised as follows: with properly drafted planning objectives, the planning organisation can be much more confident that the proposals it produces will actually deliver the desired changes.
- 1.2 A brief note was circulated to Steering Group members last month in which a draft set of planning objectives was proposed. At that point, the objectives had been drawn up on the basis of the workshop held in Dundee on August 30<sup>th</sup>. Since then, further information has been gleaned from the on-train surveys and focus groups conducted during September. Comments were also received from Steering Group members on the draft objectives. This note takes those various inputs into account.
- 1.3 The purposes of this note are to provide revised draft planning objectives and to establish the foundations of the appraisal framework which will be used to assess options later in the study. Consultation details are attached to this working paper.

## Planning objectives

### *Planning objective (PO) 1 – accessibility*

- 1.4 The strongest message from all our information-gathering was that, at present, rail does not facilitate as many desired journeys as it might. This is for a number of reasons – cost, frequency, times of last trains, lack of integration with bus, location of stations, to give some examples – and it has a number of undesirable impacts, such as excessive car use, social exclusion of certain groups and the prospect of new development provoking predominantly car-based access trips. There was a general consensus that improvement in this area was the key goal of the Tay Estuary Rail Study.
- 1.5 Accessibility, to be fully understood, has to incorporate both ends of a journey. An individual does not benefit from being within walking distance of a rail station if the trains from it travel to destinations of no value. Accessibility must also encompass all characteristics of the prospective trip: trains at inconvenient times are of no use and, if fares are too high, it does not matter how good the public transport services are.
- 1.6 For these reasons, accessibility measurement can become very complex if some rationalisation is not applied. For the purposes of this study, it is proposed that a number of key locations are identified, and attention then concentrated upon the ease with which they can be reached. The range of locations has been developed by focusing on a spatially-representative sample at different times of the week which will encompass a range of different journey purposes:
- Dundee city centre – a representative point within the inner ring road;
  - A location in west central Dundee - Dundee University;
  - A location in western Dundee - Nine Wells Hospital/Dundee Technology Park;
  - A location east of Dundee – Monifieth;
  - A location in central Perth;

- A location in central St Andrews;
  - A location in Angus - Angus College, Arbroath.
- 1.7 Clearly, there is a risk in concentrating on a finite number of locations: it would be possible to improve access to these specific places without affecting other destinations to any real extent. Thus, this selection should be seen as a proxy for the improvement of general accessibility and options not worked up purely so as to serve these seven points.
- 1.8 To ensure that travel for a range of different journey purposes are addressed within this objective, the analysis will be undertaken for several different time periods during the week. The following are proposed:
- Weekday AM peak;
  - Weekday other;
  - Sunday daytime.
- 1.9 **The objective will be measured by assessing the increase in the numbers of people living within a “representative journey” of these destinations, at the times of day set out above.** The technical approach to defining feasibility would be to set a maximum generalised cost for the trip which could allow for travel time, fare, interchange, waiting and walking. The principal difficulty with this is that values of time will differ: for some communities, the fare will be the major barrier to travel; for others, journey time is decisive. Lesser issues relate to differing views of the unpleasantness of interchange and other non-travel elements of the journey. To avoid these subtleties, we propose the following as a workable proxy.
- 1.10 *A representative journey* has been defined here to consist of:
- A maximum of two public transport stages;
  - A maximum of 10 minutes’ walking or cycling<sup>1</sup> and 10 minutes’ waiting;
  - A total journey time (door-to-door) of 45 minutes.
- 1.11 It will be noted that fare is omitted from this definition. As will be seen, the integration objective (PO4) below is intended to cover this topic.
- 1.12 The representative journey is, like the sample of attractors, not definitive; people will be prepared to travel for longer in many cases. But it is assumed that an increase in this catchment will imply general improvements in journey times to the defined points.
- 1.13 A simple increase in catchments may miss certain areas of greater poverty and lower car ownership, such as in north Dundee. The options will be retained to concentrate on these areas and define separate sub-objectives accordingly.

---

<sup>1</sup> By implication, if cycle access is used, it must be possible either to take the bicycle through to the destination or to lock it securely at a boarding point.

*Planning objective (PO)2 – efficiency and effectiveness of rail operations*

- 1.14 Many comments were made at the workshop and focus groups concerning the limitations of the rail service as it stands. On-train surveys revealed that many people were using Dundee station to “rail-head” for journeys which would, in principle, be feasible without a car leg if stopping services were more convenient. Beneath these observations lies a general view that there is a need for rail to “fulfil its potential” and that, if it does, several positive social developments will result.
- 1.15 It is therefore proposed that this should be encapsulated in the second planning objective. Given that comments related largely to the limited number of stopping services and that this where untapped demand lies, this is the basis of the draft objective.
- 1.16 **The proposed objective is to increase the maximum number of “station-visits” feasible on the section of the network under consideration in the study.** Current stopping patterns in part reflect capacity restrictions further down the line, notably within the Central Belt. Some changes to infrastructure may be necessary to facilitate more stopping services in the vicinity of Dundee and Perth; other gains might be possible through changes to working timetables. This objective makes clear the task of investigating these options. If, as has been suggested, it transpires that the major constraint lies in the peak (or relates to services which would travel through the central Belt in the peak), it may be appropriate to focus this objective specifically on the relevant time period.

*Planning objective (PO)3 – quality of public transport offer*

- 1.17 Much was said at the workshop and focus groups concerning the overall standard of the public transport offer, with particular emphasis on vehicle quality and station environments and with specific mention of personal security, staffing and disabled access.
- 1.18 Most of these attributes are qualitative and even those which can be measured objectively still elicit varying responses dependent on the priorities of the individual involved. For this reason, it is proposed that this planning objective should be tackled by seeking increases in the level of passenger satisfaction with the range of facilities relating to journey-making. The items suggested are:
- Accessibility of stations by all means including walking and cycling and for those with disabilities of any kind;
  - Station environment including security;
  - Train quality and ride quality;
  - Information;
- 1.19 **The planning objective therefore is to deliver significant improvements in passenger satisfaction with the quality of provision.** It is proposed that attention should be concentrated on rail.
- 1.20 This objective must be managed with care because there tends to be an “ambient” level of dissatisfaction on the part of users with regard to facilities such that improvements are absorbed and, in effect, forgotten after a short time.

- 1.21 A panel survey may be the best way to work around this or, if performance must be estimated with accuracy ex ante, interviews could be conducted in which members of the public are asked to compare current conditions with those likely to come about with the implementation of a preferred strategy. This is frequently done in stated preference surveys and may ultimately be the best solution, although at this stage it is felt that existing information (derived from focus groups and other surveys undertaken for this study) will provide useful information.

*Planning objective (PO)4 – integration*

- 1.22 The hard side of integrating services – making buses, cycles and trains combine to provide an increase in the feasible journey catchments – is tackled above under PO1. This fourth planning objective is targeted at the soft side – that of creating the sense that individual public transport services are part of a unified whole. This has a number of features:
- Branding;
  - Shared and through ticketing;
  - Unified travel information.
- 1.23 Fares deserve specific mention. Most comments on fares related not to their absolute levels but to the high cost of making interchange journeys, though the focus groups did reveal some dissatisfaction with the cost of trains for local journeys. Research typically shows that modal shift is not easily achieved through fares reductions despite the significant expense involved. Furthermore, there are serious practical obstacles to achieving reductions in rail fares (given the mechanisms which determine them). For these reasons, it is proposed that fares should be dealt with in the context of multi-stage travel.
- 1.24 Given that this is a rail study, it is inappropriate to aim for all the public transport services in the study area to conform to the target of integration, so it is proposed to focus on bus services which do or could connect with rail.
- 1.25 The chapter in STAG on integration establishes two categories of achievement in service provision under the sub-objective of transport integration (the infrastructure aspect having been dealt with under PO3):
- Seamless ticketing; and
  - Seamless public transport network.
- 1.26 It is suggested that the second of these should form the basis of the fourth planning objective, with **the criterion being that passengers feel when travelling on the relevant bus or rail services that they are integrated by design**. The precise measures for this are to be refined. At this point it is proposed that some “seamlessness” criteria be defined for information provision, timetabling, ticket availability, multi-stage tickets, marketing and branding.

**Targets**

- 1.27 It is not appropriate at this stage to discuss targets to associate with the planning objectives. It is necessary first to obtain consensus amongst key stakeholders that the planning objectives as proposed are the right ones. Subsequent to this, it will be

appropriate to seek a measure of the baseline – how the transport network is currently performing – before discussing what targets might be desirable and realistic given the likely funding available and the relative importance of each of the planning objectives.

### **Appraisal framework**

- 1.28 The immediate goal is a STAG Part 1 appraisal. The framework for this is given in the guidance document, the only study-specific constituent being the planning objectives which have been discussed above. For performance against planning objectives, some indications of likely method have been discussed above. It is proposed that GIS-based analysis be used to gauge options' performance against PO1 (accessibility). Some form of capacity modelling will be necessary for PO2 (efficiency and effectiveness of rail). Measurement for PO3 (quality) will be based at this stage on an assessment of the existing (recently collected) public survey and interview data and the seamlessness thresholds will be devised to allow options to be graded against PO4 (integration).
- 1.29 In addition to performance against planning objectives and some general contextual information, a STAG Part 1 requires assessment of "implementability", as follows:
- transport land use integration – a preliminary appraisal of the proposal's fit with established land use policy and environmental designations at a local and, where appropriate, a national level;
  - policy integration – a preliminary appraisal of a proposal's fit with wider local and, where appropriate, national policy measures;
  - distributional impacts – a preliminary assessment of which spatial, socio-economic or user groups benefit from, or are impacted upon, by the proposal;
  - technical feasibility – a preliminary assessment of the feasibility of construction or implementation (if relevant) of a proposal and the status of its technology (e.g. proven, prototype, in development etc.);
  - operational feasibility – who would operate the proposal, including, if relevant, their statutory powers to operate a proposal and any other issues; which may impact on the operation of a proposal;
  - technical risks – any cost, timescale or deliverability risks associated with the construction and/or operation of a proposal;
  - other risks – any other risks that should be considered. These include risks associated with the planning process (e.g. a need to obtain statutory powers before implementation);
  - affordability – the financing burden on the promoting authority and other possible funding organisations;
  - financial sustainability – a proposal's on-going operating or maintenance costs and its likely operating revenues (if applicable);
  - public acceptability – the likely public response to a proposal. Supporting evidence, for example results from a consultation exercise, should be provided where appropriate.
- 1.30 It will be sufficient to produce a qualitative assessment of proposals' performance against these criteria. If major schemes are proposed later in the study, it will be necessary to carry out fuller investigation of any feasibility concerns. The final part of STAG Part 1 is a preliminary assessment of a proposal's likely performance against

the Government's five objectives: environment, safety, economy, integration and accessibility. This can be carried out quite approximately at this stage so no additional research will be required.

## CONTROL SHEET

Project/Proposal Name: TAY ESTUARY RAIL STUDY

Document Title: Planning Objectives and Appraisal Framework

Client Contract/Project Number:

SDG Project/Proposal Number: 204976

Document Number: See footer

Originator: TXC

Other Contributors: APB / APH / LMM

Review By: Print: APB

Sign: Signed remotely

## ISSUE HISTORY

Issue No.	Date	Details
2	18/10/02	Second version
3	21/11/02	Third version
4	31/07/03	Final version with appendix

## DISTRIBUTION

Clients: Steering group

Steer Davies Gleave/Babtie: Internal



Date	<b>27 June 2003</b>		
Circulation	<b>Client Group</b>		
Project Name	<b>Tay Estuary Rail Study</b>	Project/Ref no.	<b>204976</b>
Subject	<b>Addendum to Working Note A - Stakeholder Consultation</b>		

## **1. TAY ESTUARY RAIL STUDY CONSULTATION**

### **Workshops**

- 1.1. Workshops and consultation were undertaken at a very early stage in the project in order to bring together perceptions on the problems, opportunities and issues with respect to rail services in the Tay Estuary area and to contribute to the setting of objectives for the study. The latter in turn creates the framework within which the appraisal sub-headings are cast (working within the STAG).
- 1.2. The study partners and representatives from a range of stakeholder organisations (including transport providers and potential beneficiaries) were invited to a one-day workshop in Dundee. The day involved a number of sessions; some involving the entire group and some with smaller groups in 'break-out' sessions. The aim of the day was two-fold:
  - To provide input into the process of objective-setting for the study. Involving a wide-range of people in the process means that organisations will feel some degree of ownership in the study.
  - To focus more specifically on rail by identifying problems, opportunities and issues.
- 1.3. The format of one of the sessions involved getting delegates to think about the Tay Estuary area in terms of what is good and bad about living and working there. These exercises help to focus people's minds on what the area should aspire to in terms of for example social, economic, and environmental issues. It is from this discussion that objectives for the study emerge. The second type of workshop will be to elicit views on the existing and potential role of rail services in the Tay Estuary area. The discussion was based around thinking more specifically about rail services: what are the good and bad things about rail services at present and what sort of rail service should we be aspiring to provide? This part of the discussion is typically hung around three concepts of problems, opportunities and issues.
  - Problems – what are the problems associated with rail services at the present time?
  - Opportunities – what are the opportunities that exist to provide a service that is supportive of the study objectives?
  - Issues – what are the issues (physical, institutional etc) that stand in the way of realising the opportunities?

- 1.4. The whole day was framed by an introductory session and a concluding session where the study is introduced and the aims for the day made clear and the outcomes from the discussions may be fed back to the group.
- 1.5. Transcripts of the workshop and break-out sessions are attached to this note.

### **Focus Groups**

- 1.6. In addition to the workshops, a series of focus groups were convened with members of the public. The aim of these groups was to encourage rail users and potential rail users to talk about their perceptions of rail services in the area. The discussion was structured so as to get the group to think about the good and bad things about the rail service and the opportunities that exist to make it better. Given the context of this study the discussion focused to some extent on travel into Dundee or within the study area. In particular these groups were aimed at eliciting those factors that discourage people from using rail services and those improvements that would make them use rail services more often.
- 1.7. Five groups of 8-10 people were convened (Perth, Leuchars, Arbroath, Dundee and Carnoustie). The groups comprised a mix of existing rail users and non-users. A summary of key findings is attached to this note.

### **Other Feedback**

- 1.8. A summary of written representations is also attached as an appendix to this note.



Venue	<b>Dundee; Tay Estuary Rail discussion forum</b>		
Date	<b>30th August 2002</b>	Time	
Attendees			
Circulation	<b>All Attendees</b>		
Project Name	<b>Tay Estuary Rail Study</b>	Project/Ref no.	<b>204976</b>
Purpose of Meeting	<b>Establish draft planning objectives for rail in the Tay Estuary area</b>		

- 1 The discussion forum was held on Friday 30<sup>th</sup> August 2002 at ‘Scottish Enterprise Tayside’, Enterprise House, 45 north Lindsay Street, Dundee. The following delegates were in attendance:**

**Andrew Warrington (Perth & Kinross Council)**

**Jim Lee (Travel Dundee)**

**Iain Sherriff (Dundee City Council)**

**Chris Bell (Fife Council)**

**Neil Prentice (Angus Council)**

**George Gammack (Living Streets)**

**Michael Gale (Scottish Enterprise Tayside)**

**Robert Samson (Rail Passengers Committee)**

**Colin Robertson (Angus Council)**

**Ken Armstrong (Tayside University Hospital NHS Trust)**

**Gordon Paterson (Communities Scotland)**

**Graham Esson (Perth & Kinross Council)**

**Ian McConnel (Cyclists Touring Club)**

**Geoff Cook (Railtrack)**

**Colin Forest (Friends of the Earth)**

**Ann Armstrong (Rail Passengers Committee)**

**Iain Jack (Dundee City Council)**

**Paul Kyle (Perth and Kinross Council)**

**Derek Nisbet (Angus Council)**

**Jane Findlay (Fife Council)**

**Derek Fleming (Stagecoach)**

**David Dewar (Angus Access Panel)**

**Representatives of Steer Davies Gleave, and Babbie consultants were in attendance.**

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

**2 The forum opened with an introduction to the study by Iain Sherriff of Dundee City Council who outlined the purpose of the study. The desired outputs were:**

- To obtain a good overview of the key issues for attention
- To formulate draft ‘planning objectives’ for rail in the Tay Estuary area
- To establish an ongoing channel of communication between the interested parties

Tom Cohen, from Steer Davies Gleave Consultants outlined the scope and format of the discussion forum. The forum would discuss strategic as well as specific issues, and consider rail in its ‘widest context’.

The question was raised as to who defined the study area, as there was a concern that it was not wide enough. It was established that the Tay Estuary area was to be regarded as the core study area, and that comment/discussion was not limited to this area.

**3 Break-out sessions were carried out in 3 groups where a discussion of objectives took place, concentrating on the areas of:**

- Accessibility, especially for the socially excluded
- Economic development, especially with regard to regeneration/tourism
- Sustainable travel and reduced use of the car
- Improved safety
- Environmental improvement
- Facilitation of seamless journeys

**4 Second break-out discussions were held in the 3 groups to consider specific problems, issues and opportunities relating to rail. The session concentrated on the following areas:**

- Fixed infrastructure
- Rolling stock
- Services

- Other issues

The records of the issues raised by each break-out group are attached to this meeting note.

**5 A feedback and summing up session was held with all delegates present during which the key issues for attention and objectives for rail in the study area were formalised.**

- **Key issues raised:**

Towns located away from the coastal rail route have little opportunity/incentive to use rail

There is a lack of interchange facilities between rail and other modes

Access to rail out with working/commuting hours is poor

Public transport access to rail is often poor, or car dependant

Stations are in non-ideal locations and provide poor quality facilities

Fare levels exclude some people and may be structured to regulate demand

Durations of rail journeys are often prohibitive for commuting

There is a conflict between local and inter-city journey objectives

Rail has a part to play in economic development and tourism, and in congestion reduction

Infrastructure of rail lines limits speeds and rolling stock which can be used.

Rolling stock is inflexible, but of a generally good standard

Level of service provision is over-regulated and inconsistently funded

Subsidies to rail industry are not competitive with other modes

Opportunities exist to improve information provision and marketing of rail

- **Draft planning objectives**

*Accessibility*

- Fit of Public Transport with desire lines – current and future (desire lines include time of travel)
- Access to key destinations (employment, health, peripheral areas, etc)
- Access ‘beyond office hours’

*Sustainable Development*

- Public Transport planned to fit with locations
- Sustainable development (environmental and economic) enabled through service-planning

*Effectiveness*

- Enhance effectiveness for the rail network
- Offer efficient rail service to enhance quality of life and manage car use

*Rail Market*

- Depth of Penetration (locations and technology e.g. LRT)

*Integration*

- Multi modal integration

*Journey Quality*

- Improving whole offer (inc. personal security)

**Appendixes of issues raised by each of the 3 groups during the breakout sessions are attached.**



Venue **Dundee (Breakout Group 1)**

Date **3 September 2002** Time **10:50**

Attendees **Andrew Warrington (Perth & Kinross Council)**  
**Jim Lee (Travel Dundee)**  
**Iain Sherriff (Dundee City Council)**  
**Chris Bell (Fife Council)**  
**Neil Prentice (Angus Council)**  
**George Gammack (Living Streets)**  
**Michael Gale (Scottish Enterprise Tayside)**  
**Robert Samson (Rail Passengers Committee)**

Circulation

Project Name **Tat Estuary Rail Study** Project/Ref no. **204976**

Purpose of Meeting **Discussion Forum**

## **First Workshop:**

Discussion of Objectives:

### **1 Accessibility**

Dundee and the coastal strip is well served, but all in-lying towns are not well connected.

Current interchange points exist at Cupar Angus, Markinch, Forfar, Kirriemuir and Blairgowrie, these connect to major towns (Arbroath and Dundee).

Late night accessibility issues - the Arbroath service finishing at 11:00pm was cited as an example.

Access to stations requires a high degree of car ownership, but car ownership levels in many Fife towns is lower (compared to Scottish average), but increasing. Use of buses to access stations is limited due to poor interchange facilities.

Dundee station was felt to be in the wrong place (on the edge of town and too far from the city centre) and of poor quality.

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net [i] www.steerdaviesgleave.com

*Contribution of Rail:* Huge potential for integration of services with other P.T. modes. There is good potential in improving long distance accessibility, but more limited for local accessibility.

## **2 Social Exclusion**

Fares exclude some people – are fares set to ‘price off’ demand? - there has been an extension of higher prices at holiday times, X-mas, etc (the SRA are currently reviewing fares). Consequently rail is not an option for many people. Linespeeds exclude people from rural areas of Fife as it takes 1hr 15mins to Edinburgh is deemed too long. There are too many stopping points on commuter services. There needs to be a clarity of services – are they designed to be local or inter-city.

*Contribution of rail:* Integration can make better use of existing services and through-ticketing will encourage ‘journey-joining’. Real potential exists for reduction of congestion. However fare levels are still a real issue.

## **3 Economic Development**

Rail should assist in Tourism (a mainstay of economic development in the region). St.Andrews is a major tourist destination but is only accessible by bus link from Leuchars station. Congestion is a constraint in high season. Dundee has good potential (leisure - golf, etc)

Working population (esp. middle aged) is falling in Dundee as people move to Perth/Kinross for work. Dundee must retain its ‘vibrancy’ and balance of businesses – but inward investment is required and this depends on transport links. Most business visitors come by car. Call centres are a big industry, but workers travel from surrounding towns which do not have rail access. Low wages/skills reduce the planning gain available.

Property prices are historically low in Dundee, transport links allowing commuting to Edinburgh/Glasgow will improve this.

*Contribution of rail:* Better access to new developments on periphery of city, eg Invergowrie, Western Gateway, Ninewells Hospital and Research Institute.

## **4 Seamless Journeys**

Appropriate timing of journeys – start finish times must be ‘useful’ and designed to interconnect. Interchange must be easy and attractive. There is presently poor provision of bus services to stations, with bus operators *actively avoiding* connecting to stations as they do not see rail travellers as their market. Car parking needs to be provided at stations. Access to city centres must be provided, perhaps by (free?) shuttle busses. Perhaps car parking in Dundee is too easy/cheap?



*Contribution of rail:* Can provide mode choice and a reduction in car use, but this requires improved accessibility and interchange. There must be an incentive to use the train, eg. Financial, time saving, or convenience.

*Key outcomes:* Rail must provide improved access

- To Central Dundee
- To Employment nodes
- To Health, education, tourist centres
- To the 24-Hour economy
- ‘Beyond office hours’.

Rail must facilitate sustainable development (economic and environmental) through effective planning of services.

Rail can assist in managing car use, and enhance quality of life.

## **Second workshop**

Problems, opportunities and issues.

### **1 Fixed infrastructure**

*Problems:* The Tay Bridge limits operating speed, and operates as ‘single track’ due to on-bridge restrictions. The line north of the bridge steers all traffic into Dundee (away from Perth). There is limited penetration of rail away from the coast. Capacity blockage due to single-track section at Montrose. These factors limit efficiency.

Quality of station infrastructure is poor (£140m is being spent over the next few years in Arbroath, Dundee and Montrose on information systems, CCTV etc). Security is poor. Parking provision is inadequate, especially at Broughty Ferry, Dundee, and Carnoustie.

Provision of stations: there are no stations between Dundee and Perth. Dundee station is too peripheral (station in centre of Dundee was closed in the 1970’s). Protection of listed buildings and preservation may limit line re-opening.

*Issues:* Platform length is inadequate – limits train extension. Access to funds is through a complicated bidding process.

*Opportunities:* New Stations or halts at Erroll, Dundee Airport, and Bridge of Earn. Greater utilisation of rail, possibly through light-rail vehicles and trams linking to city centres.

Access for all modes to stations.

Funding through franchising.

### **2 Rolling stock**

*Problems:* There is a perception of: Low quality stock, overcrowded at times. Inflexible utilisation between peak and off peak. Long lead times for introduction of new stock. Lack of investment in new stock. Competition legislation stifles investment. However Scot Rail rolling stock has improved recently and is now pretty good.

*Opportunities:* Investment in new/higher technology rolling stock. Management of stock and servicing locations could be improved.

### **3 Services**

*Problems:* Intercity vs Local; at present both services share common timetables. Lack of market response and monitoring of demand utilisation. Over regulation: Timetables are constrained by Public Service Requirement (PSR). A penalising performance

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

regime potentially fines changes in services, or new services which could be beneficial. Low subsidy levels for some routes, and over subsidisation on others.

*Opportunities:* Extended franchise period would allow longer term planning – ‘full-length’ franchising. Clearer definition of rail’s role – perhaps limited to long distance only, then only competing with air services.

#### **4 Other issues**

*Problems:* Fares – greater subsidy would increase demand. Integration of buses with rail needs to be improved. Pricing – bus fares have fallen in real terms. Track speed limits are still restrictive.

*Issues:* Real-time information. Marketing and special offers. Concessionary fares on local trips. Subsidy/investment in other modes – unfair competition?

*Opportunities:* Transport is high on the political agenda at present, so there is an opportunity for change. But how long will this last? How deep is government commitment?

Venue	<b>Dundee (Breakout Group 2)</b>		
Date	<b>30 August 2002</b>	Time	<b>10:50</b>
Attendees	<b>Colin Robertson (Angus Council)</b> <b>Ken Armstrong (Tayside University Hospital NHS Trust)</b> <b>Gordon Paterson (Communities Scotland)</b> <b>Graham Esson (Perth &amp; Kinross Council)</b> <b>Ian McConnel (Cyclists' Touring Club)</b>		
Circulation	<b>All Attendees</b>		
Project Name	<b>Tay Estuary Rail Study</b>	Project/Ref no.	<b>204976</b>
Purpose of Meeting	<b>Discussion Forum – Workshop 2 Notes</b>		

Please see following pages for notes.

Date	<b>10 September 2002</b>		
Circulation	<b>William Mykura, APH, TXC, LMM</b>		
Project Name	<b>Tay Estuary Rail Study</b>	Project/Ref no.	<b>204976</b>
Subject	<b>Workshop 2 Notes</b>		

## 1. FIRST BREAKOUT

### **Accessibility for the socially excluded**

This is an issue relating to rural accessibility and urban residents with poor links to the city centre. This includes those with high car ownership in rural areas (no other choice) and low car ownership urban areas.

Places mentioned included Angus – rural areas around Montrose/Brechin, and Arbroath. Fife – Levensmouth (?), Glenrothes. Dundee – those with poor links to the city centre.

The role of rail is restricted due to its alignment characteristic of passing through the more affluent areas.

Therefore impacts through rail are dependent on bus/cycle access to stations. Relationship of attracting inward investment through good transport links and providing access to jobs for those currently socially excluded.

*Improved accessibility is vital for the whole study area, not just those socially excluded.*

### **Economic Development**

The support and promotion of economic development is important both in urban centres and beyond, such as the western area of Dundee (Nine Wells, Invergowrie etc). Overarching need is to address perception of ‘remoteness’ and make the area attractive both to live and to invest in. Wish to be able to make ‘sales pitch’ to potential investors of a labour market of X thousand within a half hour road and rail catchment. Currently people focus on the population of Dundee, which is not that significant.

The A92/Tay Bridge are showing that problems are developing. Rail can address them, both for freight movements and long distance and local passenger trips.

Rail is also viewed as being able to play a significant role in providing transport for the myriad Golf Championships. Currently heavily road focused, either private car or coaches.

Rail measures need to be accompanied by development of a complete network of PT links (and walk and cycle). At trip origins, often more rural areas, require car parking and secure cycle storage. At destination station often need onward bus links, stations are not usually located within walking distance of employment sites.

### **Sustainability**

Congestion is not a pressing problem at the moment, but is acknowledged that it will become worse. There was a 5 mile tailback the other day into Dundee and following the closure of the Tay Bridge following an incident the equivalent of 20 years of traffic growth took place in a day (Perth & Kinross).

There is peak period congestion in urban areas and also at weekends related to retail trips around Kingsway.

Future development opportunities may be limited by the constraint of the capacity of the trunk roads.

### **Reducing Travel**

The issue is more about reducing car/road travel. Links in with sustainability measures. More rail opportunities will lead to more travel. Need to integrate land use planning, to reduce trips need to provide shops/jobs near to residential areas.

### **Safety**

The A92 has a poor road safety record. There is the perception of poor personal security on PT, poor quality of Dundee station.

Rail improvements can play a part – measures for the rail stations and their wider environment (access routes, car parking, provision of CCTV).

### **Environment**

Problems and issues associated with the environment are not top of people's agendas. There are moderate/limited problems related to road transport (e.g. noise). Traffic problems only really in Dundee. Wish to avoid future environmental problems.

Local air quality issue related to the tunnel at Dundee station and the fumes produced by the GNER/Virgin 125s.

Rail could play a role in preventing the build up of local problems through modal shift, though likely to have a limited impact. Rail proposals could have localised negative effects due to the introduction of halts in rural areas etc.

Environment objectives closely allied with reducing car travel and sustainability aims.

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

### **Facilitation of seamless journeys**

This objective relies completely on the dependencies of rail with other interventions. All about integration with other modes, thru-ticketing/travelcards, cycle carriages, provision of information.

### **Priority Objectives**

The conclusion of the session was that the objectives were closely related and could be integrated under an overarching objective for the study –

Improved accessibility for all – achieved through the provision of seamless journeys and improved safety and personal security for rail travellers. In doing so economic development will be promoted and there will be environmental benefits (result of greater sustainability and reduced car use).

## **2. SECOND BREAKOUT**

### **Station Environment**

#### *Problems*

- Railtrack does not look after the facilities which have been invested in
- Poor state of repair and lack of cleanliness of stations
- Lack of modern appearance, modern facilities at stations
- Lack of staff – both unstaffed stations, and staffing only during peak periods
- Poor disabled access – no disabled access across rail line at Montrose
- General image of stations is poor

#### *Opportunities*

- Should aspire to better station facilities, rather than accept current status or just slightly improve it, should start with what a station should be like, then address issue of getting stations up to that quality.
- The reopening of closed stations, e.g. Errol and opening of new stations or halts e.g. Wormit.

#### *Issues*

The study should make use of the existing work undertaken on station audits e.g. Angus. Should focus on quality of facilities, not just whether they are present. Three elements:

Interchange (CP/P&R/Cyc/bus)

Facilities (waiting rooms, ticket hall, platforms)

Operations (cleaning, customer care)

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

## **Travelling**

### *Problems*

- 2 bicycles only (dependent on train)
- Sardine packing on some trains (concerns over safety, comparison with regulations over coach capacity)
- Infrastructure – east of Dundee capacity, express trains don't wish to slow, no passing loops for local trains to pull into.

### *Opportunities*

- Montrose to Bridge of Dun to provide link to Brechin (currently historic railway)
- Link to St Andrews and beyond

## **Services**

### *Problems*

- Services are focused upon long distance travel
- Lack of service frequency
- Stopping patterns
- Limited travel opportunities, e.g. from Carnoustie, can't go direct from Fife to Perth
- In order to permit any new stops, other stops have to be removed from services

### *Opportunities*

- Overlay services to provide more trains
- With a higher service frequency at stations it could justify the staffing of stations

## **Other**

### *Opportunities*

- LRT network, extend the network and run LRT either on the new sections or inter-run across the whole area with intercity trains
- West of Dundee/Invergowrie – link or halt to integrate land use with transport provision
- More automatic ticket machines to alleviate problems of ticket office queues and delays
- Sale of tickets off-station, in shops and on trains (currently cannot get discounted tickets onboard trains)
- Simplify the fare structure

### *Issues*

- Bus vs Rail competition along the shore line corridors. Will they cooperate when in competition?
- Issue of Competition Act and introducing cross-operator thru-ticketing.

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)



- Is it worth promoting rail for short station to station trips? Or is bus better? – depends if centre to centre trips or need bus connection at either end.

### **Most Pressing Priority**

Again there was a realisation of the strong interrelationship of problems. Two key areas however emerged which were of highest priority.

- Fundamental problem is timetabling and the issue of enabling return journeys to be made when people want to make them. The priority is to have a timetable which is designed for the study area and not one which is the outcome of meeting the timetabling needs of Edinburgh/Glasgow etc.
- Station environment – need for improvement in their state of repair, cleanliness, in the access for disabled users, and for interchange with bus/cycle/walking and other modes.

### **Tay Estuary Rail Study (30/8/02 Dundee)**

#### Introduction (Initial issues/concerns of attendees)

- Cycle carriage trains/cycle access to stations
- New development
- Potential to aid economic development
- Sustainability and travel options
- Connection of rail with development

#### Objectives

- Geographic
  - Areas
  - People
  - Journey time
- Role of Rail
- Other interventions

## **1. Social Exclusion**

- Angus
  - Rural accessibility
  - Arbroath high proportion of low income/requires economic assistance
  - Bridge of Dunn rail line – Brechin/Montrose
- Fife

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

- Rural deprivation – inward investment attached to rail improvement
  - Cupar-east ??? looks to Cupar
  - St Andrews rail link/rail halts
- Dundee
  - Deprived population away from rail line
  - Access to rail improved
  - Inward investment raise economy of area as a whole

#### Accessibility

- The central belt
- For Tay area – accessibility main aim over congestion

#### Cycle network

- Connects reasonably well with national cycle network – opportunity to improve facilities
- 

### 2. Economic Development

- Railway stations locations not necessarily in best location for jobs/employment areas
- General lift to economy of area by improving the accessibility in the area
  - getting to the area and travelling within the area
- Inward investment
  - Improve number of people within an area available to a business i.e. size of workforce within a 30 minute travel to work area
- Local movements
  - Rail not answer in isolation
  - Provide network of public transport links
  - Provide Park & Ride in rural locations
  - Bus links crucial to access in urban areas

### 3. Sustainability

- Starting to look at light rail
  - Use heavy rail lines and can then use some of lines to access other areas
- Future congestion
  - Reaching capacity on roads at present
  - Currently development constraint in Dundee

### 4. Reduce need to travel

- Not a particular objective of this study

## **5. Improved safety**

- By-product by reducing road traffic (Rail safer than road)
- Personal security/safety/CCTV at stations, safe to park car
- Level of safety/security important at stations – people must feel safe to use rail, otherwise will continue to use cars
- Dundee station – poor safety and condition, other stations not particularly good

## **6. Environmental Improvements**

- Will be a benefit, but not a main driving aim
- Infrastructure can improve visual environment

## **7. Seamless Journey**

- Cyclists – need to tie in to rail
- Extremely important to consider whole journey, given location of stations and to connect to local community
- Through ticketing
- Creation of seamless journey - strong link with sustainable transport
- Safety/personal security is important
- Accessibility

### **Summary**

- Reduce car journeys
- Improve accessibility and encourage economic development by providing a seamless journey and improving personal safety/security

## **GROUP 2 – SECOND WORKSHOP**

### **Station Environment**

#### *Problems*

- Maintenance and Cleaning of all sections (repairs, maintenance, cleaning). Waste of Capital as it's not maintained
- Maintenance and cleaning can knock on to safety
- Safety – unmanned stations cause problems
- General lack of quality and facilities
- Montrose – no access across the rail line
- Waiting environment

#### *Opportunities*

- Staffing – many stations unstaffed
- Fundamental perception that it's OK for Railtrack to provide poor Victorian facilities
- Interchange – car parking/pedestrian/cycling/buses
- Should set aspiration for all stations, not start from what is there at present i.e. all stations should be easily accessed by disabled
- Journey should be considered i.e. views along the track as you are journeying through

### **Travelling Experience**

- Increase cycle carriage – currently only 2 cycles per train? may vary by type of train
- No problems with overcrowding

### **Other**

- Services not there at a time of day required and not at the frequency required
- Light rail a possibility?
- More trains, not existing trains stopping at more stations
- Lack of station loops and side platforms to allow local trains to be passed by express trains
- St Andrews link
- Montrose – Brechin link
- Automatic Ticketing

### **Priorities**

- Journeys at the correct time of day and at good frequency
- Station Environment
  - Interchange/accessibility by other modes of transport
  - Maintenance/cleanliness

**Reception House 21 Lansdowne Crescent Edinburgh EH12 5EH**

[t] +44 (0)131-535 1101 [f] +44 (0)131-346 0164 [e] [edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:edinburghinfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)



Venue	<b>Dundee (Breakout Group 3)</b>		
Date	<b>3 September 2002</b>	Time	<b>10:50</b>
Attendees	<b>Geoff Cook (Railtrack)</b> <b>Colin Forest (Friends of the Earth)</b> <b>Ann Armstrong (Rail Passengers Committee)</b> <b>Iain Jack (Dundee City Council)</b> <b>Paul Kyle (Perth and Kinross Council)</b> <b>Derek Nisbet (Angus Council)</b> <b>Jame Findlay (Fife Council)</b> <b>Derek Fleming (Stagecoach)</b> <b>David Dewar (Angus Access Panel)</b>		
Project Name		Project/Ref no.	<b>204976</b>

## **1. Preliminaries**

GC felt that rail had the potential to carry a lot more passengers in the area. There are capacity constraints but a feeling that the area underperforms.

CF wanted rail to take cars off the road.

AA felt that the social inclusion and economic regeneration potential were particularly important.

IJ commented on the huge capacity of rail to cater for local travel needs.

DN referred to the poor timing of services and that his perception of rail was costly in comparison to bus and car.

PK wanted rail to consider railfreight facilities in Perth and also cater for travel into Perth.

JF wanted access for all.

DF saw integration between bus and rail as the key.

DD wanted to see improved facilities for disabled people.

In early discussions the following points came up:

- convenience, comfort and cost are the three factors that rail must offer
- car parking is relatively cheap in Dundee
- reliability of journey time is important
- there is a need for more frequent levels of service particularly at those stations where it is very low
- the location of Dundee station vis a vis the bus station is an issue for integration
- the speed and reliability of rail services as not too bad

## **2. Discussion of Objectives**

- i Access for socially excluded

Dundee City centre is not accessible in the sense that there is no link up between bus and rail.

40% of Dundee population (households?) have no car and therefore have accessibility problems.

Accessing rail from the hinterland, particularly rural, is an issue.

It affects certain journey purposes, evening leisure trips (due to lack of late train out of Dundee).

Potentially also education trips.

Dundee and Glenrothes are main employment areas and the offer of commuting service is poor.

Rail cannot improve accessibility on its own – there must be integration between modes.

ii **Economic development/regeneration**

Good rail links are a way of selling a place for inward investment. This is an issue for Perth. Wider transport links needed to make a place attractive. Need good links to Glasgow and Edinburgh as well as Central Belt.

Investment locations are currently sold on the basis of road links.

Poor links to airports exacerbates the problem. Edinburgh airport is more relevant to Tayside and it has poor rail links.

Ninewells hospital is a regional health facility and has poor access from beyond Dundee. Problems of massive car parking overspill into residential streets.

Park and ride is not strong offer at present although this is being addressed to some extent in Angus through the PTF bid.

Tourism links with St Andrews were raised. People fly into Edinburgh and have no choice but to drive.

Dundee City centre has been improved but the environment around the station provides something of an unattractive barrier to people visiting Dundee.

Rail does have a role to play but it needs direct links to the airports and better bus links with its hinterland.

**3. More Sustainable Travel**

Feeling that transport in the area has the potential to become less sustainable. Car ownership is currently low but could increase. Rail service levels are poor but rail has great potential in the coastal corridor where the population is focused.

There needs to be a local service in the area to cater for local needs not just an express service.

**4. Reduced Need to Travel**

No discussion

**5. Safety/Security**

The dualling of the A92 was in part justified through safety benefits.

At Ninewells the chronic parking problems potentially create a road safety issue.

Personal security could be addressed through CCTV as is being rolled out throughout Fife.

Safety is a concern on the railway itself in terms of trespassing. Angus is looking at the quality of bridge parapets with Railtrack.

## **6. Environmental Improvement**

The car parking problems at Ninewells create an environmental problem.

Traffic problems have become worse in Dundee and there are problems of bus emissions which occur where there are plans to convert buildings to city centre apartments.

## **7. Seamless Journeys**

In Dundee the split between the bus and rail stations is a real problem. Perth has this problem to some extent.

Park and ride in Perth is constraint although the new park and ride gives an opportunity to access Perth stats or by bus.

The discussion foundered somewhat as delegates tried to identify the four most important objectives.

Instead we encouraged people to identify the extent to which rail could make a difference (high medium low).

- a. Accessibility
- b. Economic development/regeneration
- c. Sustainable travel
- d. Reduced need to travel
- e. Safety/security
- f. Environmental improvements
- g. Seamless journeys

## **Workshop 2**

### **i Problems**

No level access on Northbound platform at Montrose.

Services are half-hourly but not regular interval.

The single track section Arbroath-Montrose is one of the most significant constraints at Inter Urban rail travel.

Non-standard calling pattern.

End to end journey time concerns to the detriment of local stops.

Lack of secure cycle storage at many stations.

Need for safer routes to stations for locals and visitors accessing coastal pathways.

Limited parking at Arbroath although DDA issue well covered.

No targeted commuter services or services at times when people want to use them.

Poor quality (almost minimal) facilities at Barry Links and Golf Street.

Lack of road congestion in the area does little to encourage use of car alternatives.

Very much split opinion on the quality of Dundee station.

Plus points are that its sub-surface location offers same protection from the elements but the concourse and the bridge walkway are not great.

Personal security problems using the walkway to town centre in evening/late at night.

The narrow lift is a problem for wide wheelchair users.

Safety at unmanned level crossings between Dundee and Perth.

Perth station is a “barn” which is much bigger than its current train movements require.

Car parking at Perth station is very constrained and deters park and ride.

Line speeds an issue in Fife but tilting trains the only feasible solution.



## **ii Opportunities**

Bus station in Arbroath is well located so potential for bus/rail integration.

Carnoustie and Broughty Ferry have sizeable population and good potential for commuting journeys.

Better ticketing and joint ticketing (bus/rail, car park/rail).

Waterfront redevelopment in Dundee an opportunity to consider a quality bus facility integrating with the station.

New station at Wormit is well supported by local people for travel south and into Dundee.

Opportunity to take a good look at the mix of local and longer distance services.

Leuchars represents a good opportunity to capture traffic from NE Fife heading into Dundee. Good bus links from St Andrews calling at Leuchars stations.

New station opportunities at Newburgh and Bridge of Earn on the South Tayside route from Ladybank to Perth.

Rail link from Brechin to Dundee.

## **iii Issues**

Lack of real road congestion and plentiful cheap parking in Dundee makes rail relatively unattractive.

Weight limit on bridge adjacent to Dundee station currently prevents buses directly calling at station.

Rail is perhaps perceived as expensive although in fact in real terms it is probably cheaper than 10 years ago. Need to tackle public opinion.



Date	17 January 2003		
Circulation	Tay Estuary Rail Study Steering Group		
Project Name	Tay Estuary Rail Study	Project/Ref no.	204976
Subject	Consultation Feedback		

## 1. LETTERS

**Sent by:** Councillor Andrew Arbuckle of Fife Council  
**Title:** Provision of railway services in north east Fife.  
**Summary:** There is an obvious gap in the Taybridgehead area (Tayport, Newport, Wormit and Gauldry) and in the northwest of Fife (Newburgh, Auchtermuchty, Abernethy and Bridge of Earn. He also mentions that there is a strong case for the re-establishment of a rail facility in the Wormit area and on the Ladybank/Perth railway line.  
**Letter copied to:** Mr George Buchanan, the proprietor of Abbey Inn in East Port, Newburgh and organiser of a petition for the re-establishment of a railway station in Newburgh.

**Sent by:** Councillor Bob Scott JP, Convener of roads, transport and architectural services at Perth and Kinross Council.  
**Summary:** He mentions that the Perth to Dundee service adequate but a half hourly service would be more beneficial, and it is suggested that the hourly service could remain on Inter-City trains with a local service on the half hour. New housing developments at Errol or a new air terminal would highlight the need to re-open Errol station and as a result the on-going role of Invergowrie could then be evaluated. He identifies that a local service could operate from Montrose to Perth, South to Dunblane or North to Pitlochry. He also fully supports the study which Perth and Kinross are about to commence, into an integrated rail/bus interchange for Perth. He believes that through ticketing must be developed faster and that the top priority for Perth and Kinross must be improvements to the Ladybank line (Perth-Edinburgh).

**Sent by:** Councillor Peter L Mulheron JP of Perth and Kinross Council.  
**Summary:** His prime concern is the Carse of Gowrie and that the residents of this area have no other option than to travel into the already almost gridlocked railheads of Perth and Dundee in order to access rail travel. He believes that a rail head should be located in the Carse area enabling local traffic to stay local.

**Sent by:** Councillor Dr John Hulbert, JP of Perth and Kinross Council (Central Carse of Gowrie Ward).  
**Summary:** Errol seems particularly suitable for re-opening as a commuter stop with park and ride facilities. The station is at the centre of the Carse of Gowrie, at the edge of the growing village of Errol, and there is enough land for a large carpark. The other point made was that long distance trains are run using trains more fit for short commuting journeys, they are old and often overcrowded.

**Sent by:** Simon A. Hickman, Development Officer for Caledonian Railway (Breachin) Ltd.  
**Title:** Report on the trackbed from Bridge of Dun station to Hillside, Angus.  
**Summary:** The report looks at the physical condition and obstacles to reinstating a railway line from Bridge of

Dun towards Montrose. The report also includes a section on the possible benefits of a reopened railway from Brechin to Montrose.

**Sent by:** C Mullen of Strathtay Scottish Omnibuses Limited. **Summary:** Concludes “the main issue we would like you to bear in mind is that my company operates a very successful bus service between Montrose, Arbroath and Dundee. So successful in fact that the former train service was effectively withdrawn due to lack of custom.”

**Sent by:** AS Jamieson, Senior Development Executive, Scottish Enterprise Fife. **Summary:** the re-instatement of the direct rail connection to St Andrews should be viewed as a possible long-term goal, subject to detailed assessment. More pragmatic views within the TMP would suggest that in the short to medium term there are a number of measures which could be considered, from “soft” measures such as ticketing to improved interchange facilities and bus transfer.

**Sent by:** Douglas Ritchie, Chief Executive Perthshire Tourist Board. **Summary:** Railways must be welcoming and customer friendly. Perth stations must be upgraded (including operating hours of travel centre). “Before anyone gets carried away with reinstating lines to St Andrews, Brechin or wherever, it may be more appropriate and more cost effective to look at ways of improving facilities and increasing passenger loads on existing lines”. Rail improvements should consider housing expansion areas outside Perth including St Madoes, Luncarty and Stanley as well as Errol or Auchterarder. Improvements to service between Perth and Edinburgh are a priority (frequency and train length). Direct rail link from Forth Bridge to Edinburgh airport would be of major benefit. Improvements to existing rail infrastructure should be priority rather than “romantic schemes to create new lines”.

**Sent by:** Councillor MDA Scott-Hayward **Summary:** has frequently advocated the reinstatement of the St Andrews Leuchar line, but with a slip towards Cupar as a direct link to Edinburgh is far more important than to Dundee or Aberdeen.

**Sent by:** David Carter, Abdie and Dunbog Community Council **Summary:** Newburgh Station should be reopened, could be done much more simply than the reinstated St Andrews link, although that also is attractive.

**Sent by:** Bill Ure, Rail Passengers’ Committee Scotland **Summary:** To note that a study has been undertaken by the RPC(S) to examine alternative for Scottish Intercity Services and to propose a meeting to investigate the areas of mutual interest.[NOTE: meeting undertaken in December 2002)

**Sent by:** Jim Irons, Perth & Kinross Council **Summary:** Committee Report and correspondence with Annabelle Ewing MP and Scotrail re Greenloaning station reopening for information.

**Sent by:** Philip G Hutchinson, Royal Borough of Cupar and District Community Council **Summary:** To pass on appreciation of benefits of expanded Autumn 2002 Virgin CrossCountry Timetable (with 5 extra services stopping at Cupar) In principle, also fully support restoration of rail service to St Andrews (particularly given summer congestion in town centre for St

Andrews-related traffic) and to station at Wormit (although recognising the challenges that this brings).

**Sent by:** Jim Irons, Perth & Kinross Council **Summary:** Committee Report and correspondence with Annabelle Ewing MP and Scotrail re Greenloaning station reopening for information.

## **2. E-MAILS**

**Sent by:** Cllr Jack Bradie, Fife Council, Kettle Ceres and Springfield Ward.

Comments as follows

1. NOT ENOUGH SERVICES FROM LADYBANK TO PERTH
2. Timetable and fare information difficult to access
3. Lack of car parking facilities especially at rural stations eg Springfield
4. Lack of integrated transport system if car not being used

**Sent by:** James Page, Fife Independent Disability Network, transport spokesperson

**ACCESSIBILITY** - what does this mean, and how much of the existing set-up is fully accessible? For the 5% of disabled people who use manual wheelchairs this means no steeper inclines than 1 in 12, no stairs, lifts that can accommodate the largest chair and ramps from platform into every train available throughout the day at every station. Those who use electric wheelchairs or scooters need ramps and spaces in trains large enough to manoeuvre and park. For those with sensory impairments it means that information needs to be available in more than one form.

For those with mobility problems who do not use chairs or scooters it means never having to walk more than 50 metres at a time, eg from train to exit of station, or from one train to another when change is necessary, or from exit of station to nearest bus stop that is in use all the time trains are running.

It should always be remembered that the station is not the end point of a journey, and passengers have to be able to carry on to their next form of transport. Integration of different forms of transport is essential, with no more than 10 minutes waiting time. Leuchars railway station is unique in Fife in having a bus stop right beside it. Do the buses arrive and depart to coincide with trains?

If not, why not? And if they do, when will this facility be available at all other stations?

It would be most useful if consultants would use public transport in order to find out its limitations at first hand. I recommend doing so in the company of a disabled person. Try going from, say, Auchtermuchty or Newburgh to Dundee. Find out the distance in miles and see how long it takes. If the time taken is equivalent to a speed of less than 30 mph, then it is too slow.

Since your office is in Edinburgh, I recommend you take a look at Waverley station. Trains from Fife have a habit of arriving at platform 18. The nearest useful bus stops are either on North Bridge, Princes Street, South St David Street or the Mound, depending on final

**28-32 Upper Ground London SE1 9PD**

[t] +44 (0)20 7919 8500 [f] +44 (0)20 7827 9850 [e] [sdginfo@sdgworld.net](mailto:sdginfo@sdgworld.net) [i] [www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

destination. Measure the distances involved and you may begin to realise what we are up against.

Thank you for your attention, I hope you can achieve some real change in provision of public transport.

James Page Fife Independent Disability Network, transport spokesperson.

**Sent by:** Jane Ann Liston, STARLINK

**Date:** 20 October 2002 14:45 **Comments:** I have heard through the grapevine about the above study which you are carrying out, under the auspices of Dundee City Council and in partnership with other bodies including Fife Council. I am a Fife Councillor who represents St Andrews South East; in a personal capacity I have also been running the STARLINK (St Andrews Rail Link) campaign for 13 years so was very interested to see that St Andrews-Leuchars (although perhaps somewhere else on the main line would be a better junction point; see the FAST study by Scott Wilson, 1999) was included. My own view is that St Andrews needs direct services to Edinburgh and to Arbroath if not all the way to Aberdeen; this last would include Carnoustie, which should be particularly attractive to golfers. I would be grateful if you could keep me, as the STARLINK convenor, informed as to progress.

**Date:** 28 October 2002 23:07 **Comments:** Thank you for your letter, which reassures me that I am now on the circulation list. As I wrote before, my own view is that St Andrews needs direct services south to Edinburgh and north to Arbroath if not all the way to Aberdeen; this last would include Carnoustie, which should be particularly attractive to golfers. I see no reason, for example, why the Orient Express and other luxury trains should not be able to visit St Andrews, especially during the Open, and I am sure they would.

### **3. PHONE CALLS**

**Received from:** Thomas Chadwick, St Andrews Citizen Newspaper (01334) 474464 **Date:** 11/11/02 **Subject:** progress so far. **Action:** Referred to Dundee City Council Press Office.

**Received from:** Chris Ferguson, Courier Newspaper (01241) 872118 **Date:** 6/11/02 **Subject:** Follow up to article last week, is the study looking at the reopening of St Andrews and Brechin lines? **Action:** Referred to Dundee City Council Press Office.

Date	19 September 2002		
Circulation	Tay Estuary Rail Study - Steering Group		
Project Name	Tay Estuary Rail Study	Project/Ref no.	204976
Subject	Key Findings from Public Focus Groups		

#### Highways/Cars

- Traffic levels are increasing into Dundee
- Perception that congestion levels in Dundee exist and are worsening
- Local area issues of traffic management and road safety in towns and villages (affecting in some cases access to rail stations)
- Parking in Dundee perceived as increasingly expensive and hard to understand (vis a vis location/cost of short-term and long-stay parking)

#### Buses

- Routes are circuitous so journey times often unattractive
- Fares are good value (and much cheaper than rail for local journeys and sub-regional journeys)
- Personal safety can be an issue at certain times and locations
- Lack of late evening services to get home from a night out in Dundee

#### Trains

- Quality of train vehicles has improved
- Lack of a late evening service from Glasgow and Edinburgh (currently c21:30)
- Poor PM peak service from Edinburgh to Angus stations
- Lack of a direct link to Edinburgh airport
- Fares expensive for local movements (longer distance fares good value if pre-booked)
- Peak trains can be very overcrowded particularly during school term times
- Service levels have deteriorated at stations between Arbroath and Dundee
- Information provision is patch across the area
- Environment around Dundee station poor (walkways in particular)
- Perth station is confusing – poor signage to platforms and ticket office/information
- Onboard confusion/resentment when pre-reserved tickets are not claimed
- Staffing presence on trains is patch raising issues of security and ticketless travel
- Staffing at stations also inconsistent even at larger stations such as Dundee
- On-board catering is expensive
- Dundee station seen as quite inaccessible (lots of stairs and poor lifts)

28-32 Upper Ground London SE1 9PD

[t] +44 (0)20 7919 8500 [f] +44 (0)20 7827 9850 [e] sdginfo@sdgworld.net [i] www.steerdaviesgleave.com



**Access/Interchange**

- Issues of road safety/crossing near stations (particularly at Leuchars and Broughty Ferry)
- Bus/rail interchange in Dundee very poor – huge support for bus station adjacent to rail station
- Bus/rail links in Arbroath are much better (e.g. London to Carnoustie journey is easier to go through to Arbroath and change to bus than do so in Dundee)
- Perception of fewer taxi operators than in the past
- Problem of cross-boundary taxi journeys (cannot flag down a Dundee cab in Angus or Fife and also some operators reluctant to take cross boundary passengers)
- Need for through ticketing