

**West of England
Joint Scrutiny Committee
5th March 2014**

Member & Public Forum

Notice has been given for the following representations:

Statements

ITEM 1: David Redgewell on the Strategic Economic Plan, MetroWest, Greater Bristol Supported Bus Network, rail resilience and Temple Meads as a transport hub Pages 1 -18

Questions

ITEM 2: Christina Biggs on behalf of Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways on rail matters including Filton Bank stations and Henbury Loop. Pages 19 - 20
Responses to questions at Item 2 Pages 21 - 23

**John Malyckyj
Place & Infrastructure Support Officer**

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

MetroWest, Economic Strategy for Transport and Rail Resilience in the South West of England

The final plans for Phase One of MetroWest are due to be completed later this year and concurrently to work their way through the Network Rail GRIP stages 1 to 9. As of writing, there remain serious questions about some elements of the plan. In particular, the retrenchment over the siting of Portishead station is very concerning as this will undoubtedly have a serious negative impact on future take-up of rail services. We need to know if pressure has been brought to bear on Network Rail and the ORR to look at a "Stop and Proceed" arrangement into the station, similar to the Barnstaple branch. The rail authorities need to be made aware of the detrimental effect of applying over-rigid safety protocol. We understand that £7m for a bridge is unaffordable in the current climate, but we equally need to be assured that the economic and social success of the Portishead project is not jeopardized by "red tape". In addition to optimum siting, the plan must include bus-rail interchange facilities and become the focus for transport in the town.

We have not yet seen evidence of a realistic MetroBus/MetroRail interchange at the proposed Ashton Gate station or integration with the Stadium, though we understand that this is currently out for consultation with the MetroBus plans.

Statement from South West Transport Network for BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb; Bristol full Council on 18 Feb; South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb; Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb; West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known) and Joint Transport Board (date not known)

The current proposed service pattern for the Portishead line still does not include stops at Bedminster or Parson Street which for a headway of 17 minutes end-to-end as against 22 minutes does not seem to be especially critical, especially when set against bus timings and rush-hour car journey timings of an hour or more. There is also the question of integration with the Weston and Taunton line which the current service plan ignores. And finally, it should be pointed out that stopping trains in Bedminster and Parson Street provides gateway access from otherwise ill-served areas of South Bristol.

With the final adoption of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan, it is essential that a clear and defined provision is made for station sites on the Henbury Loop around Henbury, Filton (at North Platform) and Charlton Halt, and protect sites at Hallen and Chittening for future halt/s — which may not be required in the first two phases of the Metro. Park-and-Ride and Bus-Rail interchanges must also be built into the plans to ensure the maximum benefit to the local populace and the greatest uptake of services. In the case of Charlton Hayes, it would be highly beneficial to the development of the emergent community if the building of the station and transport interchanges preceded the construction of the area (in very much the opposite way to how Bradley Stoke was allowed to develop without any public services).

It is also imperative that work is commissioned with Network Rail for extra holding sidings for freight trains around Hallen/Chittening, and to the north of Bristol Parkway.

Statement from South West Transport Network for BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb; Bristol full Council on 18 Feb; South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb; Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb; West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known) and Joint Transport Board (date not known)

The signalling on the Henbury line also needs to be upgraded as part of the Thames Valley Signaling Centre when Bristol signal box is transferred to Didcot.

We welcome the local electrification study of the Greater Bristol Metro and Filton Bank and the proposed new stations at Ashley Down and Horfield/Lockleaze, but this needs to be broadened to ensure that the study encompasses not only EMUs but tram-train operation for Henbury, the Severn Beach Line and Portishead once the 165 units are cascaded.

For future transport strategy, extensions to Taunton, Frome, Westbury, Warminster, Swindon and Gloucester/Cheltenham should be put on the agenda.

Within BaNES the emphasis needs to be on ramps and CCTV at Keynsham, a new station at Saltford, CCTV at Oldfield Park and new stations at Bathampton and Corsham with appropriate bus-rail interchanges and onward links (for instance from Keynsham to Whitchurch, South Bristol Hospital and the proposed Whitchurch Park-and-Ride)

The inclusion of stations at Charfield (for Wotton-under-Edge), Stonehouse Bristol Road (Bristol-Gloucester line) and Royal Wootton Bassett need to be built into neighbouring local authority and LEP economic plans. To this end, we would like to see evidence of this joint working in progress.

Statement from South West Transport Network for BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb; Bristol full Council on 18 Feb; South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb; Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb; West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known) and Joint Transport Board (date not known)

A clear plan for the delivery of new stations and lines needs to be drawn up. With the IEP being constructed through the Bristol area (on a timeplan driven by the DfT and the Welsh Government), timescales for construction or passive provision of local stations and related infrastructure need to be clear and coordinated with the IEP. If this is not done, the local rail project is likely to be marginalized, and therefore difficult and increasingly expensive to achieve.

Intermodal interchanges need to be prioritised at Bristol Temple Meads, Bristol Parkway, Filton Abbey Wood, Lawrence Hill, Clifton Down, Weston-super-Mare, Yatton, Nailsea and Backwell, Bath Spa and Oldfield Park. In the case of Temple Meads, "Intermodal" should include ferry services as well as local and Metro buses. Any new ferry services at Bath or along the Bristol Channel should also be dovetailed into the MetroWest system.

Beyond the major projects, the economic plan needs to take account of the specific requirements of several local areas.

The rural hinterland to Bristol and Bath and within the counties of Somerset and Gloucestershire has transport networks and requirements which are significantly different from the urban areas, and need to be recognized and protected as such to allow access to jobs and services. Two examples would be maintaining bus services south to Wells, Street and Shepton Mallet and north to Dursely and Gloucester because these supply long-distance commuter and leisure services into and out of the city.

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

Tourism is a major determinant in the economic survival of the West Somerset coast and the Quantocks. The West Somerset Railway is an iconic tourist attraction which is currently owned and underwritten by Somerset County Council. In a cost-cutting measure, the Council is proposing to transfer the ownership of the infrastructure to a Railway Society. However, in light of the devastation which recent weather conditions have wrought on virtually every line in the South West (from Reading to Cheltenham to Penzance), there must be serious questions about how a private railway company could manage such an economically unpredictable and uninsurable piece of major infrastructure. This is a coastal line in part and has been washed away in the past. Other parts of the route are also liable to landslip, and there are numerous bridges, any of which is liable to bridge strikes or water damage.

We believe that, if Somerset wishes not to manage this asset, and given the fact we are almost certainly heading into a period of increasingly extreme and unpredictable weather due to climate change, the permanent way and associated infrastructure would be better protected by transferring the assets to Network Rail (who have both the wherewithal and the experience to deal with contingency and emergency planning) with a long-term lease back to the West Somerset PLC.

It should also be pointed out that Somerset County Council have themselves supported a bid through the Heart of the South West Transport Board and LEP to reopen the route to network trains along with the Okehampton line. This would allow for a year-round seven-day a week

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

*service to run through from Bristol/Taunton to Minehead, opening up the
line to serve other economic drivers beyond pure tourism.*

*South Bristol has traditionally been the poor relation in local planning and it
would benefit the area enormously to create a local enterprise zone
centered on Hartcliffe and Filwood hopefully including MetroBus/MetroRail
links to Parson Street, Ashton Gate and Keynsham. A future option which
would also benefit the area would be a Park and Ride facility at Flax
Bourton on the Weston rail line.*

*On the overall strategy we are very concerned that the current plan
displays an over-emphasis on aerospace and related industries, which
may well not remain as major employers in the Greater Bristol city region.
At the same time there appears to be a lack of focus on tourism which is
not only one of the largest employers but also likely to see growth in the
coming decades.*

*Finally, the lack of a combined transport authority for the city region is a
severe hindrance to the delivery of high quality public services and also to
giving local projects the clout and authority they need in the face of
competition from treasury-driven planning and national strategies. When
projects are brought to completion, the lack of an ITA means that
maintenance is not necessarily followed through. Bristol Bus Station, Bath
Bus Station and Cribbs Causeway are all good examples, where the
fracturing of responsibility means that information services, toilets and
cafés tend to be discoordinated rather than integral to the running of the*

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

facility. In all of the transport planning for our region, the lack of a transport authority with real powers is probably the greatest barrier to delivery.

David Redgewell

South West Transport Network

07814 794953

david@west-mail.net

*with support from Rail Futures (Sevenside)
and Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance*

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)
South West Councils (next meeting for information)
Heart of the South West LEP (next meeting for information)*

South West Regional Rail Resilience and Economic Investment Strategy

The recent unprecedented weather patterns in the South West of England, which are the latest manifestation of climate change in Western Europe, have caused considerable, unbudgeted problems for the regional rail network. As of writing, Exeter and the whole of the South West peninsula are completely cut off from the UK rail network. Bristol Temple Meads has become the largest bus station in the region and the Met Office is predicting worse weather to come.

Clearly, these events are unprecedented, but we much accept that such weather patterns will become more frequent, along with other kinds of extreme weather. The problem faced by the rail network in this region is that investment and planning have been given unduly low priorities in comparison to other English regions and that we are now reaping the rewards of underinvestment in any major projects since the Cornish Main Line project, the Falmouth branch improvements and the Exeter to Waterloo upgrade.

The current Intercity Express Project is at heart an upgrade for the London to South Wales main line. Bristol happens to fall along the edge of the route as a major junction and as such will benefit from the works.

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)
South West Councils (next meeting for information)
Heart of the South West LEP (next meeting for information)*

However, Bristol is in reality a South West railway hub and electrification of the local network, as well as the main line to Exeter, Plymouth, Penzance, Gloucester and Cheltenham should be seen as an essential part of the South West Region's economic development.

The lack of investment in the following sections of line is causing major concern and represents a real worry for future development:

- Dawlish sea wall (which needs £100m of new build and was scheduled for Network Rail control period 6 — 2019-24)
- Cowley Bridge near Exeter (raising the track to avoid flooding)
- the Exeter to Cullompton stretch through Hale (again flood prevention)
- Exeter to Yeovil section (needs to be double-tracked as a diversionary route for London and Bristol trains)
- Yeovil to Castle Cary on Weymouth line (needs to be double-tracked for diversionary options)
- Taunton to Bridgwater, Highbridge and Weston-super-Mare over the low-lying western edge of the Somerset Levels (track needs to be raised)
- Taunton to Castle Cary line near Athelney and Currymoor (track needs to be raised above flooding levels)
- Flax Bourton where flood prevention measures need to be undertaken in the cutting
- Chipping Sodbury tunnel (which requires a more effective pumping solution)
- Bristol to Gloucester line around Wickwar and Charfield (needs

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)
South West Councils (next meeting for information)
Heart of the South West LEP (next meeting for information)*

upgrading for floodwater resilience)

- Severn Tunnel Junction to Gloucester via Lydney route (line needs to be raised above normal flood levels)
- diversionary route between Exeter and Plymouth via Tavistock and Okehampton (needs to be rebuilt and brought into use)
- Chippenham to Bath via Bradford Junction diversionary route need a new chord at Bradford (-on-Avon) Junction

These works need to be programmed into a South West Rail Resilience Plan along with the mainline electrification and the Greater Bristol and Devon Metros. Without commitment to significant investment in the South West region's rail network, we are in danger of an endless patch-up and mend approach to regional transport which will further serve to detach the South West economically and socially from the rest of the country.

At the same time, there is a grave danger that budgets for project work such as MetroWest or the Devon Metro, or even the electrification of local services will be diverted into the maintenance of regional infrastructure. We must ensure that the budgets for forthcoming development is not subsumed into crisis management.

David Redgewell

South West Transport Network – Tel 07814 794953

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
Gloucestershire County Council full Council on 26 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)
South West Councils (next meeting for information)
Heart of the South West LEP (next meeting for information)*

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

Greater Bristol Supported Bus Network and its role within the Strategic Economic Plan

We are extremely concerned about proposals to take £700K out of the Greater Bristol Bus Network funding. This 33% cut is a very serious threat to the survival of the network as a coherent set of routes. We would also insist that the Bristol Mayor and Council acknowledge the cross-boundary nature of the network and accept that cuts in Bristol will inevitably entail severe disruption to services in South Gloucestershire, BANES and North Somerset. In particular there will be knock-on service-reduction (potentially large-scale withdrawal) of services through Filton, Patchway, Cribbs Causeway, Bradley Stoke, Emerson's Green, Staple Hill, Kingswood, Longwell Green, Keynsham, Bath, Nailsea, Clevedon and Portishead. This will also likely kill off the Mayor's and BANES newly established and very well received 6-days-a-week Night Bus Network. This project was originally funded by central government to the tune of £70m from the DfT and £20m from First Group to improve the bus network including investment in new vehicles which is ongoing.

Whilst we understand that cuts have to fall somewhere, it seems extremely short-sighted to jeopardise one of the most successful and high-profile developments in local public transport in recent years (including the investment in new vehicles by First and Wessex, the dropping of fares by both companies and the campaign by the WEP to get more people onto the bus and rail network).

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

The proposed network reductions, especially in the South Gloucestershire/Kingswood area, would make a mockery of the current government funded projects through the Better Bus Area and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund in the city region. Having plans to invest in bus routes 6 and 7 as well as a new bus interchange in Kingswood whilst First is replacing out-of-date vehicles on Kingswood Town services means that we may be left with lots of shiny new infrastructure which has no worthwhile bus service to justify it. That is a guaranteed way of losing public confidence in transport delivery.

It might be possible to look for significant savings in renegotiating or commercialising the Park and Ride network, especially as MetroWest Buses are supposed to run subsidy-free (including the Park and Ride services). We remain somewhat sceptical of the subsidy-free plans as no other city in Europe manages this feat at the moment. It must also be said that there is a strange lack of coherence in making the currently proposed cuts whilst pushing ahead with plans for the Metro Bus Network across the city region which is likely to leave the public with a confused and unconvincing feeling about the region's transport planning.

We are also concerned at the proposals to slash £470K from the Community Transport budget, particularly as there are still more than twenty buses providing services across the city which are non-low-floor and disability-unfriendly, thus making the Community Transport service all the more necessary.

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

It is essential that we have a clear policy on access for all to public transport in the Greater Bristol area and this will necessitate the commitment of WEP to a clear date and planned program for the removal of the remaining non-low-floor vehicles from the network in Bristol, Bath, Wells and Weston-super-Mare. The Bristol and Bath city region is lagging well behind comparable urban centres across the UK and Europe in modernising its bus and rail fleets to achieve proper access for all. This issue also has clear implications for the modernisation of the region's rail stations, many of which have limited, partial or absolutely no disabled access. With the forthcoming Intercity Electrification Program, this is the perfect opportunity for WEP to bid with FGW for Access for All grants from the DfT.

The proposals for wholesale closure of public (and disabled) toilet facilities across the region should be approached quite differently by "translating" standalone facilities into shared units within cafes, shopping centres and transport interchanges. This requires a coherent policy and a structured plan (similar to the Bath model) to ensure that these facilities do not simply disappear to the detriment of the travelling public. (Notwithstanding the fact that the Bath Bus Station toilets and café are presently closed due to a flood!)

The recent discovery of large amounts of drug paraphernalia at the toilets at Bristol Bus station led to the temporary closure of the facilities whilst they were cleaned and made safe, pending extensive repairs. In the meantime, bus passengers have had to use the toilets in the "Bear

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

Pit” and disabled passengers have been redirected to the Subway café. It should be remembered that the facilities are owned by Avon and Somerset Support Services (a PFI company consisting of the four greater Bristol authorities and Somerset County Council) with an operating lease to First Group and National Express. At the moment the problem is being managed by First Group but they feel that the origins of the drugs issue at the toilets are related to the closure of other facilities across the city and that responsibility for staff and passenger safety and comfort needs to be a joint agency approach with Bristol City Council, the West of England Partnership, the PCC, Avon and Somerset Chief Constable and Safer Bristol. Ideally this should be set up as a working group under Safer Bristol.

The following remedial precautions should be considered:

- CCTV fitted to the washroom area
- more PCSO/police officer coverage
- painting out graffiti on exterior of and approaches to bus station
- missing and expired timetables should be replaced with up-to-date information.

Within the bus policy there is a very urgent need to upgrade the interchanges and bus stations. At the moment this seems to represent a very serious omission in the city region’s transport strategy. A corresponding lack of policy in Wiltshire has allowed the closure of the bus stations in Salisbury and Amesbury with no adequate replacement facilities. In the Bristol and Bath city region the sites most in need of

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

upgrading and development are Bristol Parkway, Filton Abbey Wood, Kingswood Town Centre (partially completed), Locking Road and Weston-super-Mare station, Bristol Temple Meads (the Friary), Portishead and the proposed Ashton Gate station, Nailsea and Backwell, Keynsham Ashton Way, the City Centre and Broadmead, Cribbs Causeway and Radstock town centre.

These interchanges need to be upgraded with waiting shelters, CCTV, good quality timetable displays and real-time information and (where possible) toilets and catering. An interchange audit for the city region needs to be carried out and government funding sought for the implementation of these improvements as part of Metro Bus and Metro Rail.

As a result of decisions taken by Somerset Council a number of Cross-boundary bus routes into Bath and Weston-super-Mare are under threat: 184 Bath to Frome via Mells, 267 Bath to Frome via Hinton Charterhouse, 768 Farrington Gurney to Bath, 102 Weston to Bridgwater, 668 Lower Langford to Street (connection with 121 Bristol to Weston service), 670 Burnham to Wells, 19 Bridgwater to Street, 376 and 377 Bristol to Yeovil and Bridgwater via Pensford, Glastonbury and Street. Amongst weekly (shopping) services under threat are 754, 636, 683, 757, 752, 185 and 640 which provide in some cases the only public transport access for smaller population centres around Bath. Rather than considering withdrawal of service, the 636 route should be upgraded to provide hospital access from Keynsham.

*Statement from South West Transport Network for
BaNES Cabinet on 12 Feb, full Council on 18 Feb;
Bristol full Council on 18 Feb;
South Gloucestershire full Council on 19 Feb;
West of England Partnership Joint Scrutiny (date not known)
and Joint Transport Board (date not known)*

BaNES needs to raise with Wiltshire Council the implications for passengers to and from Bath which follow from the closure of Salisbury and Amesbury bus stations.

In summing up we would like to emphasise the importance of coherent public transport policy and planning within the WEP/LEP's Economic and Strategic Plan. Linking communities, access to services and facilities, jobs, education and employment are all tightly bound up with the provision of adequate and locally appropriate public transport. These issues are fundamental to the prosperity of the city region and should not be compromised.

David Redgewell

South West Transport Network – Tel 07814 794953

Statement from David Redgewell

THE TEMPLE MEADS TRANSPORT HUB

We are extremely concerned to see that there is no reference to the design and more importantly the purpose of a transport interchange at Temple Meads, connecting the IEP project with local rail (MetroWest in the future), MetroBus and local buses (to say nothing of the ferry services). As Temple Meads is the major rail hub for the South West Region, (as Manchester is for the North West or Cardiff for South Wales), it is inconceivable that a high quality bus-rail-taxi-ferry interchange does not appear to be at the core of the Station Development Plan. We would ask that urgent talks take place with First Group, Network Rail, Wessex, the Ferry Operators, and interested Transport Groups to put together a coherent plan for making Temple Meads into a really user-friendly integrated transport hub that our region can be proud of.

Whilst Bristol has talked about a transport interchange at Temple Meads for many years, Bournemouth, Cardiff and Manchester have made it a reality -- at the same time as maintaining their established bus and coach stations.

It should be noted that the existing interchange facilities at Temple Meads are not designed to modern standards and are in some cases almost impossible for disabled passengers.

Let us see the Mayor set up a Round Table to see this to fruition.

David Redgewell

South West Transport Network

This position is supported by TfGB, Rail Futures (Severnside), FOSBR and the Transport Unions amongst others.

From: [Christina Biggs](#)
To: [John Malychy](#)
Subject: Questions for WEP Scrutiny Weds 5 March
Date: 27 February 2014 14:08:02

FOSBR Questions for WEP Scrutiny Weds 5 March

Preamble: For BCC Scrutiny Thursday 13 Feb FOSBR asked the following questions:

Issue 1: Filton Bank stations:

FOSBR Question 1c): *What is the authority for the stipulation that stations on Filton Bank (1:75 gradient) would need to be staffed?*

To which the BCC response was:

Network Rail issued guidelines for the opening of new or re-opened stations in 2011, which states that safety must be the principal design consideration for all station proposals. It also gives advice on potential solutions to stations designed on a gradient which include the physical manning of these locations to supervise passengers on the platform environment to mitigate risk. The authority for variation on gradient issues lies with the Network Rail Western Strategic Planning Team.

Accordingly, FOSBR has searched for and found a Network Rail document (attached) named "Investment in stations: A guide for promoters and developers May 2011". Carrying out a word search for "gradient" came up with the following section from page 22 of this document:

Are track gradients acceptable at the location of the proposed station?
Railway Group Standard RT70162 states that wherever possible, platforms shall be located adjacent to track with an average gradient not steeper than 1 in 500. It may be possible to locate platforms on a steeper gradient, but not if trains are planned to reverse or terminate at the station. If proposals are put forward for new platforms on a gradient steeper than 1 in 500, consideration will need to be given to the need for additional arrangements to ensure safety.
Steep gradients can make stopping and starting trains difficult especially in areas affected by heavy leaf fall

FOSBR therefore has the following follow-up questions to put to WEP Scrutiny Weds 5 March:

- **FOSBR Follow-up question 1a:** Where in this Network Rail document is the requirement for staffing stations on a gradient found?
- **FOSBR Follow-up question 1b:** Why it is considered that staffing may be necessary, considering that all local trains have guards who could act in an emergency?
- **FOSBR Follow-up question 1c:** Can you give an example of a station that would otherwise not be staffed which has been required to be staffed because of gradient issues?

Issue 2: Henbury Loop:

Preamble: At the same meeting of BCC Scrutiny Thursday 13 Feb FOSBR asked the following question:

FOSBR Question 3b) Could BCC please update us on the timing and budgeting for the following sources of finance: i) MetroWest Phase 1; ii) Strategic Economic Plan (£2b); iii) City Deal; iv) the capital borrowing by BCC in 2013; v) Access for All; vi) £320m from Network Rail for new stations announced in 2012; vii) central funds for building bridges over level crossings as applied for by Oxfordshire in respect of the level crossing at Bicester; viii) local LEP funding?

To which the BCC response was:

The budget for MetroWest Phase 1 is being drawn from the six year £44.9m allocation, 2015/15 to 2020/21, from the devolved major transport schemes pot. The City Deal included an indicative allocation of £81.4m over ten years (from 2015/16) for MetroWest. The £44.9m for MetroWest Phase 1 through the devolved major transport scheme pot is the first six years of this City Deal funding. Regarding Access for All, the bid for local station improvements has been submitted by First Great Western to the Department for Transport. The response from the DfT is expected in March 2014. Regarding the £320m from Network Rail for new station announced in 2012, this is in fact a fund set up by the Department for Transport and administered by Network Rail called the National Stations Improvement Fund. This fund is for the improvement of exiting stations and has been awarded in three tranches to date. We are unaware of a central fund for building bridges over level crossings. At Bicester the scheme was one of two schemes prioritised by the Oxfordshire Local Transport Board for funding through the major transport scheme pot. This is the same pot from which the West of England Partnership has been allocated £44.9m for MetroWest Phase 1. Oxfordshire's allocation from this fund is £10.6m

- **FOSBR Follow-up question 2: Given that the whole City Deal allocation has now been used up on MetroWest Phase 1 and non-rail projects thus leaving MetroWest Phase unfunded, can WEP comment on the timing and budgeting of the following further possible sources of finance for MetroWest Phase 2:**
 - a) **Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy on the four developers (Skanska, Redrow, Persimmon, and Bridgehouse) of the 5,700 houses planned for Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood Scheme plus 2,200 houses in Charlton;**
 - b) **Asking the above developers to consider designing and building the three local railway stations (Henbury, Charlton and North Filton) themselves;**
 - c) **Strategic Economic Plan accessing £2bn Structural Investment Fund (EU) as drafted by West of England LEP;**
 - d) **Regional Growth Fund?**

Christina Biggs

FOSBR Secretary

Response to Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway questions to Joint Scrutiny on 5 March 2014

1a: Where in this Network Rail document is the requirement for staffing stations on a gradient found?

In the Network Rail Guide for Station and Planning Design (July 2011), and the Network Rail Investment in Stations- A Guide for Promoters and Developers (May 2011), there are several chapters on the requirement for safe design as a primary design feature.

After reading this material in detail and engaging with the local Network Rail Planning Team they have advised that certain considerations must be made for the promotion of stations on a gradient. They include the manning of the station to supervise passenger movement on the platform, engineering the grade out of the station environment and the installation of CCTV to monitor passenger movements.

1b: Why it is considered that staffing may be necessary, considering that all local trains have guards who could act in an emergency?

The manning of the station would offer supervision to the station environment particularly when trains are not at the station. Stations on a steep gradient introduce the risk of prams, bikes and wheel chairs rolling down the platform potentially causing injury to passengers. Train guards have a duty to supervise and manage the risk of injury to passengers on board trains and not at stations.

1c: Can you give an example of a station that would otherwise not be staffed which has been required to be staffed because of gradient issues?

The new station development at Corby was originally on a gradient of approximately 1:400. When the station promoters engaged with Network Rail on the development of this station they were challenged on the steepness of the grade. The promoters were asked to consider staffing the station to minimise risk. After negotiations with Network Rail and the Office of Rail Regulation, the promoters of Corby Station were allowed a variation of 1:230 for the development of the station. This required significant engineering mitigation to achieve this reduction in grade.

We are not aware of any station that have been required to man a station on a gradient as all recent station developments have sought mitigation to design stations on gradients of 1:230 or less.

2: Given that the whole City Deal allocation has now been used up on MetroWest Phase 1 and non-rail projects thus leaving MetroWest Phase unfunded, can WEP comment on the timing and budgeting of the following further possible sources of finance for MetroWest Phase 2 [2a to 2d]:

The £81.4m City Deal (devolved major transport scheme) allocation has not been used up on MetroWest Phase 1 and non-rail projects as the table below shows although funding for Phase 2 will only be available from 2021 and there is a potential shortfall.

	Cost*	Devolved allocation		Shortfall
		2015/16 – 2020/21	2021/22 – 2024/25	
MetroWest Phase 1	£55.4m	£44.9m	-	£8.3m
MetroWest Phase 2	£43.1m	-	£36.5m	£4.5m
Totals	£98.5m	£44.9m	£36.5m	£12.8m

*outturn costs.

2a) Section 106/Community Infrastructure Levy on the four developers (Skanska, Redrow, Persimmon, and Bridgehouse) of the 5,700 houses planned for Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood Scheme plus 2,200 houses in Charlton;

Policy CS26 of the South Gloucestershire Council's adopted Core Strategy sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Cribbs/ Patchway New Neighbourhood including those relating to transport, and these requirements are amplified in the draft Cribbs/ Patchway New Neighbourhood Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Following the end of public consultation on 28th February 2014 the SPD is being reported to South Gloucestershire Council's Planning, Transport and Strategic Environment committee on 26th March 2014, with a view to adopting it.

2b) Asking the above developers to consider designing and building the three local railway stations (Henbury, Charlton and North Filton) themselves;

See the answer to 2a) above.

2c) Strategic Economic Plan accessing £2bn Structural Investment Fund (EU) as drafted by West of England LEP;

Under guidance issued by the Government to Local Enterprise Partnerships in 2013 there is insufficient EU Structural and Investment Fund Growth Programme Funding available to make major infrastructure investments.

The £2bn figure quoted probably refers to the national Local Growth Fund allocation for 2015/16.

Local Growth Fund bids will be made through the West of England's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). The draft SEP bid includes bids for £8.5m to make up the shortfall for MetroWest Phase 1 and £3.2m towards the development costs of MetroWest Phase 2.

2d) Regional Growth Fund?

Round five of the Regional Growth Fund has finished. Whilst a round six is expected in summer 2014 it should be noted that funding is aimed at helping businesses create jobs rather than for local authority transport schemes.

A £43m Regional Growth Fund bid was previously made for the Portishead Line in 2011 but this was unsuccessful on grounds of not generating enough jobs and being deliverable within the timescale the funding had to be spent.

West of England
5 March 2014