

74

**Kowalska L (Louise)**

**From:** LAWRENCE MARSHALL |  
**Sent:** 14 April 2008 15:57  
**To:** NPF Team  
**Cc:** Kowalska L (Louise)  
**Subject:** National Planning Framework for Scotland 2: submission on behalf of Capital Rail Action Group

\*\*\*\*\*  
 This email has been received from an external party and  
 has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Dear Sir/Madam,

please find below the submission to NPF2 on behalf of the Capital Rail Action Group, Edinburgh. Thanks for the informative discussion events organised in support of the consultation.

Yours sincerely

Lawrence Marshall  
 Chair  
 Capital Rail Action Group  
 50 (3F1) King's Road  
 Portobello  
 Edinburgh EH15 1DX  
 Tel.: (0131) 669 1336  
[www.capitalrail.org.uk](http://www.capitalrail.org.uk)  
[www.reopenthesouthsub.org.uk](http://www.reopenthesouthsub.org.uk)

\* \* \* \* \*

There is much to welcome in the NPF2 discussion draft. It is well presented with a wealth of useful facts and analysis.

When it comes to identifying national priorities, however, these tend on the whole to subvert the good intentions of much of the rest of the draft.

The provision, as national priority no.1, of an *additional* (not a replacement as stated in the draft) Forth road crossing at Queensferry is fundamentally mis-conceived. The present road bridge can be saved. Even if de-humidification of the cables fails to sufficiently halt the corrosion found within them, full replacement or augmentation of the cables is technically feasible - and at a cost of around £100m vs. £4200m for a new bridge.

Not only would a new bridge add road capacity to a network already attracting a considerable percentage of car commuters but the opportunity cost of the expenditure required is equally huge in terms of cancelled or delayed projects promoting sustainable transport and land use.

We would, therefore, recommend deletion from the list of a new Forth crossing. In its place we would obviously promote retention of the current bridge as the first national priority for Scotland. We would then urge that the following rail-based schemes be prioritised:

a) *further capacity enhancement of the rail network in and around Edinburgh, particularly between*

14/04/2008

*Portobello junction and Haymarket west junction.*

To the east of Waverley station this should include an immediate re-doubling of the Calton north tunnel, re-instatement of the Abbeyhill loop line, reversion to its pre-electrification alignment of the East Coast Main Line through Craigentenny (thus allowing for additional tracks here) and a re-doubling and re-alignment of Portobello junction (to allow a faster speed than the current miserable 15 mph) together with re-doubling of tracks at least as far as Newcraighall and, at the time of the re-opening of the railway to the central Borders, as far as Gorebridge. Grade separation of Portobello junction should also be considered - as should re-instating the full bore and double tracks of the Calton south tunnel.

To the west of Waverley, consideration should be given to freeing up heavy rail capacity through such measures as the introduction of tram-trains (e.g. potentially on the Fife commuter lines). These would run on-street in the city centre of Edinburgh. Platform 0 is an asset worthy of continued use at Haymarket station - and consideration should also be given to a similar bay platform 5 on the south side of the station. Haymarket station itself should be revamped to provide a modern, accessible, airy, functional interchange with bus and tram services. Ideally, this would be through a new station entrance and booking hall, etc. being provided fronting Dalry Road and extending back at least as far as the current pedestrian overbridge.

Tram-trains should also be considered for a revived Edinburgh South Suburban railway local passenger service facilitating access not only to and from the city centre but around the city, to and from the Edinburgh Park area, possibly via Powderhall to Granton - and possibly further afield still.

Finally, although the finite capacity of Waverley west into Princes Street Gardens and Haymarket is 32 trains per hour in each direction (recently upgraded to 28 from 24), this could only be achieved by in effect a massive re-build of the station. It may well be worth considering whether a better benefit cost ratio could be achieved by means of a city centre rail tunnel running under Waverley sufficiently lengthy to bypass the currently congested city centre tracks. This might allow 12 to 15 extra train paths an hour instead of the 4 possible otherwise.

*b) a new, faster rail line through Fife.*

We welcome the suggestion in the draft (para. 215) of a new rail line between Inverkeithing and Halbeath - but in association with a new Forth road crossing with respect to which the Scottish Government has already pronounced that only light rail will be considered. We would suggest that this new rail line should instead run from Ferrytoll along the alignment of the M90, providing the infrastructure necessary to achieve a cut in rail journey times between Inverness and Edinburgh (via Perth) of 45 minutes and of 25/30 minutes between Edinburgh and Aberdeen (via Dundee). You will never achieve faster rail journeys continuing to run along the Fife coast via Kinghorn. This classic and very scenic route should be reserved for local commuter services (possibly tram-trains).

*c) a Scottish high speed rail line to England.*

Scotland has probably the most to gain of any part of Britain from the introduction of high speed domestic rail services. There is currently no capacity for such services at Waverley - one more reason for infrastructure enhancement in and around this rail hub in Scotland's capital city to be considered a national priority.

Here the aim is to effect modal shift not so much from the car as with a) and b) above but rather from domestic air routes, reversing at the very least the current 80:20 air:rail split between the Scottish central belt and the south-east of England.

Although the exact alignment of such a high speed line has yet to be determined, its principle should be a significant National Planning Framework priority.

*d) Scottish inter-city rail electrification.*

To further boost Scotland's contribution to cutting greenhouse gases in the transport sector, not only the rail lines between Edinburgh and Glasgow should be electrified but also those from these two cities to and from Perth/Inverness and Dundee/Aberdeen. The Scottish Government's commitment to renewable energy sources allows rail to fully play its part - unlike road transport - in tackling the urgent problem of climate change.

With respect to the other national priorities outlined in the discussion draft, we would hope that the measures outlined above would also obviate the need for further airport expansion in Scotland.

Our amended list of projects to be identified as national developments is therefore as follows:

1. Retention of the current Forth Road Bridge
2. Capacity enhancement of the rail network in and around Edinburgh
3. Upgraded and new rail infrastructure allowing faster central belt-Inverness/Aberdeen journey times
4. An Anglo-Scottish high speed rail line
5. Inter-city rail electrification
6. Glasgow Crossrail
7. Grangemouth freight hub
8. Rosyth international container terminal
9. Scapa Flow container transshipment facility
10. Grid reinforcements to support renewable energy developments
11. Glasgow strategic drainage scheme

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2007/11/0032.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

