|  |
| --- |
| confidential |
| Consultation Response |
| Network Rail consultation on Network Rail RUS - Stations |
| ***pteg*** Rail Group response |
| July 2011 |

|  |
| --- |
| Matt Brunt  Assistant Director |
| *pteg* Support Unit  Wellington House  40-50 Wellington Street  Leeds – LS1 2DE  0113 251 7445  info@pteg.net |

# Introduction

* 1. ***pteg*** represents the six English Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) which between them serve eleven million people in Tyne and Wear ("Nexus"), West Yorkshire ("Metro"), South Yorkshire, Greater Manchester, Merseyside ("Merseytravel") and the West midlands ("Centre"). The PTEs plan, procure, provide and promote public transport in some of Britain's city regions, with the aim of providing integrated public transport networks accessible to all. Leicester City Council, Nottingham City Council, Transport for London (TfL) and Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT) are associate members of ***pteg***, though this response does not represent their views.
  2. This response represents the collective views of ***pteg*** and has been consulted on with the PTEs.

## The document under consultation

* 1. Network Rail has issued a consultation draft of the "Network RUS - Stations" document. It is a 200 page document that proposes a toolkit approach to dealing with station development and removal of congestion over the next 30 years.
  2. Production of a RUS document specifically for stations is welcomed by ***pteg***. Stations are often the first point of contact that passengers have with the rail industry. The smart presentation and efficient use of stations is an important "window" for their sustainable journey. It is only right and proper that congestion should be addressed if it is already happening or designed out as future developments take place.

## Background

* 1. The Stations RUS is one of five documents covering the general network. Unlike other documents in the series, this Stations RUS proposes use of a toolkit from which selections can be made to assist with reducing congestion at stations.
  2. This is welcomed by ***pteg*** as the 30 year life of the RUS will naturally result in the evolution of the stations and the communities they serve. The rail industry will also significantly evolve in that time. With developing communities more, or sometimes less, pressure will be put on stations and they will become more, or sometimes less, congested. This development may not be known at present, even to PTEs with their close links to local authorities and long term planning. It is therefore essential that flexibility must be built into the document for the future. What might be an obvious solution if congestion reduction were to be introduced now might become overtaken by events in the future. Furthermore, the PTEs are well placed to be the link between the local communities and the rail industry when opportunities and needs for station development / congestion reduction occur.
  3. The Executive Summary gives reasons why tackling congestion is important:
* There comes a point where volumes of people cause a safety and security concern and passenger comfort and satisfaction can be compromised by crowding and congestion
* Congested platforms and concourses can make it more difficult for people of reduced mobility to access and enjoy rail travel
* Congestion at stations can risk choking off the demand for rail travel, because it adds to the overall journey time and thus makes rail less competitive
* For many people it is an unpleasant experience which they would prefer to avoid, again potentially choking off demand
* There is an economic and social cost to the nation if time is wasted as a result of congestion
  1. Recognition that station and train congestion can make rail travel less competitive is welcomed by ***pteg***. This is an important issue in particular for PTEs, and authorities from other large conurbations, as the need for travel continues to rise yet the environmental pressures on society need to be reduced. There is a need to ensure that rail does not become less competitive. PTEs are significant players in such circumstances.

## RUS Chapter 1 Background + RUS Chapter 2 Scope and Policy Context

* 1. These sections put the RUS Stations document into perspective with other similar documents and other policy documents. The 30 year vision is stated. Funding is discussed in the final paragraph of Chapter 2, Scope and Policy Context. Reference is made to local government and third party investment as well as investment by train operating companies (TOCs).
  2. ***pteg*** are encouraged that this document recognises the many years of significant investment by the PTEs in developing the railway network in their respective city regions. Whilst it is appreciated that the document is silent on any financial programme, it is hoped that funding will be forthcoming from a variety of sources over its life time to realise investment intended to remove congestion pinch points.

## RUS Chapter 3 Baselining

* 1. There is an analysis, in the Executive Summary, of those who use the stations in addition to the rail travellers. This helps to “define the baseline”. Typically these other users are:
* Those meeting people off trains
* Those bidding farewell to passengers
* Those seeking information about rail services
* Railway staff
* Other public transport staff
* Taxi drivers
* Employees of retail or catering outlets
* Customers of retail or catering outlets
* Contractors providing goods or services to the station
* Emergency services
* Railway enthusiasts
  1. The Executive Summary also breaks down the station environment into three distinct zones. These align with the four zones recently identified by the ATOC Station Zoning project now being rolled out across the country.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Network RUS Stations Zoning** | **ATOC Station Zoning** |
| Access Zone | Welcome zone |
| Facilities Zone | Ticket zone |
| Platform Zone | Train zone |
|  | Onward Journey zone |

* 1. The zoning of stations is supported by ***pteg*** to improve the passenger experience at stations and reduce travel anxiety. The need by passengers for (provision of and better quality) information at stations is frequently reported in documents from a variety of rail interested bodies. The recent refocusing through the ATOC Station zoning and the proposed zoning in this RUS document is a welcome opportunity to improve the quality of information presented to the passengers. Whilst at this stage it may generally relate to printed literature and CIS screens, zoning will enable focussed consideration of the physical location of other devices and technologies being developed now and in the future.
  2. **RUS 3.3 - Station Categorisation** - Reference is made to the station categories that were developed in the mid-1990s, from Category A, National Hubs, to Category F, small unstaffed stations. However it is pointed out that there is no direct correlation between station category and extent or potential for congestion. Small stations may be subject to sudden peak periods of congestion if they are the rail head for mass entertainment or sports venues.
  3. **RUS 3.4 - Defining and measuring station congestion** –Congestion is measured by Fruin’s “Levels of Service”. This correlates density of people with a flow rate. The more people per area, the more congested the location.
  4. **RUS 3.5 - Valuing the cost of congestion** – This is determined using the Passenger Demand Forecasting Handbook (PDFH). A Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) can then be determined.
  5. **RUS 3.6 - Station Usage Statistics** – A range of data collection techniques are discussed at length, some with strengths and weaknesses. It is possible that use of PTE, and similar, multimodal tickets may provide further useful data.
  6. A stronger emphasis on the basic purpose for data collection is requested by ***pteg***. The RUS document could usefully give greater emphasis to the fact that many areas, particularly the PTE areas and those with progressive public transport policies, have multi-modal tickets. It is known that there is an under-reporting of journeys in areas where multi-modal tickets are in significant use. Not only could the absence of including this data in business cases reduce justification for improving station infrastructure, but access to ticketing information held by PTEs might usefully give additional qualitative information. This will require further dialogue between the PTEs and the rail industry.
  7. **RUS 3.7 - Station usage** – This section has a range of tables showing top 20 stations based on ORR data. The range is London, England outside London, Scotland, Wales, Rail to rail interchanges in London, Rail to rail interchanges elsewhere in England, Wales and Scotland.
  8. The purpose of these tables is unclear other than to provide some interesting statistics on use at large stations of which nine of the twenty in table 3.15 (England outside London) are in PTE areas. As mentioned in RUS 3.3 congestion is not necessarily confined to large stations. This section could be deleted.
  9. **RUS 3.8 - Current committed plans affecting stations** - A number of existing committed plans are especially identified in the RUS document. However they are not itemised in the station-by-station tables later in the document. These relate to major station redevelopments (Reading, Birmingham New Street etc), national programmes such as NSIP and Access for All, Thameslink and Crossrail, the Intercity Express Programme, electrification and train lengthening programmes etc.
  10. ***pteg*** welcomes the reference to these schemes, some of which will involve stations in PTE areas. It is essential that investment continues to be made in these projects to ensure their effective delivery. However there should also be continuing investment in the stations individually tabled later in the RUS document to ensure a network wide improvement in facilities and reduction of congestion.
  11. **RUS 3.9 - Current congestion at stations** – This section defines the differences between active and passive management of congestion (the former for temporary situations, particularly at events, and the latter for permanent efficient working of stations). Bottlenecks at stations are listed; namely bridges, doorways, lifts and escalators, ticket office queues, access to real time information amongst others.
  12. In addition, this section reports on the nomination of stations, by TOCs and the RUS working group members, where pedestrian capacity issues were considered to be an issue. The defining measure of congestion was the Fruin Levels of Service mentioned in RUS 3.4. Stations mentioned in the geographical RUSs were also considered. Some stations are subject to congestion as a result of special planned events. 118 stations are listed in the associated table 3.20 with Fruin levels given for (1) concourse, (2) accessing platforms and (3) on platforms. The list is then sorted and discussed further in section 5 where the priority of each station uses the highest of the three Fruin levels from table 3.20.
  13. Reference to the number of nominated stations looked at in detail (118) could usefully be repeated in the text of section 3.9. It is only quoted in the Executive Summary on page 4. Also it would help to note in the header to table 3.20 that these are nominated stations and that Fruin level A is the least restricted flow and that Fruin level F is the most restricted flow. Advising readers that 118 stations is about 5% of the full 2500 (approx) portfolio would be a measure of the seriousness of the congestion problem easily understood by “professional” and “lay” users of the RUS Stations document over the years to come.
  14. **RUS 3.10 - Use of a station** – The zone concept is discussed further in this section along with types of station user. This is followed by various analyses of the Network Rail Managed Stations. There is analysis by station category and analysis of passenger type versus access mode. Reference is made to the PTE car parking policies which were collated during the drafting stage of the document.
  15. The analysis of station users types might be of interest in developing business cases. Analysis by station category and access modes might be similarly interesting. However the need to present station-by-station analysis of the Network Rail Managed Stations is questioned as this is an issue for Network Rail to deal with internally. This was similarly raised in the response to section 3.7 Station Usage. The usefulness of the mode of access table 3.8 and car parking in tables 3.9 and 3.10 are also questioned.

*(Note that this document quotes 17 Managed Stations although the Network Rail website quotes 18 including St Pancras International. This anomaly needs correction.)*

* 1. **RUS 3.10.29 – Car parking policies** – The reference to car parking policies in within Metro (West Yorkshire) is … *“The PTE is, however, looking at developing a charging scheme in LTP3 (Local Transport Plan) as a means of better managing demand and funding station enhancements such as car park extensions. This, however, will be subject to the approvals of the ITA (Integrated Transport Authority) and the PTE members.”*
  2. The reference to car parking policies in within Metro (West Yorkshire) needs to be amended to read as follows “The PTE will review the current car park strategy during the LTP3 period.”

## RUS Chapter 4 Drivers for change

* 1. **RUS 4.2 - High level policy context** - Drivers of Change deals with the high level documents from UK and Scottish governments about the future of railways. The 2007 White Paper “Delivering a Sustainable Railway” sought a railway in England and Wales which over the following 30 years:
* Will handle double today’s level of freight and passenger traffic
* Will be even safer, more reliable and more efficient than now
* Will be able to cater for a more diverse, affluent and demanding population
* Will have reduced its own carbon footprint and improved its broader environmental performance
  1. Reference is made to the influence of National Stations Improvement Programme (NSIP) and DfT Access for All (AFA) on investment at stations. The Interim McNulty report is also mentioned drawing a conclusion that “a theme for the future will be a focus on partnership working at a local level to resolve local issues, such as station congestion”.
  2. The proposed partnership working is welcomed by ***pteg***. PTEshave been striving to ensure adequate investment in the rail networks. Imaginative partnerships are called for to ensure that such investment can continue and be relevant to local stakeholders. The PTEs are willing to work with colleagues in the rail industry to achieve this.
  3. **RUS 4.3 - Growth in station footfall** – Suppressed demand and modal shift are discussed here. It is stated that suppressed demand can be released by factors such as:
* Train lengthening
* Increased train frequency
* Addressing station congestion
* Increased car parking spaces at a station
* Improved access by public transport to the station

Modal shift can be triggered by:

* The relative cost of rail against competitor modes
* The relative overall journey time of rail against competitor modes
* The relative quality, convenience and ease of use of rail against competitor modes
* The extent to which rail is perceived by passengers as more environmentally friendly than competitor modes.
  1. ***pteg*** members are well placed to coordinate modal shift of public transport both on and off the railways. Working with the rail industry to tackle issues of suppressed demand will be an effective means of reducing congestion in such circumstances.
  2. **RUS 4.4 - Train service patterns** – An increase in frequency can lead to less crowding as gathering passengers are more frequently offered train services so build-up of crowds does not occur. However it is recognised that the better train service from the increased frequency is likely to generate increased patronage reintroducing congestion at certain times!
  3. Increased train frequencies are generally welcomed by ***pteg*** members to provide a higher quality sustainable service. However the reduction in congestion that this can deliver at certain stations is seen as a secondary consequence of this action. With the complexity of urban train services and timetabling it is surely very unlikely that altering a timetable to justify reducing congestion at a station would be realistic. Also, by changing the train service pattern, there is a possibility that congestion could increase elsewhere. Notwithstanding that, the consequences on congestion when altering a timetable need to be understood, considered and acted upon as necessary.
  4. **RUS 4.5 - Rolling stock interface** – There is discussion about the different types of rolling stock, length of units, and options for selective door opening (SDO). Reference is also made to platform stepping distances, horizontal and vertical.
  5. It is recognised by ***pteg*** that different types of rolling stock have different door widths and positions and internal layouts. Also some stock has selective door opening (SDO). Notwithstanding the statement of fact that this section makes, there remains a need for significant amount of funding for additional rolling stock and for infrastructure works to bring platform stepping distances within sensible limits. Level access with minimum gaps, as seen on many dedicated metro systems, are unlikely for much of the network. Platforms at the stations are located on multipurpose lines with freight, local and InterCity services of differing loading gauges travelling at different speeds. At typically £0.5M per platform face this is not likely to be a high priority at many stations in the current economic climate. The draft Rolling Stock RUS is more thorough in dealing with platform stepping distances. That RUS document and this Stations RUS document should be more aligned and say the same thing, that clear standards are needed to reduce vertical stepping distances to zero and ensure horizontal stepping distances are appropriate to the use of that part of the network.
  6. **RUS 4.6 - Accessing the station and onward travel** – The document recognises that the rail journey is only part of the complete journey. Opening of new routes and journey opportunities can lead to increased congestion at the interchanges but can also reduce congestion on the original routes.
  7. These elements of public transport are the raison d’être of the PTEs and provide that much needed sustainable integrated transport network. Intelligent assessment of, and investment in, different modes to and from stations will continue to address these issues. ***pteg*** members look forward to working with others in the rail industry to reduce congestion on this element.
  8. **RUS 4.7 – The physical layout of the station and facilities** – It is recognised that the historical layout and assets of stations, many up to 150 years old, do not necessarily align with the current culture, technology and information.
  9. Opportunities for working with station facility operators and Network Rail to improve flows through stations are welcomed by ***pteg***. This will build on much work already undertaken by these parties in the metropolitan areas over many years.

## RUS Chapter 5 Gaps and Options

* 1. **RUS 5.1 – Gaps and Options Introduction** - There are two categories of gap identified in Gaps and Options. One relates to gaps in information and the other relates to gaps in congestion i.e. locations where congestion is, or will become, a critical issue unless interventions are made.
  2. **RUS 5.2 – Type 1 gaps and options: information on station usage** - For the former type there is a need to obtain comprehensive and meaningful data on station usage. It is recognised that such levels of information at all 2,520 stations would be an expensive, and sometimes excessive, exercise, however such information for many stations will be helpful in:
* Ensuring that congestion levels remain within safety tolerances
* Improving customer experience by easing congestion
* Identifying congestion hot spots
* Providing evidence to support the settling of station rents
* Identifying trends over time
* Predicting what levels of growth will cause the station to progressively “fail”
* Supporting investment decisions

There is discussion about different methods of data collection.

* 1. ***pteg*** welcomes gathering of information on station usage. With local knowledge, area wide interest and multi-modal responsibilities, PTEs may be in a position to add further information to allow development of plans to reduce station congestion. Sharing of the station usage information might also assist in developing onward journey opportunities.
  2. **RUS 5.3 – Type 2 gaps: stations with capacity gaps** – This section deals with capacity gaps in relation to the future. It identifies potential growth forecasts and then applies these to the 118 stations nominated by the train operators and working party members. Long term passenger growth, derived from elsewhere, is shown in Table 5.3 of the RUS document[[1]](#footnote-1):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Market** | **% growth per year** |
| **Regional Urban Other** | **3.00%** |
| **Regional Urban Commuter** | **2.75%** |
| Rural | 2.50% |
| London Other | 2.50% |
| Long Distance | 2.00% |
| London Commuter | 1.30% |

* 1. The 118 nominated stations are then resorted from Table 3.20 and presented in Table 5.4 in order of Fruin level of service with highest Fruin level at the head of the table. Within each group the stations are listed alphabetically.

Conclusions fall into a number of categories:

* Investigation of intervention recommended in CP5
* Continue development of existing plans
* Keep under review for 2019
* Investigation of intervention recommended by 2031
* Keep under review for 2031
* No intervention proposed beyond current plans
* Information applied for
  1. Table 5.3 shows that the PTE areas are to be subject to the largest growth on the network. The ***pteg*** response is that this is a clear indication of the need to invest substantially in the regional urban networks. However, there is concern that the growths shown are at the low end of the range published in the Northern RUS dated May 2011 and therefore likely to underestimate future problems with pedestrian flow. These figures should therefore be reviewed.
  2. As with the response to RUS paragraph 3.9, it would be sensible to mention that this table represents the 118 nominated stations. This avoids a misunderstanding that this could be seen as a definitive list of the only congested stations on the network.
  3. The list of the 118 nominated stations in Table 5.4, when resorted into Fruin levels, provides a useful analysis of stations. Local knowledge by PTE officers will give an appreciation of the problems on their networks and allow development of future capital programmes.
  4. In the list of nominated stations that are in the North West, there is no reference to North West Electrification and Northern Hub. This significant regional project, which will influence traffic patterns and station usage over an even wider area, will result in even greater pressures on stations and possibility that congestion levels will reach critical state sooner than the table suggests. The stations should be retained in the table and consequences revised in view of North West Electrification going live from 2013 and Northern Hub from 2016. They should not be removed from the list in the same way as Birmingham New Street, Reading, CrossRail etc because there is no mechanism for considering congestion as part of the electrification project.
  5. **RUS 5.4 – Type 2 gaps and options**: toolkit of options to address generic station capacity gaps
  6. The toolkit of options is listed in this section. It is spit, in Table 5.6, into three sections, each reflects the Network Rail station zones; Access, Facilities and Platform. A Special events section is also included.

Each individual option is labelled in one of three categories:

A – Options which affect the level of demand at stations

B – Options which affect the way in which the demand uses available capacity

C – Options which increase available capacity

Table 5.5 lists 13 case studies. PTE stations in the case studies are represented by Liverpool Central on the Merseytravel network.

* 1. The toolkit is likely to be the section of most interest on a day to day basis for ***pteg*** member organisations and staff and their colleagues in the TOCs. However it is considered that the early chapters of the RUS document have buried this station-by-station analysis amongst the high level discussions of information gaps and desire to carry out studies and formulate plans at 50 significant stations across the network including half of the Network Rail Managed Stations portfolio. At a regional level more simplistic questions are likely to be asked:
* What has been proposed in the RUS for the local stations on our network?
* What should be considered for further investigation if we were to get an enquiry from the MP, local councillor or community group?
* What work can be effectively planned for inclusion in the capital programme for next year and the future?
  1. The toolkit is a “shopping list” of work that could be considered, and hopefully undertaken, at stations to ease congestion. Whilst concentration on significant stations in a national level document is laudable, local officers are required to consider the toolkit for any cost effective, time efficient or objective solutions that are easily understood by officers, members and the travelling public in the suburbs and smaller communities. Even within Chapter 5 Gaps and Options, the toolkit is only in section 5.4 after lengthy discussion on information about station usage. It is indeed accepted that physical solutions should not be progressed without sufficient justification and a good business case however there is a potential danger that the industry could get involved with information gathering and data collection at major stations marginalising the carrying out of the physical work on site to solve the congestion problems.
  2. There needs to be a bolder statement in the document that this toolkit is not a definitive list of potential work streams. Others should also be considered. Some options will not currently be at an adequate level of technical development but will have progressed by key dates of 2019 and 2031. Further options might not yet have even been invented or discovered.
  3. It is not obvious what will be the mechanism for updating this document to include these developing toolkit options, and also to update comments about the nominated stations. This needs to be addressed.

## RUS Chapter 6 Recommendations

## RUS 6.1 – Introduction

* 1. This section does identify that the toolkit is “not an exhaustive list of prescriptive solutions, but rather a resource for any organisation considering addressing congestion at stations.” [[2]](#footnote-2)
  2. There could be bolder emphasis in the document that the list of prescriptive solutions identified in the toolkit is not exhaustive.

## RUS 6.2 – Information on Station Usage

* 1. This section of the RUS document develops earlier comments in Chapters 3 and 5 with regard to data collection. It introduces the concepts of Station Master Planning and Station Travel Planning, both to be introduced by Network Rail at their Managed Stations, on the Southern franchise and at a number of stations in a pilot project. Various options are discussed including counts being undertaken concurrently and greater coordination of data.
  2. ***pteg*** will be willing to work with colleagues in the rail industry with regard to information on station usage and data collection to ensure that there is a meaningful set of data that can be used to benefit programmes of investment at station. This provision of information is most likely to be “information exchange” with no, or minimal, additional cost to the PTEs due to the current financial situation they are facing. It must be noted, however, that there is no industry standard and that amount and quality of locally held information will vary. PTEs have an obvious interest in being stakeholders at many stations throughout their areas, particularly in the conurbations where interest in rail and road public transport can help develop opportunities that benefit the community at large. With the emerging thoughts on Localism and proposed changes by the ORR in relation to Station Access Conditions, to include more “3rd party” interest, this development of Station Master Plans is welcomed. It is known that some PTEs are also developing station travel plans outside of the pilot projects mentioned above as part of smart management of public transport infrastructure and park and ride policies as part of LTP3s.

## RUS 6.3 – Assessment of Station Capacity

* 1. There is discussion about the benefits of dynamic and static modelling at stations, the former at larger stations and the latter at smaller stations. The Executive Summary makes reference to modelling being used in setting station rents.
  2. ***pteg*** wishes to reemphasise the prime purpose of pedestrian flow modelling. Stations are primarily a transport hub and all information gathered should be initially intended to be used to make such locations more efficient. Whilst this will be a tool to enable better dialogue with regard to station rents, this should be very much a secondary benefit of gathering the data. It is considered that the station rent / commercial interest issue is over emphasised.

## RUS 6.4 – Congestion at Stations

* 1. “The remit of the Network RUS (Stations) is to produce a high level analysis of the ability to key stations on the network to handle present and predicted future demand.” [[3]](#footnote-3) Following analysis of the 118 stations nominated by TOCs, working group members and those shown in the geographical RUS documents, a schedule of fifty stations for further investigation has been compiled. Those stations that are in the English PTE areas are listed in Appendix 1, in the sequence shown in RUS section 6.4. Stations and routes where there is already a clearly defined programme of improvements are not pursued within the Stations RUS. Examples of these are Thameslink, Crossrail, and stations affected by the introduction of the IEP train.
  2. The lists shown in this section are similar but not the same as the lists in the Executive Summary. They need to be the same.
  3. ***pteg*** recommends that it can be more clearly stated that this list of stations, and the list of 118 nominated stations, are not definitive. The RUS Working group have advised that other stations can be investigated as opportunities arise during the life span of this document. How this evolution will develop to include additional stations is not specified in the RUS. Inclusion of the review process in the RUS would give comfort to PTEs and 3rd party organisations if it is considered that station congestion is arising elsewhere on the network. It is understood that the RIPG (Railway Industry Planning Group) oversee the routine strategy review process and the improvements and new methods of pedestrian flow analysis should be part of this review.

## RUS 6.5 – Generic station congestion gaps and toolkit of options

* 1. The toolkit addresses the following areas:
* The generic kinds of congestion that have been found at stations
* The relationship between ticket delivery systems / station gating policy and future station design and capacity
* The relationship between the location of facilities at concourse and platform level and crowding, both on train and at stations
* The appropriate provision of facilities at key bus and tube interchanges
* The effects of changing perceptions of personal safety on the requirement for station facilities.
  1. The generic approach to the toolkit of options is welcomed by ***pteg***. Development of innovative solutions, particularly with regard to works outside the railway estate, must be worked up with local authorities, particularly the PTEs in the relevant areas. ***pteg*** looks forward to working with the rail industry partners to achieve this.

## RUS 6.6 – Car parking provision

* 1. The RUS recognises that there are reasons beyond commercial rates of return for levying, or not levying, car parking charges. Provision may also relate to land available at a station. Car parking supply needs to be considered at local level and it is suggested should form part of a Station Travel Plan approach.
  2. The development of Station Travel Plans is an area of work that ***pteg*** members are involved with. Access to public transport networks other than the railway allows for effective development of such plans.

## RUS 6.7 – Investments in Stations Guide

* 1. The “Investments in Stations Guide” document has been updated and is available on the Network Rail website.

## RUS 6.8 – Conclusion

* 1. Recommendations include gathering more information on station usage and building upon, and coordinating more effectively, the datasets that are already in existence.
  2. The need for funding by a wide range of partners, including Local Authorities, is recognised.
  3. A toolkit of generic station capacity gaps and options has been considered.
  4. Reference should also be made to Passenger Transport Executives and ITAs as a potential source of funding, although this is limited due to the economic climate at the present time.

## RUS Chapter 7 Next Steps

## RUS 7.1 – Stakeholder consultation

* 1. The benefits of consultation are outlined.

## RUS 7.2 – How you can contribute

* 1. The response details of this consultation are outlined.

Appendix 1

1. Derived from Section 6.4 Congestion at Stations

Stations within the English PTE areas recommended for intervention (alphabetical in each group):

Of 12 stations recommended for investigation of interventions by the end of CP5, 2019:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Station** | **PTE** |
| Liverpool Central | Merseytravel |
| Liverpool Lime Street | Merseytravel |

Of 9 stations with long term plans which would address existing congestion issues but which may not be fully developed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Station** | **PTE** |
| Leeds | Metro |
| Manchester Piccadilly platforms 13 + 14 | Greater Manchester |
| Manchester Victoria | Greater Manchester |

Of 10 stations where there is some uncertainty whether current improvement plans will fully address congestion issues but need to be kept under review for 2019:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Station** | **PTE** |
| Birmingham Snow Hill | Centro |

Of 19 stations recommended for investigation of interventions by CP8, 2031:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Station** | **PTE** |
| Birmingham Moor Street | Centro |
| Bradford Forster Square | Metro |
| Bradford Interchange | Metro |
| Coventry | Centro |
| Halifax | Metro |
| Huddersfield | Metro |
| Liverpool James Street | Merseytravel |
| Salford Central | Transport for Greater Manchester |
| Solihull | Centro |
| Walsall | Centro |

Of 2 stations where there is some uncertainty whether current improvement plans will fully address congestion issues but need to be kept under review for 2031:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Station** | **PTE** |
| Guiseley | Metro |
| Shipley | Metro |

1. “Planning Ahead – the Long Term Planning Framework” RFOA, ATOC & Network Rail 2010 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Paragraph 6.1.4 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Paragraph 6.4.1 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)