My Ref: Your Ref: Contact: Chris Carter Email:



Planning Transport and Intelligence Strategy Environment and Regeneration Exchange Buildings Smithy Row Nottingham NG1 2BS

www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Network RUS Consultation Response National RUS Manager Network Rail 4th Floor, Section 0 Kings Place 90 York Way London N1 9AG

27th March 2009

Dear, Sir/Madam

Network RUS: Scenarios and Long Distance Forecasts – Nottingham City Council Consultation Response

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the scenarios that will form the basis for future RUS work. CP4 has seen commitments from Network Rail and the ORR to schemes which will greatly benefit both Nottingham and the wider region. This includes work along the Midland Mainline and at Nottingham Station. The City looks forward to continuing this relationship with Network Rail throughout the CP5 period and beyond in addition to RUS elements which specifically refer to electrification and the East Midlands RUS itself.

Comments on the Consultation Document

- 1. Whilst it is recognised that the document is required to make assumptions for the future it is essential that it is reviewed to ensure that the assumptions made can be verified and adapted as time goes on. This is of particular importance with the growth agenda and allocation of new housing sites, in particular within the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area. Therefore it would be beneficial, that over time future discussions with stakeholders will take place to discuss needs and future requirements.
- 2. The establishment of collaborative working practices involving Network Rail, regional partners and local authorities will be particularly important in bringing forward major housing developments in line with national housing targets. Inadequacies of national networks must not be used as a reason to simply block development that is identified as being required through the planning process. There must be a requirement for all parties to work together to determine the best solution to accommodate such development based on the totality of evidence available at the time and appropriate balance achieved between competing objectives.







National Network/Regional

- 3. Whilst a RUS and rail in general inform and provide national transport infrastructure it is essential that Local Authorities are fully involved and can influence national infrastructure investment programmes and that bodies such as Network Rail and DfT Rail adequately engage local stakeholders. Although not the stated primary purpose of these networks it remains the case that the predominant use of national infrastructure is for local or intraregional trip making and therefore there is a very strong inter-relationship with local transport networks that must continue to be recognised.
- 4. Within the baselining information on page 13 a reference is made to the importance of ensuring fast and reliable services from and to Nottingham from London and the other core cities. A particular issue for Nottingham is that because it lies at the end of a spur of the Midland MainLine this results in a lower standard of connectivity to other Core Cities. In particular there are no direct rail services to the south west, north east or Scotland from Nottingham. Also even where direct services are provided they are of a minimum standard. The only service that can be described as of 'Inter City' standard from Nottingham is to London. All other services provided to other Core Cities are only to a 'Regional' standard and do not meet the level of service expectations of the modern business traveler. Any assessment of the strategic corridors therefore needs to include a proper assessment of the adequacy of the existing services provided and identify routes which are appropriate for upgrading to a modern 'Inter City' standard.
- 5. The East Midlands Trains Liverpool Manchester Sheffield Nottingham Norwich route should be added to the list of strategically important rail routes on the basis it links four Core Cities and provides important inter regional connectivity. The supporting evidence for the route is set out in the East Midlands Trains business case for capacity improvements and route enhancements recently submitted to the DfT and the importance of this route has been raised with the DfT as part of the DaSTS consultation process.
- 6. The Cross Country service between Nottingham Birmingham Cardiff provides a poor level of rail connectivity between the east and west midlands. Currently services between Nottingham and Birmingham are via Derby utilising inadequate rolling stock, resulting in very uncompetitive journey times. The introduction of a direct inter-city standard service over a more direct route (via an existing freight line) would dramatically enhance connectivity between the two City Regions and is the type of proposal that should be further explored.

Freight

- 7. A key issue for the East Midlands remains determining the need and demand for an intermodal rail freight terminal to serve the region. If it is deemed that such a facility is warranted an appropriate appraisal mechanism also needs to be completed to determine such a facility's optimal location so that the matter can be adequately dealt with through the planning process.
- 8. There is a need for Local Authorities to be able to influence decisions on important policy areas such as freight terminals which can have very significant local impacts. In any new arrangements it is vital that local concerns are listened to and decision making bodies are properly accountable for decisions made.

Specific Comments on plans and figures

- 9. It is a concern that Figure 2.1 in the document excludes Nottingham as a major destination within the Midland Mainline corridor. Nottingham is a Core City and also one of the ten largest urban areas identified as part of the DaSTS process. The diagram should also include:
 - the Nottingham to Liverpool corridor
 - High Speed 1 rail corridor
 - St Pancras International needs to be highlighted as the UK's international rail gateway.

10. As with Figure 2.1 it is disappointing to see that Nottingham is excluded from Figure 8.4.

11. As with Figure 2.1 the non inclusion of Nottingham in table 8.4 as the only Core City not represented is a concern.

I trust these comments will be taken on board within the final document which the City Council looks forward to receiving. This is in addition to the East Midlands RUS and the Working Group 4 work on electrification. If there is any further information on growth projections within the area or any other information the City Council can help provide please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Carter Transport Strategy Manager