

**TAYSIDE AND CENTRAL SCOTLAND TRANSPORT PARTNERSHIP****22 SEPTEMBER 2009****CONSULTATIONS****REPORT BY STRATEGY MANAGER**

This report seeks the Partnership's endorsement of officer responses to consultations by SEStran on its Bus Passenger Transport Information Strategy and the Scottish Ambulance Service on its future strategy. The report also seeks approval of proposed responses to Transport Scotland on developing a Station Car Parking Policy and the Scottish Government on a Low Carbon Vehicles Policy.

**1 RECOMMENDATIONS**

## 1.1 That the Partnership :-

- (i) endorses the officer response to SEStran's consultation on its Bus Passenger Transport Information Strategy, as detailed in Appendix A;
- (ii) endorses the officer response to the Scottish Ambulance Service on their future strategy, as detailed in Appendix B;
- (iii) approves the proposed response to Transport Scotland's consultation on developing a Station Car Parking Policy, as detailed in Appendix C; and
- (iv) approves the proposed response to the Scottish Government's consultation document on Low Carbon Vehicles, as detailed in Appendix D.

**2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 The South East Scotland Transport Partnership (SEStran) has published a Bus Passenger Transport Information Strategy. SEStran sought comments on their Draft Strategy from neighbouring Regional Transport Partnerships and Councils by 16 August 2009. The consultation paper is available for inspection at:

[http://www.sestran.gov.uk/files/A12.a.%20ASEStran%20Final%20%20Strategy%20-%20\(Appx%20A\)%20-%20Final%201-0.pdf](http://www.sestran.gov.uk/files/A12.a.%20ASEStran%20Final%20%20Strategy%20-%20(Appx%20A)%20-%20Final%201-0.pdf)

2.2 Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) has published a discussion document on their future strategy for the next three to five years. Comments on the strategy were sought by 11 September 2009. The consultation paper is available for inspection at:

[http://www.scottishambulance.com/UserFiles/file/SAS\\_strategy\\_partner.pdf](http://www.scottishambulance.com/UserFiles/file/SAS_strategy_partner.pdf)

2.3 Transport Scotland has published a discussion document on developing a Station Car Parking Policy. Consultation responses are sought by 25 September 2009. The consultation paper is available for inspection at:

[http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/files/documents/rail/Car\\_parking\\_-\\_Consultation\\_letter\\_-\\_29\\_July\\_2009.pdf](http://www.transportscotland.gov.uk/files/documents/rail/Car_parking_-_Consultation_letter_-_29_July_2009.pdf)

- 2.4 The Scottish Government has published a consultation document on Low Carbon Vehicles. Consultation responses are to be submitted by 2 October 2009. The consultation document is available for inspection at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/06/25103442/0>.

### **3 DISCUSSION**

#### **SEStran Bus Passenger Transport Information Strategy**

- 3.1 SEStran has published a Bus Passenger Information Strategy which is intended to be capable of adoption, in whole or in part, by SEStran's constituent authorities in order to raise the minimum and prevailing standards of bus information in the region. The principal interest for Tactran is the potential impact on publicity for cross boundary bus services between the two regions.
- 3.2 A copy of the submitted officer response, which was compiled in consultation with the Public Transport Officers Liaison Group, is included at Appendix A, which the Partnership is asked to endorse.

#### **Scottish Ambulance Service: Our Future Strategy: Discussion with Partners**

- 3.4 The Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) is in the process of reviewing its strategy for the next five years and has embarked on a national consultation programme with key stakeholders.
- 3.5 The Service responds to nearly 600,000 Accident and Emergency calls and its Patient Transport Service (PTS) carries 1.6 million patients annually. It notes that the demand for ambulance services is increasing each year due to people living longer, being better informed and having more complex needs than previously.
- 3.6 The proposed strategy sits within the context of Scottish Government and NHS Scotland aims to increase the range of services available within communities and to develop a more joined up service for patients. There is recognition of the need to link more closely with other parts of the NHS and Local Authority Social Care.
- 3.7 The SAS strategic direction focuses on:
- Improving patient access to emergency care
  - Defining their role in the management of care and long-term conditions in the community
  - Developing their contribution to planned and unscheduled care
  - Developing genuinely integrated transport services
  - Increasing efficiency of resources
  - Identifying opportunities for shared efficiencies in partnership with Health Boards.
- 3.8 The Consultation concentrates on four themes with a series of questions under each theme.

(i) Accessing the right help in an emergency

SAS notes that the Scottish Government's strategy "Better Health, Better Care" recognises a need to ensure that patients are appropriately routed to the care they need when accessing emergency services. As such, the SAS and NHS 24 have been asked to explore the development of a single clinical decision support tool. The aim will be to ensure that all patients, regardless of whether they access care through 999 or NHS 24, will receive a consistent response through a triage system and will be directed to the most appropriate service. The triage system will determine whether the situation is a life-threatening or other emergency, in which case an ambulance will be dispatched, or if not a referral will be made to another service such as a GP, pharmacy or specialist service.

(ii) Delivering for remote and rural healthcare

The Scottish Government's report "Delivering for Remote and Rural Healthcare" has identified a lead role for the SAS to collaborate with Health Boards to improve emergency response in remote and rural communities. Possible models of care identified by SAS include:

- Provision of Community CPR training and public access defibrillators
- Training of volunteer "First Responders" who can provide life support ahead of an ambulance arriving on scene
- A Retained Ambulance Service, similar to the Retained Fire service
- A Community Practitioner Response scheme where local GPs and nurses would respond to suitable emergency calls
- A Retained Driver Service, to support GPs or nurses responding to emergency calls
- A fully trained Ambulance Service response unit providing 24 hour care directly within rural communities.

In addition, SAS is exploring the role it could play in the provision and coordination of non-emergency, scheduled healthcare services. For example, unnecessary trips to hospital could be avoided by carrying out routine tests at home for those managing conditions such as diabetes.

(iii) Getting patients to and from hospitals

The SAS is looking to develop the Patient Transport Service (PTS) to ensure it is properly focussed on meeting the clinical needs of patients as part of an integrated transport strategy across Scotland. SAS primary responsibility is to provide a service for patients with a medical care need or with limited mobility. It also transfers patients between hospitals and takes them home upon discharge, for example, following surgery.

The Service recognises that while patients do not automatically qualify for ambulance transport because they have a hospital appointment, a lack of general awareness of available alternatives results in a higher dependency on the SAS. Patient consultation has shown that 80% of SAS patients are able to travel on other transport when not attending hospital. The lack of awareness also extends to reimbursement schemes.

SAS believes there is an opportunity to develop a dedicated transfer service between hospitals and specialist healthcare facilities. There is potential also to develop further transport services for patients with specific needs, for example those with renal conditions, or for taking patients home from hospital.

SAS comment on the need to work towards providing an integrated transport strategy for Scotland, working alongside the Scottish Government and other transport and healthcare providers.

(iv) Enhancing the care we provide

SAS comment that “Better Health, Better Care” calls for improved access to primary care and greater efficiency across the NHS. The Service has identified areas where there are such opportunities.

It notes that Emergency Dispatch Centres could provide a platform for other organisations to co-ordinate their mobile resources more appropriately to communities needs. Examples are cited of community nurses, midwives and local authority falls teams.

The Service functions as a mobile healthcare provider and considers that there is an opportunity to extend their range of skills to meet unmet needs and manage long-term conditions in communities.

- 3.9 A copy of the submitted officer response, which was compiled in consultation with the Transport and Health and Public Transport Officers Liaison Groups, is included at Appendix B, which the Partnership is asked to endorse

**Transport Scotland: Station Car Parking Policy in Scotland**

- 3.10 Transport Scotland has published a discussion document on developing a Car Parking Policy for railway stations in Scotland. The intention is to encourage more efficient use of existing station car parks and other park & ride facilities to encourage modal shift from road to rail.
- 3.11 Transport Scotland notes that there is no nationally consistent policy on provision of car parking, or charging for car parking, at railway stations. Provision of car parks has been developed on an ad hoc, station specific, basis. Similarly, there is no consistent policy on the level of charges at station car parks, or on redeeming the costs of car parking against the costs of tickets and onward travel.
- 3.12 They comment that while current policy encourages passengers to cycle or walk to railway stations rather than using their car, car is often the most practical way for passengers to get to the station, especially in semi-rural and rural areas, or for specific reasons; carrying of luggage, dropping children at school en route, weather, etc. However, they accept that data on car parking usage is limited at present and that issues such as suppressed demand are not fully understood currently.
- 3.13 A proposed response, which was compiled in consultation with the Transportation Officers Liaison Group, is included at Appendix C, which the Partnership is asked to approve for submission by 25 September 2009.

## **Scottish Government Consultation on Low Carbon Vehicles**

- 3.14 The Scottish Government has published a consultation document on Low Carbon Vehicles. A series of questions are posed on technology options and setting targets.
- 3.15 The Government notes that transport is responsible for around 25% of Scottish emissions and, of these, more than 70% are from road transport. The recently introduced Climate Change (Scotland) Act sets an ambitious framework to reduce Scotland's emissions by at least 80% by 2050. While accepting that the market is likely to deliver low carbon vehicles over time it is believed that this may be too slow in the absence of some level of intervention.
- 3.16 The consultation aims to help determine the most effective use of targets for the development and uptake of Low Carbon Vehicles and alternative fuels by 2020. The definition of a Low Carbon Vehicle is taken to be a vehicle powered by alternative fuels or technologies, including electric vehicles, plug-in hybrids, stop-start/micro hybrids, hydrogen vehicles or equivalent.
- 3.17 The Government indicates it is committed to facilitating the upgrading of the public sector bus fleet by 2020. It is also committed to reducing freight emission through the Freight Best Practice Scotland. This programme includes the development of case studies demonstrating the advantages of electric vehicles over diesel equivalents for city centres, as well as the use of technology in reducing the unladen weight and improving efficiency in rural areas.
- 3.18 A proposed response is included at Appendix D, which the Partnership is asked to approve for submission by 2 October 2009.

## **4 CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 The various responses addressed in this report have been prepared in consultation with partner Councils and other stakeholders through the relevant Officer Liaison Groups.

## **5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There are no resource implications arising directly from this report.

**Michael Cairns**  
**Strategy Manager**

For further information e-mail [michaelcairns@tactran.gov.uk](mailto:michaelcairns@tactran.gov.uk) or tel 01738 475774.

### **NOTE**

The following background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 (and not containing confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above Report:

SEStran Bus Passenger Information Strategy April 2008

Scottish Ambulance Service: Our Future Strategy: Discussion with Partners

Transport Scotland: Station Car Parking Policy in Scotland 31 July 2009

Scottish Government Consultation on Low Carbon Vehicles June 2009

## APPENDIX A

Trond Haugen  
BPIS  
SEStran  
Hopetoun Gate  
8b McDonald Road  
Edinburgh  
EH7 4LZ

Bordeaux House  
31 Kinnoull Street  
PERTH  
PH1 5EN

Tel: 01738 475775  
Fax: 01738 639705  
E-mail: [info@tactran.gov.uk](mailto:info@tactran.gov.uk)

14<sup>th</sup> August 2009

Dear Trond,

### **Consultation, SEStran Bus Passenger Transport Information Strategy**

I refer to the above consultation. The response from *tactran* and our Partner Councils is as follows:

*tactran* is in the process of preparing a Regional Bus Information Strategy (RBIS) which it is anticipated will be adopted by partner Councils. One of our partner Councils has previously adopted a Public Transport Information Strategy (PTIS). This response has been considered having regard to the existing PTIS and current thinking on the likely shape of our emerging RBIS.

I note that there is no reference to information regarding cross boundary services into neighbouring RTP or Council areas. This is a major issue as current practices and standards are often different. There is also a need to reflect the joint working arrangement which exists through the Stirling & Clackmannanshire Councils' Transport Co-ordination Centre, which has responsibilities across the SEStran/*tactran* boundary. Future development of initiatives including in particular Real Time Information (RTI) would need detailed joint consideration.

Specific points with regard to Appendix A of the Report are as follows:

A.1.10 It is noted that the SEStran strategy will be reviewed after five years. *tactran* will also review the RBIS within five years subject to any RTS review in the interim.

A.2.6 This paragraph (and the detailed standards in A.2.8) states that the cost of timetable leaflets should be borne by operators. This is not necessarily the approach that will be adopted in the *tactran* area, where some local authorities currently produce service and area leaflets/guides, particularly for supported bus services, but also in the interests of ensuring comprehensive and composite timetable promotion of commercial service provision. Again consideration should be given to cross-boundary service arrangements.

A.2.8 It is noted that printed timetable information will be published and distributed at least 14 days before the introduction date. The existing PTIS in the *tactran* area states that the time scale should be seven days and it is currently anticipated that this minimum standard will also be adopted in the RBIS.

The requirement for a route description covering the urban area can also be covered by a town map in the relevant leaflets.

A.2.11 The detailed specification for information included in display cases may need to be reviewed for cross-boundary services, in the interests of ensuring a consistent approach across RTP boundaries.

A.2.22 We would suggest that the SEStran Public Transport Information Gateway should consider links as appropriate to neighbouring RTP/Council websites for more detailed information on cross-boundary services outwith the SEStran area.

A.2.37 – Standards – It is agreed that all buses should carry a clear headsign (destination/route number display), illuminated at night, though this may not always be possible, particularly in rural operations. Clearly this may have implications for supported bus services and will need to have regard to Council policies on these.

A.2.38 Again the issue of cross-boundary consistency is important as some local newspapers and local radio stations circulate/broadcast in more than one RTP area.

A.2.40 This needs to reflect that there may be different distribution points in neighbouring council /RTP areas.

In Appendix C it is noted that regular opinion surveys will be carried out at intervals of no more than two years and preferably one. The existing PTIS in the *tactran* area stipulates regular monitoring at two yearly intervals. It is anticipated that the *tactran* RBIS will recommend undertaking periodic surveys to ensure the currency of the Strategy, reflecting the cost of undertaking such surveys and aspects such as changing technologies. There may be scope for combining surveys with SEStran to achieve economies, ensure compatibility between relevant strategies and reflect technological developments.

As indicated in a number of the comments above, the cross-boundary issue is of considerable significance in ensuring that information at both ends of a journey is consistent; to avoid costly duplication, especially of timetable leaflets; in notification of changes in service, particularly in informing local media; ensuring that technology is compatible, especially with regard to RTI systems and, most importantly, ensuring that users and the public generally can expect to be confronted with a consistent and compatible standard of information provision. *tactran* will be pleased to work with SEStran in jointly seeking to develop consistent cross-boundary standards of information provision in these areas.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance. If you require any further information, or clarification of any aspect of this response, please contact myself on 01738 475774 in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,



Michael Cairns  
Strategy Manager

## APPENDIX B

Future Strategy Project  
Scottish Ambulance Service  
National Headquarters  
Tipperlinn Road  
Edinburgh  
EH10 5UU

Bordeaux House  
31 Kinnoull Street  
PERTH  
PH1 5EN

Tel: 01738 475775  
Fax: 01738 639705  
E-mail: [info@tactran.gov.uk](mailto:info@tactran.gov.uk)

10<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **SCOTTISH AMBULANCE SERVICE: OUR FUTURE STRATEGY CONSULTATION**

I refer to your email of 28<sup>th</sup> July seeking comments on the above consultation.

Responses to the consultation questions posed are as follows.

#### **Delivering for remote and rural healthcare**

- Q1 *How can we develop our current role in the provision of emergency care?*  
Q2 *Given the unique challenges faced by remote and rural communities, how can we share resources to improve emergency care services?*

These are not issues on which Tactran is in a position to respond.

- Q3 *How can we share resources to deliver integrated non emergency care?*  
Q4 *How do we involve communities better in the planning and delivery of services?*  
Q5 *What additional skills and infrastructure would we need?*

SAS has considerable resources available for passenger transport and expertise in providing such services, and is in a position to improve and integrate passenger access to health service facilities. There is great potential to work in partnership with Regional Transport Partnerships (RTP), Local Authorities and communities to provide transport in support of broader health and well-being objectives and in line with national and local strategic objectives.

*tactran* can assist in the better planning and delivery of services. The Partnership has Accession software that calculates accessibility from origins defined either by postcode or Census Output Areas to any defined destination, such as GP surgeries, hospitals or public transport hubs. This could be used to assist in identifying and prioritising access needs in rural areas and developing appropriate solutions.

There is considerable scope for reviewing transport provision and working with other partners. *tactran* has established a regional Transport and Health Working Group, incorporating representatives from the RTP, Health Boards and SAS, to promote and implement transport and health initiatives. The work undertaken by our partner Council, Perth & Kinross Council, together with NHS Tayside and SAS under the

Transport with Care - Integrated Delivery Project – Blairgowrie pilot indicates the opportunities that exist to work with local authorities and the voluntary sector to address rural transport needs efficiently. *Tactran* also anticipates introducing a Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) scheme in one of the region's rural areas, together with Partner Councils, that will aim to improve access to essential services, including health. Clearly this could complement SAS PTS.

### **Getting patients to and from hospitals**

*Q1 How do we work with local and regional Transport Co-ordinators to take forward an integrated transport strategy?*

As indicated in previous answers *tactran* believes that SAS should seek to work with local and regional transport co-ordinators to identify opportunities to consider the early integration of SAS PTS and wider passenger transport provision. The regional Transport and Health Working Group will be of value in considering such opportunities. This approach would generate considerable benefits in establishing good quality passenger transport links to the new acute hospital in Larbert.

*tactran* can assist in a number of ways already outlined in replies to the previous headings: through identifying sectors of the population with differing levels of accessibility to health services using Accession software; the application of the hospital/other NHS location journey plan initiative to assist those who are able to travel by other means; and promoting the integration of transport modes through the wider geographical application of the Blairgowrie Integrated Delivery Project pilot and development of DRT schemes.

The possibility of proving information on the travel reimbursement scheme could be considered in developing the journey plan initiative.

In terms of inter-hospital transport we would commend the Ninewells Hospital and Perth Royal Infirmary bus service (service number 333) as good practice. This was developed by our Partner, Perth & Kinross Council, jointly with NHS Tayside and Stagecoach. It provides a fast and direct link between the two hospitals and would be available for inter-hospital transfers where there are no specific medical needs.

*Q2 The current eligibility criteria is not adhered to across the NHS – how do we ensure it is correctly applied?*

This is a management issue for SAS to consider.

*Q3 How can we support NHS Boards in:*

- *meeting hospital transfer targets?*
- *meeting the 18 week target?*
- *meeting the 4 hour target?*
- *managing the patient discharge process?*

This is not an issue on which *Tactran* is in a position to respond.

*Q4 What services should the PTS deliver?*

As indicated in previous responses *tactran* believes that the SAS PTS should be considered along with other passenger transport services to deliver good quality access for the public to health service facilities.

## Enhancing the care we provide

- Q1 *How can we build on the existing models of care currently available to patients, for example, extending the work of community paramedics?*
- Q2 *Is there a role for paramedics in the provision of primary care?*
- Q3 *What role could we have in managing long-term conditions at home?*
- Q4 *What skills do we need to develop?*

These are not issues on which Tactran is in a position to respond.

- Q5 *What are your expectations of the Ambulance Service within the wider NHS framework?*
- Q6 *How can we exploit SAS infrastructure and expertise?*

*tactran* would strongly support SAS to combine its considerable expertise and infrastructure with that of RTPs, Local Authorities, bus operators and the voluntary sector to improve accessibility to health services and for the public in general.

In terms of transport similar dispatch centres can exist in local authorities, dealing with education and social work transport, and in the third sector, such as the Order of Malta Dial a Journey operations in Stirling. It is possible that these functions could be expanded within the *tactran* region to include a dispatch centre for DRT operations as these are expanded in future. There may be scope to consider combining these functions with those of the SAS. This would require detailed examination but initial principles could be considered by the *tactran* Transport and Health Group.

- Q7 *How could we support the co-ordination of all mobile unscheduled care resources?*

This is not an issue on which Tactran is in a position to respond.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance. If you require any further information, or clarification of any aspect of this response, please contact Michael Cairns, Strategy Manager on 01738 475774 in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,



Eric Guthrie  
Director

## APPENDIX C

Peter Lloyd  
Rail Policy Executive  
Strategic Policy and Integration Team  
Transport Scotland  
Buchanan House  
58 Port Dundas Road  
Glasgow  
G4 0HF

Bordeaux House  
31 Kinnoull Street  
PERTH  
PH1 5EN  
Tel: 01738 475775  
Fax: 01738 639705  
E-mail: [info@tactran.gov.uk](mailto:info@tactran.gov.uk)

22 September 2009

Dear Mr Lloyd,

### **Station Car Parking Policy in Scotland**

The Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership considered the above consultation at its meeting on 22 September 2009 and agreed to submit the following comments.

#### **Suppressed demand**

- *Does further expansion of car parking provision in effect just service suppressed demand?*
- *Can we then assume that creating more space at a particular time (pre 9am) by pricing interventions will just service “pre 9am” suppressed demand. Passengers who do not currently take their car to the station because of lack of spaces in the peak travel period now would.*
- *It is proposed by Passenger Focus that by showing parking space availability in real time on websites/text services would allow passengers to make informed choices, avoiding use of alternative modes because they think the station car park is full. Is that a realistic option?*

*tactran* does not have any information available on suppressed demand and would suggest that this is an issue on which Transport Scotland should commission research. We have detailed information on parking usage and user characteristics at stations in the region which has been supplied to you and hopefully should be of assistance in considering the issue.

It is important to recognise that parking by station users does not just occur in station car parks. Where the station parking is perceived to be too expensive or is operating at capacity passengers will consider parking in other operators' car parks nearby or on-street. Expanding parking provision in such circumstances does not necessarily service suppressed demand but encourages motorists to park appropriately without causing nuisance to neighbouring residential properties or prevent public car parks servicing other needs.

The nature of the suppressed demand also needs consideration. If by providing additional parking at stations longer journeys already being undertaken by car are substituted completely or partly by rail then this is likely to support national, regional and local aims to tackle congestion and reduce the environmental and other impacts of car usage.

*tactran* would support Passenger Focus in providing real time information on parking availability, especially if this reduces “rail-heading” or car travel for the whole journey. It is recognised though that there could be significant costs in implementing this measure and therefore it should be subject to a relevant appraisal. We would also suggest that an audit should be undertaken of station car park usage and condition. This would ensure that maximum capacity is achieved through appropriate layouts and bay markings and, where necessary, enforcement to deter use by non-train travelling motorists.

### **Station choice**

- *Passengers will drive to stations which are not the closest to their home but which offer greater service frequency.*
- *Passengers chase capacity and service. Does this suggest that there is an element of self-regulation of the balance of parking and service provision? Is an intervention required?*

It is undoubtedly the case that some passengers will “rail-head” to a station further than their nearest station. This should not be subject to self-regulation. Clearly each instance needs to be considered individually however, issues that need to be considered include ensuring that the total journey time between the passenger’s origin and destination is as attractive for making a long train journey as it is for this being a smaller proportion of the overall travel time. Fare structures could be reviewed to encourage a longer train journey, particularly for commuters, with tapered season ticket prices.

### **Overpricing for car parking dissuades people from rail travel**

- *Following simple demand and supply considerations, the pricing of rail fares already acts as rationing: it manages passenger demand against the supply capacity of rail services*
- *How would any additional car parking charges affect this position? Would that discourage passengers from using rail? Currently we do not understand in any detail the price sensitivity and elasticity of demand around car park charging interventions to maximise capacity in shoulder and off peak times*
- *Conversely, how do we stimulate demand if car parks are already full? By creating peak time capacity by pricing do we only tap into suppressed demand? What are the implications building overall demand by creating a peak to off-peak shift?*
- *Would car parking charges be additional, or would these be redeemable against ticket costs? How could this be managed?*

Again, the issue of car park charges needs to be considered as part of a wider picture of transport and travel considerations. Rail fares serve a dual function in terms of managing demand on train services and also contributing to the determination of modal choice, particularly between train travel and the main alternative car travel. In some instances it may be possible to give further consideration to these aspects through the use of local authority traffic/transport models where the overall relative cost of travel including actual motoring/train ticket/parking costs can be considered together with the impact of walking and waiting time, etc.

Making parking available at peak times may be more effective at reducing traffic congestion than encouraging off-peak travel. The latter is more likely to be

suppressed than essential peak time journeys where if public transport is not feasible for commuting then the journey will not disappear but be undertaken by car.

The issue of car park charges and whether they should be additional needs to be considered separately for each station. In general, it is believed that, outside major urban centres where there will be a comprehensive network of local/Park & Ride bus services and walking and cycling routes, charges should not be levied. If these are necessary to prevent abuse by non-passengers then the parking charge should be refundable against a train ticket.

Passenger Focus surveys have shown that the majority of passengers (60%) are not satisfied with the value for money for the price of their ticket. Inflating the costs of rail travel further through parking charges will worsen the perception of rail travel being expensive vis-à-vis car travel.

The operation of each station car park and the charging policy should be considered in the local context in consultation with local authority officers, particularly those concerned with parking and traffic management, to give full consideration to the impact on parking demands and controls in the area of each station generally and overall accessibility.

#### **Supply and demand**

- *How do we bring about a set of circumstances which create a shift in demand (time or geographic shift)?*
- *What, if any, are the implications for timetabling and rail service capacity?*

*tactran* commends adopting the ATOC Station Travel Plan approach to ensure that station car park charging is put in a context of overall station accessibility. Shifting demand from car to alternative modes to access stations could then be considered as well as peak to off-peak train travel.

The implications for timetabling and rail service capacity can only be determined by Transport Scotland and First ScotRail as the only organisations that have access to detailed patronage figures, though *tactran* would wish to be involved in any discussions.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance. If you require any further information, or clarification of any aspect of this response, please contact Michael Cairns, Strategy Manager on 01738 475774 in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Guthrie  
Director

## APPENDIX D

LCV Consultation  
Sustainable Transport Team  
Area 2-D (North)  
Victoria Quay  
Edinburgh  
EH6 6QQ

Bordeaux House  
31 Kinnoull Street  
PERTH  
PH1 5EN

Tel: 01738 475775  
Fax: 01738 639705  
E-mail: [info@tactran.gov.uk](mailto:info@tactran.gov.uk)

22 September 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

### Consultation on Low Carbon Vehicles

The Tayside and Central Scotland Transport Partnership considered the above consultation at its meeting on 22 September 2009 and agreed to submit the following comments.

*tactran* supports the Scottish Government's policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and agrees that intervention will be required in the vehicle market.

### Technology Options

*Q1 Which low carbon technologies and fuels do you envisage will be first to be influential in reducing GHG emissions from the transport sector? Why?*

*Q2. Which low carbon technologies and fuels do you believe will ultimately have the greatest emissions abatement impact? Why?*

*Q3. What timescales do you believe are feasible for the **development** of specific low carbon technologies and fuels? Are there any important intermediate milestones within these timescales?*

*Q4. What timescales do you believe are the feasible for the **uptake** of specific low carbon technologies and fuels? Are there any important intermediate milestones within these timescales?*

*Q5. Are there other barriers to the **development** of such fuels and technologies that are not mentioned in this document? If so, what are they?*

*Q6. Are there other barriers to the **uptake** of such fuels and technologies that are not mentioned in this document? If so, what are they?*

*Q7. Are there any negative social impacts associated with either the development or uptake of such technologies/fuels? If so, what are they?*

*Q8. What, if any, technical challenges would the grid reinforcement upgrades be likely to present? How might these be overcome?*

*Q9. Who would fund any grid upgrades? And, how might these costs be recovered?*

*Q10. Do any of the technologies present any specific challenges or opportunities to island communities and sparsely populated rural areas in Scotland? If so, how might these challenges be addressed, and by whom?*

The implications of a Low Carbon Vehicles policy for rural and remote areas needs detailed consideration. Supply of alternative fuels, except electricity, could be difficult in areas with low demand and widely dispersed filling stations. This has been experienced with the supply of LPG for vehicles which is not widely available outside urban areas. The need to travel and costs of travel due to longer distances are critical and such areas should not be disadvantaged as a result.

*tactran* can foresee difficulties with the future use of electric vehicles in terms of the demand that this would place on the electricity transmission infrastructure. Also, there are practical difficulties in recharging vehicles parked remotely from properties, such as residential flats. Pre-1950s flats rarely have off-street parking available and therefore there are concerns how vehicles can be recharged safely and free from vandalism or interference on-street.

In terms of the application of fast charging technology *tactran* has identified a partner that potentially would be interested in a demonstration project in a park and ride car park. We would be happy to discuss this further with the Government.

## **Setting Targets**

*Q11. Do you think that having a twin approach for the public sector and other users is appropriate? If so, why? If not, why not?*

*Q12. If so, should targets relate to the uptake of low carbon vehicles (either as a percentage of the fleet or an absolute number), or a reduction in total emissions across the fleets or another format of target? Why?*

*Q13. If we follow a target relating to the public sector uptake of LCVs, what percentage of the fleet should be LCVs by 2020? Please give reasons for your answer.*

*Q14. If we follow a target relating to the uptake of LCVs across all road users, what percentage of all new vehicles should be LCVs by 2020? Please give reasons for your answer.*

*Q15. Are there any vehicle categories that should be excluded from the public sector target? If so, what are they and why should they be excluded? If not, why not?*

*Q16. As LCVs may have higher upfront costs than traditional vehicles (albeit with a smaller discrepancy between lifecycle costs) do you consider it to be efficient use of public resources to devote a greater short-term budget towards the purchase of LCVs? If so, why? If not, why not?*

*Q17. Are there any opportunities or barriers to public sector procurement of LCVs that are not mentioned in this document? If so, what are they?*

Q18. What are the individual roles of different groups and organisations in ensuring the provision of any infrastructure required for low carbon vehicles?

Q19. Are there other supply side/capacity constraints impacting on LCV development and uptake? If so, what are they?

Q20. Are there barriers to the development of an indigenous low carbon vehicle industry in Scotland? If so, what are they and how might they be overcome?

Q21. Should Scotland's industry focus on particular vehicle types? If so, what are they and why? If not, why not?

Q22. Are there gaps in the supply chain? If so, what are they and how might these be overcome?

Q23. Do we have the required skills base for the development of this market? If not, where are the gaps?

Q24. How could the various stakeholders collaborate to stimulate the development and uptake of LCVs?

It is noted that the Government is committed to facilitating the upgrading of the public sector bus fleet by 2020. The consultation document indicates that the average age of such vehicles is four years and therefore the average life is likely to be around eight years. Setting a target for 2020 therefore means that the public sector will be into the second round of vehicle renewal. It is believed that the time scale should be shortened and that it should aim for this fleet to be entirely Low Carbon by 2015/2016.

It is noted also that the Government is committed to reducing freight emissions. While accepting there may be some specialist vehicles that may need to be excluded *tactran* suggests setting a target of 2020 for most if not all public sector vehicles (including cars and freight) to be Low Carbon emitting.

Financial support will be needed from Scottish Government to meet the cost difference between Low Carbon and conventional vehicles and recognition by Audit Scotland of procurement of vehicles that offer low carbon emissions but are not necessarily optimal in purely financial terms.

There will be benefits to achieving a greater proportion of Low Carbon Vehicles earlier as many public sector vehicles are sold for further use and therefore this will influence the second hand market as well.

*tactran* is undertaking a study into the feasibility of freight consolidation centres in Dundee and Perth. Any introduction of such a centre would enable the substitution of low carbon for existing delivery vehicles in the city centres. It is unlikely that such an initiative would be self-financing and therefore *tactran* would urge the government to consider financial support in such circumstances.

In Section 6.4 reference is made to the Scottish fleet. This raises an issue with UK-wide operations and measures may be needed to discourage operators from registering vehicles elsewhere in the UK to avoid more stringent requirements in Scotland.

Finally, there is a need to recognise that the most effective means to reduce carbon emissions is not to undertake travel, for example through substituting video conferencing. A Low Carbon Vehicles policy should sit alongside other initiatives including travel planning.

I trust that the above comments are of assistance. If you require any further information, or clarification of any aspect of this response, please contact Michael Cairns, Strategy Manager on 01738 475774 in the first instance.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Guthrie  
Director