



## Questions for Network Rail (as of 2 December 2015)

The following questions have been prepared by The Strathbungo Society further to the receipt of a letter of 6 November 2015 from Network Rail (Ms. Niamh Hegarty, Senior Public Affairs Manager Scotland). The Society asks Network Rail to respond to these questions, *prior* to a meeting between The Strathbungo Society, local political representatives and Network Rail.

### 1. Risk Assessment

Please provide clear specifications for all your fencing classes.

Under what classification has Network Rail evaluated the current fencing on a) Moray Place? b) Darnley Rd. Also, is it in same class for whole of this section of the line?

Please provide the standard for risk scores as referred to in letter of 6 November 2015.

You say that assessments of risk of trespass are done as if the vegetation, no matter how dense or spiny, were not there. Is that the case? If so, please provide a copy of the policy document or regulation that specifies that trees and vegetation *cannot* be considered as an additional deterrent when assessing risks.

We note in a reply to Cllr Norman Macleod that you state hoop style fencing could be climbed over. Have you done a risk assessment of this happening? How does this compare to the risk of people climbing over the *low level* gates (and steps) that Network Rail have already installed on Moray Place and Darnley Rd? Why was the risk assessment sufficient for the installation of low level gates in these locations but not for the fencing proposed by Network Rail?

Please provide a copy of the risk assessment that was undertaken when a gate and steps were installed about two years ago by Network Rail, located just past the junction with Shields Road on Darnley Road. There should also be a similar risk assessment for the wooden gate and steel steps installed on Moray Place about twenty years ago. If an assessment was not done or is unavailable for that installation, has any assessment of risk been completed on this Moray Place gate since its installation, perhaps as part ongoing safety concerns?

### 2. Fencing

Please provide complete specifications and cost estimates for all the quotes you have obtained for installing a) weldmesh fence b) Barkers Styleguard and c) hooped-top fencing for the length of Moray Place. It is important to indicate on *which boundary line* each quote applies (i.e. is it the boundary to Moray Place road or the boundary indicated by

Network Rail in the summer i.e. further back amongst the trees?).

Please provide breakdown of traffic management costs for the various fence options you have so far considered.

Please provide description/specification for how all these proposed fences will link with the listed Victorian pedestrian bridge over the railway.

It is unclear from your correspondence whether the current Victorian hoop top fence will remain. Initially you said in your letter of 5 January 2015 was that it would be demolished. Then in an email on the 24 April 2015 you say "It is our understanding that the 1890s black iron fence running along a section of Moray Place and Vennard Gardens would remain. This is not a matter for Network Rail but rather an issue for the Local Authority." Since then you then imply it is not a Local Authority matter after all. In your letter of the 6 November 2015 you claim that it you have "possession" of the fence and land it is erected on". Furthermore, you imply any new fence could be sited where the old one is, which would again necessitate its demolition.

Network Rail told a representative of the Glasgow City Council Planning Department in January 2105 that you would *consult* on a suitable fence design before any works went ahead. Can we ask why advice – which could have been extremely useful to you (and to the Strathbungo Society) and would have provided designs to consider – has not yet been sought?

In site meetings and a recent email to Cllr Norman Macleod, you have claimed that Network Rail have no personnel with experience of heritage restoration or installation of new infrastructure that is appropriate for a heritage setting. Frankly, how does that view fit with completed projects like Gleneagles Station where Network Rail fitted a lift which blends with a historic station and its cast iron footbridge? Or perhaps, as Network Rail is a UK wide organisation, the restoration of Manchester Victoria Station by its in-house team?

### **3. Legal Boundary**

Does Network Rail have any further evidence – beyond the 1858 feu document – that was used for the April 2015 mapping exercise which claims to show Network Rail land coloured in blue? If so, what is this evidence?

Can you please indicate the *legal* basis for Network Rail to claim 'possession' of the land on which the present 1890s cast iron hooped fence is erected; you say it is because you have inspected and maintained the fence but we can find no legal basis for this.

Has any study or inspection been done on the consequence for access and the free flow of traffic in Moray Place were any new fence to be installed on what you claim to be your boundary in the first section of Moray Place? You note that Network Rail are legally obliged to place the fence on its boundary but given the narrowness of Moray Place it would become impassable to cars were a fence were sited along the kerb.

Also on the subject of your legal requirement to build on the boundary, what do you propose as a solution to the fact that you claim a large portion of the roadway in Moray Place outside No 1 Moray Place – including a large portion of its garden?

#### 4. Effects on Wildlife

Please provide a copy of any assessments done to identify wildlife species that could be affected by the proposed works, including any assessment of the potential harm to wildlife by the removal of trees and vegetation or the effects of the installation of a weld mesh fence which would block the movement of wild mammals in particular. You have stated that such assessments are done in the weeks just prior to any works commencing. Given the original February 2015 start date, some such assessment must have been completed.

You state that no replanting or remedial work will be done on the site if the plans go ahead. Which policy statements allow Network Rail to remove habitat from a designated Green Corridor with no ameliorating works?

#### 5. Grants

Has Network Rail approached any external organisation, such as the Railway Heritage Trust for example or other relevant agencies for grant funding to enable Network Rail to install appropriate railings in what is a key Conservation Area, that faces Grade A and B listed buildings of considerable national heritage value?

If no approaches have been made, why has Network Rail not done so?

#### 6. EAAP

The EAAP was updated in July 2015, yet there are still questions that have been answered by Network Rail in a contradictory manner. For example in 10.2 you state that no road or pavement closures are needed yet a response to Cllr Macleod details £11,000 to be spent on traffic management. In Question 10.4 road closures are marked as needed.

In other questions the answer given by Network Rail seems to be wrong. For example in Question 8.1 Network Rail seem to be saying that the site of a new high security fence is not near/at or can be seen from a site-specific townscape designation. The fence will be in a Conservation Area which is an official designation of importance. This should surely have been marked as YES.

In Section 2 of the document, Network Rail states that "...we will be mindful of the need for an appropriate fence and adhere to the general approach that works in a conservation area should not *adversely affect* its character." The present proposal will adversely affect the Strathbungo Conservation Area and the A listed 1-10 Moray Place (among the oldest A listed buildings in Glasgow) and the other B listed terraces on Moray Place. The document says clearly that Network Rail will "Liaise with Town Planning Team, community and Glasgow City Council to ensure an appropriate solution is found." Yet in a recent email to Cllr Macleod you stated that you would be proceeding on the basis of standard weld mesh or palisade. This is very much at odds with the above statements, especially as NR has not consulted Glasgow City Council or any other body (for example Historic Environment Scotland) who could provide specialist advice on what sort of fencing would not *adversely affect* Strathbungo Conservation Area.

The timescale is given as 'ongoing' which is vague.

There are more issues which need further explanation and possible amendment within this document and we urge Network Rail to discuss, review and update it.

The Strathbungo Society, December 2015