

Hi Both,

Sorry for the delay on this,

Here is the breakdown,

[Redacted, S33(1)(b)]

I would be happy to have a quick catch up on a next steps conversation?

Cheers

[Redacted]



[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Scotland's Railway
Network Rail
151 St Vincent Street, Glasgow, G2 5NW
[Redacted]
[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk
My pronouns are [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Sent: 24 March 2023 16:35

To: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>

Cc: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Winchburgh

OFFICIAL

From: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>

Sent: 17 February 2023 17:23

To: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Subject: Re: Winchburgh

OFFICIAL

Hi [Redacted]

From our friends at capital delivery

“

We have revisited the AiP (inc SI/GI) price on a like for like basis against the previous submission. The revised cost, including revised supplier pricing is **[Redacted, S 33 (1)(b)]**

“

Let me know what else you need

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Scotland's Railway

Network Rail

151 St Vincent Street, Glasgow, G2 5NW

[Redacted]

[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk

My pronouns are: [Redacted]

From: [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2023 3:51:52 PM

To: [Redacted]< [Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>

Cc: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>; [Redacted]< [Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>; [Redacted]< [Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>; [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>; [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Railway Station at Winchburgh

OFFICIAL

Before we respond we were hoping to understand if you had a revised cost breakdown for the development work. Or does the estimate remain at [Redacted, S 33 (1)(b)]. The reason I ask is this cost was provided before the NR Winchburgh position paper was produced, which carries a lower AFC.

This information is important for TS to consider if it would be appropriate to fund this next stage of development.

I would be grateful if you could advise?

Kind regards,

[Redacted]



[Redacted]
Project Sponsor | Transport Scotland Rail
T: [Redacted]
transport.gov.scot



Forgot about this one – sorry!

The new quote of [Redacted, S33(1)(b)] needs to go to Bill, if you can share that on please.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]



TRANSPORT
SCOTLAND
CÒMHDHAIL ALBA

[Redacted]

Project Sponsor | Transport Scotland Rail

T: [Redacted]

transport.gov.scot



From: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>

Sent: Monday, June 19, 2023 12:22 PM

To: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Cc: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>;

[Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Winchburgh station position paper

OFFICIAL

[Redacted]

Please see below in the email text some responses from the team to the specifics raised.

On the broader point of active travel integration, [Redacted] did a brief note at the time(attached for info) on the back of this mini-report. This generally further highlights that this work has yet to be concluded by the promoter (and we would imagine be something that would form a key element of any planning application), whilst also defining the role/size of any car-park. It should also be noted this could be an elemental source of funding.

We've had a look at trying to reduce the proposed [Redacted S33 (1)(b)] for next stage of design, and believe it could be possible to reduce it to circa [Redacted, S33(1)(b)] This would be with a view to having something that could support a planning application but therefore would be dependent on a better understanding of roles and responsibilities regarding active travel and other integration aspects.

This all then points to the broader question of whether overall funding sources and roles/responsibilities should be clarified before further design work is undertaken (and itself funded) or whether such further development would help conclude some of these issues.

Hopefully the upcoming dialogue will help answer this, as always please don't hesitate to contact us if you want to discuss in the interim.

Best regards

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Sent: 02 June 2023 16:28

To: [Redacted]< [Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>; [Redacted]) <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@networkrail.co.uk>

Cc: [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot; [Redacted]@transport.gov.scot

Subject: Winchburgh station position paper

OFFICIAL

[Redacted], [Redacted], [Redacted],

Thank you for sharing the Winchburgh station position paper. We have some comments which are detailed below.

To note - Bill has discussed the Winchburgh station proposal with the Minister. It's been suggested that our Chief Executive may speak to the Head of West Lothian Council to discuss where their responsibilities lie on this proposal. It has also been suggested that the Minister may want to meet with John Hamilton, CEO Winchburgh Developments Ltd.

All of the comments below are in the context of extreme budget pressure with no scope for funding of new projects without removal of some other options.

Observations on the revised **scope and cost** estimate :

1. We would need the six car platforms at least. We could not afford the dwell time extensions that short platform working would entail, and I am not sure if risk based safety case for short platforms would be acceptable here. That said, we should ensure there is a contingency option to stop 8 car E&G trains by exception, to assist in times of disruption.
[Noted.](#)
2. There is a real opportunity to integrate the station design and construction with the new road bridge being built by the developer at one end of the station site. However, since that bridge is to be built this year, I am concerned we may miss that opportunity. We should establish if this is still possible urgently.

This opportunity has indeed essentially passed as the new over bridge works are on site and due to be completed in Autumn 2023.

3. I cannot understand how we can cost two lifts and two sets of steps at [Redacted, S33(1)(b)] - Especially as they are to be integrated with the road bridge. That needs some urgent cost challenge, and a look at alternative materials to steel if it is the steel step design that is driving much of the cost? I also note from the drawings there are two pairs of steps – one at each lift and one further down the platforms – why is this?

Lift specification and materials will be considered during the next development phase. Over the past 3 years, we have installed several sets of new lifts at stations and robust benchmarking information is available. The second set of steps is driven by the requirement for a secondary means of fire escape. The project will consider options for derogation from this requirement during the development phase.

4. Are we certain the mast portals need to be moved. Is there a safe option for the platforms to be built around them and still leave safe spaces on the platform?

No we aren't certain at this stage. The existing stancheons would clash with platform footprint but how to deal with this will be dealt with in design detail during the next development phase.

5. What signalling design and data alterations are necessary? Are we proposing to add another block section? If not, why are there any signals or signal alterations – what is driving that?

At this stage the signalling scope simply includes a single signal relocation to provide the optimum platform configuration, and any associated data alterations.

6. We should look at GRP for the platforms, as used at Robroyston. We should also look at lighter and more cost effective materials (e.g. modern timber laminates) than steel for other elements such as steps, if the combination of a potentially over-conservative design and steel prices is causing excessive costs.

This opportunity will be developed throughout the next stage of development.

7. I note the developer is looking to provide adjacent parking anyway – to confirm this would be at its own cost. There is another consideration which is that the combination of parking charges and EV charging tariffs could make the car park self-funding. WDL has committed to building a public car park on Block T on the west side of the railway line, regardless of whether the railway station proceeds. They said this is *'to safeguard options on the wider public transport strategy in the event that Project Feasibility for the railway station is not reached.'* Block T on the plan is directly across the railway line across from Block Z – where the station is proposed.



8. It would be good to explore the use of the Developer's earth moving and construction capability – indeed this might form a large part of the Developer's contribution.

If you have any questions please let me know.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]



TRANSPORT
SCOTLAND
CÒMHDHAIL ALBA

[Redacted]

Project Sponsor | Transport Scotland Rail

T: [Redacted]

transport.gov.scot



From: [Redacted]

Sent: 31 March 2023 09:07

To: Bill Reeve <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Cc: [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@transport.gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Winchburgh Station

Dear Bill,

NR has now provided a cost breakdown for the next stage of Winchburgh development work (attached).

Simply to follow up on if you managed to speak to Alex Hynes about the possibility of NR progressing the funding from their development budget?

Kind regards,

[Redacted]



TRANSPORT
SCOTLAND
CÒMHDHAIL ALBA

[Redacted]

Project Sponsor | Transport Scotland Rail

T: [Redacted]

transport.gov.scot



Please note (*Winchburgh Summary Position Paper*) – the Network Rail revised report has been withheld under S33 (1)(b) FOISA.