

FC57. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

(a) Bonnybridge Railway Station

Councillor Buchanan, seconded by Councillor CR Martin, moved that:-

“The Former minister for transport Stewart Stevenson responded to my letter of September 2010 by stating quite clearly that and I quote:

“A new rail station at Bonnybridge was considered as part of the appraisal process within STPR but it was concluded there was no strategic case for an additional station. The proposed station location places it one of the most strategically significant sections of the Scottish rail network. Passenger services from Glasgow and South West to destinations in Northern and Eastern Scotland utilise this section of track, thus a new station at Bonnybridge would limit the potential to accommodate wider service patterns while also restricting other STPR improvements.

In light of these issues a new rail station at Bonnybridge is not supported.

This was after both former MSP Denis Canavan from 2005 until he retired and Margaret Mitchell MSP in 2009, had raised the issue with questions in the Scottish Parliament. They both were informed on each occasion that there was no support for a railway station for a number of reasons. On the 14th November 2010 I wrote to the new transport Minister Keith Brown, asking him to re-open the issue, and take a fresh look at the proposal for a Bonnybridge Rail Station. He responded by stating that his predecessor had been in contact to explain the government position, and that it has not changed in all this time and, there was no support. Despite this government response and the clear message coming out Michael Matheson MSP, had for some considerable time, been sending out letters and leaflets to my constituents, trying to blame the administration of Falkirk Council for in his words blocking attempts, to establish a new station, and attacking Councillor Gow and myself for not supporting proposals put forward to the Council to fund a stag report. This was a concerted effort by Mr Matheson and the SNP to discredit. This kind of reprehensible behaviour was disgraceful as Mr Matheson was well aware that for years his colleagues had given no support for the station.

Knowing this he still raised expectations in our community therefore, I propose the following motion, that this Council contacts Michael Matheson MSP and ask, that he, be whatever means, select committee, motion to parliament, moves for support for his colleagues for the opening of a rail station at Bonnybridge and that he publically apologises to the administration of this Council, and to Councillor Gow and myself. But more importantly apologises to the community of Bonnybridge for his disgraceful conduct in misleading them”.

By way of an Amendment, Councillor Coleman, seconded by Councillor Alexander, moved that:-

“Council notes the previous SNP/Independent Administration from 2001 – 2007 were able to demonstrate the feasibility of a railway station at Bonnybridge.

Council notes that Michael Matheson MSP has not been able to demonstrate the sustainability of a station at Bonnybridge.

In contrast Cllr Buchanan and his current colleagues have failed to invest a single penny in the process despite being advised by the Transport Minister that a station for Bonnybridge was “a case unmade” by Falkirk Council.

Council therefore calls on Cllr Buchanan to work with the SNP, Bonnybridge Community Council, the Foxdale Residents Association and other local groups making a genuine contribution to the debate on the delivery of a railway station rather than his continuous grandstanding”.

In accordance with Standing Order 31.1, Provost Reid moved, Councillor CR Martin seconded, and Council **AGREED** unanimously, to extend the time of the meeting to 6.30 pm, or later if necessary, to allow the current, and subsequent, items to be dealt with.

Following discussion on the terms of the Motion and Amendment, and in accordance with Standing Order 25.2 (ii), Councillor Gow, seconded by Councillor Coleman, moved that the “question now be put”.

On a division, 24 members voted for the Motion and 4 voted against.

The mover of the original Motion then spoke in reply before the Motion was put to the vote.

On a division, 12 voted for the Amendment and 16 members voted for the Motion.

Accordingly, **AGREED** the terms of the Motion.