

Yorkshire **railfuture**

President: Alan Whitehouse Vice-Presidents: Mike Crowhurst & Alan Williams

Transport for the North's Vision

By Mark Parry



Jonathan Brown – photo by Mark Parry

Transport for the North's (TfN) Senior Rail Strategy Officer, Jonathan Brown, outlined their vision for our railways across Northern England at our last branch meeting in Pontefract. They see improved transport links as the key to enhancing our economy and quality of life. TfN is the first "sub-national transport body and has 4 aims:

- A single voice for the North and strategic partner with the Government.
- Co-manage two rail franchises and identify rail priorities.
- Deliver a strategic plan for road and rail investment.
- Deliver smart travel across the North.

TfN has 4 development partners, 11 Local Enterprise partners and 19 local government partners. They work closely with Rail North and the two will eventually merge. With 16 million people, Northern England is nearly as large as the Netherlands, with 19% of the UK economy. They anticipate an increase of 400% in rail travel and 55% increase in road travel by 2050. They are working on developing strategic development corridors, not all of them linking large cities. Since 1995 rail has grown by 185% with little investment. Northern Powerhouse Rail aims to link large cities with journeys of 30 minutes with 6 trains an hour. New lines will be needed to link Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds, Hull and Newcastle to meet these targets. The TfN strategy is expected to be published in 2018 for consultation. As the meeting was held in Pontefract, it was pointed out by the new local user group that Pontefract has the lines and the stations but with few services constrained to county boundaries. An example of something TfN could help change.

Railfuture, Yorkshire Branch Meeting

Speaker: Rachel Maskell MP for York Central (Labour) and Shadow Rail Minister

13:00 to 16:00 hours, Saturday, 28 October 2017

@York Explore, (York Library) Library Square, Museum Street, York, YO1 7DS

See flyer for more details

PLUS extra Supplement on the Airport Parkway Station Debate – see back section

“BRITAIN’S GROWING RAILWAY” is edited by Jerry Alderson and Ian McDonald and published by Railfuture ISBN 978-0-901283-19-1 Price £9.95.

Subtitled “An A-Z guide to more than 400 new and reopened stations”, this book does what it says on the tin. It is the sixth edition of the title, and is produced to a much higher standard than previously. A5 size, printed on high quality paper and well-illustrated, this book represents truly excellent value and is an indispensable reference work to all rail campaigners.

As well as describing in alphabetical order those stations opened since 1960, the book also covers those expected to reopen during the next few years. But this book is about more than stations. It has a chapter on new and reopened lines for passengers, and another on lines reopening soon. There are short chapters devoted to Ireland and to overseas. There is a full chapter covering “Metro, light rail and tramways”. The final two chapters are really appendices, and list in chronological order station (re) openings and line (re) openings. Finally, there are maps showing the geographical spread of new and reopened stations.

The annual footfall at each new station is shown in the paragraph devoted to that station. It would be helpful if the next edition could have an appendix listing these by size of footfall and also, in the interests of balance, a list of closed stations and lines since, say, 1970. A skim through the 400 stations shows a very large range of usage. At the top end are stations with seven figure footfalls including Birmingham Moor Street (nearly 7 million), Dalston Kingsland (6.5m), Manchester Airport (3.6m), Bristol Parkway (2.5m), Chafford Hundred in Essex (2.5m), Meadowhall (2.1m) and Bathgate (1.2 m).

In Yorkshire, forty stations were opened or reopened. These are:

Adwick 1993 (205k)	Apperley Bridge 2015 (96k – part year)	Baildon 1973 (205k)
Bentley 1992 (141k)	Berry Brow 1989 (33k)	Bramley 1983 (317k)
Brighouse 2000 (416k)	Burley Park 1988 (698k)	Cononley 1988 (168k)
Cottingley 1988 (89k)	Crossflatts 1982 (525k)	Deighton 1982 (96k)
Dodworth 1989 (48k)	East Garforth 1987 (239k)	Featherstone 1992 (86k)
Fitzwilliam 1982 (293k)	Frizinghall 1987 (377k)	Glasshoughton 2005 (187k)
Goldthorpe 1988 (63k)	Hornbeam Park 1982 (353k)	Horton-in-Ribblesdale 1986 (16k)
Kirk Sandall 1991 (128k)	Kirkstall Forge 2016 (no data)	Low Moor 2017 (no data)
Meadowhall 1990 (2.14m)	New Pudsey 1967 (891k)	Outwood 1988 (390k)
Pontefract Tanshelf 1992 (33k)	Ribblehead 1986 (19k)	Rotherham Central 1987 (690k)
Saltaire 1984 (880k)	Sandal and Agbrigg 1987 (275k)	Sherburn-in-Elmet 1984 (50k)
Silkstone Common 1984 (39k)	Slaithwaite 1982 (213k)	Steeton and Silsden 1990 (839k)
Streethouse 1982 (28k)	Swinton 1990 (391k)	Thurnscoe 1988 (78k)
Walsden 1990 (102k)		

It will be observed that in most cases there are strong correlations between footfall and the frequency and quality of train services. Airedale Line stations have done very well, stations with poor service frequency and/or no direct Leeds service, as in the Pontefract area, less well. This highlights the need for higher frequency services in such areas. The accuracy of footfall figures is also questionable, particularly in the metropolitan areas where many passengers use joint train and bus period cards.

This book is highly recommended. Do buy it, ideally from your local independent bookshop if you have one, and also fill in a reservation card for it at your local public library.

Pass this newsletter to a friend when you’ve finished and help advertise Railfuture.

Extra Supplement on the Airport Parkway Station Debate – see back section

This summit has been widely featured in both the print and broadcast media. It was called in response to Grayling's cancellation of the Midland Main Line electrification north of Kettering, and the growing uncertainty over whether the Huddersfield trans-Pennine route would, after all, be electrified. The Transport Secretary appears to think that bi-mode trains are cutting edge technology, yet they are clearly inferior to pure electrics regarding acceleration, weight, noise (when in diesel mode) and, most importantly, environmental impact. These decisions have caused many to be concerned about the Government's commitment to a new high-speed cross Pennine rail link, originally referred to as HS3, subsequently as Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR), and now increasingly as Northern Crossrail or Crossrail for the North.

When the Midland Mainline bombshell and the grave worries regarding Trans Pennine electrification emerged, I thought that maybe Railfuture would have to lead a campaign to ensure the Trans Pennine line was electrified. The sheer scale of such a task alarmed me as we are volunteers and don't have the time or resources to lead a big campaign. So, I was mightily relieved when the big guns of Northern politics decided to mount a campaign! Hence, the summit, arranged at short notice, and very well attended, mostly by council leaders and officers and business people, with a small number of Third Sector people present. It was very encouraging to see how much business people seem to be on board with the need for fast inter-city transport across the north.

Greater Manchester Mayor Andy Burnham was the leading player and at the end he asked those present to support a statement to Government. Specifically, the draft statement calls on the Government to:

- Honour in full, commitments already given to deliver improvements to rail services across the North, including full electrification, track and signalling improvements on key commuter routes and the upgrade of hub stations, and to remove uncertainty about this at the earliest opportunity
- Prioritise its manifesto commitment to deliver new west-east rail infrastructure reaching across the North, work with Transport for the North to set out a clear timetable for its delivery in the Autumn Budget, and provide evidence that this timetable will not be adversely affected by decisions to fund other large infrastructure projects elsewhere in the country; and
- Set about a fairer distribution of transport funding (revenue and capital) across all regions of the country.

Clearly Railfuture can endorse this. The meeting also agreed to establish a representative forum to enable the voice of the North of England to be properly and effectively represented on issues of common concern. The draft presented to the meeting referred only to the forum being of political and business leaders, but in discussion there were calls for the Third and Trade Union sectors to be included, and Andy Burnham appeared to have taken these on board.

Perhaps the most important point made at the summit was one made by Bradford Council Leader Susan Hinchcliffe, namely that the difference in land values between London and the North meant that there was a distorted playing field regarding investment decisions. She said this had to change. Stephen Leigh of the Mid Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry said that the North will always find it difficult to win investment funding until a project appraisal system is developed which takes into account the special circumstances of the North. Allison Page of Business North said that the Government needs to look holistically when developing transport appraisal systems. She said that as well as the points already made, the formula needed to take account of the health and human capital benefits of investment in public transport. In his closing address, Andy Burnham, a former Treasury Minister, stated that the Benefit Cost Ratio funding formula is weighted in favour of London and the Home Counties and against the North (and by inference other regions) due to prioritising the amount of GVA (Gross Value Added) that a proposed investment would generate. Burnham called for a social weighting to be introduced into the Treasury/Department for Transport funding formula so that areas that already have strong economies do not continue to enjoy an unfair advantage when government funding is being allocated.

Amongst other important points made at the summit was the reiteration that Leeds is the largest city in Western Europe without a tram/metro system and that needs rectifying. Nick Forbes, leader of Newcastle City Council, spoke of the frustration at how many trivial things need Government authorisation, and called on Government to give the north devolution and resources so that we can make things happen.

I came away feeling some degree of optimism that things may change for the better. It depends on how much power our London-centric government is prepared to relinquish to the North and, most importantly, whether the government is prepared to put in the level of investment that the railway system in the North needs to correct historic imbalance. Given the stormy economic waters staring Britain in the face, how optimistic can we really be?

This is a short article summarising the main rail issues in South Yorkshire as I see them. There is not enough space to expand on the issues, many of which are complex. The South Yorkshire economy has suffered for the decline of the coal and steel industries, and new employment is moving in to Sheffield. South Yorkshire is seeing increased commuting to Leeds, Sheffield and Manchester. However new employment opportunities tend to require improved transport links, and these have been slow in arriving.

South Yorkshire does seem to have missed out on investment by the governments, maybe because it has been short of marginal seats. The London service from Sheffield is very slow, and Sheffield is by the far the largest city in the Country without an electric railway, apart from those currently being connected.

Local infrastructure

The routes in and out of Sheffield to the north and south are both double track. The line to the south could be easily doubled again, whereas the track to the north was only ever double track, and is in deep cutting - to widen would be extremely expensive. There are also a number of freights from the Hope Valley line which run through Sheffield station, even at the height of the rush hour. Sheffield has no depot, and main line services work out of Leeds or Derby. The last train from Leeds is 2111. There are nine services after this time from Sheffield to Leeds. It should be possible to go from Sheffield for an evening out by rail. The flat junction at Doncaster means it is likely to be impossible to increase service frequencies between Sheffield and Hull or Scunthorpe, even if there was capacity at Sheffield.

Main Line Services

The Sheffield to London service is slow. Doncaster to London is 1 hour 32 minutes, while Sheffield takes 2 hours one minute. The stopping pattern of Chesterfield, Derby and Leicester does not help. On top of that the more frequent Thameslink Bedford services will occupy the fast line south of Bedford and slow down the Sheffield trains. It looks as if the plans to improve the track layout at Derby and Market Harborough are going ahead. One possibility might be to upgrade the Erewash line and run alternate fast trains bypassing Derby. Electrification is essential – see below. The Sheffield to Manchester service is half-hourly, and passengers are regularly left on the platform at Sheffield. The Hope Valley route is indirect and has many sharp curves, which cannot be straightened because of the terrain. The target journey time by Transport for the North is 30 minutes, yet trains currently take 51 minutes from Piccadilly. The only solution to this is HS3 (High Speed Line). The obvious route is Woodhead, but ideally trains should come into Sheffield Midland without going through Barnsley. The Nottingham service takes 50 minutes, which is very slow, with calls at Alfreton and Chesterfield. The new Northern trains on order will help, but major works to speed up the line especially at Trowell junction are required.

Local Services

North of Sheffield there are a number of local services which are slow, operated by Pacers and infrequent. The two tracks north from Sheffield station, combined with the flat junctions at Nunnery, Meadowhall and Swinton make frequency improvements difficult. There is a strong case for examining possible locations for new stations, and also for a local service on the old Grand Central Penistone line out of Sheffield. There is a severe capacity problem at Dore, where the Manchester main line is single track through the station. The Network Rail scheme for re-doubling envisaged completion for the December 2018 timetable change, but the scheme has been on the Minister's desk for some time. Dore station would also benefit from platforms on the London line.

Prospects for the future

The arrival of HS2 (High Speed Line) will put pressure on the capacity at Sheffield station, but will give a much-needed fast service to London and possibly to the North East. Hopefully the Dore re-doubling will take place in the near future, and the Midland Main Line improvements also. The prospects for electrification at present are poor. Sheffield has less obvious opportunity to increase capacity than some other major cities, and the flat junctions at Doncaster inhibit increasing services from Sheffield to Hull and Cleethorpes.

Pass this newsletter to a friend when you've finished and help advertise Railfuture.

Extra Supplement on the Airport Parkway Station Debate – see back section

Rail User Groups affiliated to Railfuture within the Yorkshire Branch

Aire Valley Rail Users' Group	www.avrug.org.uk
Bradford Rail Users' Group	www.bradfordrail.com
Halifax and District Rail Action Group	www.hadrag.com
Esk Valley	http://www.eskvalleyrailway.co.uk/evrdc.html
Harrogate Line Rail Users' Group	Email: hlrug@live.co.uk
Harrogate Line Supporters' Group	www.harrogateline.org
Hope Valley Rail Users' Group	www.hopevalleyrailway.org.uk
Huddersfield, Penistone and Sheffield Rail Users' Association	Email: hpsrua@btinternet.com
Hull and East Riding Rail Users' Association	www.hullrailusers.co.uk
Lancaster and Skipton Rail Users' Group	www.lasrug.btck.co.uk
Minster Rail Campaign	https://www.facebook.com/minstersrailcampaign/info?tab=overview
Selby and District Rail Users' Group	http://www.selbytowncouncil.gov.uk/useful-links/selby-district-rail-users-group/
Settle-Carlisle Line, Friends of the	www.foscl.org.uk
Skipton-East Lancashire Railway Action Partnership	www.selrap.org.uk
Stalybridge to Huddersfield	Email: MarkAshmor@yahoo.co.uk
Upper Calder Valley Renaissance Sustainable Transport Group	Email: Nina.Smith@railfuture.org.uk
Yorkshire Coast Community Rail Partnership (Yorkshire Coast Wolds Coast Line)	www.yccrp.co.uk

Branch Committee and the small print

Chair: Nina Smith, 14 Bank Terrace, Hebden Bridge HX7 6BU, Nina.Smith@railfuture.org.uk
Vice Chair and Media Relations: Chris Hyomes, 12 Monument Lane, Pontefract WF8 2BE, Chris.Hyomes@railfuture.org.uk
Vice Chair and Parliamentary Liaison Officer: Graham Collett, Graham.Collett@railfuture.org.uk
Secretary/Conference Organiser: Dr. Mike Troke, Michael.Yorkshire@talktalk.net , 07947 062632
Treasurer: Ian Wood, 11 Langdale Drive, Ackworth Wakefield WF7 7PX, ianfWood@hotmail.co.uk
Membership & Distribution: Paul Colbeck, 14 St Giles Way, Copmanthorpe York YO23 3XT, Paul.Colbeck@railfuture.org.uk
Technical Engineering Officer: Steve Brady, 07973 481516, Arthingtonsag@aol.com
Freight Lead: Tony Ross, 01482 842150, Tony@Ross53.karoo.co.uk
Assistant Treasurer: Geoff Wood, 6, Westfield Terrace, Wakefield, WF1 3RD, esperanto11@hotmail.co.uk
Newsletter Editor: Mark Parry, 07941 642349, Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk
Branch Facebook Page: www.facebook.com/RailfutureYorkshire Railfuture web-sites: www.railfuture.org.uk www.railfuturescotland.org.uk www.railfuturewales.org.uk www.railwatch.org.uk http://www.railfuture.org.uk/Yorkshire+Branch Twitter Accounts: @RailfutureYorks @Railfuture
The views in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect the views of Railfuture.
Railfuture is independent and voluntary. It is the campaigning name of the Railway Development Society Limited, a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee. Registered in England and Wales No 5011634. Registered Office: 24 Chedworth Place, Tattingstone, Suffolk IP9 2ND.

Pass this newsletter to a friend when you've finished and help advertise Railfuture.

Extra Supplement on the Airport Parkway Station Debate – see back section

Membership News: 194 as at September 2017 Paul Colbeck – Membership Secretary

Welcome to our new members: Pontefract Civic Society Rail Sub Section,
Mr C Dye of Harrogate, Mr A Easson of York & Mr & Mrs R Lowe of Ilkley.

Membership by location

West Yorkshire (86), North Yorkshire (54), South Yorkshire (31),
East Riding of Yorkshire (12), Derbyshire (5) & elsewhere (6).

Diary

21 October 2017 10:30-16:00	Railfuture Branches and Groups Day, Birmingham venue to be agreed.
28 October 2017 13:00	Railfuture Yorkshire Branch Meeting in York Library with Rachell Maskell, York Central MP and Labour's shadow Rail Minister speaking. See flyer for full details.
30 October 2017 @ 19:30	Campaign for Better Transport West and North Yorkshire Rail Group. Meeting at "Veritas" 43-47 Great George Street, Leeds LS1 3BB. Contact Mark Parry for more details.
4 November 2017 10:00 for 10:45	Railfuture Annual Rail User Group Awards, The Curve, 60 Rutland Street, Leicester, LE1 1SB.
11 December 2017 @ 19:30	Campaign for Better Transport West and North Yorkshire Rail Group. Meeting at the Grove Pub, next to Bridgewater Place Tower, Leeds LS11 5PL. Contact Mark Parry for details.
Want to advertise your meeting here? Contact Mark Parry: Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk 07941 642349.	

Our next issue (**Yorkshire Rail Campaigner 39**) will be out in December 2017.
Please email material, news and feedback to: Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk to arrive by
Saturday 4 November 2017. Alternatively call or text 07941 642349.

Stories of campaigns and successes are especially welcome.

Choosing to have your Yorkshire Rail Campaigner sent by email saves us time and money.
Contact Paul Colbeck on Paul.colbeck@railfuture.org.uk to request this.

Interested in Joining Railfuture for just £18 a year?

Members receive national magazines as well as this Yorkshire Rail Campaigner.

***Find out more and join by clicking on www.railfuture.org.uk/join/
or by contacting our membership secretary***

***Paul Colbeck, 14 St Giles Way, Copmanthorpe York, YO23 3XT,
Paul.colbeck@railfuture.org.uk***

If you join online please let Paul know by email.

Pass this newsletter to a friend when you've finished and help advertise Railfuture.

Extra Supplement on the Airport Parkway Station Debate – see back section

The Airport Parkway Station Debate

In response to the contrasting views expressed about the proposed Parkway Station on the Harrogate Line, to serve Leeds Bradford International Airport, this supplement has three articles expressing different views and options.

Leeds Bradford Airport Parkway Station

by Mark Leving & Brian Dunsby



Both photographs were taken by Brian Dunsby from the footbridge over the Harrogate line leading to the Bramhope Tunnel Portal. The upper one is looking south and considered by Brian to be the best location where there is a longer section of track with better visibility than to the north of the footbridge. Also, the embankment walls are much lower. The lower photograph is looking north towards the Portal.

- a surface access strategy providing the most efficient, regionally inclusive, cost-effective and economically sustainable option.

PROPOSAL

- Use existing services on adjoining Leeds-Harrogate-York rail line. These are being enhanced to an all-day 15 minute frequency in the new Northern franchise from 2017 plus new Virgin Trains East Coast direct services between London and Harrogate at two-hourly intervals from 2019.
- Provide new dual function Airport “Parkway” station just south of Bramhope tunnel, connected to Leeds Bradford Airport terminal by existing shuttle buses already serving the adjacent airport car-parks.
- Integrate with Leeds North West Airedale services when the Harrogate Line is 25kV electrified (in Network Rail’s Control Period 6) to provide direct services from Bradford, Keighley, Shipley & Skipton. These services already share the same tracks and platforms between Leeds City station and Wortley Junction.
- In the future, if a business case can be established, install a fully automated high frequency people mover as used at other airports (e.g. Gatwick/Heathrow). This would also service long-stay car parking stops en-route between the new rail station and the airport terminal.

BENEFITS

- Avoidance of high capital and maintenance cost of new route infrastructure and rolling stock.
- Operationally efficient. There is no requirement for separate exclusive/dedicated rail or bus services which would import significant recurring additional on-costs of operation. Improved capacity utilization of platforms 1-5 at Leeds would be possible if the services are integrated with the Airedale Line once the Harrogate Line is electrified in Network Rail’s Control Period 6.

- Reliably faster generalised and actual journey times than any other mode.
- Improved regional connectivity (including new direct services) to the Airport from the whole Leeds City Region including Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Skipton and Wakefield plus North Yorkshire etc. via Leeds or York.
- Better, simplified regional penetration to include Harrogate, Knaresborough, York and beyond.
- Significantly lower and more efficient use of public funds with sustainable operating costs.
- Many additional local Park & Ride beneficiaries including Arthington, Bramhope, Pool and Yeadon, whilst Cookridge is within easy walking distance.
- Overspill for constrained Horsforth station in terms of car access, parking and platforms.
- Will make a proportionately greater fare-box contribution to net costs than any other option

RATIONALE

This is a highly cost-effective, operationally efficient and better penetrating approach using existing infrastructure to best advantage. Entirely consistent with firm prioritised and committed plans already in place for improved walk-up service frequencies, train capacities, and electrification. It takes full advantage of 25kV electrification of the Harrogate Line prioritised for Network Rail's Control Period 6 (2019-2024).

Future service frequency upgrades (e.g. 10 mins) will benefit both the Airport and the whole corridor

Long-term sustainable option providing far better regional penetration than any other option. Excellent wider connectivity to Leeds Bradford Airport across Leeds City Region via both Leeds and York stations.

Uses scarce capacity on the rail network to best advantage by integration with existing services.

Multifunctional station combining airport access with substantial local commuting needs.

Train to terminal interchange by shuttle bus from the Parkway Station should be better than that already provided between nearby long-stay car parking and the terminal in terms of timing and shelter. Transit time should be no greater than the existing walk time between the premium/mid stay car parking areas and the terminal are today.

Recognises objective Department for Transport data/advice that this regional airport, like most others, functions primarily for leisure users (with luggage) and with limited demand for more revenue-generative business users. Consequently, it provides a poor business case for major capital investment in a new direct rail link to the Terminal both in terms of initial capital expenditure and subsequent ongoing operating costs (in perpetuity).

STATION AND CONNECTION TO AIRPORT

It is difficult to be certain at this pre-feasibility stage (dependent upon costs and alternative options) but my initial expectation is that the station should be about 1 mile north of Horsforth, just south of the Bramhope tunnel portal. The portal and retaining walls of the cutting are Grade II listed. Space for the station would be excavated, the cutting walls removed to accommodate the width of the station platforms and then reinstated at new wider width (probably after cleaning and full restoration and thereby both enhancing the original aesthetics and making the tunnel portal and cutting walls publicly visible. As a listed structure, it may be possible to attract additional funding for retention/restoration and we need to explore and pursue that.

There is a risk that costs drive the station southwards where the cutting is less steep but our preference is as stated above because it is closer to the Airport terminal and provides a good 1 mile distance between Horsforth station and the proposed Airport station.

The key point is that it (the station) could all be kept very elegant and low key visually and in-keeping with what already exists. Car parking can also be designed to be invisible using vegetation (Mark did this with his project manager Granville Spencer at Leeds station alongside the riverbank in 1989 with Leeds City Council's agreement and 28 years later it has created a virtual rural riverside haven in the centre of the city, parallel to the river). Obviously, we can't speak for what Leeds City Council might permit in terms of industrial development.

For airport-station access, the tried, tested and most economic system is the Westinghouse (now Bombardier) rubber tyred electric people mover. It is fully automated, can deal with gradients and is ideal for the 1 mile distance. As it could also be integrated to serve the airport car parking (and therefore replace the buses) it may yet provide a viable business case. These are used at Heathrow T5, Gatwick North and Stansted over roundly comparable distances.

Compiled by Mark J Leving & Brian L Dunsby for Harrogate Chamber of Trade & Commerce.

(Further technical information available on request from: info@harrogateline.org)

The proposal to site a new railway station at the southern entrance of Bramhope Tunnel with a Park & Ride provision alongside is impractical. It has all the hallmarks of an ill thought out element of the Leeds City Council £173m transport package hurriedly submitted just before the last General Election.

Proposed Railway Station south of Bramhope Tunnel

A new railway station located just south of Bramhope tunnel, or around a mile north of the existing Horsforth station with its already built, and currently unused, turnback facility, would be a complete waste and misallocation of public money within Leeds and importantly within West Yorkshire. No thorough and transparent analysis of such a railway station is in the public realm. The proposal should have reached Network Rail's "GRIP2" stage before being even proposed for further detailed analysis, never mind funding. Where is the sound business case, the full considerations of alternatives to address a clearly identified transport problem, or the assessment against all other possible uses for the money? None appears to exist! For Network Rail to accede to it, a "GRIP3" analysis would normally be required. It is not a priority site for a new railway station within West Yorkshire and sites exist with far higher potential returns.

For the "*New Railway Stations in North and West Yorkshire Feasibility Study Final Report*" (West Yorkshire Combined Authority, [WYCA] 2014), the consultants Atkins elicited the views of Network Rail and the then affected Train Operating Companies, and undertook much detailed analysis. In this report, a station near the southern exit of Bramhope tunnel was not even considered, yet no less than 55 other sites were investigated. Of the three railway sites now being proposed by Leeds City Council only Thorpe Park was listed and accepted by the WYCA as of Priority 1 ("*Recommended for further Business Case development*"). There was a Park & Ride station at Horsforth Woodside listed amongst Priority 2 sites as having "*Strong potential but timetable issues & high dis-benefits to existing users*".

There are major engineering matters that need to be addressed before any new station south of the Bramhope tunnel can be judged to be technically feasible and practical. The exact location of the proposed station has yet to be defined. If this is immediately outside the south portal of the tunnel then it needs to be noted that the tunnel is in a rock cutting with substantial stone retaining walls on either side. To fit platforms in here would be extremely expensive resulting in new retaining walls at more than double the height of the existing walls. Furthermore, the whole area, tunnel portals and the retaining walls, is currently listed Grade 2 so the prospects for gaining planning permission for a new station and its attendant footbridge, escalators, lifts and facilities, is highly questionable and likely to be opposed on Planning grounds. It would contravene railway design guidelines being far too close to a tunnel portal. Further, Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate dislikes new station platforms on curves and there could be wire height problems should electrification be pursued. Recent revised regulations prohibit overhead wires at minimum height through station platforms.

Should the proposed new railway station be located about 200m further south (south of the "Leeds County Way" overbridge) it would be only about 1 mile north of the existing Horsforth station. This is still in a cutting but without retaining walls. Unless this railway is to be electrified, this position would certainly have a detrimental effect on the operation of existing trains and dis-benefits to all users particularly as there is a rising gradient of 1 in 100 from Horsforth Station to just south of the "Leeds County Way" overbridge. The existing Horsforth station is already perfectly adequate but would be affected adversely as trains on the Harrogate Line are unlikely to keep stopping at both stations while maintaining and improving travel times for all other passengers on the Line. Instead the asset base offered by the existing Horsforth station should be capitalised upon by developing direct from its already built turnback siding, a spur railway line right to the Leeds Bradford airport terminal building, using a curvaceous route that provides an acceptable gradient. In the interim, a bus shuttle link from the existing Horsforth station should be instituted and funded by Leeds Bradford Airport to foster public transport use. Leeds Bradford Airport has an access problem and its venture capital owner needs to contribute heavily towards the external costs its expansion places on the community, local Councils, and the National Health Service.

Any traveller or bus connection from the proposed new station would duplicate what can be provided now from the existing Horsforth station, and would just delay the time at which a proper rail connection right to the airport terminal would be built.

The air and noise emissions, and landscape impacts, or even any environmental assessment, have escaped the thorough attention by advocates of these proposals.

Railway station planning and delivery have very long lead times, certainly longer than the 3-4 years that Leeds City Council have for the delivery of the former trolley bus package. A realistic planning and delivery time would be a minimum of 6-8 years even with devolved powers.

Park & Ride at a Proposed Railway Station south of Bramhope Tunnel

The proposal is for a Park & Ride facility to be built adjacent to the new station south of Bramhope tunnel. There appears to be a belief that this will alleviate the very real parking demand in central Horsforth including around the existing station and decant central Leeds bound traffic. Park & Ride sites, however, need very careful assessment as they can just generate more road based vehicle-kilometres on the road network, and exacerbate congestion and emissions. Park & Ride works best when there is, very nearby (within 100m), a heavily trafficked main road with its traffic heading to or from a very limited number of locations. Park & Ride also can require subsidy unless there is a major traffic generator located adjacent to the Park & Ride site such that the public transport is full in both directions, as York has learnt and implemented. These conditions do not exist close to the proposed Bramhope tunnel station and Park & Ride.

Parking demand in Horsforth arises partly by North Yorkshire residents driving into West Yorkshire and parking in Horsforth to catch the train onward. A Park & Ride provision would further encourage this rather than address the real issue of differential rail fares. All the undefined proposed sites would need to be served by extensive new access roads across green belt land, would just generate still more traffic, and may sever potential rail alignments.

The land on the Leeds Bradford Airport side of the proposed site near the Bramhope tunnel exit rises steeply such that any road would have steep gradients, further exacerbating environmental impacts.

The railway at most possible locations is in cutting such that immediately adjacent flat land is scarce, and where adjacent it has experienced flooding thus raising drainage concerns.

If the Park & Ride facility was to serve Leeds commuters, it would be full at times throughout the day when Leeds Bradford Airport users would want to use it. If Leeds Bradford Airport users were to use it, it is likely they would arrive early in the morning as that is their peak time for departures from the airport, and then occupy its capacity until the mid-evening, thereby denying its use to Leeds commuters. The two users are incompatible. Do these proposals have more than a whiff of the Leeds Bradford Airport owners protecting their very lucrative car parking revenue?

The travel origins of most Leeds Bradford Airport workers are from areas south and south-west of the airport but not predominantly from the Harrogate direction (Leeds Bradford Airport *Route to 2030 Strategic Development Plan Surface Access Strategy*, March 2017, Fig.3.5). A railway station located to the south of Bramhope tunnel would not meet their needs and indeed if they travelled part way by rail would involve longer journeys.

A connecting bus from either site for the proposed station south of Bramhope tunnel would hardly be attractive to Harrogate airport terminal users as the existing direct bus service every 30 minutes offers a shorter total journey time than would an interchange to a shuttle bus at some new station south of Bramhope tunnel. Why such public transport users should use this proposed station is distinctly mysterious.

In none of the proposed railway station and associated Park & Ride provisions south of the Bramhope tunnel, is any consideration apparent of the environmental impacts. Proposals that are so ill thought out, and such a misallocation of resources as this one, lessen economic development, hold back productivity, and harm the health of most West Yorkshire residents while a few in Harrogate might gain.

Tony Plumbe, Chair, Rail Group of West & North Yorkshire Campaign for Better Transport

(Retired Transport Planner. International Development Project Planner, Manager, Adviser and Consultant)

Back in the 1950s Leeds had an extensive Tram network running throughout the city centre. This Tram network also extended outwards in all directions to places like Lawnswood to the North and Hunslet and Belle Isle in the South, East to Seacroft and West to Guiseley. The heavy gauge rail network had similar but wider connectivity. Ripon, Wetherby, Otley and Addingham all had train lines running through them. It was the rise in popularity of the motorcar which not only saw off the Leeds Tram Network in its entirety but also contributed to the demise of heavy gauge rail links to some of the places I have just mentioned.

As the popularity of the motor car continued unabated and traffic jams started clogging up the roads into Leeds, it soon became apparent that something needed to be done. The solution put forward for Leeds was Super Tram. Money was spent by Leeds City Council and Metro consulting and developing the idea which also included buying up sections of land along the proposed route. Super Tram was to run to and from Park and Ride facilities at Boddington Hall and Sturton into Leeds City Centre. One of the reasons for choosing this route was that the A660 Otley road into Leeds was identified as being one of the most heavily used roads into the City. Super Tram was intended to produce a modal shift from the car back to public transport. But in reality, would the car driver using the A660 really have been prepared to ditch their car at Boddington Hall in favour of queuing in a shelter before cramming in a Tram for the rest of the journey into Leeds Centre?

It was events elsewhere however which may have influenced the final outcome because following the massive cost overrun of the Edinburgh Super Tram system it soon became apparent that building new Tram networks in the United Kingdom was no longer as cost effective as some people would have us believe. Perhaps following the lessons learned in Edinburgh caused the then Labour government to pull the plug on the Leeds Super Tram idea by suggesting instead that Metro should look at the cheaper Trolley Bus alternative, which they did. However, following wide spread public hostility to the project by local campaigning groups it soon culminated in a public enquiry involving a Government appointed Independent Planning Officer. The result of the Planning Officer's report was of course to consign Trolley Bus like the Super Tram Scheme before it to the dustbin. By this time an estimated £72 million pounds had already been spent on the design and development of both schemes. Disappointingly the council tax payers of Leeds still have nothing to show for all this expense.

Following the failure of Trolley Bus, representations were made by Leeds MPs in Parliament directly to the Government, who have now conceded that the £173 million pounds earmarked for the trolley bus scheme can be spent on other transport projects for Leeds instead.

It's the can of worms that the £173 million pounds has opened which I will discuss further. To this end I will present some facts for consideration which I would expect to influence the decision makers as to how this money should be spent.

As previously stated the A660 Otley Road is one of the most heavily used arterial routes into the centre of Leeds. The clue to the primary source of most of the traffic using this route is in the name. The town of Otley and the Wharfe Valley area as a whole has a fairly large population if you include all the surrounding villages. Large housing estates have been built in the area and more are planned following Government Site Allocations Plans. The consequence of new housing will of course be yet more cars using the A660 to form part of the daily commute into Leeds. In reverse, the A660 forms a major route from Leeds outwards to Leeds Bradford Airport (LBA) and in some cases towards Harrogate where it meets up with the A658 Bradford Harrogate Road at the Dynley Arms Traffic lights. The A658 is in its self another heavily used commuter route between Bradford and Harrogate with LBA positioned in the middle.

We know that both the Cities of Leeds and Bradford are prioritising connectivity to LBA as part of their transport strategies as is the Town of Harrogate. How this is to be achieved is another issue in itself. A new trunk road has been proposed through Rawdon. A new fixed light rail link running directly from Horsforth to LBA which would ultimately link up with the Ilkley line at Guiseley has been suggested using Tram Trains. As has a new LBA parkway station close to Bramhope Tunnel on the Harrogate line. This Parkway station would not only serve the airport but also help to reduce parking around Horsforth Station and benefit the wider Leeds City region by providing Park and Ride facilities for travel by train into Leeds and beyond. Trams Trains which as we know are still not running on heavy gauge track in Sheffield are being favoured because some people say that the gradient up to the airport is too steep for heavy gauge trains whilst other say this point is questionable. Also questionable is how a Tram Train system starting in Leeds, and involving street running from Leeds City Square along Kirkstall Road linking into the Harrogate Line at Burley Park, will be able to fit into the existing and planned enhanced train

timetable which is intended to be operational on the heavy gauge Harrogate Line over the next few years. I cannot see the regular Harrogate line rail users being happy with delays caused through actors getting on a Tram Train at Yorkshire Television Studios or a car with a flat tyre blocking the tram line in City Square.

In truth, none of these schemes will drastically eliminate the traffic problems on the A660 and A658 simply because the vast majority of car drivers are not flying from LBA on a daily basis. They are instead commuting to and from their homes to their places of work in Leeds, Bradford or Harrogate and all other places in between. The intended use of the £173 million pounds was to produce a transport system which would help to reduce commuter traffic running into Leeds. But for some reason this intention appears to have been side tracked along the way.

The leading question which always rears its head for all transport schemes is of course that of cost versus benefit. To that end does the business case for LBA really stack up at the moment?

Dealing with the benefit first. The number of people flying from LBA currently stands at 3.63 million, but this figure is forecast to increase to 7 million passengers per year over the next 15 years. Of the potential frequent flyers using LBA how many would be likely to arrive by train if a direct fixed rail link was provided? Perhaps the actual current usage for a dedicated rail link to Manchester Airport Station (3.62 million) serving the third largest airport in the country, Manchester Airport (25.6 million) should be used in percentage terms to demonstrate the likely scenario going forward. As should train usage for Liverpool South Parkway Station (footfall 1.893 million) which provides a bus connection to Liverpool John Lennon Airport (4.778 million) as well as serving the surrounding areas.

In terms of the actual cost of building any rail link or connecting station to the airport I would not be telling the truth if I said I had some idea. In reality, we all know it would depend on how the link was to be achieved and what exactly it involved. Tram Trains, Heavy Gauge or a Parkway Station?

Consulting on any scheme comes at a price. Would it therefore really make economic sense to spend a lion's share of the money, primarily on a scheme which directly connects LBA via a fixed rail link in whatever guise or should we think about spending it on something which will not just benefit LBA but the wider population as well?

Having lived in the Wharfe Valley area myself since 1988 it appears to me that the obvious solution to all these issues is staring us in the face. Reopen the line from Arthington through Otley to Menston and Burley in Wharfedale. At the cost of reinstating around 7 miles of track on a mostly un-built and disused old railway track bed which was last used in 1965 and you have another means of commuting between most of the main towns and cities in the area. If you opt for the rail station on the Harrogate line close to LBA you also get what is currently lacking in West Yorkshire. Connectivity. I would be more inclined to favour an LBA Parkway Station above the other proposals so long as it's built alongside an Otley rail link. Build this rail link and LBA Station and you deliver at a stroke direct train connectivity between Bradford, Ilkley, Harrogate, Leeds, Otley, York, Skipton and all places in between in addition to LBA itself. Trains could run directly from Bradford to Shipley, Baildon, Guiseley, Menston, Otley, and Pool in Wharfedale to LBA Parkway and onwards into Leeds. They could even reverse at Horsforth and then head back towards Harrogate. The link would produce less traffic on the A660 because Otley would be back on the rail map. Trains could run directly to Harrogate from Bradford and miss Leeds City Station altogether. Leeds City Station being a place which already has its own capacity constraints. This new direct Bradford Harrogate rail route would also mean fewer cars on the A658. Couple this to the proposed electrification of the Harrogate line and it would mean standardisation of the rail system because only electric trains would be needed. This is something that Tram train, requiring new track and its own support and maintenance facilities would not bring to the proceedings.

Whatever the £173 million pounds is spent on it needs to prioritise schemes which can benefit most of us in some way. The simple fact is our roads are congested due to poor connectivity. They are busy because there is no alternative. Nothing will improve unless everyone is united concerning the task ahead. We need a well thought out transport scheme for Yorkshire which can deliver an alternative to the motor car.

Reinstating the missing link and building an LBA parkway Station not only delivers the perceived primary objective of airport connectivity but also benefits the wider communities living in the Cities, Towns and Villages of Yorkshire and beyond as well. All this of course is before I even touch on the possibility of providing an alternative route for freight trains which could travel along the new Otley line to York thus avoiding Leeds. There are many benefits and perceived problems which will be argued from reinstating the Otley line which I have not mentioned but I am sure through discussion someone else will.