

21st ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF RAILFUTURE LTD

Priory Rooms: 40 Bull Street, Birmingham B4 6AF (held in Main Meeting Room) on Saturday 4 July 2026, starting at 11.00

MOTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AND VOTING BY MEMBERS

There are four motions, as listed below. Each has a proposer and seconder, who have up to three minutes to explain their motion. Questions are then taken from the audience. Amendments to the motions may be tabled. There is a vote on any amendment and if carried then the motion with the amendment is voted on.

1. Ensuring a Strong Passenger Voice

This AGM mandates Railfuture to lobby national and regional government to call upon the Government to ensure Transport Focus is tasked with creating appropriate regional structures representing rail passengers in all the English Regions.

Proposed by Phil Davis (West Midlands) Seconded by Steve Jones (East Midlands)

Supporting Information

Later this year a Railway Bill will be passed into law to create Great British Railways which will be responsible for co-ordinating all aspects of railway transport in England, Scotland and Wales. One of the Government's intentions in this Bill is to strengthen the rail powers of the passenger watchdog, Transport Focus.

At the same time there is growth of devolved regional rail bodies linked to regional Metro Mayors and Combined Authorities and that while rail services require national standards and regulation, service delivery and the passenger experience has a substantial regional element.

Prior to 2005, this was recognised by the existence of regional Transport User Consultative Committee (TUCCs) created in 1948, which subsequently evolved into regional Rail Passenger Councils (RPCs). These were abolished in 2005, with the exception of London Travelwatch which has provided continuous passenger representation at the regional level. We believe effective rail passenger representation under GBR can only be provided by a strong regional element as in London.

2. Off-peak fares

This AGM condemns the attempts by the Department for Transport to end the availability of off-peak fares on Britain's Railway, using the false premise that fares are being simplified. We congratulate Scottish Government on instead scrapping peak fares.

This AGM agrees to oppose this pilot, demand its withdrawal, and seek the re-instatement of off-peak fares, including off-peak returns on the East Coast Main line.

The AGM further agrees to work with any interested parties as may be relevant, in support of this objective.

Proposed by Martin Jones

Seconded by Trevor Bishop

Supporting information

1. That the Dft claims that the LNER fares pilot is an attempt at fares simplification, when in fact there are now 49 different fares between London and Edinburgh alone.
2. That travellers on the East Coast Main Line now have no idea what fares will be charged and can even be told "No tickets available".
3. That the DfT claim that passengers prefer advance tickets is false. These tickets sell simply because they are cheaper.
4. That off-peak tickets - the traditional railway tickets - allow planned or unplanned flexible travel, connections across several journey legs including to other transport modes, flexible return tickets, break of journey, no "operator" restrictions, and availability of relevant alternative routes.
5. That the attempt to replace off-peak tickets with booked trains only is an import from a privatised and deregulated airline industry, and is a methodology that does not fit on a complex rail network.
6. That the price of a walk on return from Manchester to London rises from £114 to £386 if the present pilot rolls out.
7. That advance tickets are not available at stations where there is no ticket office and that not everybody pays for things by computer or mobile phone, or can use machines- even where these exist.

8. That the DfT claim that only 11% of passengers use off-peak tickets is selective, misleading, and not supported by analyses carried out by the Campaign for Better Transport, where the figures show an increase from 35% in 2019/20 to 46% in 2022/3. (P15 on the linked report) <https://bettertransport.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/2310-fare-future-report.pdf>
This is also supported by more recent ORR statistics which show a 9% increase year on year to 47% in the July to September 2025 quarter (P5 of the linked report) <https://dataportal.orr.gov.uk/media/i5ap5mxy/passenger-rail-usage-jul-sep-2025.pdf>
9. That this is the same claim used by DfT to try to close all ticket offices until a record 750,000 objectors put a stop to it, and that this pilot is an attempt to achieve the same ends by more complicated means.

Amendment

This AGM condemns the current LNER Simpler Fares implementation because it means that passengers often have no choice but to pay fares considerably higher than the previously available off-peak fare. In contrast, we welcome the Scottish Government's provision of simpler and more affordable fares all day every day by scrapping peak fares.

This AGM believes that it is essential that passengers can travel every day anywhere at a cost no more than the old off-peak fare everywhere including on the East Coast Mainline. This promise is key for passengers who cannot plan their travel long in advance to take advantage of the cheaper fares available at that time.

It is essential that passengers who have chosen price over flexibility have the opportunity to change their mind - for a fee and, if relevant, the incremental cost of the new ticket. The AGM further agrees to work with any interested parties as may be relevant, in support of this objective.

Proposed by Neil Middleton

Supporting information

1. That the only fare that will definitely be available on the East Coast Main Line for stations in-scope for the current trial is the Anytime fare (eg London to Newcastle without a railcard £200.80). The portion of rail travellers that can easily afford this has to be very low and alternatives such as fly, coach and drive are chosen.
2. This pricing is a particular disincentive to any potential traveller who cannot predict their outbound and return journeys to within 70 minutes well in advance when cheaper tickets are likely to be available.
3. That intending passengers without internet access find purchasing Advance / Flex tickets much more difficult, needing to visit a station ticket office, or on some ticket vending machines following complex menus.
4. Making cheaper ticket prices available, either by requiring very early booking or by travelling at less popular times is to be welcomed. But that is not a reason for the guaranteed to be available fare to be so high.
5. That personal experience of LNER trains is that there is frequently a significant gap between the number of passengers expected (as shown by seat reservations) vs those actually travelling and that this gap is likely to be causing LNER's systems to claim "No tickets available" (they really mean "We don't think there will be any seats for you").
6. Whilst having a seat is important to many passengers for longer journeys, for shorter journeys most passengers prize flexibility over a guaranteed seat and limiting ticket availability because of lack of seats is unwanted.
7. That the railway should always offer a flexible ticket option. For longer journeys, when Advance / Flex tickets have been purchased that right could involve a change fee (smaller at time of purchase or a bit more at the time of change (and payment of the price increment is relevant).

3. Attracting young people to Railfuture

With the aim of recruiting more young people to Railfuture, this motion proposes that Railfuture should welcome people under 30 by promoting paperless membership costing only £1. Alternatively under-30s could be invited to become non-member supporters. They would receive a free copy of Railwatch.

Proposed by Ray King. Seconded by Julian Langston

Supporting information

Voluntary groups have reported increased membership (and involvement) when they offered free membership to young people.

4. Use of X (formerly Twitter)

With the aim of improving Railfuture's reputation and reach, this motion proposes that Railfuture groups and branches be encouraged to consider also using alternatives to X (formerly Twitter) such as BlueSky or Threads. It could be assumed that Railfuture condones other content on X if our only micro-blogging platform is X.

Supporting information

The proposer/seconded will explain their concerns about X verbally when presenting this motion.