



Community Rail Development

A consultation paper on a
strategy for Community Railways
February 2004

Contents

Chairman's foreword	1	6. Community involvement	17
1. Background	2	6.1 Community Rail Partnerships	17
2. General approach to Community Railways	4	6.2 Station adoption	17
2.1 Community Rail designation	4	6.3 Funding	18
2.2 Objectives	4	6.4 Consultation questions	18
2.3 Managing change	4	7. Pilot schemes	19
2.4 Microfranchising	5	7.1 The Esk Valley Line	19
2.5 Scotland, Wales, PTEs, London	5	7.2 Island Line	19
2.6 Scope	6	7.3 Looe Valley Line	19
2.7 SRA strategies	6	7.4 St Ives Branch	20
2.8 Consultation questions	6	7.5 Watford Junction to St Albans Branch	20
3. Definitions	7	7.6 Consultation questions	20
3.1 Change process	7	8. Other issues	21
3.2 Consultation questions	8	8.1 Business case	21
4. Increasing passenger use and revenue	9	8.2 Affordability	21
4.1 Fares	9	9. Information for respondents	22
4.2 Ticketing and ticket sales	9	Appendices	23
4.3 Marketing	10	Appendix A: Consultation questions	23
4.4 Timetables	10	Appendix B: List of consultees	25
4.5 Integration	10	Appendix C: List of lines proposed for Community Rail designation by region	26
4.6 Local management	11	Appendix D: Existing TOCs and future franchises covering Community Rail routes	29
4.7 Ancillary income	12		
4.8 Consultation questions	12		
5. Managing costs	13		
5.1 Standards	13		
5.2 Accessibility	13		
5.3 Contracts and regulation	14		
5.4 Insurance	14		
5.5 Performance	14		
5.6 Cross-functional projects	14		
5.7 Staffing	14		
5.8 Train operations	15		
5.9 Track	15		
5.10 Signalling	15		
5.11 Rolling stock	16		
5.12 Consultation questions	16		

Front cover: Lelant to St Ives; the park and ride train.
Photograph courtesy of Wessex Trains.

Chairman's foreword

Britain's branch lines are important for social, economic and financial reasons. But, for many, service patterns reflect the needs of the 1970s, rather than the 21st century. For others, the slimline operation following earlier BR rationalisation schemes now leaves little room for growth, whilst traffic levels are too low to give them any priority when it comes to investment or development. In transport economic terms, many currently offer poor value for money, and recently costs have been increasing in line with industry trends.

But these lines can and do fulfil a key role in the local economy, furthering tourism initiatives, or as the main provider of school transport, or as a key freight link for local industry, and in some cases, they are the only form of public transport on offer.

Any question of change raises fierce passions not just locally, but nationally. There has been little rational debate about the future of these lines and how they might be developed to meet the needs of the communities they serve. This consultation paper offers the opportunity for that debate.

So, the task is to find ways to increase earnings and reduce costs to provide a sustainable future for these lines. It is also to look at greater local accountability and control, with greater local involvement in specification, and in seeking top-up funding to make them of greater use to the communities they serve.

Now is a good time to prepare a strategy for the development of Community Railways, both as a clear signal that our approach is one of development rather than retrenchment, and to move to a position where local and rural lines can be improved with local commitment and support, sooner rather than later. That is why we have created a team, led by an Executive Director of the SRA, to focus solely on the Community Rail Development agenda (in its widest sense) and why we are excited by the overwhelming support given to this initiative in just the first few weeks. It is already clear that there are significant and worthwhile benefits to be achieved from this approach.

As with all Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) strategies, delivery is dependent not just on the SRA using its powers to direct (though we can do that through, for example, franchise specification) but also on the co-operation of and partnership with a wide range of agencies, such as the Office of the Rail Regulator (ORR), Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs), Network Rail, Passenger and Freight Operating Companies, Regional Development Agencies, local authorities and amenity groups to name but a few. The role of such partnerships between the private, public and voluntary sectors are crucial to their success. We will consider carefully the responses to this consultation, which will form the basis of a formal SRA strategy (under section 206(1) of the Transport Act, 2000) that will define and guide the development of Community Railways over the next decade in partnership with all those listed above and no doubt many more. For that is the essence of a Community Railway. It truly is 'everyone's railway'.



Richard Bowker
Chairman and Chief Executive
Strategic Rail Authority
February 2004

1. Background

In the 19th century, every town wanted its rail connection and those that were off the main network promoted connecting branch lines. Towards the end of the era of rapid rail expansion, this was encouraged by Parliament, which legislated through the Light Railways Act, 1896 to provide a quicker process to encourage the provision of lines with simpler standards to serve rural communities. Some of these carried with them restrictions on locomotive weights and on speeds that were appropriate to their function, but, with a few exceptions, they provided a common carrier service, capable of handling all types of freight and passenger traffic and were specified and maintained accordingly.

Branch line and local station closures started early, with a number in the 1930s and more in the 1950s. During the 1960s and 1970s, around a third of the network was curtailed. Many other routes were simplified to match the traffic then on offer at minimum cost. Goods yards were closed, sidings taken out, double track lines were singled, and on single track lines, passing loops were removed and signal boxes closed.

Today's rural routes and branch lines now reflect the slimline railway created by BR during that period, and generally provide an infrastructure appropriate to the levels of demand of the 1970s. In the 1980s, new, lightweight rolling stock was provided, but during the same period, track maintenance costs were reduced, even though the last significant track renewals programme for many of these routes was in the 1960s. But, on many lines demand has more recently grown strongly. The railway is fulfilling a new role, never envisaged 30 years ago, in terms of tackling local traffic congestion, or as part of the local tourist economy, or in providing environmentally friendly access to historic coastal towns and national parks.

The gap between costs and income on these lines, reflects the high fixed costs of providing a rail service with its own infrastructure and terminals. Rolling stock costs are high in comparison with the cost of buses and average rail fares are low. Rural and local lines tend to have higher levels of leisure travel at discounted fares, little full fare business travel and no travel at premium (first-class) rates. Whilst both passenger and freight traffic has grown since privatisation, and some of the seasonal peaks are very high, short journeys at relatively low fares generate insufficient income to meet the high fixed costs of even a basic railway. Typically, fares income covers only one quarter of the attributed costs of providing the service. This economic reality has constrained development, and on many routes the service provided is resource-led and development is unaffordable because of the step change required to resource more than the minimum cost service currently provided.

Nevertheless, neither closure nor further conventional cost-cutting can resolve the issue. Closure of rail infrastructure is not part of Government policy nor the Secretary of State's Directions and Guidance to the SRA. Railways represent a long-life fixed investment, and closures leave huge residual liabilities which have to be managed (the SRA inherited a large property portfolio of structures with their attendant maintenance liabilities, now remote from the operational railway). Closures are hotly contested and the closure process takes significant senior management time to handle. With limited cost savings achievable from the limited resources devoted to these routes, it is highly debatable whether the benefits ever outweigh the costs.

So, there is an overwhelming need to break out of this circle, to reduce the gap between income and costs and to increase the value of the railway to the community measured in terms of financial support per passenger journey. This can be done through greater local involvement in defining, promoting and funding the services provided and particularly in harnessing the enthusiasm and drive of the local community in the development of their railway.

There are some impressive examples of local management in mainland Europe. In some countries, such as Switzerland and Denmark, independent locally managed railways have been part of the scene for decades. In Germany, there is a tradition of locally owned railways, but in recent years, the number has grown significantly. Several loss-making lines with limited residual services have been dramatically transformed and ridership has grown enormously. A similar process is happening in the Netherlands. We need to learn from these experiences and apply them where appropriate in the British context.

A good start has been made with the establishment of Community Rail Partnerships over the last ten years, and these have recently expanded to cover a total of 34 lines proposed for designation as Community Rail routes. Without exception, passenger volumes have increased on lines supported by a partnership. The Bittern Line in Norfolk has seen a 140% increase in demand over the last seven years with active promotion by the line partnership and its operator, Anglia Railways.

At the same time, local enterprise has expanded the railway network with new independent lines like the Wensleydale Railway and the Dartmoor Railway starting up, as well as the expansion of professionally managed heritage railways. There are lessons to be learned from the innovative solutions adopted which have resulted in lower unit costs for these lines, as well as impressive ridership figures.

Local authorities are more closely involved, and can use a range of funds, including section 106 funding from new developments, to improve public transport in their area and to fulfil other aspects of Government policy for which they are responsible. All this suggests the need for a systematic approach to Community Rail Development, rather than piecemeal endorsement of ideas as they arise.

The railway is now helping local authorities and others to deliver on a wide range of Government objectives, including those relating to the environment, accessibility, safety, health, economic development, social inclusion and rural affairs as well as its transport objectives. This was set out in more detail in the SRA's publication 'everyone's railway' which can be obtained from the address on the back cover, or viewed on our website www.sra.gov.uk.

This is the basis on which the SRA has appointed one of its Executive Directors to lead and develop a strategy for Community Railways to put them on a sustainable basis for the medium to long term.



*Egton Station.
Photograph courtesy of Arriva Trains Northern.*

2. General approach to Community Railways

2.1 *Community Rail designation*

The approach proposed is to designate Community Rail routes separately from the conventional and high speed rail networks, as happens elsewhere in Europe. Consequently, they would not be covered by certain European Union regulations on issues such as interoperability – and they would have separate operational and engineering standards, appropriate for the nature of a local operation. Separate designation of Community Railways would allow a fresh approach to the way these lines are managed, marketed and supported as well as to the way they are maintained and renewed. The principal opportunities are outlined in the sections below.

2.2 *Objectives*

The lines concerned will never provide a conventional commercial return and will always require franchise support payments, reflecting the external benefits they bring and the delivery of the range of Government policies referred to above. The approach is to reduce the gap between income and expenditure, and to increase the net value of each line by reducing the support payment per passenger journey. Increasing patronage and better use of existing resources brings greater social and economic value for the support levels paid – particularly in relation to tourism, which is a principal economic activity for many of the areas served. The objectives of the strategy are therefore threefold, and are reflected in the structure of this paper. They are to:

- Increase passenger volume and income;
- Manage down the unit costs of running the lines now and in the future; and
- Involve the local community more closely in the development of its railway.

2.3 *Managing change*

The initiatives described in this paper offer many opportunities to improve the value of Community Railways. Some can be adopted within the current framework of franchise agreements, track access agreements and licensing. Others may require change to current agreements or current group and company standards. Much can be achieved through spreading best practice. In each case there is an opportunity to change to something designed to meet local circumstances and fit for purpose. Safety is paramount, and the approach proposed supports this by focusing on the assessment of risks and how they will be managed.

The rich diversity of the railways covered in this paper means that there is no single 'template' solution for Community Railways, but rather a menu of initiatives from which a bespoke solution can be produced, in conjunction with the local community, for each route. These solutions will need to remain flexible as success will increase demand – substantially in some cases – and the railway will have to continue to adapt to meet that.

2.4 *Microfranchising*

Microfranchising is a generic term which covers several approaches, each representing a different form of local management. This can range from subcontracting certain aspects of the operation of train services (for example station retailing, catering or cleaning), through to a separate vertically integrated operation similar in structure to the Wensleydale Railway. A pragmatic start might be with the establishment of a Railway Development Company, working closely and positively with the TOC and Network Rail to develop ways of delivering rail services which are both cost-effective and beneficial to the local economy. This approach could encourage the development of some smaller independent operators alongside the larger established train operators on the rest of the franchised passenger network. In considering this, the maintenance of network benefits (such as ticketing, information and main line connections) would be a key requirement. Microfranchising might provide the right solution for smaller self-contained routes – or groups of routes – but is not the universal solution for Community Railways. It is one innovative approach on the menu of initiatives.

2.5 *Scotland, Wales, PTEs, London*

Routes in Scotland are not specifically covered in this paper, although the principles could be applicable to some of them. The Highland Rail Partnership has been particularly successful in raising the profile of the Highland, Far North, West Highland, Kyle and Aberdeen–Inverness lines, and in developing new freight business. This paper draws on the ideas generated by this Partnership and their drive and initiative graphically illustrates best practice in this area. Services within Scotland are specified and funded by the Scottish Executive, and the SRA acts as the agent for Scottish Ministers in letting and managing the Scottish franchise. However, close contact has been maintained with the Executive in the development of this paper to ensure that the ideas it contains can be considered for the future in a Scottish context.



*Kinbrace: timber loading.
Photograph courtesy of Highland Rail Partnership.*

Routes in Wales are included, but here all fall within the recently created 15-year Wales franchise, now operated by Arriva Trains Wales. Clearly, any designation would be subject to discussion with Welsh Assembly Government and with Arriva and Network Rail before specific lines were designated as Community Railways. Designation proposals will also have to be considered in the light of any future changes in the role and responsibilities of Welsh Assembly Government on rail services in Wales and of their strategic objectives.

Passenger Transport Executives (PTEs) are co-signatories of franchise agreements for their areas. A few of the lines in [Appendix C](#) are within the PTE areas. Their role in specification and funding is a key issue and they will have an interest in the benefits that Community Rail designation could bring.

Routes within Greater London are not proposed for Community Rail designation.

2.6 *Scope*

The approach outlined in this paper is designed to be applied to the existing franchised passenger network or to freight routes where this is appropriate. It is not intended to apply to independent or heritage railways, although it draws on their best practice and innovative approaches. Equally, it is not designed to facilitate the extension of the local and rural railway network, recognising that even where such extensions represent value for money in economic terms, they invariably require additional subsidy which is currently unaffordable.

2.7 *SRA strategies*

Whilst this paper focuses on Community Railways, it is aligned with other SRA strategies, and should be seen in the context of the Authority's overwhelming priorities of improving operational performance and controlling costs. This paper contains many ideas for improvement, but no change is proposed to the basic rule that only those projects which have a business case and represent value for money can be taken forward. This approach is robust and ensures that public money is properly spent as well as ensuring the proper prioritisation of projects.

2.8 Consultation questions

1. Do you agree with the general approach proposed for Community Railways?
2. Are there ways to increase the socio-economic value of local and rural lines, other than through the three broad objectives outlined?
3. Microfranchising might involve vertical integration (bringing train and network operations together under a unified management). What role do you think microfranchising has to play in the development of Community Railways?

3. Definitions

This paper relates to a variety of local and rural rail lines and services that might benefit from a fresh look at their physical and operational requirements, the way they are presented and marketed, and their role in the community. There are, however, some common features that underpin the concept of separate designation of Community Railways in terms of their specification, promotion, and community involvement.

The definition of lines that would be eligible for Community Rail designation is based on some broad principles. These definitions are not designed to be prescriptive, but should allow a flexible, common sense approach to be adopted. Both freight and passenger lines can be covered by the concept. Specifically, Community Rail lines would *not* be:

- Trans European Network (TEN) routes;
- High speed lines or lines where the ruling line speed is higher than 85 mph;
- Multiple track lines (more than double track);
- Lines with a frequent (hourly or better) through passenger service to London; and
- Lines carrying significant freight flows.

In general, they *would* be lines that typically:

- Have a speed limit of 75 mph or less;
- Are low frequency (normally hourly or less);
- Normally have a single operator (or one franchise operator plus freight);
- Are local or rural in character; and
- Do not carry international passenger or freight traffic via the Channel Tunnel.

A list of potential routes is annexed to this paper. In total they cover 1,300 route miles, or 12.5% of the national network, and include 420 stations (17% of the total).

Within these definitions there is a wide variety of lines, including short branch lines, operationally separate from the rest of the network, with a low speed limit (40 mph), low service frequency and a limited freight service – such as the Liskeard–Looe Branch Line in Cornwall. At the other end of the spectrum are lines such as the Grantham–Skegness Line, a 55 mile long route with some double track, carrying freight and with a key interchange at Sleaford. For such a variety there can be no ‘one size fits all’ solution, and no template is therefore proposed.

3.1 *Change process*

The initial list of lines for Community Rail designation will be established following consultation, as part of the SRA's strategy on Community Rail Development (see [Appendix C](#) for the lines proposed). However, market conditions alter and it is important to have a proper change process in place. Changes would be based both on analysis of the costs and benefits and on public consultation. It would allow other lines to be included in the future, or the removal of those where changed circumstances mean that they would more appropriately revert to form part of the conventional network, recognising the costs required to meet the different standards.

3.2 Consultation questions

4. Do you agree with the broad definition outlined above for Community Rail designation?
5. Are there any other characteristics that could usefully be included in such a definition?
6. Do you agree that the lines listed in [Appendix C](#) are those that should initially be designated as Community Railways?
7. Do you agree with the process proposed to include or exclude Community Rail lines in the future?

4. Increasing passenger use and revenue

Passenger use varies hugely between the lines under consideration. Many have significant seasonal variation, for example, the St Ives Branch in Cornwall where the summer usage is 20 times that in the winter. Similarly, their role as feeder routes to the network varies considerably. For example, on the Newquay Branch in Cornwall, over three quarters of the passengers travel beyond the junction at Par to main line destinations, whereas on the nearby Tamar Valley Line, some 95% of passengers are local to the branch.



*Looe Valley Line.
Photograph courtesy of Wessex Trains.*

4.1 Fares

In some parts of Britain, short-distance rail fares are well below bus fares on the same route, whereas over longer distances, and in other parts of the country, rail fares are higher than bus. There is a case to bring the two into line to allow interavailable ticketing and offer choices to passengers on those journeys where the bus provides an alternative. Given the higher cost of providing rail services with their own infrastructure, rail fares should not be less than the bus. Following the example of heritage railways, it would be appropriate to consider differential pricing (which could, for example, be realised through a local residents' railcard) to ensure a proper level of general pricing for Community Railways, with a discounted rate to attract local users. The groundwork has already been laid with products such as the Devon & Cornwall Railcard and the Dalesrail card on the Settle & Carlisle Line.

4.2 Ticketing and ticket sales

Simpler products could be made available for Community Railways, including carnets and zonal tickets (ultimately making more use of smartcard technology). For branch lines, this could lead to Community Railways being priced as 'add-ons' to the main line fares structure. The advantage of this approach would be that such simpler products could be retailed through newsagents, post offices, and convenience stores as well as through conventional travel agencies, stations and on trains. Recognising that most stations on Community Railways will not have ticket offices, this approach would provide a big increase in the

number of outlets available, and would also raise the profile and awareness of the railway locally, without leading to a reduction in network benefits. Such an approach would also help to improve the revenue allocation process, to ensure that branch line revenue is properly identified. At the same time, there is also potential to increase the number of larger stations with independent ticket agents (sometimes combined with other retailing or travel sales activities) as have already been established at a number of principal local stations that were formerly unstaffed.

4.3 *Marketing*

Promotion of lines using the existing structure of Community Rail Partnerships has been very successful, and there is a clear case for extending them from the 34 lines covered currently to the 60 initially proposed for designation as Community Railways. Many of the lines have considerable tourist potential, and there is an opportunity for joint promotion with local authorities, tourist boards or visitor attractions. In particular, this should include web-based promotion with links between the line's website and those for local tourist offices and hotels. The Association of Community Rail Partnerships (ACoRP) has already sponsored *Scenic Britain by Train*, an excellent guide to lines supported by their members, and this is to be developed further in 2004 with support from the SRA.

4.4 *Timetables*

As many Community Railways routes serve a substantial tourist market, they see a huge seasonal variation in demand, whereas there is generally little seasonal variation in the level of service provided. The opportunity exists with local management and marketing, to reflect this more closely in a timetable varied to meet seasonal demand, following the example of heritage railways which are generally serving a similar tourism market. This could involve different timetables (varying by month and by day of the week) to fine-tune the available resources to demand (see [Section 7.4 Pilot schemes](#)). Such changes would mean replacement of existing Passenger Service Requirements and Service Level Commitments by a 'core' service all year round with a more flexible enhanced timetable to meet seasonal demand, based on analysis of local demand from closer local engagement. A new approach to presenting timetable information would also be required to ensure that it was readily understood by occasional, as well as frequent rail users. Nothing proposed here would change the commitment to the maintenance of national timetable information and to NRES and Traveline.

4.5 *Integration*

There are many cases where bus services compete with, rather than feed local rail services, or are simply planned in isolation from them. In some cases, subsidised rail and bus services are competing for the same market. On some routes, there will be an opportunity, in conjunction with local authorities, for train and bus services to be planned together to provide a bus feeder service to the railway, or to provide a better combined bus and train frequency (with integrated ticketing to provide choice for passengers), than would be possible with each mode working independently. Integrated ticketing already operates between Derby and Matlock and many other bus/rail ticket products already exist as a basis for this development. Where commercial bus networks operate, this may raise competition issues that might need to be discussed with the Competition Commission.

There is also scope for links with community transport operators or demand responsive transport, specified and supported by local authorities, such as the Penistone Line Partnership's Holmfirth Branch Line bus, or the Coggeshall Community bus link to Kelvedon station in Essex. Chiltern Railway's Taxibus also provides a model here – fixed route and stops in the peak, and a flexible routing 'dial-a-ride' service off peak. Information is key to this element of the policy, and local authorities have a major role to play here.

The Department for Transport is looking at accessibility planning, which will help tackle integration issues by developing software which will map existing transport services, their interchanges and places people want to go (shops, schools etc). Local authorities will all be asked to undertake accessibility planning as part of the 2005/06 round of Local Transport Plans. Guidance is to be issued this summer. Working closely with them during this period will also help develop links with Community Rail services.

Integration also includes the provision of secure and convenient cycle parking at stations and working with local authorities to ensure that stations are linked with local cycle priority networks. There may be scope for more stations to provide cycle hire facilities or cycle centres.

Community car clubs, where local groups of people can hire from a small fleet of cars owned by the club, offer another opportunity for integration with Community Railways to provide an integrated alternative to ownership and extensive use of a car, or a second car. The Penistone Line Partnership already manages a community car club, and there is evidence that it has led to people giving up their own car and using the car club vehicle when necessary – using the train or bus for regular journeys. The car clubs could be located at railway stations, offering further synergies.

4.6 *Local management*

Local management for Community Railways has the advantages of being closer to the customer, and of releasing the time of more senior managers who currently get drawn into the management of Community Railway routes where public interest and concern hugely exceeds their commercial importance. In some cases, this local focus could be provided by a line development company. In other cases, dedicated local management would be appropriate where their added value exceeds the cost, and might encompass more than one route where lines are in close proximity.

In some cases, it would make sense for the local manager to combine the responsibilities of train and network operation, and even of train and track maintenance, providing a more integrated operation with the potential for multi-skilling and cost reduction as well as the better deployment of staff to meet customers' needs (see [Section 2.4 Microfranchising](#) on page 7). Island Line already demonstrates that such an approach is practical, as do railways in the independent and heritage sectors. Such an approach would help to encourage a high level of staff commitment at all levels. Local management can also be of value to the local economy in terms of encouraging procurement of local goods and services.

4.7 *Ancillary income*

Some scope exists to attract new income streams from ancillary services, particularly making use of station buildings which are usually much larger than required by present day needs, and are sometimes derelict. The Railway and Community Trust, currently being formed by Network Rail and ACoRP, will be a further means of bringing unused stations back to life for railway or community purposes. Other services that might be provided from these buildings could include catering and retailing, cycle centres, tourist information offices or travel agencies selling local rail travel as well as other products. Where appropriate, schemes involving the restoration of historic buildings might attract heritage funding, and the advice of the Railway Heritage Trust will be valuable here.

Other forms of income might be developed through using best practice from heritage railways and would include packages with local hotels and tourist attractions. On-train refreshments, such as trolley services, can both generate income and provide an added-value service for passengers on longer-distance routes. Production of souvenir merchandise is a potential means of generating income – such as line guides, pottery, and clothing. These can be sold on the train and also at stations and other local outlets such as Tourist Information Centres. Special events and ‘open days’ are another useful way of generating additional income, as well as raising the profile of the local railway within the community.

4.8 Consultation questions

8. Do you agree that fares structures on Community Railways should be changed to provide for integration with local bus fares?
9. What simplified local ticket retailing options do you think should be considered to encourage sales through local outlets such as newsagents and post offices?
10. Do you think that more flexible timetables, geared around seasonal variation in demand, would provide a better service within the resources available, and how would they best be communicated?
11. What are your views on use of railway stations for retailing or community activities where the buildings are no longer required for railway use?
12. Do you think there would be value in the integration of bus and rail services in the way described? To what extent do you think that buses and trains can substitute for each other?
13. What role do you see for community transport operators in providing rail-link services, including demand-responsive services?
14. How can local management best be introduced? What would be the advantages and disadvantages?

5. Managing costs

Cost reduction is a key element in putting Community Railways on a stable financial footing for the long term. However, many routes were rationalised by BR in the 1970s, and there is relatively little scope for further reduction in the quantum of track and signalling provided. Safety remains the first consideration, so the approach is to ensure that the standards applied to Community Railways are appropriate to their characteristics, such as the lower line speeds, less-frequent services and fewer passengers, than apply to the high speed and conventional networks. The other area with potential is in the area of transactional costs, where some simplification would be possible on routes with a single operator. The reduction of costs may also help in reducing the cost of expanding ridership and revenue, for example in the provision of a station to serve a new development or in offering a more affordable way to provide additional rolling stock to meet growth in demand.

5.1 *Standards*

The SRA is challenging standards creep and is looking at cost reduction through ensuring that standards are appropriate throughout the network; work is already under way with Network Rail on further differentiating standards. The opportunity already exists to make better use of the derogation process where current Group Standards are inappropriate for specific lines, and this is helped by the recent revision of the Group Standards code. As a consequence of this process, consideration could be given to combining these derogations as the basis of a Community Rail Group Standard. This would be supported, where required, by a risk assessment and/or a safety case for the line to identify and manage the actual risks on each route.

Community Rail lines would not form part of the 'conventional network' for the purpose of EU Interoperability. Similarly, a simpler approach could be developed for staff and community workers or volunteers (where they are not involved in safety-critical work), who want to provide services or improve facilities on their local stations, reflected in simple method statements or risk assessments, covering the activities to be undertaken.

5.2 *Accessibility*

At the same time, reviewing standards may also help to improve accessibility of stations. The approach in recent years has been to remove foot crossings at stations with consequent limitations in accessibility, or with significant costs involved in bridging the line. This approach should be reconsidered on Community Railways, and experience with light rail systems taken into consideration, as they frequently involve street running. Similarly, many stations have low platforms which, because of their location or the track geometry, require significant costs to raise. Where passenger numbers are low, the right solution may be to provide portable ramps or short sections of raised platform with selective door opening to meet passengers' needs at an affordable cost. A risk-assessed approach at each location could improve access for passengers with disabilities or with luggage, as well as avoiding unnecessary costs that would squeeze out investment elsewhere.

5.3 *Contracts and regulation*

There is already some flexibility in dealing with regulatory issues for independent and heritage operators. Where routes are operated by a single franchised passenger operator, with no potential for freight, it should be possible to consider a simpler regulatory regime for Community Rail lines, or for regulatory exemption for some of the branch lines. The opportunity should be taken to seek to simplify contractual requirements and reduce transaction costs, and this could represent an important saving, particularly in the development of microfranchises.

5.4 *Insurance*

Insurance costs have risen steeply over the last three years, and can bear particularly heavily on small independent operators. However, mechanisms already exist to vary the £155 million cover specified and Community Rail designation would be an effective way of identifying a separate group of lines with a potentially lower risk profile. Joint insurance or some form of mutuality for smaller independent operators may be a way to reduce premium costs.

5.5 *Performance*

There are two reasons for considering the exemption of passenger services on Community Railways from the performance regime, or for a radical simplification of it. The first is to provide a better service to passengers and the second is to reduce costs. Despite the designation of key connections, the present regime does not incentivise operators to hold branch line connections, and this works against the interests of connecting passengers, frequently resulting in the cost of providing taxis as an alternative. The costs of compliance and enforcement are high in relation to the number of passengers involved, and the associated costs and risks find their way through the bidding process to the subsidy line. This proposal would allow the local operator to hold connections without penalty where this met the interests of the majority of the passengers. Community Rail performance figures would need to be excluded from national statistics and reported separately to recognise this.

5.6 *Cross-functional projects*

In some cases cost efficiencies are not pursued because their realisation is inhibited by organisational issues, and there is no incentive to reduce costs because the benefits are spread between several parties, or accrue to parties who are not in a position to make the investment to achieve the savings. Local management and, where appropriate, microfranchising, will also help to tackle these issues which in other cases may need leading or facilitating by the SRA.

5.7 *Staffing*

One of the biggest opportunities for Community Railways is to develop a strong sense of commitment by the staff themselves. In some cases it is possible that staff may transfer to locally managed operations, whereas in other cases they will continue to be employed by the existing train operator or Network Rail. In either case, it will be important to involve staff fully in the running of Community Rail operations, and full co-operation with and by the trades unions is important. Any staff transferring to local companies will have their wages, conditions and pension rights guaranteed by TUPE rules. The experience of locally managed railways on the continent suggests that staff who transfer from large enterprises to local community-based railway companies experience higher levels of job satisfaction and actively participate in the running of the enterprise.

5.8 *Train operations*

Flexibility and multi-skilling would allow more effective and rewarding jobs for staff, and would include added value in higher levels of customer service. Local management also allows a much more flexible approach to serving local events by train, and to local service branding (Wessex Trains has rebranded by simply and effectively wrapping its diesel units in vinyl). Local fuelling, servicing or maintenance of rolling stock might allow some savings to be made in empty mileage to and from depots.

5.9 *Track*

Much of the track on the lines shown in [Appendix C](#) is jointed and laid on timber sleepers. Whilst renewals took place under BR regularly until the mid 1960s, thereafter the renewal rate fell and very little work was undertaken on these routes during the 'maintenance holiday' taken by BR's regional railways in the late 1980s or during the period of Railtrack ownership. In consequence, much of the track on these routes is in excess of 40 years old and maintenance costs have risen accordingly.

The main issue in relation to track costs is about the level and mix of traffic. On routes which carry only lightweight diesel units with no freight, it may be possible to apply different standards from those required for a mixed traffic railway, both in terms of renewals and of maintenance. The roll out of mechanised maintenance and renewal work on rural lines, in tandem with a more efficient possessions pattern, offers the opportunity of achieving agreed standards at lower cost. Practical examples are in extending mechanised sleeper replacement, the welding of alternate rail joints and reviewing methods of patrolling. Use of cascaded materials from the main line would also be appropriate, particularly where 'track-friendly' trains are the sole users of a route.

The high seasonal peaks on many of these routes point towards track maintenance being undertaken outside the busy summer period. At quieter times, it would be possible to carry out track maintenance on weekdays rather than overnight or at weekends, with consequent cost savings.

In the long run, the optimum approach for Community Railways will be through consistent levels of maintenance, properly resourced, which will extend track life and minimise the need for renewals.

5.10 *Signalling*

Most of the lines in [Appendix C](#) have already been rationalised, so that there may be relatively few opportunities for further signalling cost reductions here. On some lines, however, there may be scope for using basic signalling technology when renewals fall due, or capacity increases are proposed. On self-contained passenger-only routes, simplified light rail technology might be appropriate. In the long run, the European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS) may provide a permanent and cost-effective solution to train control on single lines. Specifically, the ideas in this paper will not affect the early deployment of ERTMS on the Cambrian Line, or its future extension if supported by a business case.

5.11 Rolling stock

The characteristics of Community Railways, and the costs of new trains mean that it is likely that it will generally be cheaper to make use of existing rolling stock, adapted or refurbished where necessary, rather than provide bespoke new trains. Development of light rail and ultra lightweight rail vehicles (for use on lines that operate independently of the conventional network) may provide an alternative in the longer term, and the concept is worth developing on a trial basis, but for now the principal focus has to be on making best use of the existing fleet, and the factors involved are set out below:



Reedham.

Photograph courtesy of Norfolk County Council.

- The current high level of new rolling stock orders and the working of the train leasing market is likely to mean that some DMU vehicles (probably Pacers) will be off lease, and might become available at lower lease costs for Community Railways after 2006, capable of providing additional capacity or frequency;
- Mark II and Mark III coaches and Driving Van Trailers are now becoming available and could be paired with locomotives from freight or independent operators. Whilst the operating costs (and the effect on track wear) are higher for locomotive-hauled trains, the lease costs should be relatively low, and this solution could be suitable for addressing seasonal peaks in demand as well as supplying the market for special trains for sporting events and for charter trains, given that many Community Rail lines are attractive destinations for tour operators. This is unlikely to be a practical solution for shuttle services on short branch lines, however;
- There are a limited number of earlier heritage diesel units which, if modified with TPWS, central door locking and provision of wheelchair space in the passenger saloon, might provide a low-cost short-term solution for meeting seasonal peaks or specific overcrowding problems. These units are popular with tourists, because they provide good views for passengers on scenic routes (including panoramic views to the front and rear), and have large flexible space for cycles, push-chairs and large items of luggage.

Decisions on rolling stock deployment are not freestanding, and have implications for track maintenance and renewal requirements. In particular, the use of Pacers may have consequences for sidewear on rails and for dipped joints. Similarly, regular use of locomotive-hauled trains may impact on maintenance requirements, as their effect on track tends to be greater than for lightweight diesel units in the class 15x series.

5.12 Consultation questions

15. Do you agree with the approach of defining separate standards suitable for the characteristics of Community Railways?
16. Do you think passengers' interests would be better served by altering or ending the performance regime, to incentivise operators to maintain connections, rather than to put the priority on punctuality? Where do you think the balance of interests lies?
17. Do you think that local management of operations is likely to bring improved staff motivation and involvement, and better service for customers?
18. Would you support the use of older heritage diesel units in the short term (up to five years) where they were retained to meet a specific local requirement?
19. What scope is there for light or ultra-light rail solutions on some Community Rail routes?
20. How can the future potential for rail freight best be protected and developed on these routes?

6. Community involvement

The strength of local and rural railways is in the way they can serve the community, support the local economy – particularly the tourist economy – and help to tackle questions of social exclusion and accessibility as well as provide some solutions to local traffic congestion. This is understood by heritage railways which have generally good links with the communities they serve, and are often a significant contributor to the local economy. Harnessing local support can ensure the proper specification of services and facilities, increase ridership and maximise local grant funding opportunities. In the longer term, consideration could be given to devolution of powers following the examples of Scotland, where services are specified and paid for by Scottish Ministers, and Merseyside where the Passenger Transport Executive is the franchising authority for the local rail franchise. In London, the Mayor has some powers of specification and funding. In London, as well as in Wales, extensive consultation already takes place on the services and facilities to be provided with significant funding being provided to support improved facilities.



*West Runton.
Photograph courtesy of Anglia Railways.*

6.1 Community Rail Partnerships

Local involvement is best tackled initially through the mechanism of the successful Community Rail Partnerships. These should be extended to local and rural lines not already covered. The Association of Community Rail Partnerships is an effective body for sharing best practice, tackling common problems and issues, and latterly of joint marketing. Community Rail Partnerships invariably have paid support staff and a budget for promotional activity. Their funding has come from a range of bodies including the Countryside Agency, local authorities, regional development agencies, train operators, Network Rail and private charities. It is important to ensure that funding for the partnerships is secure and relatively long-term, and that it is broadly based, with all relevant stakeholders able to contribute in cash or in kind.

6.2 Station adoption

This initiative has been successfully introduced by Arriva Trains Northern and Anglia. Trained local volunteers keep an eye on stations, reporting faults and problems including vandalism, and securing local funding for station improvements. Not only has it helped to restore a sense of local 'ownership' of the station, but also in securing continuous local monitoring, it has served to prevent trespass and vandalism and improve personal security, and raised the railway's profile in the local community. In some cases, local groups have improved the station environment through landscaping or providing station gardens. There is scope for much wider application of this principle.

6.3 *Funding*

Local engagement can provide access to other sources of community funding to make improvements to stations, to improve services and facilities or to market and promote services. In particular, section 106 agreements can provide resources from new development for local transport improvements. There is an opportunity to be much more creative in using funding programmes designated for tourism development, regeneration, community safety and social cohesion. As soon as it is affordable, the SRA would wish to reintroduce the Rail Passenger Partnership fund or a similar mechanism, as well as freight facility grants to act as a catalyst and to provide the basis for match funding from local sources.

6.4 Consultation questions

21. Do you agree with the extension of Community Rail Partnerships to all rural and local lines?
22. How could Community Rail Partnerships be funded to ensure they have a stable, long-term future?
23. Do you think that station adoption can be effective in improving conditions at stations and highlighting issues for station facility owners to address?
24. Are there any other forms of funding that could be secured to provide improvements to stations, facilities or services on Community Railways?
25. Are there any other forms of community involvement on local and rural railways that ought to be considered?

7. Pilot schemes

Five routes are identified below for consideration as pilot schemes to demonstrate different aspects of the strategy. This is not an exhaustive list, and this consultation seeks views on the lines listed as well as other candidates. The purpose of the pilot schemes is to test a range of the initiatives outlined above in a controlled way. Those proposed at this stage are:

7.1 *The Esk Valley Line (Middlesbrough to Whitby)*

The Esk Valley Development Company has been established to promote the line, with the ability to take on other responsibilities such as station management and provision of information, ticketing and on-board services. Provision has been made within the invitation to tender for the Northern Franchise, for the franchisee to co-operate with the SRA in examining the scope for more cost-effective operation of the line. Arriva Trains North (ATN) has actively worked with the Development Company on promoting the route.

This line would be chosen to test the benefits of local management, development of the present service pattern (which currently sees only four trains daily), the use of heritage trains for tourism development (it is linked to the North Yorkshire Moors Railway at Grosmont) and integration. The latter would be based on linking the line with local bus services, and community transport as well as the NYM Railway and potentially other green tourism initiatives for access to the National Park.

7.2 *Island Line (Ryde Pier Head to Shanklin)*

This unique, self-contained railway is already vertically integrated and effectively a 'microfranchise'. The current franchise term ends in February 2007 and this timescale allows alternative methods of operation to be considered, including light rail and integrating infrastructure maintenance, from 2007 onwards. The first stage is to establish a Community Rail Partnership on the Island to bring together the disparate initiatives supporting the railway, as well as the five rail user groups covering the Island. The long-term challenges revolve mainly around rolling stock replacement, given the line's restricted loading gauge.

7.3 *Looe Valley Line (Liskeard to Looe)*

This route is already supported by the active, well-resourced and effective Devon & Cornwall Community Rail Partnership, and performs a modest park and ride function as well as connecting with the Great Western Main Line at Liskeard. It is self-contained and operationally simple, with scope to carry out local servicing of rolling stock, and would be well suited to working through the implications of a full microfranchise. Freight traffic uses part of the line from Liskeard to Coombe Junction, continuing to Moorswater, and this would need to be provided for within the project. The park and ride role of the line might be expanded as it is very close to the A38. There could be some synergy in combining local management of this and the Tamar Valley Line which is also proposed for Community Rail designation. Implementation could coincide with the letting of the Greater Western franchise in 2006.

7.4 *St Ives Branch (Cornwall)*

The base demand here is for main line connections at St Erth to main line stations throughout Cornwall and beyond. In the summer, however, the main demand is for visitors from the park and ride at Lelant Saltings to St Ives, a joint venture with Penwith District Council that has run for many years. There is scope to change the peak summer timetable to reflect this, and to focus during this period on the park and ride operation (whilst maintaining principal main line connections) to maximise ridership and benefits to the community. This would require skill in presentation of a complex timetable to ensure it was understandable, but with some real potential wins in terms of providing a more frequent park and ride service without additional resources.

7.5 *Watford Junction to St Albans Branch (Hertfordshire)*

More urban than rural, this self-contained line is constrained by its physical characteristics which impose an uneven timetable pattern, and require continued operation as a heavy rail branch from the main line. Running it as a local orbital route, using simple signalling and control systems together with local management, could allow a more regular and frequent service which, when integrated with feeder bus services, would allow it to fulfil its potential as an effective and reliable local service in this area of high traffic congestion.

7.6 Consultation questions

26. Do you agree that the lines selected could be used to trial some of the initiatives outlined in this paper as pilot schemes?
27. Are there any other routes that you think should be used to trial aspects of this strategy and why?

8. Other issues

8.1 *Business case*

Where reference is made to the need for a 'business case' to demonstrate that an investment represents value for money, this involves comparing the costs and benefits of projects using the SRA Appraisal Criteria. This is available in hard copy, or via the SRA website at www.sra.gov.uk. It should be noted that benefits are not related solely to financial benefits but also to social benefits such as reducing congestion and accessibility. The business case looks at the overall value of the project to the community, regardless of the source of funds.

8.2 *Affordability*

If a project has a positive business case then it can be considered for funding. All projects with positive business cases are weighed against other calls on the SRA's budget to determine an appropriate funding allocation. Therefore, the presence of a positive business case in itself does not automatically guarantee funding for a project. Funding from local sources can clearly reduce the call on the SRA's budget and so increase the likelihood of projects that are value for money going ahead.

9. Information for respondents

Our intention is to use the responses from this consultation exercise to help inform the development of a strategy for Community Railways to be published in July 2004. We will also engage with the industry and stakeholders during the course of the consultation period to explore the issues in more detail. In the meantime, this document poses questions to which consultees are invited to respond. Your responses need not be limited to these questions – we would welcome other comments. For convenience, the consultation questions are combined in [Appendix A](#).

A list of the bodies formally consulted and which have received a copy of this consultation document is at [Appendix B](#). Please let us know if there are other bodies you think should receive a copy of this document.

This document can be made available in an accessible format on request.

Please make your responses in writing to:

Chris Austin
Executive Director, Community Rail Development
The Strategic Rail Authority
55 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0EU

E-mail: communityrail@sra.gov.uk
Fax: 020 7654 6045
Tel: 020 7654 6279

The deadline for responses is Friday, 28 May 2004 but earlier replies would be very welcome.

We may make your consultation response public unless you specifically ask for all or part of it to be kept confidential.

Appendix A: Consultation questions

The questions raised in the paper are set out below. If you have any other issues you would like to raise in connection with the policy, please let us know.

General approach to Community Railways

1. Do you agree with the general approach proposed for Community Railways?
2. Are there ways to increase the socio-economic value of local and rural lines, other than through the three broad objectives outlined?
3. Microfranchising might involve vertical integration (bringing train and network operations together under a unified management). What role do you think microfranchising has to play in the development of Community Railways?

Definitions

4. Do you agree with the broad definition outlined above for Community Rail designation?
5. Are there any other characteristics that could usefully be included in such a definition?
6. Do you agree that the lines listed in [Appendix C](#) are those that should initially be designated as Community Railways?
7. Do you agree with the process proposed to include or exclude Community Rail lines in the future?

Increasing passenger use and revenue

8. Do you agree that fares structures on Community Railways should be changed to provide for integration with local bus fares?
9. What simplified local ticket retailing options do you think should be considered to encourage sales through local outlets such as newsagents and post offices?
10. Do you think that more flexible timetables, geared around seasonal variation in demand, would provide a better service within the resources available, and how would they best be communicated?
11. What are your views on use of railway stations for retailing or community activities where the buildings are no longer required for railway use?
12. Do you think there would be value in the integration of bus and rail services in the way described? To what extent do you think that buses and trains can substitute for each other?
13. What role do you see for community transport operators in providing rail-link services, including demand-responsive services?
14. How can local management best be introduced? What would be the advantages and disadvantages?

Managing costs

15. Do you agree with the approach of defining separate standards suitable for the characteristics of Community Railways?
16. Do you think passengers' interests would be better served by altering or ending the performance regime, to incentivise operators to maintain connections, rather than to put the priority on punctuality? Where do you think the balance of interests lies?
17. Do you think that local management of operations is likely to bring improved staff motivation and involvement, and better service for customers?
18. Would you support the use of older heritage diesel units in the short term (up to five years) where they were retained to meet a specific local requirement?
19. What scope is there for light or ultra-light rail solutions on some Community Rail routes?
20. How can the future potential for rail freight best be protected and developed on these routes?

Community involvement

21. Do you agree with the extension of Community Rail Partnerships to all rural and local lines?
22. How could Community Rail Partnerships be funded to ensure they have a stable, long-term future?
23. Do you think that station adoption can be effective in improving conditions at stations and highlighting issues for station facility owners to address?
24. Are there any other forms of funding that could be secured to provide improvements to stations, facilities or services on Community Railways?
25. Are there any other forms of community involvement on local and rural railways that ought to be considered?

Pilot schemes

26. Do you agree that the lines selected could be used to trial some of the initiatives outlined in this paper as pilot schemes?
27. Are there any other routes that you think should be used to trial aspects of this strategy and why?

Appendix B: List of consultees

Action for Communities in Rural England	Local Government Association for Wales
ASLE&F	National Association of Local Councils
Association of British Chambers of Commerce	National Cycling Strategy Board
Association of Community Rail Partnerships	Network Rail
Association of Train Operating Companies	Office of Fair Trading
ATCO	Office of the Rail Regulator
British Transport Police	Passenger Transport Executives Group
CBI	Railfreight Group
Commission for Integrated Transport	Railfuture
Community Transport Association	Rail Passengers Council and Rail Passenger Committees
Competition Commission	Railway Forum
Confederation of Passenger Transport	Railway Heritage Trust
COSLA	Railway Industry Association
Countryside Agency	Railway Safety & Standards Board
Countryside Alliance	Regional Development Agencies
County and Unitary Authorities	Regional Government Offices
CPRE	RMT
Cyclists Touring Club	ROSCOs
DEFRA	Rural Affairs Forum for England
Department for Transport	Rural Stress Information Network
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee	Scottish Executive
DTI	Scottish TUC
English Heritage	Social Exclusion Unit
English Nature	Sustrans
English Regional Assemblies	Train Operating Companies
Environment Agency	Transport <i>for</i> London
Freight on Rail	Transport 2000
Freight Operating Companies	TSSA
Freight Transport Association	TUC
Friends of the Earth	Village Retail Services Association
Health & Safety Executive	VisitBritain
Heritage Railway Association	VisitScotland
Local Government Association	Wales Tourist Board
	Welsh Assembly Government

(Rail user groups should send comments in the first instance to the Rail Passenger's Committee covering their area.)

Appendix C: List of lines proposed for Community Rail designation by region

* Asterisk marks services already supported by a Community Rail Partnership.
Italics indicate junctions that are not passenger stations.

South West

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
St Erth to St Ives	St Erth to St Ives	Wessex Trains
<i>Penwithers Junction</i> to Falmouth	Truro to Falmouth*	Wessex Trains
Par to Newquay	Par to Newquay*	Wessex Trains
Liskeard to Looe	Liskeard to Looe*	Wessex Trains
<i>St Budeaux Junction</i> to Gunnislake	Plymouth to Gunnislake*	Wessex Trains
<i>Cowley Bridge Junction</i> to Barnstaple	Exmouth/Exeter to Barnstaple*	Wessex Trains
<i>Narrowways Hill Junction</i> to Severn Beach	Bristol TM to Severn Beach	Wessex Trains
Castle Cary to Dorchester Junction	Bristol to Weymouth*	Wessex Trains
<i>Thingley Junction</i> to <i>Bradford South Junction</i>	Swindon to Southampton	Wessex Trains

South East

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
Ryde Pier Head to Shanklin	Ryde Pier Head to Shanklin	Island Line
Brockenhurst to Lymington	Brockenhurst to Lymington	South West Trains
Twyford to Henley-on-Thames	Twyford to Henley-on-Thames	Thames Trains#
Maidenhead to Marlow	Maidenhead to Marlow	Thames Trains#
<i>Oxford North Junction</i> to Bicester Town	Oxford to Bicester Town	Thames Trains#
<i>Eastern Junction</i> to Sheerness	Sittingbourne to Sheerness*	South East Trains
<i>Southerham Junction</i> to Seaford	Brighton to Seaford*	South Central
Paddock Wood to Strood	Turnbridge – Paddock Wood to Strood*	South East Trains

To be operated by First Group

Wales

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
<i>Llynvi Junction</i> to Maesteg	Cardiff to Maesteg	Arriva Trains Wales
Dovey Junction to Pwllheli	Machynlleth to Barmouth/Pwllheli*	Arriva Trains Wales
Craven Arms to <i>Morlais Junction</i>	Shrewsbury to Swansea* (Heart of Wales Line)	Arriva Trains Wales
Shrewsbury to <i>Saltney Junction</i>	Cardiff/Birmingham to Chester/Holyhead*	Arriva Trains Wales
Wrexham Central to Bidston	Wrexham Central to Bidston*	Arriva Trains Wales
Llandudno Junction to Blaenau Ffestiniog	Llandudno to Blaenau Ffestiniog*	Arriva Trains Wales

West Midlands

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
Great Malvern to <i>Shelwick Junction</i>	Paddington/Birmingham to Hereford*	Central Trains/ First Great Western Thames Trains #
Stourbridge Junction to Stourbridge Town	Stourbridge Junction to Stourbridge Town	Central Trains (Centro service)
Shirley to Stratford-upon-Avon	Birmingham Snow Hill to Stratford-upon-Avon*	Central Trains (Centro service)
Hatton to <i>Bearley Junction</i>	Leamington Spa to Stratford	Central Trains
<i>Ryecroft Junction</i> to Rugeley Trent Valley	Birmingham New Street to Stafford	Central Trains (Centro service)

Thames Trains to be operated by First Group

Eastern England

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
Marks Tey to Sudbury	Marks Tey to Sudbury*	First Great Eastern#
Wickford to Southminster	Wickford to Southminster*	First Great Eastern#
<i>Whitlingham Junction</i> to Sheringham	Norwich to Sheringham*	Anglia#
Brundall to Lowestoft	Norwich to Lowestoft*	Anglia#
Reedham to <i>Breydon Junction</i>	Norwich to Yarmouth via Reedham*	Anglia#
Westerfield to <i>Oulton Broad North Junction</i>	Ipswich/Liverpool Street to Lowestoft	Anglia#
<i>Chippenham Junction</i> to <i>Coldham Lane Junction</i>	Harwich/Ipswich to Cambridge	Anglia#
Bedford to Bletchley	Bedford to Bletchley	Silverlink
Watford Junction to St Albans Abbey	Watford Junction to St Albans Abbey	Silverlink

To be transferred to the Greater Anglia Franchise

East Midlands

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
<i>Ambergate Junction</i> to Matlock	Derby to Matlock*	Central Trains
<i>Radford Junction</i> to Worksop	Nottingham to Worksop	Central Trains
Stoke on Trent to <i>North Stafford Junction</i>	Crewe to Nottingham/Skegness*	Central Trains
<i>Allington Junction</i> to Skegness	Crewe to Nottingham/Skegness*	Central Trains
Barnetby to Lincoln	Grimsby to Lincoln/Newark	Central Trains
Barnetby to Retford	Cleethorpes to Sheffield	Arriva Trains Northern

Yorkshire & Humberside

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
<i>Guisborough Junction to Whitby</i>	Middlesbrough to Whitby*	Arriva Trains Northern
Barnsley to <i>Springwood Junction</i>	Sheffield to Huddersfield*	Arriva Trains Northern
Ulceby to Barton-on-Humber	Cleethorpes to Barton-on-Humber	Arriva Trains Northern
Beverley to Seamer	Hull to Scarborough*	Arriva Trains Northern
Knaresborough to <i>Skelton Junction</i>	Leeds to York via Harrogate	Arriva Trains Northern (Metro service)

North East

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
Darlington to Bishop Auckland	Saltburn to Bishop Auckland*	Arriva Trains Northern

North West

Route	Passenger service	Current operator
<i>Mickle Trafford Junction to Edgeley Junction</i>	Chester to Manchester Piccadilly*	First North Western
Hazel Grove to Buxton	Blackpool North etc/ Manchester Piccadilly to Buxton*	First North Western
<i>Farrington Curve Junction to Ormskirk</i>	Preston to Ormskirk*	First North Western
Wigan Wallgate to Southport	Manchester Airport/Rochdale to Southport*	First North Western (GMPTE)
Wigan Wallgate to Kirkby	Rochdale to Kirkby	First North Western (GMPTE)
Blackpool South to Kirkham and <i>Gannow Junction to Colne</i>	Blackpool South to Colne	First North Western
<i>Hest Bank South Junction to Heysham</i>	Leeds/Lancaster to Heysham	First North Western/Arriva Trains Northern
<i>Daisyfield Junction to Hellifield</i>	Manchester Victoria to Clitheroe and Hellifield (seasonal)*	First North Western
Barrow to Carlisle	Barrow to Carlisle	First North Western
<i>Settle Junction to Carnforth</i>	Leeds to Morecambe*	Arriva Trains Northern
Oxenholme to Windermere	Manchester Airport Oxenholme to Windermere	First North Western#

To be operated by the Transpennine Express Franchise

Appendix D: Existing TOCs and future franchises covering the Community Rail network

Present TOC	Future franchise	Date for renewal
Anglia	Greater Anglia	2004
ATN	Northern	2004
Central Trains	-	2006
First GE	Greater Anglia	2004
First NW	Northern	2004
Island Line	-	2007
Silverlink	-	2006
South Central	-	2008/10
South East Trains	Integrated Kent	2004
SWT	-	2007
Thames Trains	Greater Western	2006
Arriva Trains Wales	-	2018
Wessex	Greater Western	2006

