

## *Yorkshire* **railfuture**

Vice-Presidents: Alan Whitehouse and Mike Crowhurst

### North Yorkshire's Vision for Rail

By Mark Parry



Graham North – photo by Mark Parry

Graham North addressed our branch meeting in York on 8 October. Graham is the Policy Support Officer for North Yorkshire County Council on Rail. He outlined the rail network within the County which has nearly 8 million passengers annually with Harrogate and Skipton being the busiest stations. His remit also covers the quieter routes in the County, such as the Esk Valley line. The county's priority is the Harrogate line involving a third of the county's demand. The Department for Transport directs the County Council to focus on existing lines. On this line the case for electrification and double tracking is strong. Meanwhile Network Rail is to improve the signalling. Northern has invested £1.2 million on Harrogate Station and Virgin East Coast is working towards a 7 trains a day service to London. The County's residents can also look forward to other improvements by the franchises, with improved frequencies on Northern services and new

The County has set targets for the next 20 to 30 years. The first is for 85% of residents to be within 40 minutes of an HS2 hub. The second is for residents to be able to access any station within 20 minutes. Station studies, costing £30 to £40 thousand each, are to be competed on Northallerton, Thirsk, Seamer, Selby, Skipton, Cross Hills and Harrogate. These studies will look at the opportunities each site could offer. The Skipton to Colne link maybe reviewed as part of an East West corridor analysis. But under the Department for Transport rules this has to involve all modes of transport so we might get the missing rail link and we might also get more roads.

Yorkshire Railfuture Branch Annual General Meeting

Speaker: Chris Page, National Chair of Railfuture

13:00 to 16:00 hours

Saturday, 11 February 2017 @ The Town Hall, St. George's Street, Hebden Bridge, HX7 7BY

**See flyer for more details**

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



Seven branch members visited the Institute of Railway Research at Huddersfield University on 27 September where Professor Simon Iwnicki outlined the work the Institute does.

Huddersfield University is in the top 10 for teaching excellence and one of the five most financially viable. It has 24,000 students and has recently doubled its research income.

The Institute's 36 staff work in three elements, "The Centre for Innovation in Rail", "The Rail Safety and Standards Board Strategic Partnership" and "The Institute of Railway Research". They work on wheel to rail interaction, vehicle suspension, the design of the track, sleepers and ballast, data collection and the prediction of failures and railway safety and risk. One of their projects recommended a slight change in the rail profile to avoid rail contact fatigue. Another allows the prediction of rail corrugation growth. They have investigated a flexible track system allowing better support of the track. Work for the tram train pilot has led to them recommending a wheel profile to improve the tram trains efficiency on both light and heavy rails. They are in the process of building a jig, costing nearly £5 million, which will be able to test wheels and rails by running bogies on a revolving drum of rail. We were able to see this 150 tonne rig during construction from the Control Room. One interesting fact we learned is that 1% of recently awarded franchises income goes towards innovation projects in this and other Institutes. We left having agreed to keep in touch as our experience and links to the Operators could be useful to the Institute.

**HS2 in South Yorkshire & the Eastern Branch****by Mike Crowhurst**

The change of route announced in July 2016 in South Yorkshire, with new proposals for serving Sheffield, together with the earlier revision to the proposals for Leeds station, suggests that a serious review of at least the Eastern Branch has been undertaken. Unfortunately, the outcome is not as radical as might have been hoped in a number of respects. The new Leeds proposals are undoubtedly an improvement but still lack full integration with the present network. The rejection of several alternatives to Toton also leaves the East Midland Cities with a poorly sited station in relation to the local rail network and, give or take the extension of the "NET" tram, inconvenient to all but road users.

The new approach to serving Sheffield split the High Speed Service into two parts, the through service using a new alignment east of Rotherham, with no call in South Yorkshire, and a separate service coming off the main route south of Chesterfield, joining the existing line through that town, with perhaps some services calling there, and into Sheffield station over existing tracks which, south of Dore at least, will still only be two tracks. A proportion of these services would apparently continue, again over existing tracks with perhaps some of the original four tracking restored here too, re-joining the through route in the Dearne Valley area.

Although this offers the prospect of at least a few services calling in Sheffield and even Chesterfield, it is not certain that overall this is a better solution than Meadowhall even for Sheffield, let alone South Yorkshire. It would mean that for a distance equal to about half that between Leeds and Nottingham or Toton, services calling at Sheffield would be using the classic network. Add the time taken for one or even two station stops, and the time penalty in leaving the route to serve Sheffield will be close to prohibitive for any through trains. London to Leeds or York trains are unlikely to

leave the direct route, as it would wipe out the time savings over the fastest East Coast services, so separate paths for London to Sheffield services on the High Speed route would need to be found, which may not be easy. The Cross Country route from Birmingham may not merit separate Sheffield terminating trains, so some at least of the Birmingham to Leeds or York services would presumably have to make the detour, with the consequent effect on end to end timings and patronage, versus the classic route via Derby.

Furthermore, although a Chesterfield call may seem a benefit, it is by no means clear why this second tier centre should be served when equally deserving places like Barnsley, Wakefield, Loughborough, Macclesfield, Warrington, and not to mention Coventry, Leicester and Stoke are not. What is more, without Meadowhall, Barnsley and Rotherham, as well as Doncaster, will actually be worse off, having to connect in Sheffield. Routing the High Speed line east of Rotherham brings these places no benefit if they have no station.

Compare the proposals for the Western Branch. Each primary destination, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Preston and the North, has a separate service group from London, as have Leeds, York and the North, reflecting the present service pattern. In addition, there will be cross country services between Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds, and possibly others. Birmingham and Manchester have their own branches, and one for Stoke is being considered. Out of town calls for both main cities are included, one on the branch, the other illogically on the through route. The only other on line station is Crewe. (A more imaginative solution would be to put Stoke on the main line and Crewe on a branch).

An equivalent solution on the Eastern Branch would involve separate services into not just Leeds but also Sheffield and Nottingham, on branches with some shared tracks, and out of town calls at convenient interchange points with the classic network on the through route. On present plans however, due to a lack of capacity south of Birmingham, this would require extensive use of paired short sets, split and joined at strategic locations. In the longer term the best answer would be a second high-speed line into London down the M1 corridor, via Leicester, so that all places on both the Midland and East Coast routes that currently enjoy their own service groups would continue to do so on the High Speed network.

Toton is effectively an out of town parkway. Nottingham trains could join and leave the High Speed Line near Trent junction, perhaps with portions for Derby, and use the existing track into the City. Whatever route the Leeds Branch takes, a parkway station at Micklefield on the East Leeds Line is possible if this part of the through route is diverted south of Garforth. (See my article in issue 31 of the Yorkshire Rail Campaigner). A bypass to York would also be worth considering.

In RAIL magazine number 809, a correspondent suggests the High Speed Main Line could end at Doncaster instead of York, running into that town alongside the M18. This would avoid crossing the Sheffield to Doncaster corridor, but would leave a question mark over the Leeds Branch, unless that city were served from the East via Hambleton and a new east Leeds bypass, as part of the High Speed 3 Northern Powerhouse Rail. An interesting idea, but not taken further for now.

The shortest Branch into Sheffield station would be via the "old route" along what is now the Line from Workshop, possibly with extra track. This might connect directly with a Sheffield to Manchester high speed route under the "Northern Powerhouse", using parts of the old Grand Central Woodhead Route. But this would not be suitable for through high speed trains calling at Sheffield, unless by reversal. And the rest of South Yorkshire needs a parkway station on the Main Line. The location chosen for this will depend on and determine the revised route of the Main Line.

Meadowhall could have been an excellent location for a South Yorkshire parkway. Failing this, there are two possible alternatives for easy interchange further east, both on the Sheffield to Doncaster Corridor, but neither on the Route now proposed for the High Speed Main Line. The first is the old station site at Rotherham Masboro. This would be fine for Rotherham, but interchange with the Local Service via Rotherham Central would be difficult, and there is no direct link to Barnsley. Reinstated platforms would be required for Transpennine and other semi fast services. The High Speed Line might be built mainly on old Midland Railway trackbeds, via Swinton, but the curvature through Rotherham may be unacceptably tight. An alternative direct route north from Rotherham, re-joining the old midland Line near Darfield, would require much tunnelling to negotiate developed areas.

A better alternative parkway location is further east at Swinton. This lies on the Doncaster Line, as well as the Dearne Valley Line to Wakefield, but again currently has no link with Barnsley. This could be remedied by restoring the old closed Barnsley to Wath Line, offering the opportunity to reconnect Barnsley with Doncaster, the one missing interurban link in South Yorkshire, as well as with the High Speed Interchange, by providing both a Doncaster to Barnsley to Manchester service and a Sheffield to Rotherham to Swinton to Barnsley to Huddersfield service.

The High Speed Route would need to deviate from that currently proposed south of Hooton Robert on the A630, and run west of that village into Swinton. There is space at Swinton for the High Speed Station, in the old canal basin to the east of the present station. The High Speed Line would continue in a short tunnel under the Doncaster to Leeds or York lines towards Wath, after which it would run broadly in the old Midland Corridor but with adjustments to eliminate curves. Alignments either west of Darfield or east of Cudworth look possible, largely using old colliery land, disused railway land or other industrial land. There may be worries about mining subsidence in some areas, as apparently there were both in the Erewash Valley and the Potteries, but these have been resolved for other developments so should not be insuperable.

By the time this route enters West Yorkshire at Royston, or by Cold Hiendley, it would be back on the alignment originally proposed. (Again see my article for options in West Yorkshire in issue 31 of the Yorkshire Rail Campaigner.) This seems to offer fewer problems than the Meadowhall Route, and none of the difficulties encountered on the suggested route east of Mexborough. Proposing to demolish new or half completed housing estates seems on the face of it insane, and guaranteed to generate maximum opprobrium! Surely this should have been picked up by even a basic local consultation? On top of which, public relations seemingly worse than the those with the Fracking Industry have compounded the problem!

To conclude, I suggest branches into Leeds, into Sheffield from the east, and into Nottingham on the existing tracks, together with three interchange-cum-Parkway stations on the main line at Leeds Elmet (Micklefield), Sheffield Hallam (Swinton) and Nottingham Trent (Toton).

### **Pontefract Meeting**

**by Mark Parry**

On Wednesday, 14 September, the Pontefract Civic Society hosted a public meeting to gauge public interest in starting a new Rail User Group for the area. Jim Kerr, a Campaign for Better Transport member, attended and reported back on the excellent turnout, including two local councillors and members from The Friends of Askern Station. He found the presentation outlining how the Pontefract area has ended up with the present limited service informative. The Civic Society has requested basic improvements to the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. Two improvements are going ahead. The Knottingley to Wakefield Kirkgate hourly service (via Pontefract Monkhill) is to be extended to Leeds and will also operate on Sundays. The Huddersfield to Wakefield hourly service will also be extended to Castleford, again operating on a Sunday. Two further improvements the Civic Society is pressing for are an hourly Leeds to Goole service via Pontefract Monkhill, and the new Scarborough to York service to be extended through to Sheffield via Pontefract Baghill.

### **Harrogate Chamber Transport Update**

**by Mark Parry**

Members of the Harrogate Line Supporters Group and Railfuture Branch members were invited to this Harrogate Chamber of Commerce event held on 7 November in Harrogate's Crown Hotel. There were no less than four speakers.

Tony Hallwood, Aviation Development Director, Leeds Bradford Airport spoke of the proposed £1 million upgrade of the Airport Terminal. The number of passengers are forecast to double between now and 2030. The Airport hopes to attract new businesses around the Airport not to mention a doubling of Airport staff. So, an upgrade of "road access" was listed along with extra parking facilities. However, improved rail connectivity featured prominently also. The Airport's favoured option is for a Parkway Station on the Harrogate Line with a connecting bus shuttle. This new station would also have a park and ride attached for drivers to connect onto trains to continue into Leeds. Trains need not terminate in Leeds but continue onto Bradford and Skipton.

Alex Hornby, Chief Executive Officer, Transdev Blazefield Bus Company told us of the developments in his bus businesses based in Blackburn, Burnley, Keighley, Harrogate, York and Malton. They have increased patronage by providing new buses with excellent seating, wifi, charging points for computers, pull down tables, stop announcements and even a small library! Harrogate will be getting electric buses in 2018. The City Zap service was introduced, as a none stop service from Leeds to York. Will the new Northern trains and services match up to Transdev's standards?

Paul Barnfield, Regional Director – East, Northern Rail outlined the new franchise's £1 billion investment reported in previous editions of the Yorkshire Rail Campaigner. Relevant to Harrogate is the new four trains an hour timetable in the daytime with more and later evening services. Services will be faster with two trains per hour on Sundays. They expect to operate class 170 units and refurbished 150 trains on this line. Disappointment was expressed over the lack of any mention of the proposed Parkway Station for the Airport and electrification of the line. Electrification is a matter for Network Rail and Paul said the suggested Parkway Station was a matter for the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and other relevant public bodies. North Yorkshire County Council was represented at the meeting and it was highlighted that the Council has provided £12 million towards the duelling of the Harrogate Line between Knaresborough and York.

Susan Donnelly, Commercial Director, Virgin Trains East Coast listed the benefits of their franchise's new investments, also previously reported in the Yorkshire Rail Campaigner. Harrogate will see a two hourly London service so Leeds will see three trains every other hour to London. In 2018 we hope to see the new Azuma trains built by Hitachi.

## Response to West Yorkshire Transport Strategy

by Mike Troke

*Editor* - Our branch response to this strategy was sent in October and the main body of this response is below:

Overall, we support in principle what the Combined Authority is trying to achieve and so the arguments are not repeated here. However, we see the following Key Principles as fundamental to the success of the Strategy. We have also made some over-arching comments which are intended to add weight to the aims of the Strategy.

### **Key Principles**

**Passenger-centred transport:** We support proposals for public and social transport provision that are passenger-centred. They need to be determined by optimum ability to meet the needs of the community, particularly in the context of facilitating access to work, leisure, healthcare and education throughout the North of England – and not just within the West Yorkshire Combined Authority area.

**Sustainability & Integration:** We support proposals which would make a positive contribution towards integrated, sustainable, public transport networks across the whole of the North of England.

**Cleaner air:** We encourage work which facilitates modal shift from private car transport towards increased use of public, shared or social transport so as to take advantage of the known health benefits of emission reduction. All vehicles providing public services should be zero or (at least) low emission.

**Partnership working:** The Combined Authority needs to reassure all users that any proposals resulting from this consultation emerge from partnership working with other relevant bodies, not least Transport for the North, Rail North, the city regional authorities, the two metropolitan district councils, transport operators, major employers and informed campaigning organisations.

### **Comments on the Strategy Consultation**

**Travel Without Boundaries:** When addressing the needs of the population in the context of access to healthcare, employment, education and leisure, it is important to remember that notional local authority, transport authority or operators' boundaries do not necessarily feature in users' transport choices. An integrated system, driven primarily by travel patterns, which minimises the unwanted effects of such boundaries, is therefore essential if people are to be successfully encouraged to use public or active transport modes.

**Regional Travel Characteristics:** The development of a 'Metro' style network serving the major cities (along similar lines to Greater Manchester) is welcomed but the picture of travel patterns is more complex than the diagrams and tables suggest. The region has the highest concentration of higher education institutions in the country, which, along with the colleges and schools generates considerable need for both local and longer distance travel. Similarly, there are major supra-regional centres of healthcare excellence across the North which along with major district hospitals and local health centres generate needs for integrated, accessible and seamless travel both locally and across the

region. An increasing and aging population adds further to these imperatives. In addition to the principal cities, major clusters of employment exist all across the region. Their transport needs, be it for the movement of people or freight, require transformational solutions. The economic benefits of easy, rapid transport to and from these centres needs further recognition. There are a number of internationally recognised visitor locations, destination cities and large areas of important natural landscape in this part of England. Integrated provision of public transport to serve these centres is essential to their success.

**Movement of Freight:** It is striking from the statistics illustrated in the consultation documents that by far the majority (93%) of freight is currently moved by road. There are considerable opportunities for better use of the major ports in the region, better use of inter-modal freight transport to distribution centres and the use of cleaner road vehicles for the 'last mile' of distribution – as advocated in Transport for the North's report. Use of water transport for freight, especially utilising the larger waterways in the region has hitherto been largely ignored and should be explored fully. A significant shift away from current methods of small parcels and perishables distribution (as already developed with the Great Western and East Midlands train operating companies) is essential if air quality targets, which are currently failing to protect a substantial proportion of the population, are to be met. Movement of freight and people are inter-dependant, especially in the context of infrastructure provision and more emphasis on this would have been welcomed.

**Development Priority Areas:** Whilst it is acknowledged that the spatial priority areas will require a mix of transport solutions, they should only be approved on the premise that integrated public transport provision is provided from the outset – not seen as a desirable afterthought. Additionally, enterprise zones, airports and city regional distribution centres should all be rail, as well as road, connected.

**National Connectivity:** The current proposals for the Yorkshire Hub in Leeds still miss an opportunity to improve regional connectivity and improve compatible capacity. The same principle now being proposed for HS2 in Sheffield should be applied to Leeds. An HS2 terminal station in Leeds will have higher operating costs whereas an expanded through station (as advocated by "HSUK") connecting in a loop to the northern end of the HS2 line would be much more efficient. Cross-city feeder rail, light rail and bus services would then be able to provide a much more seamless interchange with HS2 than is currently being proposed. Such additional heavy rail capacity east of Leeds will be needed sooner rather than later, and so should be incorporated in plans at an early stage. Additionally, the early development of a comprehensive tram/light rail system in Leeds is essential, and needs to be progressed without further delay.

**City & Regional Connectivity:** Plans for high speed rail across the Pennines are currently unknown and so it is very difficult to comment on their likely utility. The proposal for an intermediate stop on any high-speed rail line between Manchester and Leeds may have merit, depending on the route chosen. Each interchange needs to be a fully integrated hub with seamless connectivity between all modes of transport. Inter-availability of ticketing is also an essential component of national and regional and city connectivity, and deserves complementary development in parallel with infrastructure and services enhancement.

**Rail Infrastructure:** Support from the Combined Authority for rail service improvements across the region is welcomed but it would be productive to investigate ways in which the current costly, bureaucratic and time-consuming GRIP system can be replaced by a speedy, cost-effective and environmentally-friendly alternative. Additionally, there is growing evidence that project costs for enhancements are inflated, especially when exclusively carried by Network Rail. Greater use of approved contractors would offer opportunities to simplify planning procedures, speed up delivery of projects and reduce costs – thereby allowing additional enhancements within existing budgets.

**Travel by road:** Some highly focussed road enhancements can be argued as essential towards providing a spectrum of travel opportunities which support the whole range of travel needs in the region. However, the potential for environmental damage of any road construction programme and the potential for environmental damage from increased road traffic so generated, needs to be balanced fairly against the advantages of encouraging public transport of all modes. The West Yorkshire Combined Authority needs to take account of Transport for the North's current study into a new trans-Pennine road tunnel and consider how (or if) such a development might affect transport plans in West Yorkshire. An expensive new road tunnel would not support the aims of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority Transport Strategy, and would divert resources away from improvements in West Yorkshire which might otherwise attract funding. Re-opening of the existing Woodhead rail tunnel, adjusted and gauge-enhanced for high speed rail passenger and freight transit would be a more practical and cost-effective solution. The Transport Strategy should aim to reduce car use, rather than manage increase, by influencing planning decisions, providing high quality public transport and encouraging the use of alternative modes.

**CHILTERN RAILWAYS – AND NORTHERN.** I attended Railfuture's Branches and Topic Groups day in Birmingham at the end of October. I then went on to a family event in Hampshire on the Sunday. Because of the location of the family event, it was more convenient to take the car than rely on public transport, taxis and lifts. So, I stayed Friday evening close to Warwick Parkway station and headed into Brum on a Chiltern Railways class 170 DMU. This was my first experience of Chiltern. Warwick Parkway station is about two miles from the M40. It was commissioned and is owned by Chiltern Railways and opened in 2000. It is a major success story, with space for 959 cars in three ground level car parks and a three deck multi-story. It has bus stands with services to Warwick, Leamington Spa, Kenilworth and Coventry, and a taxi rank. I paid £5 to park (compare that to Leeds or Wakefield) and £5.10 with a senior railcard to be whizzed in comfort to central Birmingham, some 30 miles away, in about half an hour. That reasonable fare is despite the train crossing from Warwickshire into the Centro (West Midlands Combined Authority) area. Chiltern Railways is an impressive operation. The class 170s are well laid out with comfortable seats and have a quiet coach. The windows needed cleaning however! Chiltern also runs loco hauled trains with a class 68 on the London end and a Driving Van Trailer on the other. I watched one of these smart trains load whilst waiting for my train. One of the Mark 3 carriages is Business Class, much cheaper than First would be, but I am told offering an excellent standard of service.

Chiltern is one of three franchises plus an open access operator (Grand Central) run by Arriva, so we can hope that Northern will emulate some of Chiltern's best practice. Using the interior design and fittings of the class 170s as a template for Northern's refurbished Sprinters would be a good start. The seat design would be suitable for the new trains on order. I wasn't able to sample the different seat designs that Northern showed recently, but I hope that the chosen design is at least as comfortable as those on the Chiltern 170s. Northern is desperately short of rolling stock at present, the result of past under-investment of course. The rolling stock shortage is likely to be exacerbated whilst the much-needed "good as new" refurbishment programme takes place, so I do wonder whether there are not some stored Mark 2 or Mark 3 carriages that Northern could hire together with short-of-work freight locos to provide higher quality services on some routes, and in doing so release Sprinters to lengthen overcrowded commuter services in Yorkshire and Greater Manchester. Which routes are most suitable will depend on a number of operational considerations, but candidates should include Leeds-Settle-Carlisle (when reopened), Newcastle-Hexham-Carlisle and the Yorkshire Coast route.

**HAROLD WILSON AND BEECHING.** I was lucky enough recently to attend the first Harold Wilson Memorial lecture at the University of Bradford. Wilson was its first Chancellor, and held that post for 17 years. The lecture was given by Hull MP and former minister Alan Johnson, and very impressive it was too. Johnson is an excellent public speaker, his writing style is excellent and the content fascinating. There is little doubt that Wilson was one of our most successful post-war Prime Ministers, but like all of us, he made mistakes. One of these, so obvious now was to blindly implement so many of the closure recommendations of the Beeching Report, commissioned by the former Conservative Transport Minister Ernest Marples. People tend to forget, or be unaware, that most of the closures happened between 1964 and 1970. How we could now do *inter alia* with the Spen Valley Line, the Wetherby Line, the Ripon Line, the Minsters Line, the Keswick Line, and the Borders route as well as Skipton-Colne that, ironically, was not recommended for closure by Beeching.

**FREIGHT AND PARCELS.** I think most people, if asked, would say that there are too many lorries on the road and that more freight should be on the railways. When a heavy goods vehicle is involved in an accident, the effects can be devastating. The recent appalling case of the mobile phone using lorry driver who killed four people in Oxfordshire brought the safety issue into national headlines. One national newspaper followed up this verdict with photos of about 20 lorry drivers speaking or texting on their phones. Most were foreign, and are driving over here because the very small volume of cross Channel rail freight is a disgrace. Tunnel charges are too high, the Calais situation has been off-putting and we foolishly scrapped or sold all our train ferries. Rail freight is going through a difficult time. The closure of coal powered power stations has had a devastating effect on the rail freight operators. "DB Cargo", for example, has cut nearly a thousand jobs. Biomass has taken up some of the lost traffic, but only a relatively small amount. The sector needs new customers fast. Intermodal is clearly one way forward but the key import and export routes differ from those traditionally used by coal trains. There is still a serious lack of capacity, not least across the Pennines. It is ridiculous that so much freight from Ireland to Europe travels by road across the M62. Those containers need to be on the railway and there is surely enough spare capacity at night time and in the later evening to accommodate such trains – assuming that the loading gauge is sufficient for nine foot six containers. It's about time piggy backing of lorries on rail freight flats was developed in this country. "HSUK Ltd" have proposed this as an alternative to a road tunnel in or near the Peak District. There needs to be much more internal container traffic transferred to rail. Food distribution is one example. Tesco have transferred significant amounts of bulk haulage to rail, but I'm not sure if any

of their competitors have. There has to be a strong case for a more generous system of rail freight grants to encourage this.

And what about parcels? Few travel by rail, although how many is unclear because we don't know if some parcels firms are trucking in rail-borne containers. It's time that there was a resurrection of railway parcels traffic. Let's have high speed parcels trains. Convert some HSTs and class91s/225s when they come off passenger duties, for both parcels and mail traffic. After all, the French have La Poste TGVs. Rail freight is much more environmentally friendly than road freight and with the right kit can be much quicker. It's time for action from government, the rail industry and the parcels companies.

### Rail User Groups affiliated to Railfuture within the Yorkshire Branch

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

### Branch Committee and the small print

<b>Chair:</b> Nina Smith, 14 Bank Terrace, Hebden Bridge HX7 6BU, <a href="mailto:Nina.Smith@railfuture.org.uk">Nina.Smith@railfuture.org.uk</a>
<b>Vice Chair and Media Relations:</b> Chris Hyomes, 12 Monument Lane, Pontefract WF8 2BE, <a href="mailto:Chris.Hyomes@railfuture.org.uk">Chris.Hyomes@railfuture.org.uk</a>
<b>Vice Chair and Parliamentary Liaison Officer:</b> Graham Collett, <a href="mailto:Graham.Collett@railfuture.org.uk">Graham.Collett@railfuture.org.uk</a>
<b>Secretary/Conference Organiser:</b> Dr. Mike Troke, <a href="mailto:Michael.Yorkshire@talktalk.net">Michael.Yorkshire@talktalk.net</a> , 07947 062632
<b>Treasurer:</b> Ian Wood, 11 Langdale Drive, Ackworth Wakefield WF7 7PX, <a href="mailto:ianfwood@hotmail.co.uk">ianfwood@hotmail.co.uk</a>
<b>Membership &amp; Distribution:</b> Paul Colbeck, 14 St Giles Way, Copmanthorpe York YO23 3XT, <a href="mailto:Paul.Colbeck@railfuture.org.uk">Paul.Colbeck@railfuture.org.uk</a>
<b>Technical Engineering Officer:</b> Steve Brady, 07973 481516, <a href="mailto:Arthingtonsag@aol.com">Arthingtonsag@aol.com</a>
<b>Freight Lead:</b> Tony Ross, 01482 842150, <a href="mailto:Tony@Ross53.karoo.co.uk">Tony@Ross53.karoo.co.uk</a>
<b>Assistant Treasurer:</b> Geoff Wood, 6, Westfield Terrace, Wakefield, WF1 3RD, <a href="mailto:esperanto11@hotmail.co.uk">esperanto11@hotmail.co.uk</a>
<b>Newsletter Editor:</b> Mark Parry, 07941 642349, <a href="mailto:Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk">Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk</a>
Branch Facebook Page: <a href="http://www.facebook.com/RailfutureYorkshire">www.facebook.com/RailfutureYorkshire</a> Railfuture web-sites: <a href="http://www.railfuture.org.uk">www.railfuture.org.uk</a> <a href="http://www.railfuturescotland.org.uk">www.railfuturescotland.org.uk</a> <a href="http://www.railfuturewales.org.uk">www.railfuturewales.org.uk</a> <a href="http://www.railwatch.org.uk">www.railwatch.org.uk</a> <a href="http://www.railfuture.org.uk/Yorkshire+Branch">http://www.railfuture.org.uk/Yorkshire+Branch</a> Twitter Accounts: <a href="https://twitter.com/RailfutureYorks">@RailfutureYorks</a> <a href="https://twitter.com/Railfuture">@Railfuture</a>
<b>The views in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect the views of Railfuture.</b>
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.



*We need an "Outings Organiser", a new "Membership Secretary" and a South Yorkshire Co-ordinator to help boost our membership.*

*If you are interested, please contact Nina, her details are on page 8.*

#### **Membership News:**

**Paul Colbeck – Membership Secretary**

**Welcome to our new group member:** Stalybridge to Huddersfield RUG

I would like to thank all those who have agreed to have their copy of **Yorkshire Rail Campaigner** sent by email. This saves us time and money. Contact me at [Paul.colbeck@railfuture.org.uk](mailto: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 <http://www.railfuture.org.uk/join/> or by contacting our membership secretary Paul Colbeck on [Paul.colbeck@railfuture.org.uk](mailto:Paul.colbeck@railfuture.org.uk)***

***If you join online please email Paul to let him know.***

Our next issue (**Yorkshire Rail Campaigner 36**) will be out in March 2017. Please email material, news and feedback to: [Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk](mailto:Mark.Parry@railfuture.org.uk) to arrive by **Saturday 4 February 2016**. Alternatively call or text 07941 642349. **Stories of campaigns and successes are especially welcome.**

#### **Diary**

16 January 2017 @ 19:30: Campaign for Better Transport Rail Group. Meets in the Grove Inn next to the Bridgewater Place Tower off Victoria Road. Contact Mark Parry for more details.

11 February 2017 @ 13:00: Yorkshire Branch of Railfuture Annual General Meeting @ Hebden Bridge Town Hall, St.George's Street HX7 7BY. Speaker – Chris Page, National Railfuture Chair.

14 March 2017 @ 19:30: Campaign for Better Transport – "Ben Still" Managing Director of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. Oxford Place Methodist Mission, next to Leeds Town Hall. Contact Mark Parry for more details.

27 February 2017 @ 19:30: Campaign for Better Transport Rail Group. Meets in the Grove Inn next to the Bridgewater Place Tower off Victoria Road. Contact Mark Parry for more details.

23 March 2017- 11:00 to 13:00 Institute of Mechanical Engineers. Thursday. "Leeds High Speed Rail Station - the challenge of integrating the old with the new!". Pontefract WF9 1AB. More info: [IMechE Booking essential](#).

20 May 2017 @ 10:00: Railfuture Annual General Meeting. Peterborough Central Library, 36 -40 Broadway, PE1 1EX. [Booking essential](#).

17 June 2017 @10:45. Railfuture Summer Meeting. The Carriageworks Theatre, Millenium Square, Leeds LS2 3AD. [Booking essential](#).

#### **STOP PRESS - PRESS RELEASE**

Selby and District Rail Users Group was surprised and very disappointed to learn that the Department for Transport has rejected a scheme to electrify the line between Templehirst Junction to Selby, and between Selby and Hull. This goes against the concept of "The Northern Powerhouse." The scheme was seen as a logical addition to the TransPennine Upgrade which includes electrification between Manchester and Selby. The Group believes passengers in the Selby District are now denied extra benefits of an electrified line from Manchester to Hull, and an electrified line between York and Hull.

**Well done to Huddersfield, Penistone and Sheffield Rail Users Association for winning the Gold award for the best newsletter in the Rail User Group Annual Awards this year.**

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