

# CLIENT TO SPONSOR REMIT

## PROJECT: Transport Links, Skipton to Colne

	<b>Remit date:</b>	
<b>Prepared by (Scheme Client signature):</b>	<b>Name:</b>	
	<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Accepted by (Scheme Sponsor signature):</b>	<b>Name:</b>	
	<b>Date:</b>	

### PREVIOUS VERSIONS

<b>Date</b>	<b>Reason for Publishing</b>
08 May 2012	Version 1

## 1 SUMMARY

### 1.1 PROJECT DEFINITION AND BACKGROUND

The Lancashire & Cumbria RUS<sup>1</sup> noted that "... a number of communities on the route between Nelson and Skipton suffer from deprivation and would benefit from improved links to Leeds ...", and recommended that the line of the (Skipton to Colne) route should be protected to "... give stakeholders time to identify potential sources of funding and commission a more detailed feasibility study."

Proposals to reverse the rise in social deprivation and improve GVA have variously included a series of village and town by-passes and reinstatement of the Skipton to Colne former railway line while currently, consideration is also being given by Lancashire County Council to the extension of the M65 corridor.

The client considers that a study is now required to identify, consider and develop interventions aligned with local and National Government policy with regard to economic and social growth and development. This study should detail what intervention offers the best long term value for money for funders, residents and any participating partners. The study will be used by the client to inform, prioritise and gain commitment to future transport policy and local transport plans, specifically within the Counties of Lancashire, North Yorkshire, and West Yorkshire.

<sup>1</sup> Network Rail, Lancashire & Cumbria Route Utilisation Strategy, 2008, page 81

## **2 DETAILS OF PROJECT**

### **2.1 PROPOSITION & OUTPUTS**

The client requires that the study should, as a first stage, review work completed to date, including studies for the client and others, using recognised transport appraisal criteria compatible with the decision making processes of funders (ie DfT, Local Authorities and the rail industry) to review what the economic, environmental, and transport issues are between Burnley and Skipton and to identify options to address these. Should this first stage work recommend a rail based solution then the second stage should use the Network Rail GRIP 1-3 process, recommending a single option at GRIP 3. The report should therefore :

**1a** Review all available existing work carried out exploring the economic, environmental and transport issues that affect the study area and provide a short, no more than 20 page report for the use of the client which sets out the current evidence base:

**1b** Use established transport appraisal criteria (eg DfT Webtag) to recommend a solution to the economic, environmental and transport issues identified between Burnley and Skipton. As part of this, consider, in a scenario testing exercise, what level of development of housing etc, would be required to result in a financially viable rail service. Issues that should be considered at this stage include:

- Secure social benefits to reduce the social exclusion of residents through strong reliable transport links, available to all, removing dependency on the motor car, by providing:
  - the facility to commute to wider employment opportunities
  - better access to educational establishments, leading to increased qualification and skill levels
  - better access to health facilities
  - reasonable access to retail outlets
  - improved access to transport hubs, including airports.
- Improve environmental conditions, quality of life and road safety within Pennine Lancashire, North and West Yorkshire by reductions in:
  - traffic congestion
  - road traffic accidents
  - CO2 emissions and their effects
- Identify any new public transport services required, for example Bus, or Train together with any further potential or staged future enhancements possible e.g. increased frequency, access to additional destinations.etc
- In each case, include appropriate measures to ‘future-proof’ the intervention for further development opportunities as appropriate
- Develop a business case for each intervention detailing any future subsidy required, with the analysis demonstrating the improvement in GVA which should be expected

**2.** A break clause exists to allow the client to halt the study at the end of stage 1b

- If a rail option is recommended at the conclusion of stages 1a and 1b, and the client decides to proceed, then the study should continue to identify and recommend costed interventions, including a preferred single option as required by the GRIP process
- Develop a suitable implementation plan which also outlines levels and stages for funding provision

## **2.2 TIMING AND DEPENDENCIES**

1. The study in stage 2 is expected to follow Network Rail's GRIP criteria, which will be staged to generate high level options at GRIP 2, which can be further assessed before reducing to a single option at GRIP 3
2. The timescales needing to be achieved shall be agreed with the client within one month of commencement
3. The GRIP 2 report shall be published in draft for the Client enabling discussion followed by a final GRIP 2 report.
4. The GRIP 3 report shall similarly be published in draft for discussion before the final version is published in line with the programme timescales agreed.
  - a. Monthly written reports will be required by the Client for use at internal meetings
  - b. The study should present its staged conclusions in draft before proceeding to final reports with appropriate recommendations
  - c. The final report at each stage, should clearly set out the evidence underpinning recommendations made, including the business case analysis and sources of data.
  - d. Changes in timescales shall first be agreed with the Client.
  - e. (Other deadlines to be included, for example to get outputs included in other studies or policy publications should be considered)

## **3 CLIENTS AND FUNDING**

### **3.1 CLIENT(S)**

TBC

### **3.2 FUNDING**

- The Charges for individual stages of the study to be agreed with the Client in writing , in advance
- Funding opportunities for delivery of the scheme and any necessary ongoing subsidy to be examined by the study

## **4 INTERFACE WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS/STUDIES**

### **4.1 ORGANISATIONS - To include, but not be limited to (references to relevant strategy documents are included).**

- Lancashire County Council
  - Future of the Skipton-Colne Railway Formation, Report August 2003.
  - Local Transport Plan
- North Yorkshire County Council
  - Future of the Skipton-Colne Railway Formation, Report August 2003.
  - Local Transport Plan
- Department for Transport
  - Transport Analysis Guidance - WebTAG

- Network Rail
  - Lancashire and Cumbria Route Utilisation Strategy
  - Investment in Stations A Guide for promoters and developers
  - Interface with Network Rail's Route Enhancement Management Team LNW
  - Network Rail's GRIP process
- Highways Agency
- Greater Manchester Integrated Transport Authority
- West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority
- SELRAP
  - Re-opening of the Skipton to Colne Railway (JMP Consulting, all modules 2007)
- Train Operating Companies as required.
- Bus Operators as required

### **Distribution**

Lancashire County Council & LEP  
North Yorkshire County Council & LEP  
West Yorkshire ITA  
Greater Manchester ITA  
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council  
Pendle Borough Council  
Craven District Council  
Burnley Borough Council  
PLLACE  
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council  
Northern Rail  
Trans-Pennine Express  
Network Rail  
DfT  
ATOC  
Local MPs  
SELRAP representatives