
Decision Session
– Executive Member for City Strategy

6 July 2010

Report of the Director of City Strategy

Haxby Station Update

Summary

1. This report provides an update on the progress of the Haxby Station project and the need for a further Line Speed Improvement Study prior to Network Rail providing the necessary support for the scheme. The report also recommends that the delivery of the project should be suspended until the availability of funding is clarified.

Recommendations

2. The Executive Member is recommended to:
 - Note the progress made on the delivery of the Haxby Station scheme.
 - Progress Option 1 to deliver the station in accordance with standard procedures but defer commencement of further work, until the availability of funding for the delivery of the scheme is clarified.

Reason: To enable a high value for money scheme to be progressed whilst minimising the risk of abortive expenditure.

Background

3. The provision of a station at Haxby has been an aspiration of the Council for many years. It is included in the 2nd Local Transport Plan as a scheme to progress through a bid for funding to the Department for Transport (DfT).
4. The station, located on the TransPennine network, with trains running to Scarborough, York, Leeds and Manchester, has been the subject of extensive feasibility and investigation work over a number of years. Whilst having significant local benefits of providing a fast alternative route into York for the residents of the area, the principal benefit is sub-regional, allowing a 3km catchment population of approximately 22,000 direct access to Scarborough, Leeds and Manchester. The transfer of these longer commuting/leisure trips, many of which are currently undertaken by car, would reduce congestion levels, particularly on the A1237 Outer Ring Road and the A64.
5. Following a feasibility study undertaken by Network Rail the further development of a conventional (opposing platform) station approximately 230m south of the Station Road level crossing adjacent to the existing allotments was approved in principle by the Executive Member at the 16 March 2009 Executive Member Advisory Panel. To establish the practicality of providing the

station in railway infrastructure terms an outline layout has been developed. This proposal comprised 2 platforms, a footbridge (with ramp or lift access), a small station building, a car park and the provision of an access off Station Road. The proposal would be subject to consultation and detailed design before the submission of a planning application (including an updated Transport Assessment).

6. To enable a station to be constructed Network Rail have to be satisfied that the proposal is practical to deliver and the Train Operating Company for the route (First TransPennine) need to be assured that there is an acceptable business case for the facility. In particular the train operator must be confident that sufficient new passengers will use the service to cover the additional maintenance, supervision and station access charges. In the case of the station at Haxby separate approvals are required as it is proposed to fund the scheme from Network Rail and DfT resources.
7. The funding from the DfT is currently allocated by the region to a list of prioritised transport schemes through the Regional Transport Advisory Board. The availability of funding for the station within the Regional Funding Allocation was confirmed by the Minister of Transport on 22 July 2009. However, the role of the Region in determining funding allocations is subject to review as part of the introduction of the proposed Decentralisation and Localism Bill. In addition the entire Major Scheme process was suspended on 10 June 2010 until the spending review in the autumn is complete. It is not anticipated that the funding will be clarified until after the review has been completed and a new major scheme process has been developed.
8. Under the previous procedure, once the scheme has been allocated potential funding within the regional programme the detailed approval and ultimate release of funds is obtained directly from the DfT through the Major Scheme process. In the case of railway schemes acceptance of the scheme by Network Rail and the Train Operating Company is a pre-requisite of approval by the DfT.
9. Where the scheme is to be part funded by Network Rail it also needs to be satisfied that it is possible to obtain the necessary Station Access Charge and station development charge from the Train Operating Company to cover the operation of the station and funding for construction. In the case where the construction of the scheme is after the end of an existing Train Operator's franchise DfT(Rail) also have to provide approval.
10. Until recently it was understood that the Fast Track study on options for the station completed at the end of 2008 and reported to the City Strategy Executive Member Advisory Panel on 16 March 2009 would be adequate for Network Rail to approve the proposal in principle to allow the Major Scheme process to progress. At that time it was thought that the necessary 2.5 minutes required to allow trains to stop at the station could be incorporated into the existing timetable. However, the proposed changes to the East Coast Main Line timetable planned to be introduced in May 2011 have a knock-on effect on the Scarborough line connecting services, reducing the scope for alterations to the service. Network Rail, therefore, needs more assurance that the track works that may be required to allow sufficient time for trains to stop at the station are feasible, before confirming approval of the scheme.

11. The necessary Line Speed Improvement study would cost in the region of £60k and would be charged on an emerging cost basis. The actual costs may be significantly lower if a relatively simple and cost effective solution becomes apparent at an early stage.
12. Network Rail have an 8 stage development process described in the Guide to Railway Investment Projects (GRIP).

Table 1. Guide to Railway Investment Projects - stages of project development	
GRIP Stage	Description
1	Output definition
2	Pre-feasibility
3	Option selection
4	Single option selection
5	Detailed design
6	Construction test and commission
7	Scheme hand back
8	Project close out

13. Once the Line Speed Improvement study has been completed both the station and the necessary trackworks will be developed to the same stage i.e. GRIP 3 (Option Selection).
14. The guidance for preparing business cases for Major Schemes suggests that development of railway schemes up to GRIP 4 is required before a bid can be submitted. However, subject to detailed confirmation it is now understood that the DfT will accept a Major Scheme Business Case at a GRIP 3 stage of development. Submission of a Programme Entry Business Case at the less developed GRIP 3 stage is preferred as it reduces the level of detail and expenditure required to prepare the bid, although additional time would be introduced into the overall delivery programme.
15. It should be noted that apart from the resolution of the funding and technical approvals with Network Rail and the DfT there are a number of other risks associated with delivery of the scheme. The most significant additional risks identified at this stage are: obtaining planning consent, acquisition of land and resolution of allotment issues. These all have the potential to prevent the scheme proceeding and, therefore, detailed mitigation strategies will need to be prepared for these items once the funding and railway technical issues have been resolved.

Options

16. There are four main options to consider:
17. Option 1 (Recommended Option): Progress in accordance with standard procedures with commencement deferred until future funding allocations are clarified.
 - The commencement of Line Speed Improvement Study would be deferred until after the implications of the Comprehensive Spending Review were clear.

- Subject to the agreement and necessary funding being provided by the Regional Transport Advisory Board, Department for Transport, Network Rail and First Transpennine, it is anticipated that the station could be delivered by the end of 2014. However the delivery by this date would also be dependent on the receipt of planning consent, the acquisition of land and the satisfactory resolution of allotment issues.
18. Option 2: Progress in accordance with standard procedures immediately
- The Line Speed Improvement study would be commenced immediately.
 - Subject to the agreement and necessary funding being provided by the Regional Transport Advisory Board, Department for Transport, Network Rail and First Transpennine, it is anticipated that the station could be delivered by Mid 2014. However the delivery by this date would also be dependent on the receipt of planning consent, the acquisition of land and the satisfactory resolution of allotment issues.
19. Option 3: Progress more rapidly prior to obtaining approvals.
- Subject to the same agreements and approvals identified in Option 2 it is anticipated that the station could be delivered by mid 2013 if some of the development and preparatory work was undertaken concurrently rather than consecutively.
20. Option 4: Defer scheme.
- No further development of scheme.

Analysis

21. Both the DfT and Network Rail have project development processes designed to minimise abortive costs and to ensure that only good value for money schemes which meet the government's priorities are progressed. In particular the processes encourage resolution of railway technical issues before finalising other risk areas i.e. the provision of a station should be technically achievable in railway terms before resolving other items. However, these processes can introduce considerable additional time into the overall delivery programme, particularly if no work is undertaken on the next development stage until the previous stage is approved.
22. It is anticipated that, due to the level of national debt, there will be substantial funding reductions for transport schemes in the future. However, it is considered that the Haxby Station scheme is well aligned with the Coalition's aspirations to make the most of existing infrastructure and to develop a greener and more sustainable transport sector. There is an increased risk of abortive expenditure if work is progressed before the funding situation is clarified and all approvals are in place.
23. Under Option 1 (recommended) the necessary approval processes are progressed sequentially allowing the major risks to be addressed in a structured way. This extends the delivery programme but minimises the risk of abortive expenditure. It also ensures that expectations or concerns are not raised and abortive consultation is not undertaken on options which are not practical to deliver. However, there is still a risk that if some of the major

uncertainties materialise at a later date the scheme may still have to be terminated or significantly altered. In Option 1 the fundamental railway issues would be resolved before the secondary issues are progressed in detail. This option minimises the cost of the scheme to the Council as the major preparatory expenditure would be incurred after the receipt of Programme Entry from the DfT, when costs would be split between CYC, Network Rail and DfT.

24. The following programme has been prepared to understand the likely delivery timescale of Option 1. It is proposed to defer the implementation of the Line Speed Improvement Study until the implications of the proposed reductions to Local Authority and DfT future budgets have been confirmed in the autumn. The programme does not allow for undertaking any elements at risk in advance of the necessary approvals. This is considered prudent, due to the high cost of the preparatory work and relatively high risk of delivery. Approval would be sought from Network Rail and the Council prior to progressing to the next stage of development. A shorter programme could be progressed if more of the work was undertaken at risk – See Option 3.

Option 1 Indicative Programme		
MSB Stage	Key Elements	Anticipated Stage Dates
Development Stage	Approval in Principle (GRIP 3) Station + Line Speed Improvements	December 2010 – June 2011
Programme Entry	Outline Consultation Major Scheme Business Case	June 2011 – February 2012
Conditional Approval	Detailed Consultation Railway Development Stage GRIP4 Planning Consent Securing Land	March 2012– April 2013
Full Approval	Detailed Design & Tender (GRIP 5) Land Acquisition	November 2012 – December 2013
Implementation	Construction & Commissioning (GRIP 6, 7, 8)	January 2014 – October 2014

25. The indicative future costs of the various stages are indicated in the following table. The costs and the apportionment is subject to detailed agreement with Network Rail and the DfT. The allocation of risk and responsibility for funding of any cost overruns would also need to be confirmed prior to progressing beyond the development stage.

Option 1 Indicative Costs			
MSB Stage	Indicative Costs	Possible Cost Apportionment: Subject to Approval by NR & CYC	
		Estimated Total Cost	City of York Council
Development Stage	£75k	100%	Internal Costs
Programme Entry	£175k	100%	Internal Costs

Conditional Approval	£250k	10% (RFA 50%)	40%
Full Approval	£400k	10% (RFA 50%)	40%
Implementation	£6,900k	0% (RFA 60%)	40%
Total Estimated Cost	£7,800k	£300k (RFA £4,500k)	£3,000k

26. In Option 2 the scheme would be progressed sequentially following each approval stage as in option 1 but the Line Speed Improvement Study would be commenced straight away. This would mean each stage could commence approximately 4-5 months earlier with the anticipation that, subject to the receipt of the necessary approvals, the station could commence operation in mid 2014. It is likely that the overall costs would be similar to option 1 but the risk of expenditure on abortive work would be higher.
27. Under Option 3 the scheme would be progressed on a broad front resolving the funding, railway, land, planning and allotment issues at the same time. This option would enable full consultation to be undertaken at an earlier stage and an earlier completion date for the scheme. However this approach would increase the risk of abortive work being undertaken and would mean substantial increased costs to the council as more preparatory work would have to be undertaken before Programme Entry was received from the DfT.
28. The following programme has been prepared to understand the likely delivery timescale of Option 3. The programme includes for the preparation of designs at risk prior to approvals being received. This will increase costs to the Council and increase the risk of abortive work being undertaken. It is anticipated that the scheme could be delivered by mid 2013 subject to the necessary notices and land acquisition being completed.

Option 3 Indicative Programme		
MSB Stage	Key Elements	Anticipated Stage Dates
Development Stage	Approval in Principle (GRIP 3)	July 2010 – December 2010
Programme Entry	Outline Consultation Major Scheme Business Case Railway Development Stage GRIP4 Preparing Planning Application	July 2010 – May 2011
Conditional Approval	Detailed Consultation Planning Consent Securing Land	Jan 2011-October 2011
Full Approval	Detailed Design & Tender (GRIP 5) Land Acquisition	August 2011 - November 2012
Implementation	Construction & Commissioning (GRIP 6, 7, 8)	December 2012 – July 2013

29. The indicative future costs of the various stages for Option 3 are indicated in the following table. The costs and the apportionment is subject to detailed

agreement with Network Rail and the DfT. The allocation of risk and responsibility for funding of any cost overruns would also need to be confirmed prior to progressing beyond the development stage. The costs to the Council increase to approximately £540k with Option 3 principally due to the earlier commencement of the planning application process and preparation of the GRIP 4 Railway Infrastructure stage in advance of the Programme Entry submission.

Option 2 Indicative Costs			
MSB Stage	Indicative Costs	Possible Cost Apportionment: Subject to Approval by NR & CYC	
	Estimated Total Cost	City of York Council	Network Rail
Development Stage	£100k	100%	Internal Costs
Programme Entry	£400k	100%	Internal Costs
Conditional Approval	£100k	10% (RFA 50%)	40%
Full Approval	£300k	10% (RFA 50%)	40%
Implementation	£6,900k	0% (RFA 60%)	40%
Total Estimated Cost	£7,800k	£540k (RFA £4,340k)	£2,920k

30. The Executive Member has the option to stop the progression of the scheme taking account of the anticipated future development costs, availability of funding and risks to delivery. However this would mean that the aspirations of the residents of the area, LTP2 and the anticipated transport benefits from the scheme, both locally and in the wider region, would not be realised and the expenditure to date would have been abortive.

31. Summary of Options

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Commence Line Speed Improvement Study	Following Spending Review (December 2010?)	July 2010	July 2010	N/A
Completion Date	October 2014	May 2014	July 2013	N/A
Future CYC Costs (Subject to agreement with Network Rail)	Approx. £300k	Approx. £300k	Approx. £540k	Nil
Total Future Scheme Cost	£7,800k	£7,800k	£7,800k	N/A
Risk of Further Abortive Costs	Low	Medium	High	Nil
Delivery Risk	Medium	Medium	Medium	N/A

Consultation

32. Updates on the scheme have been presented to Haxby Town Council and the Haxby and Wigginton ward committee a number of times of the last few years. Most recently at the ward committee in July 2009 and to the Town Council in October 2009.
33. Under the recommended Option 1 (and Option 2) consultation on the outline scheme would be progressed after Network Rail had confirmed that there was a practical scheme which could be delivered. It would be proposed to consult with all residents in the Haxby and Wigginton area to gain their views on the proposal, identify their principal concerns and help to gauge the level of potential usage. Following the receipt of Programme Entry and further design development a formal pre-planning application consultation would be undertaken to refine the proposed scheme.
34. Under Option 3 the more detailed consultation would be undertaken at an earlier stage to enable the planning application to be submitted in advance of funding confirmation.

Member Views

35. Officers consulted with Haxby and Wigginton Ward Councillors Firth, Hogg, and Watson plus Councillors D'Agorne, Gillies and Potter on the proposals. Their current views on the station proposal are summarised below.

Ward Member Views

36. Councillor Firth has the following comments:
 - Questions the viability of the location of the station
 - Concerned about the impact of the station on the local area (increased traffic flow, lack of appropriate road system, parking issues in the area, the allotments and the need to link in local bus routes to the station.
 - Interested in seeing how the Train Operating Company views the viability of the station / rail link in today's market, particularly since the introduction of the free bus passes.
 - What consideration has been given to linking the station to the Park and Ride? or locating it on the edge of York near the Northern ring road providing a second rail hub for the area?
37. Cllrs. Hogg has the following comments
 - Is supportive of a station in Haxby but considers that the cautious approach in Option 1 is the preferred way forward.
38. Cllr Watson has the following comments
 - Welcomes the broad principle of a station in the area although considers that there needs to be detailed consultation on siting.
 - Considers that effects of line speed and timetabling need to be understood before progressing the scheme in detail.

Other Member Views

39. Councillor Gillies had the following comments on the station proposal
 - Concerned about the value for money of the proposal at the current location.
 - Would support a Park & Ride site next to the Railway line with access from the A1237.
 - Considers a heavy rail shuttle service between York Station and Strensall would be the best option of all, with halts at Haxby and the Hospital part of the service. Provision of a station at Haxby is not the favoured option by a long way.
40. Councillor Potter supports the progression of the scheme in accordance with standard procedures with commencement deferred until future funding allocations are clarified.
41. Comments had not been received from Cllr. D'Agorne at the time of writing the report.

Response to Member Views

42. The majority of the comments have been addressed in previous reports on the station project. The business case for the station is dependent on the large potential market within walking/cycling distance to the station (Approx. 22,000 within 3km). Additional car trips are likely to be encouraged if the station was situated further away from the population centre. The existing train frequency would need to be substantially increased to allow it to operate as a Park & Ride service with a significant impact on the level crossing downtime.
43. It is anticipated that the station will generate approximately 105,000 new rail trips annually and a further 83,000 trips abstracted from York station. The principal destination is anticipated to be Leeds (72,000 trips). The case for the station was based on these longer trips. Haxby to York trips are already well served by a regular bus service. The detailed implications on the locality, particularly the impact of additional car trips to the station, will be investigated further during the preparation of the Programme Entry Business Case.

Corporate Priorities

44. The provision of a station at Haxby will contribute to the following corporate priorities and fulfil an aspiration within the City's Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (LTP2):
45. Thriving City – The provision of a station will provide an additional more sustainable transport option for the residents in the area. It is anticipated that there will be a slight reduction in traffic on the A1237 and A64 as some of the longer distance trips are diverted to the railway.
46. Sustainable City – The provision of a station will enable more trips to be undertaken using sustainable modes.
47. Safer City – The projected reduction in traffic travelling along adjacent roads is anticipated to reduce the level of accident risk in residential areas.

Implications

48. The following implications have been reviewed.
- **Financial** – A nominal £150k allocation for the progression of this scheme has been included in the 2010/11 City Strategy Capital Programme. The implications of the £1.452m of budget cuts for 2010/11 announced by the government on 10 June is the subject of a separate report to the Executive Member. The availability of future funds for delivering Major Schemes will be the subject of the Spending Review due to be published in the autumn. In addition the methodology for prioritising and evaluating schemes is being reviewed.
 - Option 1 (recommended) proposes the deferment of the Line Speed Improvement Study until the funding levels in future years and new Major Scheme processes have been confirmed. If Option 2 is progressed the financial commitment at this stage is restricted to the progression of the Line Speed Improvement Study. Further approvals would be obtained for the costs associated with the preparation of the Programme Entry business case once Network Rail's commitment to the scheme has been established. If Option 3 is progressed the allocation in 2010/11 would need to be substantially increased and additional resources appointed to deliver the scheme. The impact on other schemes within the programme would need to be assessed prior to progressing Option 3.
 - **Human Resources (HR)** – The HR implications would be dependent on the option chosen. Additional resources would be required to deliver the station to a faster programme.
 - **Equalities** – There are no fundamental equalities implications. The station will be designed in accordance with the latest standards to be accessible to all.
 - **Legal** – It is anticipated that there will be a number of legal issues to resolve throughout the delivery of the scheme including land acquisition, allotments, procurement, agreements with Network Rail etc.
 - **Crime and Disorder** – There are no crime and disorder implications
 - **Information Technology (IT)** – There are no IT implications
 - **Property** – There will be land purchase and allotment relocation issues to resolve during the delivery of the scheme.
 - **Other** – There are no other implications

Risk Management

49. A full risk register for the delivery of the project will be prepared as the scheme is developed. An initial review of the risks that are associated with the scheme has identified: obtaining funding, gaining planning consent, acquiring land and resolving issues with the existing allotments, as the major risks to be addressed. These are considered to be significant and a failure to address would seriously affect the delivery of the scheme. The management of these risks will be reviewed at each stage of the delivery of the project.

Contact Details

Author:
Tony Clarke
Capital Programme Manager
City Strategy
Tel No. 55 1641

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Richard Wood
Assistant Director City Development and
Transport

Report Approved Date 23/06/10

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Wards Affected:
Haxby and Wigginton

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers

Haxby Station Update Report to Executive Member for City Strategy Advisory Panel:
16 March 2009.

Annexes

None