

## Appendix A

From/Date	Comments via	Position on Strategy	Comments	Officer response
Local Resident 29/04/16	Have Your Say (L&L Rail Strategy inbox)	No clear position indicated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too London-centric</li> <li>• Should re-open Melton Mowbray – Nottingham line</li> <li>• Birmingham to Cambridge/Stansted should be improved</li> </ul>	Some changes made to final Strategy text to strengthen references to Birmingham to Cambridge / Stansted services
Access Manager Leicestershire County Council 12/05/16	Email to Transport Strategy Manager	No clear position indicated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Felixstowe to Nuneaton capacity works is significant and is underestimated in the Strategy</li> <li>• Not convinced the volume of freight increase fully acknowledges the implications for the County</li> </ul>	Some changes made to final Strategy text to strengthen references to impacts of increased rail freight traffic on local roads and level crossings
Mr Terry King CC Leader of Rutland County Council 12/05/16	Email to Leader of the County Council	Supports in principle, however there are both positive and negative implications for Rutland.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy poses potential benefits and detrimental impacts for Rutland</li> <li>• Reference to 4 tracking the line between Oakham and Langham should consider the potential pressure on Castle Cement – they should be consulted if capacity is challenged by freight or passenger usage</li> <li>• If Oakham routing is used for East Midlands Gateway Freight Interchange then congestion will result from increased barrier down time</li> <li>• There is concern regarding the lack of detail for the improved Stansted service,</li> </ul>	Number of changes made to final Strategy text to seek to take account of the views expressed

## Appendix A

			<p>would it mean fewer trains stopping in Oakham which is Rutland's primary rail link?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could 'Reduced east-west journey times to Stansted Airport' (page 4) be reworded to 'Additional services from Birmingham to Norwich via'?</li> <li>● Increased freight between Felixstowe and Nuneaton would require an investment in signalling to increase line capacity. Any investment should include the mitigation of the impact on local road networks, specifically in Oakham as a result of increased level crossing closures</li> <li>● Leicestershire should consult directly with Peterborough/Cambridge regarding Stansted link improvements</li> <li>● There is a lack of acknowledgement that any mitigation will be required to avoid damaging the competitiveness of Rutland businesses</li> </ul>	
<p>Dr Terri Eynon CC 06/06/16</p>	<p>Email to Assistant Director Highways and Transport</p>	<p>No clear position indicated on the strategy as a whole</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Believes the Council is going beyond evidence provided by AECOM when it attempts to persuade members there is no business case for reopening the Leicester-Burton line</li> <li>● Supports statement from recent AECOM report on the line calling for use of</li> </ul>	<p>County Council position to remain as per June 2016 Cabinet Report, i.e. not to undertake any further work at this time. However, the situation will be kept under review in the light of any possible works that <i>might</i> be required to the line</p>

## Appendix A

			<p>updated LLITM model to investigate potential additional demand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCC must work better with local authorities in Burton/Staffordshire for strategic projects</li> <li>• The potential for growth in Coalville and NW Leics should not be underestimated</li> </ul>	to enhance its freight carrying capacity and growth in Coalville
Leicester Local Access Forum 07/06/16	Have your say (L&L Rail Strategy inbox)	Supports the strategy in principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a link to Manchester via Toton</li> <li>• The principle aim of the strategy should be to provide 30 minute services to Birmingham, and 60 minute services to London, Manchester and Liverpool</li> <li>• Coalville should be linked to Leicester via train or light tram to reduce road congestion</li> <li>• High forecasted costs for opening Leicester-Burton via Coalville could be reduced by focusing on upgrading signalling and points for a light tram</li> <li>• Stansted route should be electrified</li> </ul>	<p>The Strategy is seeking to achieve significantly enhanced rail connectivity between Leicester and Leicestershire and other major economic centres, both in terms of destinations (e.g. Manchester) and improved journey time (e.g. to Birmingham)</p> <p>See above response regarding Leicester to Burton (L-B)</p>
Cllr Roy Deeney Blaby District Council 08/06/16	Have your say (L&L Rail Strategy inbox)	No clear position indicated on the strategy as a whole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Strategy should also account for a scenario in which the HS2 link to Leeds does not materialise</li> <li>• A light-tram option should be explored for a Leicester-Burton via Coalville link</li> <li>• A direct link to Manchester is needed;</li> </ul>	<p>The Government has confirmed its commitment to HS2 Phase 2b (to Leeds)</p> <p>See above regarding L-B See above regarding Manchester</p>

## Appendix A

			<p>possibly using the Hope Valley route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Ivanhoe line should have a 'spur' towards East Midlands Airport (EMA)</li> </ul>	<p>The County Council will work with EMA and East Midlands Councils (through work on the HS2 Growth Strategy) to seek to make any further surface access improvements, although the prospect of a 'heavy rail' link to the airport appears to be extremely unlikely at the present time.</p>
<p>Environment &amp; Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee 09/06/16</p>	<p>Members of the Committee</p>	<p>Supports the strategy in principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Strategy makes little reference to Hinckley Station and the proposed 'LE-Nuckle' project</li> <li>South Wigston also receives a lack of attention regarding how it might benefit from the 'Nuckle'</li> <li>There should be greater emphasis on the potential capacity issues at St Pancras and the impact this could have on the aims of the strategy</li> </ul>	<p>Number of changes made to final Strategy text to seek to take account of the views expressed</p>
<p>English Regional Transport Association 08/06/16</p>	<p>Letter to Leader of the County Council</p>	<p>Supports the strategy in principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports reopening of GCL south of Leicester to serve Lutterworth and link with WCML at Rugby, Northampton, Daventry and Buckingham</li> <li>Advocates a jointly sponsored (Buckingham/Rugby/Leicestershire) study to examine the business case for this route</li> </ul>	<p>No changes made to the Strategy as this matter is not considered to be of sufficiently high priority. Officers will review any information prepared by other parties if the opportunity arises.</p>

## Appendix A

<p>RailFuture East Midlands 16/06/16</p>	<p>Have your say (L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox)</p>	<p>RailFuture welcomes the strategy and supports its adoption of as policy in principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A non-stop journey time between Leicester and London would be desirable</li> <li>• Toton is not the optimum location for the East Midlands HS2 hub; it is too far north to be of use for southbound traffic from Leicestershire, and does not directly serve Nottingham or Derby. East Midlands Parkway would be a better location</li> <li>• Studies should be undertaken to assess the viability of reopening the ‘dive under’ line passing under WCML south of Nuneaton</li> <li>• Further research is needed to assess the potential of opening stations along the Leicester-Birmingham line, e.g. – Blaby, Croft</li> <li>• There should be active promotion for the reopening of the Leicester-Burton line</li> <li>• Compensation should be considered for those in NW Leicestershire affected by HS2 but not directly benefiting</li> <li>• There is potential for additional stations to be added along passenger lines, e.g. – Thurmaston, Blaby, Kibworth, Elmesthorpe, East Goscote.</li> <li>• The ‘Easing curves through Market</li> </ul>	<p>See above comments about improving journey times</p> <p>The County Council is not seeking to challenge the location of the HS2 East Midlands Hub. Compensations is a matter for the Government / HS2 Ltd. and a consultation is currently been undertaken on the proposals for Phase 2</p> <p>The final Strategy text has been modified to strengthen reference to the diveunder</p> <p>The County Council has no proposals at present to investigate new rail stations, but the matter is covered in Priority iv)</p> <p>See above regarding L-B</p> <p>It is understood that Network Rail are still planning to undertake the track-straightening works at Market Harborough as well as to provide improved platforms and</p>
--	--	---	---	--

## Appendix A

			<p>Harborough' project should be reconsidered. Especially as this is under active consideration by Network Rail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The low GVA figure for re-opening the Leicester to Burton line is surprising – especially considering the success of other similar reopening's, e.g. – National Forest line</li> <li>• There is potential for Tram usage on the Leicester-Burton line</li> <li>• The GVA for Leicester-Manchester (£9.1m) also appears low. RailFuture welcomes a through-service to Manchester, however the route should operate via Derby and Dore South Curve rather than Sheffield, which represents a considerable time penalty</li> </ul>	<p>station access</p>
<p>Harborough Rail Users Group 20/06/16</p>	<p>L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox</p>	<p>Supports the strategy in principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planned electrification of MML must be accompanied by high-quality electric rolling stock suited to long-distance, high-speed travel; this is of considerable pertinence for the desirability of Market Harborough</li> <li>• Regarding section 8.2 ('The effects of HS2 on Leicester') it would be interesting to know what the GVA figures for Leicestershire as a whole as opposed to just Leicester</li> </ul>	<p>The County Council is lobbying the Government to ensure that the MML continues to be served by high quality passenger trains</p>

## Appendix A

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 'Easing curves through Market Harborough' project should be reconsidered</li> <li>• Various secondary/diversionary lines connected to MML should also be electrified in order to reduce delays in the event of disruption</li> <li>• It is essential that access for pedestrians and cyclists to Market Harborough Station is considered</li> </ul>	See above regarding Market Harborough
Local resident 01/07/16	Telephone conversation	No clear position indicated on the strategy as a whole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Leicester-Burton link should be reopened</li> </ul>	County Council position to remain as per June 2016 Cabinet Report, i.e. not to undertake any further work at this time. However, the situation will be kept under review in the light of any possible works that <i>might</i> be required to the line to enhance its freight carrying capacity and growth in Coalville
Local resident 04/07/16	L&L Rail Strategy inbox	Supports the strategy in principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy should re-consider the reopening of Blaby Station to receive trams</li> <li>• There is potential to run trams on the GCR into downtown Leicester</li> </ul>	<p>The County Council has no proposals at present to investigate new rail stations, but the matter is covered in Priority iv)</p> <p>The County Council has no proposals to investigate the provision of trams along the Great Central Railway</p>

## Appendix A

<p>Hinckley &amp; Bosworth Borough Council 06/07/16</p>	<p>L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox</p>	<p>Supports the strategy in principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy could contain additional detail and action plans to promote usage of all the train stations in the County</li> <li>• Integrated transport opportunities should be provided for key stations, e.g. – integrating walking and cycling plans</li> <li>• Improved frequency of services between Hinckley and Birmingham (and to Leicester) should be targeted to underpin evidence around cross-border commuter travel and ultimately influence Midlands Connect strategy</li> <li>• Additional research is required for the Leicester – Burton link</li> <li>• The ‘Next Steps’ and ‘Making it Happen’ should be strengthened</li> <li>• The strategy should reference the Strategic Growth Plan currently being produced for Leicester and Leicestershire</li> </ul>	<p>A new Priority (v) has been included to give greater weight to sustainable travel (including walking and cycling) and the final Strategy text strengthened to include more explicit references to opportunities for improved services to/from Hinckley</p> <p>See above regarding L-B</p> <p>The ‘Next Steps’ and ‘Making it Happen’ have also been strengthened</p> <p>Reference to the Strategic Growth Plan is included in Priority iv) and cross-referenced in new Priority 5</p>
<p>Local Resident, 17/09/16</p>	<p>L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox</p>	<p>No clear position indicated on the strategy as a whole</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy should incentivise housing and business development to be located in close proximity to rail access. e.g. closer integration with bus and cycle routes</li> <li>• The strategy should note HS2 would be negative if it diverted investment towards other areas at the County’s expense</li> </ul>	<p>Land use planning is a matter for Local Planning Authorities and is beyond the scope of the Strategy</p> <p>There is no evidence at present to suggest that HS2 will have a negative impact of the County’s economy</p>



## Appendix A

<p>Charnwood Borough Council 13/09/16</p>	<p>L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox</p>	<p>Broadly supports the strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is potential for the Rail Strategy to highlight how improved rail connections could free up capacity on the road network and the benefits associated with this</li> <li>• The Strategy should emphasise how rail can support a modal shift in line with policy (6% from travel by car to public transport, walking or cycling)</li> <li>• Capacity increases should be considered on the MML between Loughborough, Soar Valley villages and Leicester</li> <li>• There is a possibility of using the GCR for the transport of aggregates, delivering greater efficiencies on the MML in the process</li> <li>• The strategy should reference how the developments associated with East Midlands Gateway might affect travel patterns in Charnwood, e.g. M1 J23</li> <li>• The planned electrification of MML and its widening could impact Syston station – this should be elaborated upon</li> <li>• It might be useful to include a number of maps illustrating the network and where major growth is planned</li> </ul>	<p>A new Priority (v) has been included to give greater weight to sustainable travel (including walking and cycling)</p> <p>Network Rail is proposing to increase capacity of the MML and the County Council will use the Strategy to continue to lobby for the works to be completed at the earliest opportunity</p> <p>As a strategic document, the Strategy does not go into detail about specific schemes. The County Council will continue to work with Network Rail and other parties to consider the details of proposals as they come forward</p> <p>It may be possible to include further maps in the publication version</p>
---	--	--	---	--

## Appendix A

<p>TravelWatch East Midlands 27/09/16</p>	<p>L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox</p>	<p>The strategy is generally acceptable but amendments are required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Easing curves through Market Harborough to increase line speeds’ should not be listed in section 6.1 because it is scheduled for implementation between September 2017 and February 2019</li> <li>• Similarly, ‘Redoubling Kettering to Corby’ should not be included considering it is actively in progress for completion within the current control period             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Both of these schemes should be listed as committed in control period 5.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A new underpass at Nuneaton should be explored, e.g. a reversing siding either at Abbey Junction or adjacent to Down West Coast Slow Line</li> <li>• The Manchester through service should be routed via Derby and not Sheffield</li> <li>• Instead of a service to Norwich, increased services to Cambridge may have better prospects and require less rolling stock</li> <li>• The GVA figure (0.34m) for re-opening the L-B link should not be definitive considering previous successes when a line has been reopened in a former area of coal mining/heavy industry, especially in terms of passenger numbers. GVA may not be the correct methodology</li> </ul>	<p>Given the uncertainty around costs of rail infrastructure and the funding of improvements (even within previously committed Control Period 5) it is important that the Strategy continues to highlight the projects in Leicester and Leicestershire that are necessary to deliver the identified Priorities</p> <p>The final Strategy text has been modified to strengthen reference to the diveunder</p> <p>See above regarding L-B</p>
---	------------------------------------	--	--	---

## Appendix A

<p>Campaign to Protect Rural England, East Midlands Regional Group 30/09/16</p>	<p>L&amp;L Rail Strategy inbox</p>	<p>Welcomes the strategy and agrees with some of the priorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of car parking at stations must not disadvantage non-car users.</li> <li>• It is surprising that enhancements at Market Harborough are being favoured over the reopening of the Leicester-Burton link, considering the corridor has greater housing development planned, greater road congestion – this does not appear to have been taken into account regarding the GVA figure</li> <li>• There are methodological issues with GVA:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The GVA was tested in relation to already existing lines or spin-offs of the new HS2 network; however the Leicester-Burton case is different with regard to construction costs and existing or planned passenger services</li> <li>○ Did the GVA calculation start from the assumption of 0 services? Or were existing bus services the starting point? If so higher GVA should be expected considering the bus services are currently inadequate</li> <li>○ The strategy should provide greater detail on the factors taken into account for the GVA calculations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>A new Priority (v) has been included to give greater weight to sustainable travel (including walking and cycling)</p> <p>See above regarding L-B</p>
---	------------------------------------	--	---	---

