

# Calder Valley Line 2018-19 and beyond: HADRAG's concerns, aspirations and priorities

This paper originated as a commentary on the May 2018 timetable and future aspirations for service development, and has been updated to include specific comments on the December 2018 changes. It is addressed to the train and system operators, to WYCA and to TfN/Rail North Partnership. There is a copy on the HADRAG website. There will be further updates expressing our views on future changes. In addition to concerns about train service pattern some issues to do with stations are included at the end. Issues are tabulated on the following pages for clarity, using note-form language as appropriate.

**HADRAG's priorities**, as a rail users' group based on the central part of the Calder Valley Line around Halifax, Brighouse and Sowerby Bridge, are:

- A Top priority: a dependable train service that works for existing users** – commuters and others who would use the railway for a wide variety of work, personal, leisure and cultural journeys. **We are concerned** that the May 2018 timetable both damaged the pre-existent service and destroyed reliability. It was not simply that promised enhancements were not delivered but that the original proposals, whilst they would have delivered new destinations, would also worsen service patterns for existing users. HADRAG expressed concerns about these aspects as long ago as July 2017 when we responded jointly with Upper Calder Valley Renaissance Sustainable Transport Group to the May 2018 timetable consultation<sup>1</sup>. In addition, we are concerned that issues in the May 2018 timetable that might feasibly have been addressed as minor changes at the December date have not been so addressed.
- B Delivery of promised and aspired service enhancements by the Northern franchise**, including as priorities increased Calder Valley service frequency and regular through trains to Manchester Airport. **But this must be done in a way that restores service punctuality and reliability, repairs the May 2018 damage to service patterns for existing users, and delivers increased local capacity.** The opportunity must be taken to provide a better service for **Sowerby Bridge** and other key stations previously omitted by “express” services.
- C Beyond 2020, development of better services over the Elland-Brighouse route Calderdale towards Huddersfield, Leeds, Wakefield and beyond**, reflecting the growing importance of lower Calderdale in terms of business and residential development and the need for better connectivity from upper Calderdale towards Huddersfield and beyond.

September 2018 with additions November 2018, Updated 6 Dec'2018 – JSW

<sup>1</sup> <https://hadrag.files.wordpress.com/2018/11/hadragucvrstg-may18-consult-response-final.pdf>

<b>Contents – key points from pages 3-12 following:</b>		
<b>1.1 Reaction to December 2018 changes</b>	<p>(a) Welcome for through running Preston to York; but very serious concern about split of stopping services west and east of Leeds and potential capacity issues</p> <p>(b) <b>Welcome</b> for improvements to Brighouse to HFX/Bradford/Leeds trains journey time and improvement to Halifax clockface towards Bradford/Leeds. <b>But major concern</b> over increased Bradford/Halifax/Brighouse to Huddersfield.</p> <p>(c) Disappointment at lack of progress on apparently simple issues such as MYT and SOW late evening gaps.</p>	
<b>1.2 Other current timetable issues</b>	<p>(a) Service patterns, clockface intervals, lost connectivity etc – “Brighouse overtaking issue”</p> <p>(b) Performance/capacity/rolling stock issues – <b>first priority must be trains and timetable that work for existing users.</b></p>	
<b>2 Delivery of franchise promises</b>  <b>Expected progress by end of 2019</b>	<p>We expect a robust timetable with the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of the promise of an additional train each hour Bradford-Manchester and CVL services to Manchester Airport.</li> <li>• Opportunity provided by this additional service, by the CV linespeed and capacity improvements and by improved performance of the new rolling stock to be used deliver a better service for intermediate CVL stations (i.e. not just more limited-stop trains) In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Sowerby Bridge (serving a population of potentially around 20,000) should be served by the planned Manchester Airport trains;</li> <li>➢ the recently opened station at Low Moor which at present has no through trains to Manchester and somewhat unsatisfactory connections should have at least an hourly service to Manchester and preferably to the Airport.</li> <li>➢ Proposal for the Blackburn-“Tod curve”-Manchester trains to run to Manchester Airport should be implemented providing additional journey opportunities that are more useful than the Tod curve service to Southport.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Concern over capacity/performance issues over Castlefield route from Ordsall to Manchester Piccadilly. <b>But:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear geographical logic to Calder Valley Line having 2 trains/hr to Manchester Airport via Ordsall – should be prioritised as services to operate across Manchester.</li> <li>• go-ahead for proposed additional platforms proposed at Piccadilly must be pursued.</li> </ul>	
<b>3 Aspirations beyond 2019</b>  <b>Elland/Brighouse corridor linked to potential new services/reopenings</b>	<p>We reiterate need to improve services via Elland/Brighouse supporting Elland station opening and business/residential development in lower Calderdale.</p> <p>We hope there will be significant improvements linked to TransPennine route upgrade, specifically increased track capacity Huddersfield/Mirfield enabling new services. Specific suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional fast services upper Calderdale-Brighouse-Leeds (Brighouse-Leeds journey time 20 minutes or less.)</li> <li>• Upper Calderdale-Huddersfield service.</li> <li>• Service Calderdale-Wakefield-Castleford-York.</li> <li>• Longer term further new services (e.g. Bradford-Brighouse-Barnsley-Sheffield)</li> </ul>	<b>Electrification and the <a href="#">Electric Railway Charter</a></b>
<b>4 Other concerns: Stations</b>	<p>Station facilities, access and integration, developing stations as local hubs</p> <p>Halifax station gateway project – design must prioritise access needs of all station users, and be future-proof.</p>	

## 1.1 Reaction to December 2018 changes

This section is mainly to highlight immediate concerns about changes to the Calder Valley Line timetable being made in December 2018.

Area of concern	Positive aspects	Issues	Questions/suggestions
<p><b>(a) Blackpool/Preston - Calderdale - Leeds/York service,</b></p> <p><b>+ East Leeds-Bradford/Calderdale connectivity</b></p> <p><b>+ rolling stock capacity issues</b></p>	<p>Extension of Blackpool/Preston-Leeds trains to York, with fast running Leeds-York.</p> <p>In principle we support fast running by this service Leeds-York. <i>However</i>, this aspiration assumes retention of a through stopping service Calder Valley-East Leeds stations, and we are very concerned at the December 2018 changes.</p>	<p>Dwell time in Leeds, York-Preston westbound, reduces advantage of fast running Leeds-York.</p> <p>Disappointingly still not clear when full through running to Blackpool will be restored.</p>	<p>HADRAG agrees with the Blackpool-York Northern Connect service running fast/semifast east of Leeds. But we ask that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points below be addressed urgently;</li> <li>• Issues such as excessive dwell time in Leeds be addressed in future timetable changes.</li> </ul>
		<p>Splitting of CV-York/Selby services at Leeds removes long-standing connectivity between East Leeds stations (Micklefield-Cross Gates) and Bradford/Calderdale, important for commuting. → damaging to local economy.</p> <p>This connectivity apparently not specified in train service requirement (TSR) but this is no reason to cut an established link.</p> <p>We share desire to reduce propagation of delays across Leeds. However, through passengers will be greatly inconvenienced by having to change at Leeds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• waiting times 10-20 minutes;</li> <li>• long walk often over the bridge and along length of platform.</li> </ul>	<p>Alongside the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We ask that Calder Valley-east Leeds through running by stoppers be restored as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Short term, it looks feasible for the Huddersfield-Halifax-Leeds trains to be linked with the Leeds-York stopper in both directions albeit with a layover of around 10min in Leeds. This might reduce the number of units required. Could this be done as a “quick fix”?</li> <li>• When the Calder Valley Manchester Airport service is introduced, it would make sense for this to run through from York/Selby serving east Leeds stations.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>These changes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>appear to require additional train units which could be better used to relieve capacity elsewhere;</b></li> <li>• <b>threaten to worsen effects of existing rolling stock shortage.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Would not any extra sets required for the December 2018 change Calder Valley-York/Selby be better deployed both</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to provide much needed extra peak capacity on Calder Valley, and</li> <li>• to restore Leeds-Blackpool through service at least off-peak?</li> </ul>

<p><b>(b) Huddersfield via Brighouse</b></p> <p>+ Halifax-Leeds clockface pattern <b>(updated 6 Dec'2018)</b></p>	<p>Much needed journey time improvement (JTI) in one direction Huddersfield/Brighouse to Halifax/Bradford.</p> <p><b>Better connection at HFX for people returning from Manchester for Low Moor</b></p> <p><b>Improved (but still imperfect) clockface HFX towards LDS.</b></p>	<p><b>Apparent late changes to timetable have better path for Hud-Bradford-Leeds trains with welcome improvement of HFX clockface towards Leeds e.g. 01, 12, 23*, 43 – not perfect but improvement on previous/proposed 01, 12, 33/37*, 43 (*call LMR). May also save resources by cutting long layover at Leeds.</b></p> <p><b>Unfortunately, in achieving the above Leeds-Bradford-Huddersfield is made worse; trains booked to stand 4 min in Brighouse station and 5 min at Bradley Wood increasing HFX-HUD journey to 34 minutes (should be no more than 24 min). Will be major annoyance to people travelling Bradford/Halifax-Huddersfield: surely unacceptable – better solution needs to be found.</b></p>	<p>We hope that the May 2019 timetable will be a more thorough recast. We ask that it might address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the need for further improvement to poor clockface patterns including</i></li> <li>• <i>illogical variations from hour to hour which cause confusion (and people missing their train)</i></li> <li>• <i>related problems such as the Brighouse overtaking issue (1.2(a)(ii) below) as well as other issues in 1.2(a) including those specific to Sowerby Bridge.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>(c) Late evening service at Sowerby Bridge (SOW) and Mytholmroyd (MYT)</b></p> <p>Mentioned in 1.2(a) (ii) below. Also covered here because it is an apparently simple issue that arose in the May 2018 timetable on which we hoped progress might have been made with the December 2018 changes</p>	<p>No positives! This was a worsening of service compared with pre-May'18.</p>	<p>Two-hour gap in late evening service from Manchester to these stations. Last train from Bradford to these stations too early (2220 – before May 2018 was at least half hour later).</p> <p>The above is caused by late evening services running non-stop Halifax-Hebden Bridge. But at this time the priority should be to serve intermediate stations, so people can get home.</p>	<p>We were told before May 2018 that this might be fixed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could it be done now by introducing additional stops at SOW and MYT as a “quick fix” rather than wait for May 2019? (And if not, why not?)</li> <li>• Trains required to stop would be: 2218 and 2238 Leeds-MCV; 2158 and 2258SX MCV-Leeds.</li> </ul> <p>Network Rail has reportedly vetoed changes to the timetable, but have allowed the Dec'18 changes on the Brighouse line and Calderdale/Leeds-York/Selby (a) and (b) above. Additional stops in late-night services would only slightly increase journey times, and it is difficult to see how they would worsen punctuality, particularly given the recent linespeed improvements.</p>

## 1.2 Other issues May 2018 to May 2019 timetable (with additional/amended points relevant to December 2018)

**NOTE: this is not a complete account of current issues but gives some key examples**

Most points were previously made to Northern in a paper given to them at drop-in event, July 2018 "Issues for Northern"<sup>2</sup>

Heading	Main issue	Amplification/comment	HADRAG's aspirational deadline! (i.e. when we hope improvement might be delivered/observed)
(a) Service patterns, clockface intervals, lost connectivity etc	(i) <i>Cut to pre-existent (before May 2018) service:</i> York-Blackpool truncated to Leeds-Preston (York-Preston to be restored December 2018)	<b>We have welcomed these trains now serving SOW and MYT.</b>  <b>"Temporary" truncation of Blackpool-York to Preston-Leeds/York. Preston through to York to be restored December 2018. But still not clear when previously well-established link to Blackpool will be fully restored.</b> See above (1.1(a)) for issues with Dec'18 changes.	Surely must be by May 2019 at latest (for Blackpool-York)
	<i>Damage to pre-existent services brought about at May 2018 timetable change:</i>		
	(ii) <b>Brighouse overtaking/catching up issue</b>	Leeds-Dew-Brighouse overtakes Leeds-Bradford-Brighouse ( <b>outward only, but still catches up inward</b> ) in effect reducing 2/hr to 1/hr. <b>How can this be an acceptable Interpretation of the Train Service Requirement?</b>	May 2019/Dec 2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>We accept this would require significant recast and the May 2019 timetable would be different to the original May 2018 proposals. However, those proposals were flawed!</b></li> </ul>
	(iii) Sowerby Bridge catching up issue	Fast towards Manchester closely follows stopper so only about 10 min behind it by MCV only slightly better in other direction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extra service each hour Bradford-Manchester promised from Dec'19 needed to help issues like this!</li> </ul>	
	(iii) Morning peak gaps	e.g. no Sowerby Bridge towards Leeds between 0724 and 0753 (previously had 0726, 0741, 0748 and 0759).	
	(iv) Loss of connections (at BGH/HFX) upper Calderdale-Huddersfield	MYT/SOW to Huddersfield now very inconvenient by rail. TOD/HBD-HUD longer journey.	
	<b>(v) Journey time issues</b>	Some slack schedules but probably helps punctuality; e.g. Brighouse-Manchester fast running Rochdale-Manchester partially offset by padding BGH-Milner Royd. Could be helped by the new signalling? <b>Dec'18 TT includes welcome journey time improvements Huddersfield, Brighouse to Halifax, Bradford, Leeds. However, Brighouse-Huddersfield journey time significantly increased. See above 1.1(b).</b>	

<sup>2</sup> <https://hadrag.files.wordpress.com/2018/11/northern-issues-july-181.pdf>

	(vi) Cuts to Sowerby Bridge and Mytholmroyd evening services due to skip-stopping (See also 1.1(c))	M-F 2-hour gap from MCV 2120 to 2320 calling MYT and SOW but 2 trains run through fast in between. Last train from Bradford to SOW and MYT now 2220, half hour earlier than before May 2018, but two trains follow non-stop HFX-HBD.	Now! We were told before May that additional stops looked possible: but nothing done.
	(vii) <b>Clockface patterns</b> – uneven and varying between hours.	<b>Halifax departure intervals towards Leeds somewhat improved by late changes to December 2018 timetable; see above 1.1 (b). Issues remain e.g. Sowerby Bridge-Leeds/Manchester.</b>	<b>May 2019?</b>
(b) Performance, capacity & rolling stock issues	(i) <b>Continuing</b> general concern over punctuality/reliability	Preston-Leeds service (both directions) seems to be worst. <b><i>Specific issue with 0702 Hebden Bridge-Leeds and 1725 Leeds-HBD commuter trains operated by 5-car Grand Central train. These trains fill a gap and provide essential capacity, but the teatime working has recently been extremely unreliable.</i></b> <b><i>It has clearly been a bad autumn but some issues clearly due to shortages of trains/crews not just bad weather, leaf fall etc.</i></b>	<b>Urgent!</b>
	(ii) Short formations/gross overcrowding/rolling stock	Passengers left behind – “New Pudsey effect” sometimes observed at Halifax and elsewhere. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exacerbated by refurbishment programme?</li> <li>• Rumour about Class 142 Pacers not being given C exams but instead withdrawn early. We don’t like Pacers, but should they be kept in service longer rather than shorter time until all new/cascaded rolling stock delivered?</li> <li>• Class 150 trains are equally old-fashioned and unpleasant to travel on; even the refurbished ones show their age. Minimum standard should be Class 158 (or 155/6 where performance not critical)</li> <li>• Relatively modern class 170 have been promised for Leeds-Brighouse-Manchester-Southport service, but we understand there are gauging issues on the Calder Valley – resolvable? (We now hear the 170s are to be used temporarily on TPE services Leeds-Huddersfield.)</li> <li>• Will the new Class 195 trains provide enough extra capacity?</li> </ul>	<b><i>Can we expect to see the new Class 195 units on the CV line by spring 2019?</i></b>  <b><i>+ Class 170s as promised on Leeds-Brighouse-Manchester trains?</i></b>

<b>2 Delivery of franchise promises 2019</b>			
<b>Heading</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Aspirational deadline!</b>
(a) General priority	<b>Top priority: timetable that works for existing (as well as would-be) passengers. Local service must be at least as good as before May 2018.</b>	<p><b>We want to see service development promises (new destinations, increased frequency) delivered...</b></p> <p><b>... but must at same time:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Repair damage to pre-existent connectivity as outlined above;</b></li> <li>• <b>Be robustly timetabled to improve performance to restore expectation of right-time operation.</b></li> <li>• <b>Work for existing passengers not just ones who may be attracted by new destinations etc.</b></li> </ul>	<b>Dec 2019</b> But have seen hints that this may slip.
(b) Specific priorities for enhancements within the above	<b>CV line-Man Air (MIA) service, spreading benefits as widely as possible.</b>	<p>Not just for minority going to the airport but for wider cross-Manchester connectivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideally should call at Deansgate as well as Oxford Road and <b>Piccadilly (but we understand the difficulty)</b>.</li> <li>• Should serve as many CVL stations as possible, certainly Sowerby Bridge (SOW), hopefully also Low Moor (LMR) and Mytholmroyd (MYT).</li> <li>• Blackburn-Manchester (Tod curve) service should be extended to Airport to provide Airport service for East Lancs and Littleborough area stations. Was franchise aspiration (not commitment) but nothing more heard. (At present these trains run to Southport; it is clear south Manchester and the Airport would be more useful destinations.)</li> <li>• If the Calder Valley-MIA services makes more calls the Chester and/or Liverpool trains could have headline Bradford-Victoria journey time.</li> <li>• Given the above aspirations the Bradford-MIA trains should start back from Leeds or York to provide more stations in the outer parts of Leeds with an airport service.</li> </ul> <p><b>The above aspiration envisages 2/hr CV trains using the Ordsall Chord. Given the geographical orientation of the Chord this is logical and is what was to be expected. It is appreciated that capacity between Ordsall and Piccadilly (Castlefield corridor) is an issue; but if the new line is not for Calder Valley services, what is it for?</b></p> <p><b>The proposed additional MAN (Piccadilly) platforms 15&amp;16 are required as soon as possible to enable robust timetable with prudent dwell times. This must be pursued.</b></p>	

	<p><b>Third train each hour Bradford-Manchester is important</b></p>	<p>Should be seen as essential to enable better service pattern at intermediate stations, whilst providing 2/hr semi-fast Bradford-Manchester. It is a franchise commitment, but we are nervous! Should be part of strategy to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better service at Sowerby Bridge (see below)</li> <li>• Manchester service at Low Moor</li> <li>• Restoration of daytime service Littleborough stations to HFX and Bradford.</li> </ul> <p><b>Opportunity:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To use <b>linespeed and capacity improvements</b> now commissioned, together with <b>superior performance of new trains</b> to provide <b>additional stops</b>.</li> <li>• And improve frequency at Sowerby Bridge to both Manchester and Leeds (at least 3 trains/hr to each), as well York-Preston/Blackpools which do now call.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Sowerby Bridge (SOW) better deal</b></p>	<p><b>Welcome:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• York-Preston/Blackpool trains now serving SOW and MYT hourly. Based on study of local govt ward boundaries SOW potential serves potential population of more than 20000<sup>3</sup>, equal to Hebden Bridge and Todmorden combined.</li> </ul> <p><b>Concerns</b> (also affecting Mytholmroyd (MYT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOW is designated Northern Connect station, so we are told Northern Connect trains will call but not clear if this means “some” (maybe just York-Blackpools) or “all”.</li> <li>• Still a fear that Northern plans all daytime Bradford-Manchester trains to run non-stop HFX-HBD. This would leave SOW and MYT with the just the Leeds-Brighouse-Manchester(-Southport) and York-Blackpool trains giving a worse service than either now or before May 2018.</li> <li>• TSR does not specify frequency SOW/MYT-Manchester and there is a clear concern this could allow the train operator to cut the service for these stations.</li> </ul>	
(c) Other points	<p><b>Relative importance of other destinations beyond core route (vs. performance) – York-Blackpool service and service to Manchester Airport should be prioritised above other new destinations</b></p>	<p><b>Service frequency is very important for reasons given above</b>, as are services to Manchester Airport and the existing York-Blackpool route, but some of the other proposed destinations beyond Manchester are perhaps slightly lower priority. We hope the proposed extensions of Calder Valley services to Liverpool and Chester can be implemented as long as performance risk can be minimised, particularly with junction conflicts around Manchester Victoria. <b>Chester service</b> would be important in restoring a Warrington-Leeds service (since TPE has withdrawn from that corridor). It should logically therefore have the fastest Calder Valley journey time. It also offers potentially very useful connections for CV users.</p>	

<sup>3</sup> HADRAG calculation: details available at <https://hadrag.com/hadrag-reports/>



<b>3 Aspirations beyond 2019 – second half of current franchise towards 2025 and beyond</b>			
<b>Heading</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Aspirational deadline!</b>
<b>(a) Elland and Brighouse corridor</b>	<p><b>Elland station – need for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Good train timetable</b></li> <li>• <b>Quality local links including sustainable access (and P&amp;R)</b></li> <li>• <b>Quality local bus links to station – possible railhead for Calderdale/Huddersfield NHS hospitals</b></li> </ul>	<p>Need to deliver good timetable from start i.e. better than Low Moor – <b>links to need for better service along lower Calderdale route to serve housing/business development (draft local plan).</b></p> <p>Should we be concerned about “planning interface” with TransPennine Route Upgrade works?</p> <p>If Elland delivered sooner rather than later could it provide alternative railhead during any Huddersfield line blockade?</p> <p>Station could be potential railhead for hospital workers/visitors/patients from upper Calderdale with minibus link to Calderdale and Huddersfield NHS trust sites at Salterhebble and Lindley – station and hospitals linked by A629 currently under improvement.</p>	<b>Can it be brought forward i.e. before 2022?</b>
	<p><b>Service pattern to match potential local demand and encourage public transport use in areas of potential business/housing development</b></p>	<p>Like Sowerby Bridge, each of Elland and Brighouse stations potentially serves a catchment population equivalent to two local government wards (more than Todmorden and Hebden combined). Draft Local Plan suggests this area will grow (business, residential). Based on ORR annual station usage estimates, <b>Brighouse footfall has grown faster than any other Calder Valley Line station over 10 years – despite having a poor service.</b></p> <p>Present Brighouse service is effectively little better than hourly. In train planning terms the route suffers from being a link between the Bradford and Huddersfield lines. Could a different approach yield a better timetable?</p> <p><b>Sunday service</b> needs to be improved. The Leeds-Brighouse-upper Calderdale-Manchester service should run on Sundays to provide for the weekend economy – work and leisure. This does not require any infrastructure enhancement.</p> <p>We hope it can now be assumed that <b>TransPennine Route Upgrade</b> will restore track capacity Huddersfield-Mirfield-Ravensthorpe... → giving additional capacity for trains routed through Calderdale via Brighouse to Huddersfield/Mirfield and beyond.</p> <p><b>Potential for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fast journey Brighouse-Leeds, 1 stop, 20 minutes, cutting upper Calderdale-Leeds journey time by up to 15 min.</b></li> </ul>	2020-2024?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increased frequency.</b> Need for genuine 2 trains/hr <b>Elland-Brighouse-Leeds</b> (at least 1/hr fast as above), but also improved service <b>Bradford-Brighouse-Huddersfield</b>.</li> <li>• <b>Regular service upper Calderdale-Huddersfield.</b> This could be a service from Rochdale/Manchester or an additional service from the Preston and East Lancs route (augmenting Blackpool-York service). Would support work, educational, social, cultural demand for travel to Huddersfield as well as inward travel into upper Calderdale.</li> </ul>	
<b>(b) Potential new services, reopenings, etc</b>	<b>Preston/Rochdale via Brighouse to Huddersfield (and beyond?)</b>	<p>As noted above.</p> <p>Potentially overlaps with following:</p>	
	<b>New services via extant routes e.g. via Wakefield to York; + East Lancs-Yorkshire corridor</b>	<p><b>e.g. East Lancs/Calderdale/Huddersfield to York via Wakefield and Castleford</b> would provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional capacity to/from York and beyond avoiding congested Leeds area</li> <li>• potentially faster journeys</li> <li>• economic benefits for upper and lower Calderdale bringing in people for work and leisure, whilst giving Calderdale (and possibly Bradford) easier route to Wakefield and York.</li> </ul> <p>Links with aspiration to increase Blackpool/Preston-Burnley-Yorkshire service via “Roses Rail Link” route.</p> <p>Would seem logical for any additional service via East Lancs and Calderdale corridor to operate via Elland-Brighouse, with present Blackpool-York service retained via Halifax and Bradford.</p> <p>In longer term if Skipton-Colne reopens we can see some reconfiguration of services on East Lancs corridor. Obviously, we would expect existing connectivity for Calderdale/Halifax/Bradford provided by the highly successful York-Blackpool service to be maintained.</p>	Early in next franchise
	<b>Potential reopenings of disused but former passenger routes (where formation extant)</b>	<b>e.g. Crigglestone curve (Horbury) for Bradford-Halifax-Brighouse-Barnsley-Sheffield service</b> promoting north-south connectivity.	Next franchise?!

(c) Electrification of Calder Valley and other routes in the North	The Electric Railway Charter	<a href="https://electriccharter.wordpress.com/">https://electriccharter.wordpress.com/</a> <a href="https://electriccharter.wordpress.com/charter/">https://electriccharter.wordpress.com/charter/</a>  The Charter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has a strong environmental focus and demands that as road transport moves towards zero carbon so should rail.</li> <li>• Calls for rolling programme across North of England based on 2015 NETF report <i>Northern Sparks</i> which ranked the Calder Valley Line as top scheme on and range of business, economic and environmental criteria.</li> <li>• Calls for smart electrification. Every mile does not have to be live. Use of electric trains with modest amount of battery storage, but not inefficient diesel bimodes. <b>But the greater the length of the route that is wired, the less the need for onboard energy storage, and the more efficient the trains can be.</b></li> </ul>	Realistically CP7
---	---------------------------------	--	----------------------

4 Other current issues		
Station standards and issues	Retailing – TVMs	Inadequate/unsatisfactory provision of ticket vending machines at MYT, SOW and (proposed) BGH. One side of line only not acceptable. (November 2018 second TVM now being installed at MYT)
	Retailing – booking offices	Need to develop and increase role of booking offices at key stations, not downgrade. Could do more e.g. selling MCard products + wider retailing, local information etc
	Access/parking!	Sowerby Bridge, Brighthouse parking!
	Minimum facilities for stations	We note car parking and access improvements to take place e.g. at Hebden Bridge and Mytholmroyd. Beyond this, minimum facilities at all stations should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure cycle lockers, monitored by face recognition quality CCTV</li> <li>• Electric cycle charging points (important especially in the hillier areas of WY) and electric car charging points</li> <li>• Good lighting and good, safe pedestrian access to the station</li> <li>• Good access for those with luggage/wheelchairs/pushchairs/limited mobility</li> <li>• Good signage to local destinations, e.g. bus stops/town centre</li> <li>• Toilet facilities wherever feasible, maintained to high standard</li> <li>• Refreshment facilities wherever feasible</li> <li>• Taxi waiting areas</li> <li>• Café facilities/child minding-nursery businesses etc close at hand</li> <li>• Minimum national standards for the number of disabled parking spaces</li> </ul>

<p><b>Station development – strategic</b></p>	<p><b>Halifax station gateway plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>prime importance of maintaining good access for rail users</b></li> <li>• <b>need for future-proofing for developing service pattern</b></li> </ul>	<p>We support broad aim of concept designs. But:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• serious concerns if parking and drop-off moved to east side of line (back of station) with pedestrian access as it must be on west (town, front) side. Access route to P1/2 would be very indirect with multiple level changes. Pedestrian safety/personal security issue at night via “station garden”. Pedestrian, taxi/drop-off and parking need to be kept together on west side facing town.</li> <li>• Any platform 3 reinstatement scheme needs to be future-proof to allow for possible reinstatement of third running line. Moving the track (which looks feasible) would be preferable to building out the platform to the existing P2 track. Future service patterns could be facilitated by having a third platform to increase station capacity particularly if some trains terminating/reversing in HFX. Network Rail have said they do not see the need – is this not short sighted? A third track with platform in the station would potentially allow present reversing siding to be removed as trains could turn back in the station.</li> </ul>
---	---	--

JSW

12.x.18; 20.xi.18; 6.xii.18