

Scheme ID No.	Proforma completed by	Date
81	Chris Wragg	3.11.05

<b>1. Scheme name</b>
New Rail Service Corby to London
<b>2. Promoting authority</b>
DfT / Network Rail / Catalyst Corby / Northamptonshire County Council
<b>3. Contact name, telephone number and email address</b>
Chris Wragg 01604 654411 cwragg@northamptonshire.gov.uk
<b>4. Type of scheme (e.g. new access road, bypass, guided busway, multi-modal interchange, freight village, maintenance scheme)</b>
Restoration of passenger rail services to the currently freight-only line between Kettering and Corby
<b>5. Scheme location (map if available)</b>
N/A
<b>6. Is the scheme within the East Midlands?</b>
Yes
<b>7. Current scheme status (is it a committed scheme e.g. on the HA's Targeted Programme of Improvements, or has it been given provisional approval or is it a scheme that has not yet been developed for submission? Has a bid for funding been submitted? Is it a major scheme proposed for LTP2?)</b>
Scheme is under investigation. Results in this proforma based on phase 2 conclusions for Option 5: additional hourly off-peak service Corby to London, with peak hour services diverted from elsewhere. Phase 3 work, which may refine these results, currently underway.
<b>8. Scheme description</b>
Option 5: Re-opening of the Corby – Kettering line to passenger rail service with a re-opened station at Corby and a one train per-hour through service between Corby and London St Pancras.

**9. Scheme-specific objectives (if any)**

Not known

**10. Beneficiaries – which area(s) will benefit?**

**Areas that directly benefit:**

Corby – new passenger rail service  
People wishing to reach Corby – new passenger rail service

**Areas that indirectly benefit:**

Users of road network between Corby and London

**Areas that will be impacted adversely:**

Derby, Loughborough, Leicester, Market Harborough – loss of some peak services to/from London St Pancras.  
Users of existing rail-bus link to intermediate destinations

**11. Beneficiaries – who will benefit?**

**Car users**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     Direct adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Bus/tram passengers**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     INDIRECT adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Pedestrian users**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     Direct adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Cycle users**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     Direct adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Rail passengers**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     Direct adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Heavy Good Vehicles**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     Direct adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Rail Freight**

Direct benefit     Indirect benefit     Direct adverse impact     Direct adverse impact

**Any other (state which and how)**

Likely to have a positive benefit in terms of widening the social mix of the population of Corby (by encouraging commuters to live in the town) with a positive impact in terms of regeneration of the town.

<p><b>12. What are the current problems to be addressed (<i>this is an opportunity to be more descriptive than you may have been in your response to Q9</i>)</b></p>
<p>Corby is the largest town in Britain (and possibly Europe) without a passenger rail service. The lack of a passenger rail service has been identified as a key barrier to the regeneration of Corby, particularly in terms of the difficulty of London commuting and the attraction of new business to the town. This problem has been heightened now that Corby is also part of the MKSM growth area.</p>
<p><b>13. What future problems will the scheme address e.g. congestion, delay, road safety, accessibility, social inclusion, deprivation etc?</b></p>
<p>With the growth planned for Corby, the problems caused by a lack of a passenger rail service are likely to be exacerbated, and will adversely impact upon the types (and numbers) of new jobs and residents who will be attracted to the town.</p>
<p><b>14. Does the scheme ‘fit’ with any other proposals in the corridor/ wider area? This may include both current and future schemes, and schemes promoted by other parties, especially in the case of cross border schemes and schemes of national importance. If so, in what way does the scheme fit with other proposed schemes?</b></p>
<p>No</p>
<p><b>15. Latest total capital cost estimate (£000s) with year of estimate and price base</b></p>
<p>£7.74million. 2003 estimate, 2003 price base.</p>
<p><b>16. Part of the above total cost that is being sought from the regional pot (please include an amount rather than a percentage)</b></p>
<p>None at this stage.</p>
<p><b>17. What are the other potential sources of funding being considered and how much is being sought from each source?</b></p>
<p>Rail Industry funding</p>

Growth area funding
<b>18. Who developed the costs?</b>
Arup as part of the phase 2 study work
<b>19. What is included in the total costs?</b>
Civil and structural work Permanent Way Signalling and Telecommunications Unmeasured items Preliminaries and Design Project Management etc Environmental Mitigations
<b>20. What is the forecast annual operating cost and revenue received (if appropriate)? What is the operating ratio?</b>
30-year present value operating costs and revenue based on 2005 commencement of service: Revenue - £67.16m Operating Costs - £44.22m  Text indicates that financial break-even occurs in 2013 so a better business case would be obtained if service did not start until nearer that date.  Operating costs include train leasing costs.
<b>21. What is the assumed funding profile (over which years)? <i>i.e. amount per year for years 1 to 5 rather than 2008 to 2013. Include development/design period in this profile if it will require the funding for which a bid is being/has been submitted i.e. out of the amount reported in your answers to Qs 15 and 16.</i></b>
Assumed to be 2004/2005
<b>22. What year is the scheme planned to open? <i>If applicable - if it is three years after funding is approved, then state this instead.</i></b>
2005
<b>23. What are the benefits that have been quantified in the economic appraisal (e.g. journey time improvements). <i>Append AST if easier way of summarising the impacts.</i></b>

*User Benefits – Corby Demand*

**1.1** These benefits are for access time for users of the rail service, calculated using the change in journey time between each option and the 2005 Timetable scenario. The variables included in the calculation of user economic benefits for Corby are:

- access time by car to Kettering, parking cost at Kettering Station, wait time for a service, rail in-vehicle time to final destination;
- access time to Corby Station, wait time for a service, rail in-vehicle time from Corby to final destination.

Only passengers boarding at Corby receive journey time benefits of about 25 minutes per trip. The methodology to calculate these benefits is shown in Appendix 20.

*User Benefits – Impact on Existing Rail Services*

**1.2** MOIRA calculates economic benefits based on the change in generalised journey time multiplied by the number of 2005 Timetable rail trips, to derive the benefits (or dis-benefits) to existing users. The benefits (or dis-benefits) to new users are calculated using the change in generalised journey time and multiplied by the number of rail switchers. The change in journey time is multiplied by value of time parameters from PDFH for reduced, season and full-fare passengers.

**1.3** Option 5 generates economic benefits for Corby passengers, and these benefits are sufficient to outweigh the dis-benefits accruing from the revision of the Derby services during the peak periods. The economic benefits generated by Corby passengers outweigh the dis-benefits arising from service changes north of Kettering from about 2014.

**24. Who developed these benefits?**

Arup as part of the Phase 3 study work

**25. Please list the non-economic impacts (to cover environment, integration, accessibility and safety).**

*Non-User Benefits – Corby Demand*

- 1.4** Non-user benefits comprise highway decongestion savings and accident savings that result from the removal of vehicles (and hence car kilometres) from the highway network due to car trips switching to rail. The following methodology has been used to calculate decongestion benefits:
- station access model is used to apportion the total demand from Corby to either the town centre station, the proposed parkway south of Corby or Kettering Station;
  - the proportion of rail trips boarding at Corby is multiplied by the road distance from Kettering to calculate car kilometres from the highway network;
  - the number of car kilometres diverted from the highway network is multiplied by a decongestion factor derived by the Department for Transport, adjusted to 2003 prices.

- 1.5** Accident savings have also been calculated using total car kilometres removed from the highway network, and based on the accident rate per million kilometres, and a rate per accident saved, (reference HEN1). Parking at Corby town centre and the parkway stations assumed to be free.

*Non-User Benefits – Impact on Existing Rail Services*

- 1.6** Outputs from MOIRA can also be used to calculate the change in decongestion benefits and accidents. The change in rail passenger kilometres between the 2005 Timetable and each Option, this value is multiplied by a decongestion factor per kilometre. The methodology to calculate the decongestion benefits assumes the trip length by rail or car is comparable, and assumes 60% of transfer is from car.

**1.7**

**Positive Impacts:**

**Neutral Impacts:**

**Adverse Impacts:**

**26. An overview account of how the scheme fits with policy and longer term strategies.**

The scheme supports the delivery of development outlined in the MKSM SRS.

It forms part of the LTP2 strategy for growth together with the strategy for tackling congestion through providing high quality alternatives to the car.

**27. An overview account of how the scheme fits with national priorities, e.g.**

**access to airports, growth zones.**

The scheme forms an integral part of the infrastructure required for the MKSM growth area.

**28. An overview account of how the scheme contributes to targets (to include the shared priorities - accessibility, air quality, congestion and safety – that are reflected in the mandatory LTP2 targets, but also any other local targets want to mention)**

The scheme has a positive benefit in terms of accessibility, congestion and safety, and a neutral impact on air quality.

**29. Please describe feasibility work completed to date (include, if applicable, details of environmental assessments, public inquiry, public consultation or economic impact report)**

No feasibility work to date

**30. Were any alternative solutions developed? If so, what feasibility work has been completed to date? (If you are still to identify your preferred option, briefly state the alternatives and make it clear which option you have used to compete this proforma)**

Phase 2 study report (April 2004) used as basis for completing proforma. Phase 3 study work is currently underway.

A range of preliminary options was assessed using an evaluation framework. This shortlisted a smaller number of options for a more detailed study:

- Option 1: 1tph between London and Corby displacing the existing hourly Derby to London stopping service;
- Option 2: Option 1, plus an hourly shuttle between Derby and Leicester, and revisions to the stopping pattern of the London St Pancras to Nottingham trains to include additional stops at Kettering and Market Harborough;
- Option 3: Option 2, plus an additional hourly service between London and Corby. There is no current capacity for the second train per hour, this option was tested to establish sensitivity to frequency;
- Option 4: a new hourly shuttle service between Kettering and Leicester via Corby, Oakham

and Melton Mowbray;

- Option 5: a new hourly service between Corby and London superimposed onto the 2005 timetable outside the peak periods. Stopping pattern and departure time of the 'slow' Nottingham to London service revised. Some peak trains between Derby and London during the AM peak are assumed to start at Corby.

OPTION 5 has been used to complete this proforma.

**31. Has a Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) been undertaken? Is so, in which year and what is the size of the risk assumed in the economic appraisal?**

Not known

**32. What level of optimism bias has been applied?**

Does not appear to have been used.

**33. Economic Appraisal results (If available, please provide a TEE table (Transport Economic Efficiency) and an Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (AMCB))**

<b>BCR:</b>	1.36
<b>NPV:</b>	£15.20m Financial NPV £18.58m Net Present Value
<b>PV Costs:</b>	£7.74m capital £44.22m operating
<b>PV Benefits:</b>	£0.52m User Benefits £2.86m Non-User Benefits
<b>Appraisal Period (30/60 yrs)</b>	30 years
<b>Discount rate (3.5/6%):</b>	3.5%
<b>Year appraisal completed:</b>	2003/2004

**34. Are there any timescale constraints?**

It is important that the restoration is included as an option in the new East Midlands rail franchise.

**35. If funding has been committed, what is the timescale for delivery?**

N/A

### SDG COMMENTS BOX

<b>General notes:</b>	<p>Long standing scheme to reintroduce passenger services to Corby. Decision to proceed ultimately lies with DfT Rail and the franchisee for the proposed East Midland Rail Franchise.</p>
<b>Assumptions made in the assessment:</b>	<p>The scheme is not considered for Regional funding, and so only the policy fit assessment has been undertaken.</p>
<b>Comments on the technical appraisal</b> (e.g. if the Optimism Bias and risk assumed does not reflect the stage of development):	<p>No QRA or Optimism bias, this is a particular issue given the volatile nature of costs for rail schemes.</p>
<b>Comments on stage of development:</b>	<p>Scheme is well developed, with clear analysis of costs and benefits.</p>
<b>Comments on eligibility for funding from sources identified:</b>	<p>Scheme is a heavy rail scheme, and therefore not eligible for regional funding.</p>
<b>Scheme cost (if available) in 2004</b> (our reference year, including contingency and risk but excluding Optimism Bias):	<p>Capital £7.94m (Operating - £45.3m over 30 year period, assuming 2005 start – discounting unknown.)</p>
<b>Amount sought from RFA</b> (2004 prices):	