

**COMMENTS ON NETWORK RAIL'S LEWES-UCKFIELD RAILWAY LINE REINSTATEMENT STUDY**

**COMMENTS ON TECHNICAL REPORT IN STUDY**

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>NATURE OF COMMENT</b>	<b>KEY ISSUES</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Sussex CRP Isfield PC Isfield parishioners	<b>technical report (general)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ quality accepted as being high</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ pleased to note this</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP	<b>electrification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ consideration should be given to electrification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ has been considered (pg. 76 of study) by Network Rail. Cost would be incurred from obtaining a connection to the National Grid and third rail would cost £30m for single track, £50m double track, including cost of electrifying Uckfield – Hurst Green</li> </ul>
John Missenden (member of public)	<b>track bed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NR requires £22m of land acquisition to create a 15m wide corridor but acknowledges only 8.5m is required, so the existing track bed should be sufficient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 8.5 m is the final width of the completed railway, however we need more than that for the construction period – this is common for roads and railways, hence the 15 metres required for acquisition</li> </ul>
John Missenden	<b>structures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NR estimates £56m to allow for structures. Existing structures only need modest maintenance to north of Uckfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ does not look at cost of acquiring existing structures to the north of Uckfield. Only the Lewes-Uckfield section has been costed, which is south of Uckfield <b><i>potential error in his text –he may mean South of Uckfield</i></b></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NR acknowledge that existing structures may not have had detailed inspections and perhaps only 25% need serious attention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The cost for structures works assumes that only 25% need major works</li> </ul>
John Missenden	<b>track and signalling</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ costs of £43m are more to expectation, but the standard achieved of 90mph line speed with double track bed and intermediate signalling does not represent the most economic way of establishing rail connection (north of Uckfield prevailing line speed is 70mph)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ double track bed installed to 'future proof' as further consents and significant additional cost if doubling of track bed is required at a later date.</li> <li>○ difference in cost between 90mph and 70mph is negligible for new railways</li> </ul>
John Missenden	<b>bridges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ grade separation of foot and wheeled bridges may be intrusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
John Missenden	<b>level crossings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ORR clear that although not desirable level crossings may be justified in some circumstances</li> <li>○ crossings tolerated north of Uckfield should also be permitted to the south if this enables a safer rail scheme to progress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ advice taken by NR from the ORR on acceptability of level crossings on the Lewes-Uckfield line</li> <li>○ only main safety issue in respect of the rail network is the presence of level crossings. Installing level crossings would not make a rail scheme safer, quite the opposite</li> </ul>
John Missenden John Missenden	<b>economic analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ over-specifying and over-engineering has led to NPV's of £31-74m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ project is specified to railway group standards for new lines, and assumes standard contracting and construction methodology. Alternative suppliers will do exactly the same</li> </ul>

<p>John Missenden</p> <p>John Missenden</p> <p>John Missenden</p> <p>John Missenden</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ higher costs (Options 2 &amp; 3) result from extra operating costs beyond Lewes (trains to Newhaven &amp; Eastbourne) without reducing other services to those destinations leading to oversupply</li> <li>○ best option is to extend services just from Uckfield to Lewes (i.e. not Newhaven etc).</li> <li>○ Investment should be limited to £25/29m to have a BCR &gt;1.5</li> <li>○ £25/£29m is justifiable to achieve reinstatement</li> <li>○ the NR model for reinstatement is excessive in cost and impact and needs re-examination, possible with an alternative supplier, in part. If NR pass most work on to external consultants or contractors, each will inflate specifications and work requirements, adding overheads and profit factors. This has been shown to inflate railway costs by a factor of 3 (Ford, R “Modern Railways”)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
<p>John Missenden</p> <p>John Missenden</p>	<p><b>alternative model</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ main needs: secure land title/lease, repair structures and installation of appropriate rail systems</li> <li>○ Heritage sector (Lavender Line) could make progress with much of reinstatement work. It has</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ Heritage railways do not have to conform to same standards as the national network and operate at</li> </ul>

		to conform to the same quality standards as NR, but may have the motivation to find economic solutions (between Uckfield and Hamsey?). The TOC could pay access charges to the Heritage line	lower line speeds and traffic levels
Bernard Pratt (member of public) (see also <i>Connex comments in business case section below</i> )	<b>Connex</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Connex's proposals showed a financial case for reinstatement. Double tracking the railway throughout is not an insurmountable solution, and would include a flying junction at the Lewes end. Connex's engineers showed this as eminently practicable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ there is a difference between practicability and justification. This report shows that the project is practicable, however it is not justified. If the Connex proposal had had a good financial case it would have been reinstated before now</li> </ul>

## COMMENTS ON BUSINESS CASE

RESPONDENT	NATURE OF COMMENT	KEY ISSUES	COMMENTS
Crowborough TC Sussex CRP	<b>below standard of technical report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the business case should be reviewed which has been received with widespread reservations with regard to scope and forecasting (also local support for this action)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
John Missenden  John Missenden  John Missenden Ian Smith (member of public)	<b>cost of reinstatement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>£19m per mile is expensive; industry benchmarks suggest a base cost of £1.5m per mile</li> <li>Alloa reopening in Scotland was £6m per mile</li> <li>30% contingency needs close examination</li> <li>important social and economic benefits have been overlooked, possibly as a result of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>purchasing and laying new track (new rail, sleepers and ballast) costs approximately £1.5m per single track mile, before the cost of any civil engineering, signalling, telecoms, stations, land purchase, consents, environmental mitigation, design etc</li> <li>Alloa line was largely in existence already – very little land take or civil engineering was required and the majority of the line is freight only, and limited to 30 mph with rudimentary signalling</li> <li>contingency applied as per Network Rail project management process, note this is less than required at this stage for DfT Transport Assessment</li> <li>all relevant social and economic benefits were factored into the business case</li> </ul>

		wrong questions being posed by the consultant or the CRC Board	
Sussex CRP David Haxell (member of public)	<b>port of Newhaven economic development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis undertaken</li> <li>○ there is no direct link from Newhaven to London and BML is at maximum capacity. If the line was reinstated, services would be able to be run from Newhaven to London and vice versa</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ direct, all day services London - Newhaven could be provided today on the existing network if there were a case for doing so and this was specified in the South Central franchise</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP John Missenden	<b>economic value to TOCs and NR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis of an additional north/south route for regular as well as emergency passenger working - would be valuable to TOCs and NR</li> <li>○ service would be well used mainly for end to end journeys (NPV £80/94m in fares ahead of operating costs of £40/55m)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ use of additional north – south route – covered in Section 3.6 of report</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP David Haxell	<b>potential for southward passenger traffic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis of the true potential for southward passenger traffic has been undertaken</li> <li>○ if the whole line was reinstated it would open up the whole of north east Kent to Sussex. For rail users to get from Brighton from east Kent they currently face a gruelling journey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the demand modelling included a full analysis of southward passenger traffic</li> <li>○ assuming respondent thinks the Eridge-Tunbridge Wells line is included as part of this study, which it is not.</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP	<b>latent demand when</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis demonstrated on the line northwards from Uckfield and on the recent openings in Scotland and Wales</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the demand modelling included a full analysis of all passenger traffic on the line</li> </ul>

	<b>additional rail services are offered</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ recent reopenings in Scotland and Wales have been in areas of very different economic activity; direct comparisons are not easy to draw</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP	<b>passengers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ additional demand would arise from stations on existing lines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ abstraction – existing passengers transferred from using other stations, and this would not impact on the BCR as they would be existing users</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis of the true potential for southward passenger traffic undertaken</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Barcombe PC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ too few passengers would use the line, and cannot envisage this changing either through increased housing levels or travel pattern change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Hamsey PC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ too few passengers would use the line, therefore cannot justify capital costs, annual operating losses, adverse environmental</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Rosalind Marriott (member of public)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ passengers would travel to places along the Lewes-Uckfield line to commute or visit from Tunbridge Wells and stations south of here</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP	<b>cost of fuel</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ increased cost of fuel – no proper analysis undertaken</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Network Rail used prices of fuel as they were at the start of the study. Fuel prices are now back at this level (October 2008)</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP	<b>lack of space for new roads</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis undertaken</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

Isfield PC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ doesn't enable light industry to be served with raw materials and get orders delivered. Without new businesses residents have to travel outside the County to find employment, negating the benefits a reinstated link would bring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP Rosalind Marriott Ian Smith (member of public)	<b>modal shift to public transport</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis undertaken</li> <li>○ existing bus service from Tunbridge Wells and Crowborough is poor. A good rail link to Lewes would encourage people to use rail as opposed to driving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ considered through demand forecasting model</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP John Missenden	<b>advantages of rail over road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no proper analysis undertaken</li> <li>○ there would be benefits of over £8m from reduction in road accidents and congestion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP Barcombe PC Crowborough TC	<b>assessment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ new methods of calculating public funding cost/benefit could affect calculations made in the report</li> <li>○ changes to assessment criteria would not influence BCR to warrant reinstatement of the line</li> <li>○ Board should lobby Parliament for a positive review of the NATA criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

Sussex CRP	<b>road fund tax revenue for journeys transferred to rail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ overestimated - as the bulk of vehicles would still be owned, just used less, as the line area is rural and car ownership is an essential feature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ tax revenue adjustments relate purely to fuel duty</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP	<b>funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ study doesn't look at funding outside the public sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered in funding section of report</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ development contributions should be considered across the area, not just adjacent to this line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Sussex CRP		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ consideration needs to be given to commercial partnership funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Councillor Lyndon Elias (Cllr outside of East Sussex)	<b>freight on rail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ consideration of transferral of waste by rail needs to be considered e.g. Newhaven incinerator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ potential for freight traffic was considered; note that freight traffic to/from Newhaven can use existing network</li> </ul>
Councillor Lyndon Elias	<b>tickets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ only looking at sales from the pertinent station is flawed (does not account for visitors)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ all potential demand for the line was assessed in the forecasting model.</li> </ul>
Councillor Lyndon Elias	<b>houses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ cost of houses are 11% higher for properties close to railway stations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ it is difficult to capture the value gained on existing properties.</li> </ul>
Councillor Lyndon Elias	<b>Eridge-Tunbridge</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ reinstating this link would provide an opportunity between Lewes and Tunbridge Wells West</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

	<b>Wells</b>		
Paul Sinclair (member of public)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ not surprised that looking at Uckfield-Lewes on its own does not justify a business case for reinstatement. The big traffic generators are Brighton and Tunbridge Wells. If Eridge-Tunbridge Wells had been included in the study there would have been no difficulty in establishing a business case. Presently towns in west Kent have to make a detour via Redhill to reach Brighton by rail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Ian Smith	<b>comparable schemes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ebbw Vale to Cardiff/Newport reinstatement – understated passenger forecasting ahead of a line reopening</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2,000 new houses built adjacent to just one of the new stations on the Ebbw Vale line. Difficult to make comparisons with the Lewes-Uckfield line as they are completely different with dissimilar circumstances</li> <li>○ sensitivity analysis demonstrated that forecasts would need to be underestimated by a factor of 3 for a business case to be made</li> </ul>
Ian Smith	<b>Gatwick station</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2012 Olympics – Gatwick station estimated to be unable to handle proposed passenger numbers. Reinstated alternative route between Lewes and London via Uckfield would provide relief (result of ORR's suggested £9m to NR's requested £30m for station improvements at Gatwick station)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ESCC has raised extreme concerns via the consultation process which is a draft determination, and to this significant reduction in funding in particular. There is scope, however, for the proposed reduction in funding to change to a sum the same, or similar, to that requested by NR</li> <li>○ the Lewes – Uckfield line would not relieve</li> </ul>

			passenger capacity at Gatwick station
Rosalind Marriott  Richard Newman (member of public)	<b>poor existing bus service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ people have to use cars to visit Lewes or Brighton as the bus service is poor</li> <li>○ there is demand for the link, especially because of the poor existing bus service: 29 bus takes nearly an hour to get to Lewes and 1.5 hours to get the Brighton from Tunbridge Wells bus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the study demonstrates that whilst there is demand, it is insufficient to justify the costs of reinstatement</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Isfield PC	<b>stopping service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ minimum cost £143m scheme doesn't include stopping services at Barcombe or Isfield. Extra cost of stopping service here would offer no benefit to Isfield residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Bernard Pratt (see also Connex comments in technical report section above)	<b>Connex</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ consideration should be given to Connex's proposals which identified a financially viable solution to the re-opening of the line. It was identified that re-opening formed an integral part of a new Main Line, relieving pressure on the BML and relieving congestion at Croydon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lewes – Uckfield does not and cannot relieve congestion at Croydon. Were the Connex proposal viable financially, it would have progressed towards construction</li> </ul>
Bernard Pratt Michael Ballard (member of public) Richard Newman	<b>Brighton Main Line</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ reinstating the link would be a good alternative route to the BML</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3.6 of the report covers this.</li> </ul>

## OTHER COMMENTS

RESPONDENT	NATURE OF COMMENT	KEY ISSUES	COMMENTS
Hamsey PC Peta Browne (member of public) Ian Smith Richard Newman	<b>consultation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no consultation on the proposed routes took place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ public consultation does not occur as part of GRIP Stage 2 studies. Should a case for reinstatement have been made a further study i.e. GRIP Stage 3 or 4, would have involved public consultation, as this would look in more detail at potential routes</li> </ul>
Adrian Allaway (member of public) Hamsey PC Isfield PC David Tyler (member of public) F.A. Browne Peta Browne Isfield parishioners	<b>“once and for all decision”</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ this was expressed by the Chair of the CRC Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ study commenced on the understanding that a “once and for all decision” would be an achievable objective based on the premise that other factors would remain the same</li> <li>○ a greater understanding of the basis for major transport scheme assessment and potential for significant changes in Government transport and fiscal policy has emerged since commencement of the study and since this comment was made</li> </ul>
Adrian Allaway Barcombe PC Hamsey PC F.A. Browne Peta Browne Isfield parishioners	<b>blight</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ not accepting a “once and for all” decision will blight residents living along the disused route</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

<p>Adrian Allaway Hamsey PC Peta Browne</p> <p>David Tyler</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ planning restrictions to protect the disused line, or the preferred route, should not be imposed</li> <li>○ if LDC is asked to protect land on the potential route from development it protects land on north of Hamsey as proposed by Hamsey Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
<p>Adrian Allaway Hamsey PC Peta Browne</p> <p>David Tyler</p> <p>Crowborough TC</p> <p>Councillor Lyndon Elias</p>	<p><b>policy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ planning restrictions to protect the disused line, or the preferred route, should not be imposed</li> <li>○ if LDC is asked to protect land on the potential route from development it protects land on north of Hamsey as proposed by Hamsey Council</li> <li>○ press for the retention of the protection of the line from non-railway development with additional protection being given to the rpeferred Hamsey option route</li> <li>○ Lewes Council should consider applying for and issuing itself planning consent to protect the route north of Eridge and to Sheffield Park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ Wealden and Lewes Councils have recently at their Cabinet meetings recommended the retention of policies protecting line from development which would prejudice it's future reinstatement in LDFs</li> <li>○ protection of disused lines would be through the LDF process and as policies protecting the disused line from development which would prejudice its reinstatement, and not through planning consent</li> </ul>
<p>Councillor Lyndon Elias</p>	<p><b>heritage sector</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ most rail re-openings in England are achieved by the heritage sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

John Missenden		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the affect on heritage operations (aspects contributing to rural development) at both Barcombe and Isfield is adverse, possibly eliminating both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Councillor Lyndon Elias	<b>Yeovil - Folkestone trunk road – Transport Solutions for the South Coast</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ outlined by the HA, trunk road for Amberley – Clayton Tunnel – north of Cooksbridge – across the trackbed between Isfield and Lewes – Mountfield Tunnel – Bodiam. This would sever Isfield and Lewes adversely affecting Seaford, Glynde, Polegate and Eastbourne</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ not aware of such a proposal that would affect the disused Lewes-Uckfield line</li> </ul>
Hamsey PC	<b>funding</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ if additional capital becomes available, this should be spent on upgrading existing services e.g. additional stopping service and parking at Cooksbridge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Isfield PC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ who will fund ongoing lobbying?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ an issue that will be dealt with by the CRC Board subsequent to decisions made at the 17<sup>th</sup> October meeting</li> </ul>
Uckfield Line Parishes Committee	<b>views not being heeded by the Board</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ national press, rail press and individual experts say there is an overwhelming case in favour of re-opening this section of the line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NR undertook the Lewes-Uckfield railway line reinstatement study in accordance with recommended Government guidelines and assessment criteria, and to Guide to Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) Stage 2</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ by commissioning Network Rail, the owner and operator of Britain's rail infrastructure, the Central Rail Corridor Board ensured that the most appropriate organisation in the rail industry undertook the feasibility study</li> <li>○ the report is the most in depth study to date into reopening the line.</li> </ul>
Isfield PC	<b>existing bus service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ timings do not coincide with railway departure and arrivals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ few evening bus services exist due to the lack of available funding to underwrite costs</li> <li>○ County Council funds the evening bus service 28 linking Lewes, Ringmer and Uckfield providing limited opportunities for evening rail users to travel from Lewes to Ringmer. There are additionally daily bus journeys from Uckfield to Lewes which provide a reasonable connection with train arrivals</li> </ul>
Isfield PC	<b>level crossings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ if not permitted in Isfield this would inconvenience residents by making a cul-de-sac of Station Road resulting in deterioration of quality of life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
David Tyler F.A. Browne Peta Browne	<b>alternative Hamsey route</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ this route should pass north of the village of Hamsey, joining the existing London – Lewes line, just north of the position shown in the study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
David Tyler F.A. Browne		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ this route wouldn't divide the village; it would be less obtrusive as it would be in a cutting; it would</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

Peta Browne		only cross one road; noise of trains would affect fewer residents; likely to cost no more than Route 1A; urge CRC Board to make this the preferred route	
Crowborough TC	<b>progress to GRIP 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ private development proposals should be pursued as they appear to have been misunderstood in terms of the scheme requiring additional rather than actually required planned numbers of housing along the route. Some form of partnership should be investigated to take this forward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>
Crowborough TC	<b>support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ encourage additional local authority support for the project from the region</li> <li>○ Network Rail and the DfT need to retain the old station site at Uckfield for potential future use</li> <li>○ Short listed bidders for the new South Central Franchise should co-operate with future work in connection with the reinstatement of the line</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> <li>○ covered elsewhere</li> </ul>

Acronyms

TOC Train Operating Company

NR Network Rail

HA Highways Agency

LDF Local Development Framework

PC Parish Council

TC Town Council

BCR Benefit Cost Ratio

CRC Central Rail Corridor

GRIP Guide to Railway Improvement Projects

ORR Office of Rail Regulation

ESCC East Sussex County Council

LDC Lewes District Council

BML Brighton Main Line

CRP Community Rail Partnership

**RESPONDENTS – FOR OR AGAINST REINSTATEMENT OF THE LEWES-UCKFIELD LINE**

<b>Name</b>	<b>For reinstatement</b>	<b>Against reinstatement</b>	<b>Not stated</b>
Sussex Community Rail Partnership	✓		
Adrian Allaway		✓	
Councillor Lyndon Elias	✓		
Barcombe Parish Council		✓	
Hamsey Parish Council		✓	
Trevor Wells	✓		
Ian Smith	✓		
Rosalind Marriott	✓		
Isfield Parish Council		✓	
Bruce Oliver	✓		
Professor John	✓		

Missenden			
David Tyler		✓	
F.A. Browne		✓	
Peta Browne		✓	
Isfield parishioners			
Bernard Pratt	✓		
Paul Sinclair	✓		
John Kenton-Page	✓		
Councillor Roy Martin			✓
David Haxell	✓		
Charlie Deacon	✓		
Michael Ballard	✓		
Richard Newman	✓		
Crowborough Town Council	✓		