

RAIL STATION FEASIBILITY STUDY: COVERING NOTE

This working proposal was created by the Rail Station Feasibility Study Working Group for consideration by the Clay Cross Town Deal board on 24th September. It provides a snapshot view of the status of the project, the current hypotheses / working assumptions and the current plan to deliver the completed business case to CLG by Q3 2022.

Please note that all elements of this document are potentially subject to change, should that be necessary, and will be iterated further as required during the course of the business case creation.

Key Points to note:

The Board should draw its attention to:

- **Potential changes in scope:** the Working Group is recommending the following changes to the original Town Investment Plan scope at this stage:
 1. **Type of feasibility study to be produced:** given the lack of an open New Stations Fund-type programme by the Department for Transport (DfT), it is not physically possible to conclude the full feasibility process on this proposal (as to do so would require DfT inputs, review from DfT civil servants, likely DfT match funding etc.). As a result, the scope of this initiative has been defined as the creation of a written document, which would cover submission of a proposal for the first stage of that process [known as a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC)]. This is the furthest that the initiative can get without an open New Stations Fund-type process and full DfT involvement.
 2. **Cost:** as a result of the above recommendation, it is possible that this project will not cost the full allocation of £200,000. The project wishes to retain the allocated Town Deal funds for now as costs could change as further work is undertaken. Any underspend can be reallocated to other projects, with MHCLG approval, at an appropriate point when costs are more certain.
- **Key working assumptions:** none to report at this stage.
- **Procurement:** the Working Group recommends procuring a consultant to begin work on SOBC as soon as is practical. To align with MHCLG requirements, a Strategic Assessment will be produced at the earliest opportunity to seek approval to draw down the funds. Simultaneously, it is proposed to progress the process for appointing a consultant. A draft procurement brief has been created by officers and, following agreement with the NEDDC procurement team, the process of appointment will be started whilst the Strategic Assessment is being agreed with MHCLG.

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21

Recommendation:

That the Clay Cross Town Deal Board:

- **notes the current detail and proposals contained within the document;**
- **notes the caveats therein and the potential for change in future iterations;**
- **acknowledges the particular focuses that the Working Group has chosen, and;**
- **endorses the broad approach of the Working Group described in this paper and confirms their willingness to build the business case based on that approach at this stage.**

Should the approach be endorsed, the Working Group commits to returning with a further iteration to the next Town Deal board on (date to be confirmed) which will primarily focus on providing more detail around (i) the full scope of the study based on the final brief agreed by the Working Group (ii) updates on the procurement process and (iii) the expected cost of the study based on market testing. The Board is asked to minute, as part of this approval:

- any particular steer they wish the Working Group to pursue in advance of the next meeting, and;
- any specific detail they wish to see in the next iteration.

Proposers & quality assurance

The proposers of this document are the Working Group comprising:

- Lee Rowley, Chair of the Working Group (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Martyn Handley, NEDDC, Lead Officer (joint lead and joint ultimate author of this document)
- Other members of the Working Group (outlined below)

This document has been reviewed and quality assured by Gill Callingham, Director of Growth NEDDC who, based on this early stage of the proposal development, deems this to be a reasonable and achievable proposal.

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21

CLAY CROSS TOWNS FUND – BUSINESS CASE SCOPING PLAN

1. Project name	Rail Station Feasibility Study
2. Project aim	<p>Summary aim of overall project: To complete a Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC), to the most practically detailed level possible, on re-opening a railway station in / near Clay Cross</p> <p>Summary aim of current stage: to produce an interim “Strategic Assessment” document and to begin the procurement process for appointing a consultant to create the SOBC, which will allow Town Deal funding to be released for the full Strategic Outline Business Case.</p>
3. Project description / initial considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clay Cross railway station, located at Station New Road in Tupton, closed in 1967 and the town has been without a direct link to the Midland Mainline / Erewash Valley lines since then. Residents wishing to use the train either must travel to Chesterfield or elsewhere. • There has been a long-standing aspiration to re-open a station in Clay Cross for a number of decades and previous masterplans / strategic frameworks (e.g. Clay Cross Regeneration Framework, 2013) have all recorded this ambition. No detailed work has been undertaken in recent years nor, until now, has any practical process been identified to undertake that more detailed consideration. Other track considerations have also slowed progress in recent years – including HS2 effectively freezing any new development on the line until it is clear what is happening with that project. • This project does not have the specific aim of re-opening the station itself given the continuing wider considerations of HS2 and the Integrated Rail Plan. In addition, it should be stated that it cannot conclude a full business case process, for both cost and practical purposes – specifically that a 3-stage business case process requires input from the Department for Transport as part of a wider “New Stations Fund” type programme. There is no current DfT process open which would prevent the relevant checkpoint reviews being done. Instead, this project aims to produce a document which could be submitted to cover the first stage of that process at the point when it next opens for consideration. • The project was identified, in discussion with MHCLG, as one that could potentially be expedited. The Working Group have, therefore, looked as to how timelines could be brought forward to respond to that request.
4. Definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railway station: defined as a passenger railway station providing scheduled passenger services • “Clay Cross”: for the purposes of this document, it is accepted that the area under consideration may be wider than that covered by the Town Deal (primarily to enable consideration of sites such as the old Clay Cross Railway station in Tupton). • Strategic Assessment: document which will be prepared to release funds for the consultant to be employed to create the SOBC. This Strategic Assessment will be a high-level document which covers the local context, the study objectives, the study goals and the procurement process (and how to expedite the output).

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21

5. TIP Stage Assumptions	<p>The TIP recorded the following assumptions on this initiative when submitted to CLG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Rail Station – this project will explore the feasibility of re-establishing a rail station to serve the town and wider area” (p.6 /8)</i> • <i>“Commissioning detailed work to investigate the feasibility of re-instating a train station within Clay Cross” (p.45)</i> • <i>“Planning for a Railway Station – this may take some years to realise, but it would be important to begin planning for this now” (p.57)</i> • <i>“Delivery Programme: Q4 2021 Business Case development, Q1 – Q3 2022 Feasibility concept design” (p.66)</i>
6. Scope of Delivery	<p>Scope of overall project: to deliver a Strategic Outline Business Case, using the established template which has previously been required from the DfT for a new stations application, which would enable a submission at the point a “New Stations”-type Fund opens. Subsequent business case stages, and any final build / construction / project costs will be dealt with by a future project / initiative. This SOBC document will be delivered by Q3 2022.</p> <p>Scope of current stage: to produce an interim “Strategic Assessment” document, which will allow funding to be released for the full Strategic Outline Business Case. This document will cover, at a high-level, (i) the local context, (ii) the study objectives, (iii) the study goals, (iv) the procurement process and (v) how to expedite the output.</p>
7. Working Assumptions / Hypotheses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location: no decisions have been made on site location but the Working Group is aware of a number of potential options (a safeguarded site on the Egstow Park development and the old station location in Tupton). The work associated with the delivery of the SOBC would expect to highlight a preferred site, subject to that being possible, albeit with a clear caveat that it would be pending further investigation at later stages • Wider strategic rail context: it is unlikely that the wider context around HS2 / Integrated Rail Plan will be resolved in a timeline which fully works for the delivery of this SOBC. Thus, where it is necessary to do so, the SOBC will ring-fence off these considerations in order to progress with this project • Type: the specified aim of this project is the delivery of a station for heavy rail. The SOBC (or an associated document) should offer a clear, written statement about why light rail is not feasible in this context – and no further work should be undertaken on this point beyond that • Historic Strategic Statements: that the project has taken account of documents such as the Clay Cross Regeneration Framework (2013) and is in line with its aims and recommendations. • Area of Focus: it has been confirmed by MHCLG that they are happy for the area of focus for the project to be wider than the agreed Town Deal area, as long as Clay Cross residents are a beneficiary. • Procurement: due to the project being recommended as a Fast Track project as part of the TIP, the Working Group has agreed that an expedited Procurement process is recommended, with the actual appointment of

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21

	the consultants to be managed by NEDDC Procurement team to ensure best value for money.														
8. Key Dependencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wider strategic rail context regarding HS2 / IRP / Northern Powerhouse / Restoring Your Rail (to be referenced where necessary but ring-fenced off where appropriate) • The procurement of suitable delivery partners for the construction of an SOBC • Willingness to engage from key stakeholders such as Network Rail, Department for Transport etc. • Understanding of other transport initiatives in Clay Cross to work out how best to integrate a future railway station at the location which is eventually proposed by the SOBC 														
9. Outputs	<p>The following outputs are assumed at the conclusion of the project:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Quantity</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outputs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strategic Outline Business Case</td> <td>1 document</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A Land Value Capture Report</td> <td>1 document</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Any associated additional documents (such as disregard of light rail or equivalent) which are created as part of the SOBC development or can be created at this time to assist the success of future funding bids</td> <td>As determined by the project team</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Following the submission of the Town Investment Plan and the ‘in principle’ funding award, MHGLG now requires the following mandatory outputs to be collected/ reported annually:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monies spent directly on project delivery (either local authority or implementation partners) • Co-funding committed (private and public) • Co-funding spent on project delivery (private and public) • Number of temporary FT jobs supported during project implementation • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs created through the projects • Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) permanent jobs safeguarded through the projects <p>Further detail about outputs will be provided at a subsequent iteration of this document.</p>	Indicator	Quantity	Outputs		Strategic Outline Business Case	1 document	A Land Value Capture Report	1 document	Any associated additional documents (such as disregard of light rail or equivalent) which are created as part of the SOBC development or can be created at this time to assist the success of future funding bids	As determined by the project team				
Indicator	Quantity														
Outputs															
Strategic Outline Business Case	1 document														
A Land Value Capture Report	1 document														
Any associated additional documents (such as disregard of light rail or equivalent) which are created as part of the SOBC development or can be created at this time to assist the success of future funding bids	As determined by the project team														
10. Costs	<p>The following high-level assumptions around costs have been made:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>(£million)</th> <th>2021/22</th> <th>2022/23</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2024/25</th> <th>2025/26</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Towns Fund</td> <td></td> <td>0.15</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	(£million)	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total	Towns Fund		0.15				0.15
(£million)	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total									
Towns Fund		0.15				0.15									

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Match/co-funding</td> <td></td> <td>0.05</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.05</td> </tr> </table>	Match/co-funding		0.05				0.05																														
Match/co-funding		0.05				0.05																																
11. Team Roles	<p>The business case team will primarily comprise the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Lead</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AMION:</td> <td>Peter Alford</td> <td>Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ramboll:</td> <td>Ed Kerr</td> <td>Scoping feasibility study brief</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nexus:</td> <td>Pete Tooher</td> <td>Partner engagement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The wider Working Group, who still steer the project between reports to the Town Board, comprise the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Partner</th> <th>Lead</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">NEDDC</td> <td>Martyn Handley</td> <td>Lead NEDDC inputs and support coordination of wider inputs Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maria Curran</td> <td>PMO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Karl Apps</td> <td>Head of Economic Development</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>Cllr Alex Dale</td> <td>Leader of Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Charlotte Cupit</td> <td>Deputy Leader of Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Clay Cross Town Deal</td> <td>Lee Rowley MP</td> <td>Chair of Working Group, Project Board Sponsor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gary Golden</td> <td>Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cllr Carolyn Renwick</td> <td>Vice-Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Derbyshire County Council</td> <td>Allison Westray-Chapman</td> <td>Head of Economic Development</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Partner	Lead	Role	AMION:	Peter Alford	Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements	Ramboll:	Ed Kerr	Scoping feasibility study brief	Nexus:	Pete Tooher	Partner engagement	Partner	Lead	Role	NEDDC	Martyn Handley	Lead NEDDC inputs and support coordination of wider inputs Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG	Maria Curran	PMO	Karl Apps	Head of Economic Development		Cllr Alex Dale	Leader of Council	Cllr Charlotte Cupit	Deputy Leader of Council	Clay Cross Town Deal	Lee Rowley MP	Chair of Working Group, Project Board Sponsor	Gary Golden	Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board	Cllr Carolyn Renwick	Vice-Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board	Derbyshire County Council	Allison Westray-Chapman	Head of Economic Development
Partner	Lead	Role																																				
AMION:	Peter Alford	Coordination and managing project team support Engaging with MHCLG / Appraisal team re. business case/approval requirements																																				
Ramboll:	Ed Kerr	Scoping feasibility study brief																																				
Nexus:	Pete Tooher	Partner engagement																																				
Partner	Lead	Role																																				
NEDDC	Martyn Handley	Lead NEDDC inputs and support coordination of wider inputs Support coordination of links to the Town Centre Regeneration WG																																				
	Maria Curran	PMO																																				
	Karl Apps	Head of Economic Development																																				
	Cllr Alex Dale	Leader of Council																																				
	Cllr Charlotte Cupit	Deputy Leader of Council																																				
Clay Cross Town Deal	Lee Rowley MP	Chair of Working Group, Project Board Sponsor																																				
	Gary Golden	Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board																																				
	Cllr Carolyn Renwick	Vice-Chair of Clay Cross Town Deal Board																																				
Derbyshire County Council	Allison Westray-Chapman	Head of Economic Development																																				

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21

	Ian Turkington	Highways and Transport
	Chris Hegarty	Highways and Transport
Clay Cross Parish Council	Cllr Ted Mansbridge	
HS2	Michael Haughton	
Network Rail	Robert Russell	
	Maria Clayton	
	Richard Joslin	
Department for Transport	Samantha Goodey	
East Midlands Railways	David Jackson	

The overall owner of this project is, from a Working Group perspective, Lee Rowley (as Chair of the Working Group) and Martyn Handley as the appointed officer to lead. Both are ultimately responsible for the output and practical achievability of the proposal.

12. Workplan

The current working assumptions around the timeline of the business case are the following:

Task	Date	Lead/role/responsibilities
Determine funding approval requirements	July – Aug 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MHCLG engagement – AMION S151 Officer engagement – NEDDC Agree local assurance requirements – NEDDC
Prepare Tender Brief for Study based on WG agreed objectives. Determine the procurement route	Aug - Sept 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine compliant procurement route - NEDDC Identify potential suppliers – NEDDC/ AMION
Produce a draft Strategic Assessment for review	Sept 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMION
Working Group review of tender brief and Strategic Assessment	Sept - Oct 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC
Board approval of tender action	By email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC
Procure consultancy to undertake the Feasibility Study	Sept – Oct 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEDDC

Version_1.0

PMO

Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study

17/09/21

	Finalise Strategic Assessment based on tender price	Oct – Nov 21	• AMION																									
	Strategic Assessment appraised by external assurance	Nov 21	• Respond to queries - NEDDC/AMION																									
	Board Approval of Strategic Assessment for submission to MHCLG	Nov 21	• NEDDC																									
	Consultant appointed	Nov-Dec 21	• NEDDC																									
	<p>The high-level indicative delivery plan for the project as a whole is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q4: appointment of consultant to create SOBC / other documents • Q1 – Q3: creation of SOBC / other documents • Q1: commencement of 1st consultation • Q3: sign-off, approval of output documents • Q3: closure of project <p>These timelines have not been validated at this stage and should be seen as highly indicative / subject to change.</p>																											
13. Risk	<p>The following key risks have been identified:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Risk name</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Rating</th> <th>Mitigations</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Business</td> <td>Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study</td> <td>Medium</td> <td>• Established clear objectives through the Working Group that are clearly aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Procurement risk</td> <td>Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study</td> <td>Medium</td> <td>• Carry out initial market testing • Tender via a robust open procurement process</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Programme risk</td> <td>Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF</td> <td>Medium /High</td> <td>• Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Funding risk</td> <td>Risk that match funding cannot be sourced</td> <td>Medium /High</td> <td>• Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions)</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Risk name	Description	Rating	Mitigations	Status	Business	Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study	Medium	• Established clear objectives through the Working Group that are clearly aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross	Open	Procurement risk	Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study	Medium	• Carry out initial market testing • Tender via a robust open procurement process	Open	Programme risk	Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF	Medium /High	• Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule	Open	Funding risk	Risk that match funding cannot be sourced	Medium /High	• Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions)	Open
Risk name	Description	Rating	Mitigations	Status																								
Business	Lack of clarity in relation to the objectives of the study	Medium	• Established clear objectives through the Working Group that are clearly aligned with wider strategic aims for Clay Cross	Open																								
Procurement risk	Difficulty in securing an appropriate supplier to carry out the study	Medium	• Carry out initial market testing • Tender via a robust open procurement process	Open																								
Programme risk	Difficulty in defraying identified TF allocation within the timescales set out in the TIF	Medium /High	• Work with MHCLG to agree alternative funding schedule	Open																								
Funding risk	Risk that match funding cannot be sourced	Medium /High	• Ongoing engagement with partners to secure match (cash or in-kind contributions)	Open																								
14. Communication / consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication assumption: Given that the project has both been identified for rapid progression and the level of interest within the community, we would expect regular communications to be issued for residents on this project. Those communications will need to be clear, 																											

Version_1.0

PMO

Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study

17/09/21

	<p>from the beginning, about the scope of the project (essentially “getting us ready for when we can bid”) so there is no misalignment within the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation assumption: the Working Group is keen to run a high-level initial consultation, perhaps regarding location, at an early stage. This will be put into the procurement brief for the appointed consultants to undertake. Then also a further consultation will be undertaken once the SOBC has been drafted.
15. Assumed Business As Usual Status (BAU)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that this project seeks to deliver a Strategic Outline Business Case only, there is no definition required of the BAU status • Once completed, the project will be wound down and the SOBC will await the opening of a New Stations-type fund for, hopefully, minimal amendment and submission into such a process. The timelines for the opening of the next NSF-type fund are unclear at this stage.
16. Business Case stage deliverable	Intentionally blank

Version_1.0	PMO
Clay Cross J: Rail Station Feasibility Study	17/09/21