

THE OFFICE OF RAIL REGULATION'S DECISION UNDER CONDITION 26 OF NETWORK RAIL'S NETWORK LICENCE FOR THE PROPOSED DISPOSAL OF NETWORK RAIL OWNED LAND

GOBOWEN TO BLODWEL BRANCH LINE, SHROPSHIRE

The decision

1. The Office of Rail Regulation has decided that consent should be granted to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (Network Rail) for the disposal of land comprising the Gobowen to Blodwel branch line, Shropshire (the land). The disposal is referred to in ORR's notice dated 7 June 2006.
2. In granting consent to the disposal for the purposes described in section 2 of Network Rail's submission dated 7 March 2006 (the submission) attached at Annex A, ORR, as set out in greater detail below, has had regard to past, current and potential future uses of the land and given due consideration to consultees' responses and the issues raised.
3. In summary, the main issues in this case related to:
 - (a) the potential for future use of the land as a heritage railway line;
 - (b) the potential for future freight use; and
 - (c) how the land featured in local authority strategies.

Background

4. ORR received notice dated 7 March 2006, from Network Rail of its intention to dispose of the land.
5. Network Rail proposed a freehold disposal of the land to Shropshire County Council (SCC) for use as a cycleway with a restrictive covenant to be placed on alternative uses apart from those that were rail related. Network Rail was aware that SCC's aim was to lease part of the railway line to a local heritage railway company.
6. Network Rail stated that the line stretched from Gobowen to a quarry at Blodwel via Oswestry and was approximately eight miles in length. Network Rail explained that the transfer of the railway line would include all of its land ownership along the branch line but would stop short of the connection with the mainline line at Gobowen, the purpose of which was to allow existing commercial freight activity at that point to continue unhindered. Network Rail therefore stated there would be no impact on current operations at Gobowen.
7. Network Rail said that the railway line had been disused for over ten years although the tracks had been retained in connection with the possibility of future freight traffic serving the quarry. However, Network Rail said that discussions within its Western Territory revealed that this was no longer a realistic possibility.

8. Network Rail said that it offered to sell the disused Gobowen branch line to SCC as Network Rail had no further use for the line, following the cessation of commercial freight traffic along the line in 1989. Network Rail said that SCC sought ownership of the line in order that local developments in Oswestry could be progressed, which would not be possible if the line and its level crossings remained in Network Rail's ownership. The proposal to dispose of the land to SCC followed lengthy discussions with the understanding that all of the track would remain in situ and that a cycle-path development may take place alongside the track where space was sufficient. Network Rail also understood that once SCC owned the land, it would consider allowing heritage operators to operate trains along the line, although this would be without the involvement of Network Rail.

9. Network Rail said that its intention to dispose of the branch line was publicised in its 2004 Business Plan & Route Plans and those provided in subsequent years. Network Rail also stated that previous attempts by Railtrack PLC (Railtrack)¹ in the late 1990s to dispose of the land had failed, as no agreement on the shared use of some of the area could be found and it was principally for this reason that Network Rail had decided to exclude the disputed area from the proposed disposal. Network Rail also considered that SCC was the most suitable body to deal with the transfer of the liabilities associated with the branch line.

10. ORR began consultation on 10 March 2006. A full list of consultees is attached at Annex B.

11. This document sets out consultees' views, ORR's decision and the reasons for that decision.

Responses to the consultation and issues raised

12. The consultation raised a number of issues regarding the future use of the line by heritage and freight operators and plans by local authorities which involved using the land for the wider development of the locality.

Future use of the land as a heritage railway line

13. The Tanat Valley Light Railway Company Limited (TVLR) objected to the proposed disposal and stated that its aim was to preserve and restore as much of the former Tanat Valley Light Railway as possible by purchasing and/or leasing the former railway land. TVLR said it had held inaugural talks with the National Assembly for Wales with regard to its aspirations and it had received support from both individual ministers and Assembly members. TVLR said it was currently evaluating the potential for a road/rail interface at

¹ On 3 February 2003, the network licence holder's name was changed from Railtrack PLC to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

Blodwel and had undertaken a small local freight survey in order to complete a business plan.

14. TVLR stated that its aspirations were dependent on the retention of the complete railway line from Blodwel to Gobowen and therefore Network Rail's proposed disposal could jeopardise its current plans and also any future expansion. TVLR also considered that the railway lines in its ownership would be severed from the national network if the disposal proceeded.

15. TVLR said that it purchased the former Nantmawr branch line from British Rail and specifically requested that the points connecting the former Nantmawr branch to the Gobowen to Blodwel branch be left in place and British Rail had agreed to this. TVLR therefore considered that the Nantmawr branch could connect to the national rail network at Gobowen. TVLR considered this important as its strategy was to provide a small freight facility at Blodwel in order to generate funds towards its plans for the former TVLR route. TVLR also considered that there were a number of places where there was not enough space for both a railway and cycle route to operate on the Gobowen to Blodwel branch line.

16. Network Rail did not accept that the branch line was linked to the national network but noted that traffic once passed by rail (believed to be up until 1974) from Nantmawr to Blodwel, thence to be forwarded on the branch to Gobowen and onwards. Network Rail said it was unable to comment further on TVLR's response.

17. The Cambrian Railways Society (CRS) objected to the proposed disposal on the grounds that:

- (a) the proposed disposal would prohibit plans for the branch line to be connected to the national rail network at Gobowen;
- (b) the proposed lease from SCC to a heritage operator would not give any guarantee that the existing railway line from Blodwel to Gobowen would remain intact and be available for future rail operations.

18. CRS noted that Network Rail's proposal included the potential for SCC to lease the land for use by heritage operators but was concerned that SCC's intention was to establish a cycle route as a priority and then sell surplus land for railway use. This could therefore thwart its aspirations to use the land for future railway operations.

19. CRS considered that Network Rail's statement that the line had been disused for a number of years was inaccurate and stated that parts of the line proposed for disposal were covered by the Oswestry Light Railway Act 1995 and the Light Railway Order, under which CRS said it regularly operated along the line between March and September and sporadically at other times of the year. CRS said that other uses such as the operation of a road/rail weed killing vehicle had operated on the line within the last ten years. CRS was also concerned that the existing rights of access currently in favour of the

railway would be lost should the land transfer to SCC's ownership and considered that the disposal was not in the public interest.

20. Network Rail said it was aware of CRS' aspirations but had avoided being drawn into any disagreements about the future of the branch line. Network Rail confirmed orally to ORR that the Light Railway Order only extended to the land that CRS currently owned and was not exercisable, nor applicable to the land proposed for disposal by Network Rail. Network Rail considered it was for SCC and CRS / CRT to discuss how subsequently to lease part or all of the line to a heritage body, should SCC purchase the land from Network Rail.

21. CRT supported the proposed disposal in principle, but considered that ORR should only grant its consent when adequate safeguards were in place that would facilitate the land's use by another operator as part of the railway network. CRT considered in particular that the proposed disposal should provide the continuation of railway rights at all existing and proposed level crossings and the retention of a mainline connection at Gobowen.

22. Network Rail disagreed with CRT's comments and considered that these issues should be the subject of any new Transport and Works Act Order, provided at the expense of the new promoter and raised directly with Health and Safety Executive (HSE) ².

23. The Shrewsbury Railway Heritage Trust (SRHT) said it had objections to the proposed disposal unless a protective covenant was included within the disposal documentation that ensured that the land was used in connection with railway purposes and that existing railway rights were protected. SRHT considered that the majority of the infrastructure was still intact and allowed for future connection to the national rail network which could act as a catalyst for the regeneration of the rural community in the Oswestry area. The Chester to Shrewsbury Rail Partnership (CSRP) responded with similar comments.

24. Shrewsbury to Aberystwyth Rail Passenger Action (SARPA) also objected to the proposed disposal and considered that the land had a potential future railway use.

The potential for future freight use

25. Hanson (a producer of aggregates and building materials which owns the closed quarry at Blodwel) objected to the proposed disposal on the basis that the quarry contained substantial reserves of stone and it had planning permission to recommence quarrying. Hanson stated that whilst it had no immediate plans to recommence freight use of the branch line, it would be

² On 1 April 2006, ORR became the health and safety regulator for the rail industry, responsibility having transferred from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).

concerned by any proposal that could prejudice such use. Hanson stated that after use of the branch line ceased in 1989, it had entered into a Facility Agreement with British Rail for the retention of the track including maintenance and bi-annual reporting of track condition.

26. Hanson considered that the agreement remained in full effect, despite part of the track being stolen in 1996, resulting in Railtrack PLC (Railtrack), British Rail's successor, being unable to fulfil the terms of the agreement, as it could no longer operate a weed killing train. Hanson said that Railtrack correspondence stated that prior to disposal of the line Hanson would be consulted over the exact terms and must agree to the sale and arrangements being made to restore the line to operational use to ensure its interests would be safeguarded. Hanson stated that in its last correspondence, Railtrack stated it had no intention to dispose of the land without preserving freight rights along the route.

27. Hanson considered that Network Rail should continue to honour the undertakings given by its predecessors to protect the future use of the branch line for quarry freight traffic and that no disposal of the line should take place without giving Hanson first approval to the proposed terms of the sale/lease.

28. Network Rail confirmed that it had given a commitment to discuss the future rail use of the branch with Hanson and would not consider its disposal until such discussions had concluded. However, Network Rail said discussions had taken place in May 2003 and July 2004 in addition to subsequent telephone calls and e-mails with Hanson that had kept them updated with the current status of the land. Network Rail understood Hanson's wishes to keep the strategic option of rail from the quarry open and considered that this was reflected in the statements made by SCC's response to ORR's consultation.

29. Freightliner was aware of and supported Hanson's objection and considered that the quarry could reopen in future, which could generate future freight use on the line. Freightliner considered that the proposed disposal was for non-rail use and said that the use of the local road network was inadequate for freight transportation. Freightliner therefore considered it would not be in the best interests of the railway industry to dispose of the land whilst opportunities for freight uses were possible.

30. Arriva Trains Wales (ATW) did not object to the proposed disposal provided English Welsh & Scottish Railway Limited (EWS) believed that it had no further interest in the line or believed that its future interest would be protected by any future owner or by the use to which the disposed track would be put.

31. EWS objected to the disposal given the absence of detailed proposals that outlined how use of the land could be restored for future railway use, including how major road level crossings could be reinstated. EWS said its current private sidings agreement had not been terminated or revoked and

that the owners of the quarry were most concerned that the proposed disposal could leave no realistic opportunity for restoring rail services, should the proposed disposal proceed. EWS considered that the railway line was shown as part of the network in 1994 and therefore should have been the subject of a formal Network Change to render it disused or mothballed. However, EWS could not provide any evidence to support its statements.

32. EWS considered that freight operations could successfully operate on railway lines that had transferred to heritage operators through the use of suitable access agreements. However, EWS considered that such aspirations could be affected should cyclists gain rights of access to use the land which would then need to be removed in order to reinstate rights of use for rail operators. EWS said that the opportunities for sharing the use of the land as a cycleway and operational railway line would be limited, given that railway line was single track in parts. EWS said that the boundary of the line should also be taken into account, in view of the fact that freight trains currently used the run-round facility at Gobowen.

33. However, EWS stated that, subject to the outcome of a formal Network Change proposal, the use of the land as a heritage railway or cycleway was preferable to any disposal comprising the redevelopment of the land, although the cycleway conversion should only be a last resort, once all possible avenues of retaining the railway in a form suitable for the restoration of freight services had been exhausted.

34. Network Rail noted EWS's view regarding Network Change but stated that the branch had been disused by commercial freight traffic since 1989 and was described as inoperative in the Sectional Appendix³ until 2001 from where it was later removed by Railtracks Great Western Zone Director to correct the anomaly of a disused line featuring in the appendix. Network Rail said that the branch line remained as a Network Rail liability, subject to annual inspection and no trains had passed on the line since 1993 and therefore Network Rail regarded the line as closed.

35. CRS was also aware of the Hanson's interest to reintroduce freight traffic to and from Nantmawr Quarry. SRHT also considered that the land could also be used to facilitate commercial use of the quarry aggregate traffic, should the facilities be reopened. The Chester to Shrewsbury Rail Partnership (CSRP) responded with similar comments.

Safety issues

36. HSE understood that Network Rail would retain the sidings and run-round facility at the end of the branch line at Gobowen, with the boundary of its property being sited at some point beyond the run-round. HSE stated that it

³ A document maintained by Network Rail which details the physical extent of the network and track layout.

was not clear from Network Rail's submission how the proposed new boundary could be demarcated to ensure that trains using the run-round facility would continue to do so safely. HSE asked Network Rail to provide more detail to demonstrate that this issue had been considered and that any potential risks to safe operation were properly assessed and minimised as necessary.

37. HSE also said that it was not clear from the submission how the proposed cycleway would link with other routes without crossing either private land or part of the operational railway and therefore considered that there could be safety implications, particularly if a new crossing was required. HSE stated that Network Rail should demonstrate that the use of the land would not result in a foreseeable increased risk of trespass or vandalism where the route adjoined the remaining infrastructure. This would require an assessment of such risks and the need for fencing to control any such risk identified.

38. HSE also stated that there were three public level crossings on the line that were currently the subject of Level Crossings Orders and that should the disposal proceed and the railway line become abandoned, the Level Crossings Act 1983 could no longer be applied and there would be no means of revoking the current Level Crossings Orders. HSE therefore requested a condition requiring Network Rail to obtain revocation of the existing Level Crossing Orders before the proposed disposal took place. HSE noted that should SCC lease part of the land to a heritage operator, a new Transport and Works Act Order would be required including the authority to cross public roads on the level and describe the necessary protective arrangements as the existing authority could not be transferred.

39. Network Rail stated in writing to ORR that it was willing to delineate a new boundary at Gobowen to satisfy HSE's requirements and that would not rule out the resumption of traffic movements between the disposed branch and the national network should the requirement materialise in future. Network Rail said it would be guided by HSE in respect of legal and technical issues regarding the level crossings on the route and some discussions had taken place. Network Rail confirmed orally to ORR that it would revoke the current Level Crossings Orders in place on the line prior to disposal of the land as stipulated by HSE. Network Rail said it would be for any new promoter of a Transport & Works Act Order to reach agreement with Her Majesty's Rail Inspectorate regarding any appropriate measures for the future use the land by railway operators. ORR (as combined safety and economic regulator) considers that Network Rail's statement that it would revoke the current Level Crossings Orders in existence on the land satisfactorily addresses the concerns raised by HSE and therefore ORR does not consider it appropriate to attach a condition to its consent requiring the current Level Crossings Orders to be revoked prior to disposal of the land.

40. ATW said it was broadly supportive of SCC's proposals for the land and did not believe there were any plans, proposals or aspirations to resume scheduled rail passenger services from Oswestry to the national rail network.

41. CSRP considered that the infrastructure was still intact which allowed for the future connection of the line to the national railway network and the future operation of the line was part of the wider aspiration and plans of several organisations including heritage railways and tourism organisations.

Local authority strategies

42. SCC fully supported the proposed disposal, stating that it would facilitate a number of important developments in around Oswestry, including the redevelopment of the former railway land at Oswestry station, the development of National Cycle Network Route 31 and safeguard the possible operation of a heritage railway.

43. SCC considered that the proposed disposal would allow it to assume responsibility of the road over rail bridges and bring about an effective means of managing and maintaining the bridges as an integral part of the highway network. SCC said it intended to construct an access road across the line in accordance with planning permission obtained by Advantage West Midlands (a Government Regional Development Agency). SCC considered that it was therefore fundamental that the disposal should not be conditioned in any way which would prevent its plans from proceeding. SCC considered that it was the responsibility of the heritage rail operator to secure any necessary approvals if a level crossing were to be required on the land as part of any future rail project. SCC considered that the National Cycle Network Route 31 could be accommodated within the branch line and expected any future rail operator to accommodate the presence of the cycle track within SCC's proposals.

44. SCC said that it would be prepared to allow its chosen heritage railway operator to have use of the entire length of the branch line and this could potentially open up the future use of the branch line to commercial freight traffic from the quarry.

45. ORR received a response from Advantage West Midlands which stated that the disposal would facilitate a number of regeneration projects in the Oswestry area including the provision of new health facilities. OBC and SCC also responded with similar comments.

46. OBC responded with similar comments to those raised by SCC above but added that in working with Advantage West Midlands and SCC, it had taken care to ensure that the land was protected so that it might retain its potential for use as a heritage railway and/or cycle route.

47. SCC said that a key objective of the Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan was the attempt to preserve and protect mineral rail routes. Within the plan area, Blodwel Quarry (near to Oswestry) had the

potential of being served by rail links. SCC considered that the transportation of minerals by rail would have advantages within the context of sustainable development. SCC considered that although the value of minerals did not currently provide an incentive to carry out major investment in rail facilities, there was considerable support for the use of rail to transport minerals and the economic circumstances could change.

48. Oswestry Borough Council (OBC) stated its Local Plan had been adopted to safeguard the route from Gobowen to Blodwel quarry from adverse forms of development and was keen to see the land used for the reinstatement of an active railway, whilst recognising the possibilities of the use of the land for cycling and uses related to the adjoining quarries.

49. The Department for Transport, British Transport Police, c2c Rail Limited, Great Northern Railway Limited (WAGN), London Eastern Railway Limited, Merseyrail Electrics 2002 Limited, Silverlink Train Services Limited and Virgin Cross Country Trains Limited responded with no comment or no objection to the proposed disposal.

Reasons for decision

50. ORR has considered carefully the arguments for disposal of the land and the objections and concerns about future railway use. ORR notes that the land has been classified as non-operational since 1994 and that Network Rail is not funded to reinstate the former branch line.

51. However, ORR considers from the responses received from the rail industry that it is possible that the land has future development potential in connection with railway use but that there is no evidence of freight requirements for the line in the foreseeable future. ORR notes Network Rail's statement in section 2 of its submission that a restrictive covenant will be placed on the land to restrict its uses to those that are cycle or rail related. ORR therefore considers that the proposed disposal to SCC would not preclude future use of the land for heritage or rail freight purposes and therefore ORR considers that in granting consent to Network Rail to dispose of the land, the users of railway services are protected.

52. ORR also notes the statement from SCC that it would be prepared to allow a heritage railway operator to use the entire length of the branch line and that this could potentially open up the future use of the branch line to commercial freight traffic. ORR therefore considers that in the absence of other plans to invest in the land for freight purposes its decision is consistent with its section 4 duties to promote the carriage of passengers and goods to the extent that it is economically practicable to do so.

53. ORR notes the comments from SRHT and CSRP that a protective covenant should be included in the disposal documentation in connection with railway purposes and that existing railway rights should be protected. ORR considers that the inclusion of such a covenant may jeopardise the deal and subsequently the proposed wider regeneration benefits in the Oswestry area.

ORR therefore considers that the inclusion of a restrictive covenant in the disposal documentation would not be in the public interest.

54. ORR also notes that the disposal would provide wider regeneration benefits such as the provision of new health care facilities in the Oswestry area through the proposals set out by Advantage West Midlands and supported by OBS and SCC. As a Regional Development Agency, Advantage West Midlands promotes sustainable economic development and therefore ORR considers that consenting to the disposal is also in accordance with its own section 4 duty to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

55. Furthermore, in granting its consent to this disposal, ORR has had regard to the totality of its statutory duties under section 4 of the Railways Act 1993 (as amended) and in particular to section 4(1)(a) and 4(1)(b) referred to in paragraph 3(a)(ii) and 3(a)(iii) of the decision criteria in *“Land Disposal by Railtrack PLC: The Regulatory Arrangements”*; that is ORR’s duty to exercise its functions in the manner which it considers best calculated to:

“protect the interests of users of railway services”; and

“to promote the use of the railway network in Great Britain for the carriage of passengers and goods, and the development of that railway network, to the greatest extent that [it] considers economically practicable”.

56. ORR therefore consents to the disposal as described in Network Rail’s submission.

PROPOSED PROPERTY DISPOSAL

APPLICATION BY NETWORK RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED FOR
REGULATORY CONSENT UNDER CONDITION 26 OF NETWORK
LICENCE

1. PROPERTY	
Description	Branch line and structures located in north west Shropshire. The line runs from Gobowen via Oswestry to a quarry at Blodwell. The line is approx 8 miles long. The transfer of the line will include all of Network Rail's land ownership along the branch line, with no connection with the mainline at Gobowen being included within any transfer. It will therefore have no effect on current operations at Gobowen, this location remains 'live' for freight activity.
Plan(s) No(s).	59623/1 - 16
Ordnance survey co-ordinates	330538, 332867 to 325371, 323080
Photographs(if attached)	None.
2. PROPOSAL	
Type of disposal	Freehold.
Person taking disposal	Shropshire County Council.
Proposed use/scheme	The proposed use is for a cycleway with a restrictive covenant to be placed on alternative uses apart from those that are rail related. Network Rail are aware that an aim of Shropshire County Council is to possibly lease part of the line after they've purchased it to one or other of the local railway heritage undertakings.
Access arrangements	The line runs predominantly through open countryside.
Replacement rail facilities (if appropriate)	None.

Rail benefits	None.
Non-rail benefits	There are a number of bridges and level crossings along the route which currently represent a maintenance liability to Network Rail with the line having been disused for well over ten years and being heavily overgrown with vegetation in places.
3. TIMESCALES	
Comments on timescales	The line will be sold asap.

4.	RAILWAY SITE ISSUES	
History of railway use	<p>Line has been disused for well over ten years.</p> <p>The disused tracks are still in place with any possibility of reopening the line being previously linked to freight traffic serving the quarry. Discussions with the Great Western Region have revealed that this is no longer considered a realistic proposition.</p>	
When last used for railway purposes	Well over ten years ago.	
Any railway proposals affecting the site since that last use	None.	
Impact on current railway proposals	No impact.	
Potential for future railway use	<p>The line has been disused for many years and is considered a liability to the operational departments.</p> <p>This sale should not preclude future rail use of the branch by another rail operator, indeed, a network connection (i.e. at Gobowen) will remain.</p>	
Any closure or network change issues	None.	
Whether land required to meet any TOC access needs	None.	

<p>Position as regards safety/operational issues on severance of land from railway</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The disposal does not include any requirement for new fencing of the boundary, because its location or the nature of the disposal is such that boundary demarcation is not needed. 2. The disposal is on a basis under which Network Rail has had due regard (where applicable) to impact of the disposal on lineside works, including railway troughing, signalling and their maintenance. The disposal is without prejudice to Network Rail's safety obligations, with which Network Rail will continue to comply. Condition 6 of Network Rail's network licence requires compliance with Railway Group Standards. These set out requirements for – amongst other things – fencing, access and signal sighting. In addition, the Railways (Safety Case) Regulations 2000 require Network Rail to have a "safety case" which, in turn, requires Network Rail to comply with Railway Group Standards as well as its own internal standards. This safety case also requires Network Rail continually to monitor changes to the risks arising from its operations and to introduce new control measures as appropriate.
--	---

5. PLANNING & CONTAMINATION

<p>Planning permissions/Local Plan allocation</p>	<p>The County Council are to promote the use of the line as a cycleway and shall progress accordingly.</p>
<p>Contamination/Environmental Issues (if any)</p>	<p>None.</p>

6. CONSULTATIONS		
	Regulatory External party, contact name and outcome:	None
	Railway Internal:	Land Clearance Certificate issued on 28/11/2005. Route Strategy Planning Group – Mike Tedstone, Route Planner has confirmed the approval of the RSPG for the land disposal. 8/9/2005.
	Railway External party, contact name and outcome:	Arriva Trains – “Not aware of any plans, proposals or aspirations to resume rail links from Oswestry to the outside world. We are aware that Shropshire CC has aspirations for the line and, in principle, are broadly supportive of its proposals provided EWS believe it has no further interest in the line”. 14/11/2005. EWS – “EWS's views on disposal, are that a takeover by a heritage railway project or in the last resort by a body such as Sustrans for a "temporary" cycleway are preferable to any sale for redevelopment or conversion to a road. Thus EWS's attitude to a proposal to dispose of the branch will be coloured by the likely future owner / use, albeit the ORR consultation which may eventually take place may also bring out other interest from rail industry parties not connected with EWS”. 25/1/06
	Other External party, contact name and outcome:	Cambrian Railways Trust
7.	INTERESTED PARTIES	NAME & E-MAIL ADDRESSES -with name and telephone numbers for any personal contact at main consultee(s)
	TOCs/FOCs	Arriva Trains (Wales) English, Welsh and Scottish Railway Limited
	LOCAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITIES	Shropshire County Council

	OTHER RELEVANT LOCAL AUTHORITIES		
	ORR	Executive, Network Rail Regulation Policy Manager, Network Rail Regulation Policy Executive, Network Rail Regulation Policy	

CONSULTEES

Arriva Trains Wales	London Eastern Railway Limited
British Transport Police	Merseyrail Electrics 2002 Limited
c2c Rail Limited	National Express Group PLC
Cambrian Railways Society Limited	Northern Rail Limited
Cambrian Railways Trust	Oswestry Borough Council
Chiltern Railway Company Limited	Rail Freight Group
Department for Transport	Rail Passengers Council
Direct Rail Services Limited	Shropshire County Council
Eurostar (UK) Limited	Shropshire Rail Agency
English Welsh & Scottish Railway Limited	Silverlink Train Services Limited
First Great Western Limited	South Eastern Trains Limited
First Great Western Link Limited	Virgin Cross Country Trains Limited
Freightliner Limited	Virgin West Coast Trains Limited
Freight Transport Association	Wessex Trains Limited
Gatwick Express Limited	
GB Railfreight Limited	
Great Northern Railway Limited	
Great North Eastern Railway Limited	
Hanson PLC	
Heathrow Express Limited	
Health & Safety Executive	
Hull Trains Limited	