

Manchester and East Midlands Rail Action Partnership (MEMRAP)

The Cheshire Cheese, Buxton- 3rd July, 7.30pm,

Meeting No.6

Attendees: Robin Greenwood, Stephen Chaytow, John Harpur, Janet Miller, Derek Bodey, Jane Taylor.

Apologies: Bill Woolley, Dave Shaw, Ian Clark, Steve Jones, Tina Heathcote, Mike Rose

- **Minutes from Meeting No.5 on 10th June 2019**

Agreed and confirmed as a fair record.

- **Actions Arising – covered as part of the main agenda**

- **Reports from Recent Meetings**

- **Peak Rail – 13th June:** RG, JM, JH, SC met with Paul Tomlinson, Martin Gadsby, Jackie Statham
- SC has a set of notes from the meeting: meeting discussion points included:
- With Peak rail as junior partner, main Peak Rail control over quarries is retention of “ransom strip” at Rowsley South
- Concerns over stated general opposition to any passenger service, whether as impediment to quarry or competition for a heritage service – fear of loss of entire project
- Uncertainty over Buxton access and state of discussions with the developer
- Status of 1860s order, could still be valid, but in practice a new TWA would be required
- Challenge of relocating the Monsal Trail with Park approval viewed by Peak Rail in similar way to MEMRAP
- Benefits of scheme to move even more of quarry output by rail
- Overall “do-minimum” approach with high quality rail running only at 25mph
- Uncertainty of the situation concerning the replacement of the bridge over the river and A6 at Rowsley. Considerable engineering challenge.
- **Peak National Park – Joint exploration of the Monsal Trail – 19th June – RG, JM, SC with Tim Nicholson and 4 Park colleagues (JM has more detailed notes)**
- **MEMRAP** wish to record gratitude for courtesy and help received from the National Park
- TM’s help and collaboration matched by disapproval of re-instatement proposals from his junior colleagues, MEMRAP agreed it was understandable - why railway with planning issues?
- Questions raised about possible conditions of £2.5m grant for 2011 tunnel restoration
- Consultation of DfT (or DEFRA) website to find possible list of sites
- What bargaining or trading could be offered? Eg surrounding the A628 scheme for example
- Park is very much focused on environment, concerning conservation
- Possibly the light rail alternatives offer something more appealing to start with
- Focus would be to create something of equivalent interest and beauty
- Recognition of issues around SSSIs and concerns of Natural England to be involved
- Western end of trail offers an obvious alternative, but not available through narrower access
- TWA would give ownership to quarries (not lease) – how would link to Park work?
- Discussion about completeness of social, economic, environment to cover all scheme options
- DB mentioned discussion and possible interest from Blackwell Mill cycle hire owners, to shape the new trail proposal, if consortium has backing to succeed. Ruth George will meet them too
- **Peak Rail – 19th June, Open Meeting attended by MR, JM, DB, SC**
- JM has full notes of this meeting available.
- Consortium was discussed, however was not the main intention of the meeting
- Access problems at Buxton Station due to McCarthy and Stone uncertainty, re sale from Nestle
- Return of a Peak Rail presence to Buxton, probably in the autumn
- Heated debate about the fate of the Monsal Trail in any re-instatement

- **Derbyshire County Council** – 21st June – MR, SC with Chris Hegarty, Alastair Morley
- DCC are in a difficult situation. One rail resource was not replaced last autumn and a CRP colleague is long term sick at present,
- HS2 (Chesterfield – Sheffield spur) is making heavy demands on the council
- Resources are not available for this project, DCC has no appetite and recalls investment wasted in 2004 study
- Not forthcoming on status of consortium project, unclear about level of awareness
- Potential for conflict with bus provision (even Peak Rail service) and subsidy
- County provision of bus transport is complex, difficult and fragmented
- MR to stay in touch with them for potential next steps
- **Incorporation Proposals**
 - **MEMRAP has refined its preferred approach as follows:**
 - These regular meetings are an effective and practical management forum for steering the affairs of this campaigning initiative. These meetings continue to set and implement the ongoing strategy and daily agenda for MEMRAP
 - MEMRAP also notes that there is value to being able to show a well regulated public face to potential funders, well controlled, preparing and filing annual accounts, taking spending decisions and basic segregation of approval from payment. There is no further requirement to impose on those prepared to act as directors
 - Following the discovery that CICs are prevented by law from using consensual, rather than voting articles, the decision had been taken to incorporate as a private, Ltd by guarantee company, with non-voting articles, as permitted by Companies House
 - Discussion on last matters to resolve around consensus operation to be concluded by JM and RG. Once that is done, the online process to incorporate can be undertaken
 - Nothing further on bank accounts or funding at this time, other than to note that completion is likely to facilitate future applications.
 - Discussion around resolving conflict as a voting alternative – meeting concerned that the group could find itself in a situation where it could not proceed
 - Action: JM / RG to conclude discussions on Articles content, to optimise for day to day operation of the group.
- **Strategy Day Agenda (22nd July)**

The meeting discussed, compared:

- SC, MR detailed agenda
- RG higher level proposal.

Agreed that detailed focus of SC/MR agenda is too prescriptive for this group and the more general approach should be used. Also the issue of a single group versus two smaller facilitated discussions:

- Advantage of large group getting to know all attendees
- However, less opportunity for spontaneous contribution in a large group
- Facilitated smaller groups may lead to more fluent exchanges
- Decision to go with larger group at outset, with fallback to break into smaller discussions if required
- Facilitators and note takers required for this purpose
- Action – All to work on taking the day's planning forward
- Aim of the day – to put more detail around the mission statement published on the web, more than just minutes if possible to produce a document, showing options, the journey and ideas on how to achieve this.

Extra Invitees:

- SC to put together a list and brief note of link to group
- Peak Rail – RG to decide on style of invite for them
- Issue of further invites discussed after meeting closed:
 - Tarmac – Chris Swan (Head of UK Rail) or Peter Butterworth (Limes Manager, Tunstead)
 - National Park – John Scott or Tim Nicholson

- Derbyshire CC – Chris Hegarty
- SC/RG to discuss, distribute agenda and resolve who is included and the invites
- As it is unlikely that these people could manage a full day, we could run a round up session in the last hour of the day, to give a further opportunity, making the group as open as possible to collaboration

RG to circulate agenda to include service levels, resources, who to involve and the approach. Light Rail could be an option for a first stage. Issue of avoiding the absolute “do-minimum” and quarry control of the operating company to lock out a public service.

- **No AOB**
- **Date of Next Meeting:** Monday 29th July, RG house, Matlock 7pm – 8.15