



All Party Parliamentary  
Light Rail Group



## APPLRG / pteg – Inquiry into Light Rail

### *Light Rail and City Regions: a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Mode of Transport*

#### Terms of Reference and Call for Evidence

**The All-Party Parliamentary Light Rail Group (APPLRG) and pteg are setting up an inquiry to consider progress in developing modern trams in the UK and to examine how barriers to tram scheme development and implementation can be tackled.**

It is five years since the Transport Select Committee carried out an inquiry into why tram systems in the UK cost so much more than on the continent. Whilst the government has approved several new schemes and invested in trams in the intervening period, it remains a fact that tram systems in the UK take longer and cost much more to implement. As the Select Committee revealed, the reasons are complex and inter-related.

With the impending General Election in mind, the All-Party Parliamentary Light Rail Group, with **pteg**, have decided to carry out their own investigation. The aim of the inquiry will be to refresh the evidence for modern trams and help identify what are the practical actions that can be taken to move tram systems forwards.

The Inquiry's remit will be:

- (a) To review current progress with light rail schemes in the UK
  - i) What has been the experience in delivering light rail schemes in the UK?*
  - ii) What have been the issues which have helped progress schemes or acted as barriers to their development?*
- (b) To compare the UK experience with progress on light rail schemes on the continent
  - i) What has been the experience in delivering light rail schemes on the continent?*
  - ii) What are the common issues and barriers, and how have these been addressed?*
  - iii) What are the key lessons from Europe in progressing light rail?*
- (c) To examine current UK government policy towards light rail
  - i) Where have we got to on government light rail policy?*
  - ii) What are challenges for light rail in the current and future policy context?*
  - iii) What has changed since the Transport Select Committee Report of 2004?*
  - iv) What might we expect of future governments?*
- (d) To consider the opportunities and risks in developing light rail systems in the UK
  - i) What are the risks involved in developing light rail in the UK?*
  - ii) How are these currently addressed? Are there better ways of addressing risk?*
  - iii) What are opportunities that light rail offers?*

(e) To examine how a fairer, more effective and efficient framework could be established for the appraisal, development and implementation of modern tram schemes in the UK.

*i) What can be done to take forward modern tram schemes?*

*ii) How can government, promoters and industry work better together?*

The focus is primarily on modern trams rather than ultra light rail, LRT systems (like the DLR or Tyne and Wear) or tram train – though by its nature, the inquiry will no doubt touch on these systems.

Interested parties should submit evidence by **7<sup>th</sup> October 2009** to [matt.brunt@pteg.net](mailto:matt.brunt@pteg.net), clearly marking submissions 'APPLRG inquiry' in the subject heading.

### Guidance for submitting written evidence

Written evidence should consist of a **self-contained memorandum** accompanied by a covering letter. Evidence should be presented **as concisely as possible** - a limit of 2,000 words is requested. Further information may be appended to the memorandum that is appropriately referenced.

The covering letter should contain the following :

- the **name and contact details** of the persons or organisation submitting the evidence;
- **any request to give oral evidence**; and
- any request that the committee treat the whole, or part, of the written evidence as **confidential**, with reasons for the request.

The memorandum should contain the following information:

- an **executive summary** of the main points made in the submission;
- a **brief introduction** to the submitter, perhaps explaining their area of expertise;
- any **factual information** the submitter has to offer from which the inquiry might be able to draw conclusions, or which could be put to other witnesses for their reactions; and
- any **recommendations for action** by the Government or others which the submitter would like the inquiry to consider for inclusion in its report

Please make use of paragraph numbering to assist in referencing in the memorandum; and please make sure sources of information are accurately referenced.

Written submissions may be published on the internet as part of the Inquiry's work, unless requested not to.

### **Further Information**

1. The Inquiry Panel is as follows: Paul Rowen MP (Chair) (Rochdale), Tom Harris MP (Glasgow South), Graham Stringer MP (Manchester Blackley), Lord Peter Bowness, and one other tbc.

2. The Inquiry Panel will meet three times to consider evidence and hear from interested parties at the House of Commons. The Inquiry dates are: 27 October 2009, 3 November 2009 and 25 November 2009.

3. Written evidence and transcripts of the inquiry sessions can be found at the Inquiry Webhub at: <http://www.pteg.net/PolicyCentre/LRInquiry>

4. A report of the Inquiry's findings is intended to be published in early 2010.

**Media Enquiries:**

Jonathan Bray on 0113 251 7445 / 0781 904 1485

**Notes:**

The APPLRG is the All-Party Parliamentary Light Rail Group provides a mechanism to examine issues concerning light rail; to raise awareness of those issues among parliamentarians; to provide a forum for discussion and debate on those issues; and to generate recommendations for the government to improve light rail and ultra-light rail - see <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmallparty/register/memi372.htm>.

**pteg** represents the six Passenger Transport Executives which serve 11 million people in the largest urban areas outside London (see [www.pteg.net](http://www.pteg.net)).