

Policy Statement



# TRANSPORT

A transport policy for an  
independent Britain

**January 2010**

# **PUTTING BRITAIN BACK ON TRACK**

*A TRANSPORT POLICY FOR AN INDEPENDENT BRITAIN*

A POLICY STATEMENT

January 2010

## **Contents**

- Introduction**
  - 1. The Problem: Transport in a mess**
  - 2. UKIP's Vision: Executive Summary**
  - 3. Transport Examined: General Principles**
  - 4. Roads - Cars, Lorries and the Roads Network**
  - 5. Buses & Coaches**
  - 6. Trams, Trolley Buses and Light Rail**
  - 7. Taxis and Minicabs**
  - 8. Motorcycles**
  - 9. Pedal Cycles**
  - 10. Rail - The Rail Network: General Principles**
  - 11. Passenger Rail Franchises**
  - 12. Rail Freight**
  - 13. Underground and Subway Rail Networks ( London Tube etc )**
  - 14. Aviation - The Aviation Network: General Principles**
  - 15. Aviation Services ( Passenger Scheduled, Charters, Business Jets and Cargo freight services )**
  - 16. Maritime – The Maritime and Ports Network: General Principles**
- Appendix 1: Potential Rail Reopenings ( for discussion )**
- References**
- Acknowledgements**

## **Introduction**

Transport policy requires the very thing the British Government is so poor at: long term vision married to brave planning and genuine spending commitments.

Successive Governments, driven by malign short-termist Treasury interference, have failed to develop the transport infrastructure, have allowed road congestion to become intolerable and victimized the motorist, the railways to become overcrowded and overpriced, aviation to grow piecemeal, and Britain's maritime strength and port capacity to fade. The consequences of such dithering are that the country's economy and quality of life is suffering day in, day out.

Whilst France celebrates 25 years of its admirable TGV high speed rail services, Britain struggled to complete barely 70 miles of high speed rail track after 13 years of indecision, whilst the Government has wasted years without building more UK high speed rail lines, despite a growing need and consensus of support.

Neither is transport policy noted for its consistency. Transport targets are introduced, lauded, abandoned, and forgotten. Integrated transport is demanded, played down, dropped. High profile tram or rail schemes promoted, abandoned, reconsidered. Whilst the 30 year horizons contained in the Aviation White Paper are laudatory, the Government's record is too often one of dither, delay and damage.

Transport goals to reduce traffic and emissions are ignored by a succession of other Government decisions such as local hospital, school, court and police station closures, along with the destruction of local high streets and community facilities, and their replacement by out of town shopping and leisure facilities accessible only by car. Meanwhile there is a lack of vision when it comes to influencing transport needs - incentivising flexi working could save billions in infrastructure costs.

The Government would do well to remember that there are major costs in not investing too. The West Coast Rail Line project upgrade has involved years of dislocation for passengers and freight, and has gone 5 times over budget to £9 billion. This suggests a faster new high speed rail line would have been preferable in the first place.

The costly expansion of the rambling Heathrow could be avoided with a new Thames Estuary offshore airport and save billions more in connecting infrastructure such as Crossrail, whilst offering a much better solution. When it comes to transport policy, the Government should adopt the Chindits motto: 'the bravest actions are the safest'.

UKIP lays down here a bold and long term vision for transport that will transform the quality of life of the British people and enhance their economic prosperity. It can do so by bringing to bear the billions a year released from cash contributions to the EU and relieving us of suffocating EU laws and red tape. Only UKIP offers both the vision and the means to transform transport in Britain.

## **1. The Problem: Transport in a mess**

**50 years on, M1 highway to heaven is going nowhere as congestion costs will rise £25 Billion by 2025.**

( [http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry\\_sectors/transport/article6897271.ece](http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/transport/article6897271.ece) )

**“Foreign lorries threaten lives” says police chief**

( [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/real\\_story/6081596.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/real_story/6081596.stm) )

**Uninsured drivers get lower fines but are killing four people a week**

( <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article4535423.ece> )

**Hearse clamped on way to a funeral**

( <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1579488/Hearse-clamped-on-way-to-funeral.html> )

**Government cuts back promises to ease rail overcrowding by reducing new carriages order that would have eased the problem.**

( <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/standard/article-23668792-government-u-turn-on-rail-overcrowding-pledge.do> )

**Case for high speed rail grows**

( <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2186708/Case-for-high-speed-rail-grows.html> )

**London is out of airspace**

( <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article3466785.ece> )

**Councils generated a staggering £1.9 billion in parking fines and fees during 2009.**

( [http://www.24dash.com/news/Local\\_Government/2010-01-04-Councils-generate-1-9-billion-in-parking-fines-and-fees](http://www.24dash.com/news/Local_Government/2010-01-04-Councils-generate-1-9-billion-in-parking-fines-and-fees) )

**EU air safety agency puts jets in danger**

( <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-415280/EU-air-safety-agency-puts-jets-danger.html> )

**Brussels to overturn UK ban on EU super lorries which will cost the UK millions to strengthen bridges and change access ramps and slip roads.**

( <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article6860143.ece> )

## **2. UKIP's Vision: Executive Summary**

### **General principles**

- UKIP believes people have a right to readily available, frequent, reliable quality transport, both private and public, at an acceptable cost
- UKIP are not in favour of persecuting the motorist, and want a well organised and well maintained road network
- UKIP opposes 'green taxes' and believes in choice and market solutions, but accepts that the true costs of transport, including wider external costs, should be born by users, where feasible
- We will restore direct democracy to local transport decisions
- UKIP will use immigration and planning policies to reduce stress on infrastructure
- Only UKIP can invest the billions saved from leaving the EU (£6.4 billion 2010-11). in British and not EU transport infrastructure projects. UKIP anticipates £3 billion of this will be invested in transport every year, balanced between transport modes.

### **On specific policies, UKIP will:**

#### **Roads**

- Use funds released from leaving the EU on select new bypasses, road improvements, safety and widening schemes
- introduce a 'Britdisc' (vignette) on foreign lorries not paying anything for British roads, and crack down on 'killer lorries' (overladen or dangerous)
- give back a 'Windfall Return' on fuel duty above a set world oil price, where windfall Government receipts are returned to the motorist over time through fuel tax cuts
- oppose EU proposals for raising the Gross Laden Weight ( GLW ) for lorries to 60 Tonnes and oppose Longer Heavier Vehicles (LHVs) of unwieldy 25 metres. We will encourage a long term programme of shifting freight to rail for longer distances, as the majority of the British public (86%) want
- repeal EU directives such as The Working Time Directive and the new Road Transport Directive, Daylight Running Directive and Control of Noise and Vibration Regulation
- oppose EU's Galileo satellite 'spy in the sky' technology programme for road pricing
- require new insurance discs to also be displayed on windscreens to tackle over 1 million uninsured drivers
- end the 'highway robbery' of unfair fines on motorists by returning to first principles on car parking ( to keep traffic moving not be a tax generator ) and make speed cameras democratically accountable, and remove them where they serve no use.
- remove the £15 surcharge on motorists for minor offences such as not wearing seatbelts for compensation to victims of crime as a nonsense
- support electric vehicles and the battery charging infrastructure they need
- consult on raising the motorway speed limit to 80mph to suit modern reality
- legislate to introduce a crime of Vehicular Manslaughter, where for those whose excessively dangerous driving makes death on the road a near certainty
- use US-style traffic schools for the education of bad drivers

- oppose the metrification of British roads and speed limits
- introduce a simple form of 'bus franchising', particularly for local and rural buses, to deliver better value for the taxpayer and eliminate unfair competitive practices
- allow councils to offer discount public transport cards (rail/bus) not free bus passes
- invest in tram/Light Rail schemes where they have strong local support
- seek to improve the quality of taxi services but without excessive regulation
- support measures to improve motorcycle safety whilst supporting its freedoms. We will oppose EU proposals for daytime lights for all vehicles as dangerous
- support responsible pedal cycling but have zero tolerance on dangerous practices such as running red lights. We will consult on proposals for cyclists to display a cheap 'Cycledisc' to deter theft and give 3rd party insurance for car damage.

### **Railways**

- support a high quality, fast, reliable, affordable and extensive rail network
- invest in 3 new 200 mph plus high-speed rail lines: London-Newcastle (with other sections e.g. Edinburgh-Glasgow, and to West Coast Main Line), London-Bristol (for Wales)- Exeter, and fast link Birmingham to Great Western Main Line. Other rail sections could become high speed in part
- improve passenger rail franchises by allowing longer franchise periods of 10-20 years depending on investment needs. We will remove micromanagement by bureaucrats and see that the Government directs but does not manage. We will make rail franchises work better for the consumer, reward successful operators and encourage more on-rail competition. We will democratise the rail franchise process so local people have a greater say over who wins franchise bids. We will want to see a return to distinctive railway brands, identities and services. We support a return to more comfortable train designs for modern trains such as the High Speed Train (HST2). We will abolish the penalty fares regime which too often persecutes honest rail users.
- expand the rail network by reopening select closed or underused rail lines where there is a strong case, and implement an 'unBeeching Report' to identify strong cases for re-opening lines where there is a modern day need. We enthusiastically support the 'Community Rail' initiative and micro franchising on smaller lines.
- introduce democratic control over rail engineering works by passengers and freight users to stop excessive engineering closures out of convenience not necessity
- consider strike free agreements for the national railway and/or the London Tube
- scrap the current £16 billion London Crossrail scheme and repay Government debt with the released resources. We will look at the most cost efficient options.
- return London's Circle Line to a circle - the complete circular service recently stopped
- invest in rail electrification projects to reduce oil dependence and improve services
- invest in an improved national rail freight network, providing capital funds for important new or reopened rail lines, such as a North-South freight line, proper rail access to ports, and freight concentration depots, yards, interchanges or sidings.
- On Underground/Subway Networks, consider extensions or new lines where strong case and consider franchising trains and tracks as one, replacing wasteful PPPs.

## **Aviation**

- support the case for a new London Airport in the Thames Estuary East of London, linked with high-speed rail via the existing Channel Tunnel Rail Link to London and motorway connections in order to relieve the pressure on London Heathrow. We strongly oppose a sixth terminal and third runway at Heathrow as leading to unacceptable and blighting aircraft movements over London (745,000 p.a. with third runway). Oppose the (then unnecessary) expansion of Stansted and Gatwick
- accept aviation is set to grow substantially, despite fuel costs, and are not opposed to aviation growth driven by the market, as long as air passengers meet their external costs, such as noise and intrusion. We oppose AGW carbon-based emissions arguments against growth and green taxes on aviation
- rebalance true costs of flying, introduce a Local Sales Tax (replacing EU's VAT) on aviation fuel and potentially on new aircraft (currently untaxed and equivalent to EU subsidy of £30 billion p.a.). Once introduced, scrap Air Passenger Duty (APD).
- support improved competition between airports and support BAA selling off one of its 3 London Airports, and other airports in close proximity to each other such as Glasgow and Edinburgh. UKIP backs development of regional airports, including for business jets.
- allow local authorities to set reasonable limits on flight movements and alternating runway usage, whilst decisions to build and expand airports would remain a national Parliamentary decision.
- reduce food air freight by promoting UK local produce, while supporting free trade and consumer choice
- ensure night flights pay their true costs in terms of noise and disruption, and seek to persuade mail companies to operate alternative night train services.

## **Maritime and Ports**

- Given UKIP's shift towards greater global trade and a revival in UK manufacturing, support the growth of non-Channel ports and address shortages of UK port capacity
- introduce a national strategy for ports, as argued for by the Transport Select Committee, and a comprehensive freight distribution plan. This strategy will consider the desirability of foreign ownership of UK ports requiring major investment with different non-UK priorities. We will assist ports to pay for substantial new road and rail infrastructure through recovered EU contributions
- examine innovative port options such as for Orkney or the West of England, and improve vital ferry services to the UK's offshore islands, e.g. the Outer Hebrides.
- support inland waterways growth, particularly freight, under a strategic national plan. Oppose British Waterways privatisation for putting property gains before freight. Incentivise working wharves and protect 'endangered' waterways
- insist on the top quality training and expertise of seamen on ships using British waters
- encourage a serious return to UK-based shipbuilding.

### **3. Transport Examined: General Principles**

3.1. UKIP believes people have a right to readily available, frequent, reliable quality transport, both private and public, and at an acceptable cost (including for flexible walk up journeys), and that this is essential to their quality of life and enjoyment of individual freedoms. UK Independence firmly believes in choice.

3.2. We are not in favour of persecuting the motorist. We recognise that the car is often indispensable for large numbers of the population, particularly in rural areas, and we are in favour of a well organised and well maintained road network. Reducing congestion through more attractive alternative non-car choices benefits the motorist.

3.3. UKIP does accept however, that there is a balance between rights and responsibilities in transport, and that the true costs of transport choices, i.e. those wider external costs, should be born directly by the user, where feasible.

3.4. UKIP generally prefers market solutions and supports competition and not widespread Government intervention and bureaucratic management, but understands that markets can often be 'rigged', such as by hidden subsidies.

3.5. Where it is necessary to reduce transport demand in order to curtail congestion, UKIP believes this must be done in a way that increases choice, through better alternatives, not disadvantages users. UKIP believes in promoting flexi time and location to ease rail and road overcrowding. Employers would be encouraged to offer employees a choice of working hours, e.g. 8.00am-4.30pm and 10am-6pm, to spread the morning peak rush hour (the evening peak is spread out already by late working, socialising etc).

3.6 UKIP believes the Government must weigh the benefits of incentivising less travel against the massive infrastructural costs of providing for ever larger numbers. Better and more widely available electronic communications such as broadband and teleconferencing should be developed to help reduce travel needs.

3.7 Whilst UKIP believes in protecting the environment, we will not overplay the environmental case in such a way as to damage people's lives. We oppose additional new taxation masquerading as 'green' taxes, and token or spiteful attacks such as those aimed at penalising 4x4 vehicle users.

3.8 We will restore democratic choice and responsibility into transport decisions, particularly at the local council level. We fully support decision making on local schemes being decided at local levels - and UKIP will give local councils control of local business rates and retain a share of a Local Sales Tax (LST) to replace the EU-imposed VAT.

Local councils would have greater control over local spending therefore for transport use, and could decide and help fund local rail, bus, tram and road schemes, as desired. Wasteful and remote EU-inspired regional government will be abolished and their transport responsibilities reassigned to counties.

3.9 UKIP believes that historically Governments displayed gross short-termism and misjudgement in the mass railway closures (the 1960s 'Beeching cuts'). Under the Beeching Report, many railway lines were closed despite being economic or meeting important transport needs. Today, many closed railway lines would have a useful modern day role, as many communities they served have greatly expanded, and travel and commuting patterns dramatically changed. UKIP believes it is time to expand the UK wide rail network and restore rail lines to divert passenger and freight traffic away from congested roads. UKIP will reopen select closed or underused rail lines for passenger and freight trains where there is a strong case for doing so.

3.10 UK Independence will vigorously oppose any policy of rail closures or 'bustitution' (replacing trains with buses), support 'Community Rail' routes, micro franchising (locally let small franchises) and recognise wider benefits through rail support payments.

3.11 UKIP believes the planning system must take proper regard of transport impacts of developments within such a finite and often crowded landmass. UKIP would control and manage immigration to return Britain to a stable population, as the UK had for 15 years prior to 1994 and particularly of EU migration, with its massive impact on the numbers living and travelling within the UK.

3.12 Only UKIP can offer the benefits to UK transport, such as freedom from excessive regulatory burdens and fiscal and national budgetary constraints. The savings from leaving the EU, a net saving of £6.4 billion a year in cash contributions alone, will be made partly available for capital investment funds, as will the additional Government receipts from reduced red tape flowing through to tax receipts. UKIP anticipates that £3 billion a year from these funds would be dedicated to transport projects across all modes<sup>1</sup>.

#### **4. Roads - Cars, Lorries and the Roads Network**

4.1. The UK Independence Party will invest in a better maintained, safer and enhanced road network. UKIP believes the main network is complete but that major schemes are needed to widen motorways and major roads, including new toll roads which UKIP supports, and schemes to select bypasses. UKIP will also invest in safety enhancements such as road straightening, road widening, better engineering, removing obstructions, adding new overtaking sections, creating 'flow improver' lanes and safer junctions.

4.2. UKIP opposes the use of satellite-based 'spy in the sky' technology such as the EU's Galileo programme for road vehicles as an unacceptable breach of privacy.

But UKIP will allow non-satellite based road pricing for major new roads or parallel lanes, where the funds pay for maintaining roads, and where the system causes minimum delay to vehicles, such as on the M6 Toll. UKIP will give local authorities the independence to decide on local road charging schemes, such as congestion charging or bridge tolls.

4.3. UKIP abhors the widespread ignoring of motoring insurance and of taxes. It is estimated by the Department for Transport that one million motorists have no insurance, tax or driving licence and are nine times more likely to crash. Those drivers are six times more likely to drive an unroadworthy vehicle. The cost of crashes involving uninsured drivers is £500 million a year, adding £30-60 to each insurance policy<sup>2</sup>. The Motor Insurers' Bureau, who covers claims from those hit by uninsured drivers, found drivers without insurance were responsible for 36,000 crashes and 27,000 injuries in 2006<sup>3</sup>.

4.4 UKIP will require a second disc to be displayed in vehicle windscreens: an up to date insurance disc provided direct to customers by insurers, and of a similar design to the tax ( /MOT pass ) disc. The combination of these two discs will allow police or traffic wardens a quick visual guide to untaxed, uninsured or unsafe vehicles. UKIP will replace the current feeble penalties with strong disincentives for uninsured and untaxed drivers.

4.5 UK Independence is deeply concerned at the reduction in traffic police, for example from 8,900 to 6,500 over the ten years to 2002. This is allowing an increase in drunken driving<sup>4</sup>, as well as failing to deter uninsured and untaxed drivers, unsafe driving, and the growth of unregistered as well as defective vehicles. UKIP wants to see a meaningful increase in traffic policing, by re-establishing and strengthening police traffic divisions.

4.6 UKIP fully appreciates the pain that rising fuel taxes can impose on drivers, particularly in rural areas. UK Independence will be sensitive to fuel price increases, and will rebalance fuel duty and UK North Sea oil tax proceeds. We will give back a 'Windfall Return' on fuel duty above a set world dollar oil price, where windfall Government receipts are returned to the motorist over time through fuel tax cuts.

4.7 UKIP strongly believes in responsible, safe driving and a better balance between true safety measures and unnecessary or merely revenue-raising distractions. We believe that road safety cannot be improved by prescription but by education and a reasoned approach. UKIP recognises that safe speeds depend on the circumstances, and may often be less than a given speed limit or occasionally more than it.

4.8 UKIP is in favour of educating motorists to the dangers of driving, and supports the use of speed awareness courses and driving improvement courses as alternatives to points on licences. We will encourage advanced driving courses to improve overall standards, and support US-style 'Traffic Schools' for bad drivers. Driving skills and safety responsibility should be taught at school level, using simulators. Younger drivers just passing their tests should be encouraged onto the 'Pass Plus' scheme or advanced driver training with the incentive of much reduced premiums from insurance companies.

4.9 We will commission studies into the impact of drugs on driving, both legal and illegal drugs, such as antihistamines. UKIP will introduce a new ‘Vehicular Manslaughter’ offence for those whose excessively dangerous driving makes death on the road a near certainty.

4.10 In order to save lives, UKIP will consult on proposed restrictions on young ‘novice drivers’ driving passengers late at night. This is based on the Transport Select Committee’s proposals to prohibit the carrying of passengers aged 10-20 years between the hours of 11pm (or 12pm) and 5am, as half of those killed at night are 17-25 years old. This would use a graduated licence scheme, and better education<sup>5</sup>.

4.11 On speed limits, UKIP will have a comprehensive review of speed limits nationally, and update the methodology, presumptions and approach of the Government’s Speed Policy Branch. We will introduce a greater range of speed limits and variable limits at different times of day and/or conditions (such as outside schools) where possible to suit driving conditions and to replace a highly unsatisfactory chaotic system of speed limits.

4.12 We propose raising limits to 80 mph on motorways for cars to reflect realistic cruising speeds, whilst cutting speeds from the standard A road limit of 60 mph on unsatisfactory roads, whilst raising others from 30 or 40 mph where road conditions allow this. UKIP believes this can improve safety by reducing driver frustration and overcompensation on faster road sections. We will allow local councils to introduce 20 mph limits, preferably on a variable limit basis for temporary hazards ( to encourage respect for limits ), where there are schools or vulnerable pedestrian traffic.

4.13 For safety reasons and enhancing traffic flows, UKIP supports the raising of speed limits on 7.5 tonne trucks to 50mph on single carriageway roads, and to 60mph on dual carriageways, a truck limit of 65 mph not the EU speed limiter speed of 56 mph, and would base truck limits on coach limits.

4.14 UKIP would allow local authorities to remove ‘traffic calming’ infrastructure, such as speed humps and chicanes, from main distributor roads and bus routes, and use more controlled speed zones, if justified. Whilst ‘clutter’ signage would be reduced, all speed/safety cameras should have suitably clear warning signs at set distances ahead.

4.15 UKIP welcomes innovation in traffic management, and will allow trials of US style High Occupancy Lanes (HOVs) and turning on red - for vehicles in a left hand lane at a red light. But UKIP opposes use of hard shoulders for normal traffic as being potentially dangerous.

4.16 UKIP accepts that some speed (‘safety’ cameras) achieve valuable reductions in collisions and casualties through enforcing speed limits, but is deeply unhappy at the misuse of a safety device as a revenue raising item and the lack of democratic accountability in many Safety Camera Partnerships. 2.3 million drivers were fined in 2005/06 , and 8 and 7 million drivers have been caught for speeding since 1996.

One Gatso camera on the M11 in Woodford Essex is reported to have raised £2.3 million over 5 years, flashing 38,243 drivers who broke the 50mph speed limit<sup>6</sup>.

4.17 UKIP calls for a national debate on speed cameras. On the one hand, we note evidence such as PA Consulting and University College London report into 4000 camera sites over 38 partnerships which showed a 42% reduction in Killed and Seriously Injured (KSIs) over 4 Years - saving 100 lives and 1,745 casualties ( after allowing for general trend ) and a reduction of 70% in vehicles exceeding the speed limit<sup>7</sup>.

4.18 On the other, recent research from Swindon Borough Council, where cameras have been removed, shows a fall of 50% in ticket revenue but no fatalities between 1 August 2009 until 31 October 2009 despite six accidents - two described as 'serious' and four as 'slight', whereas from August 1 2008 to 31 October 2008 there was one fatal and four 'slight injury' accidents on roads covered by the cameras<sup>8</sup>.

4.19 UKIP is concerned with the management and control of speed cameras, and would abolish income-based 'taxation' targets, and would promote county-based safety camera partnerships that are fully democratic and accountable.

4.20 Partnerships should have a remit confined entirely to safety concerns and not revenue raising, must consult locally before setting up a speed camera, consider seriously the use of vehicle activated signs as alternatives, and only install cameras on safety grounds from evidence by senior local experts /witnesses or accident records. Speed cameras would have to display the correct speed visibly on the approach side of the actual camera. Cameras would also be used to monitor proper insurance and tax (MOT) discs on cars for safety reasons.

4.21 We find those policemen convicted of serious speeding offences to be totally hypocritical and would ensure that any policemen convicted of such offences are severely punished.

4.22 UKIP will vigorously oppose metrification, such as replacing miles with kilometres, as part of creating an EU State. UKIP welcomes an AA Populus survey which found that 64% motorists strongly disagree with calls for speed limits to be shown in kilometres per hour, 63% being against distances in kilometres, with only 8% supporting going metric, with the strongest opposition was from younger age groups: 83% of 18-24 year olds were opposed to kilometre speed limits and 79% opposed to kilometre distances. UKIP represents the overwhelming majority on using miles<sup>9</sup>.

4.23 For car parking and local road management, UKIP will ensure a return to first principles on parking: on the street, parking charges should be to keep traffic moving and assist safety by removing obstructions, not be an alternate local tax.

4.24 Already, councils raised £1.9 billion in parking fees and fines in 2009 with some doubling amounts raised from motorists.

Financial returns from 400 authorities for 2008-09 showed a 13% rise compared with 2005-06, with North Wiltshire's increasing parking revenues from £752,000 to £1.6 million, and North Tyneside with a 94% hike<sup>10</sup>.

4.25 Parking offences are now the largest cause of motoring offences - equal to a staggering 7.7 million penalty notices a year<sup>11</sup>. UKIP abhors the extortion of motorists and the often aggressive and unreasonable activity by clamping companies and parking enforcement agencies. One of many examples was the clamping of a hearse on the way to a funeral, with £200 demanded to release the vehicle<sup>12</sup>. This conduct resembles legalised highway robbery.

4.26 Independent Parking Adjudicator figures show that 8 out of 10 fines are overturned on appeal, which indicates serious unfairness in the system. UKIP welcomes new guidance on wheel clamping in London which limits clamping to dangerous parking and drivers who consistently refuse to pay fines as a model for other authorities<sup>13</sup>.

4.27 Traffic wardens are tasked to put revenue raising targets before anything else, and are rewarded or penalised by employers on revenue raising performance, not on their public service. This is clearly wrong. With UKIP policies to give local authorities greater control over local rates and local taxes, the temptation to use drivers as a *milch cow* will be reduced over time.

4.28 UKIP will legislate to enforce a standard framework contract across the UK, to crack down on such practices. Reasonableness will be legally enshrined - such as not issuing tickets for quick stops, or to delivery vehicles trying to deliver to awkward locations. The traffic flow principle - that tickets should only be issued for on street parking where that is unsafe, obstructive or impeding flows - should be enshrined in all contracts, though managed flexibly by local authorities. UKIP supports sensitively designed new car parks in towns or cities.

4.29 Within this framework to ensure fairness and resist abuse, UKIP would allow local authorities independence over parking decisions to suit local needs, priorities and Local Transport Plans. Local councils would also be able to specify the level of car parking required by new developments not through centrally imposed restrictions, and UKIP's proposed new County Health Boards be allowed to withdraw hospital parking charges, especially for emergency visits to patients. UKIP would also give local authorities the powers to set the price of car parking at local supermarkets, to even up the impact of out of town supermarkets on high streets, but the retailer will keep the proceeds not the council.

4.30 The latest new tax on motorists - a £15 surcharge on top of spot fines and fixed penalty notices given for minor offences such as not wearing seat belts to help compensate crime victims is ridiculous. UKIP would scrap all such surcharges.

4.31 UKIP will reduce the length of roadworks and of road closures following incidents. We will legislate to require proper coordination of utilities and phone/cable companies accessing roads. Road authorities would 'hire' the roads to utilities at agreed hire costs, which reflect congestion and disruption costs, to incentives the quickest and least disruptive roadworks. UKIP would also amend Association of Chief Police Officers guidance on road closures to minimise unnecessary delays and severe inconvenience. For example, the lone Batman protestor who caused a 12 mile jam on the M25 in August 2008 should have been swiftly removed.

4.32 UKIP would allow bus lanes to be used by fast electric delivery vehicles, High Occupancy Vehicles (at least 4 people) and by motorcycles (as now) where safe to do so. UKIP would review existing and proposed bus lanes for their usage, impact on other traffic and on local shops and facilities, and increase local authority powers to stop or remove them where costs outweigh benefits. Bus lanes should be designed to stop short of junctions and allow other traffic proper space to turn left safely, and traffic islands should not be placed between bus and other lanes for safety reasons. Bus stops should not be designed to cause deliberate delays such as kerb build outs - this is a ridiculous anti motorist measure.

### **Lorry measures**

5.1 UKIP is concerned at the safety record of large lorries, particularly non-UK lorries. HGVs/LGVs ( Heavy / Longer Goods Vehicles ) are now responsible for more fatalities than any other work vehicle and with one quarter of fatalities caused by HGVs breaking speed limits. The Highways Agency reports HGVs are involved in 1 in 5 of all accidents, and 1 in 3 fatalities<sup>14</sup>.

5.2 The specific dangers brought by booming numbers of foreign lorries owing to EU rules and the end of proper border checks is a major concern. The DFT report that 12,000 foreign lorries are in Britain a day alongside 95,000 British lorries on UK roads<sup>15</sup>. In the last five years, accidents involving lorries coming into Britain have risen by almost 50% ( DFT figures ) and 1366 people in 2006 were killed or injured on British roads in collisions with lorries from abroad (44 killed and 1,322 injured)<sup>16</sup>.

5.3 The BBC's One Story programme reported that police chiefs believe foreign lorries "threaten lives", by overworking, using vehicles with serious faults and by overloading. The Association of Chief Police Officers Chief spokesman Superintendent Geraint Anwyl said EU expansion made the situation worse, "as we've seen accession countries coming into the EU, the offending rate is getting greater and greater"<sup>17</sup>.

5.4 They reported that a Czech driver who killed a man by driving on the wrong side of the road, and a Polish Driver's hours: "My record was 32 hours... I didn't understand the English road signs. I still don't. I came to the conclusion that sooner or later I would fall asleep behind the wheel killing somebody or killing myself."

5.5 The programme found at Dover and Holyhead on one day, of 206 vehicles pulled over, 77 vehicles were taken off the road because they were unsafe. Safety issues included rusty brakes about to fall off, excessive driving hours, dangerously overloaded vehicles, and bald tyres about to explode.

5.6 The excellent ITV documentary 'Killer Lorries' ( 31.3.08 ) revealed that foreign lorry drivers under financial pressure from employers to keep moving are four times as more likely to be driving while tired as UK drivers, and with blind spots on their left hand drive vehicles large enough to hide a family saloon. They also discovered dangerous loads, poor vehicle conditions, forged European HGV licences and weak UK deterrents. A senior manager with the Vehicle and Operators Services Agency ( VOSA ) concluded that despite extra funding they are fighting a losing battle. There are reports too of exhausted foreign lorry drivers dialling 999 to ask to be arrested so they can get some sleep without being fired by their bosses<sup>18</sup>.

5.7 UKIP supports British lorry drivers and recognises that UK drivers not only have to face unfair tax competition and higher fuel prices than non-UK competitors, but are being put out of business by excessive EU red tape ( the unnecessary EU Road Safety Directive for example ). It is unacceptable that many foreign lorries currently pay nothing for using UK roads. This is due to EU competition rules that forbid such charges. Thanks to the EU, British lorry drivers are going the same way as British fishermen, farmers and post offices

5.8 Out of the EU, to rebalance the playing field, UKIP will require a Swiss style Heavy Vehicle Fee / 'vignette', called a 'Britdisc', to be available on a journey, daily, weekly, monthly or annual basis, to be paid by all Non-UK registered freight vehicles over 3.5 tonnes for use of UK roads. There will be no Britdiscs required for UK registered lorries as they already pay high fuel costs. Previously similar proposals suggested by the Conservatives and then backed by the Labour Government were blocked by the EU. UKIP would use the proceeds of a new 'Britdisc' to significantly expand the VOSA's scale of operations. UKIP is disturbed over such serious safety dangers, and will introduce tough controls at all ports of entry on lorry safety, roadworthiness, loading and driver hours checks, and at weighing stations, with checks also for illegal immigrants, goods and drugs. Dangerous driving would lead to long prison sentences, and dangerous lorries and their cargoes be impounded.

5.9 UKIP however deeply regrets the move over time to heavier, larger and longer lorries. We believe that the UK's towns, villages and countryside cannot take the massive impact that 'juggernauts' impose on them, on roads often built for horse and carriages. Maximum lorry weights 50 years ago were a fraction of weights now.

5.10 Moreover, there are ever more unnecessary truck journeys. In the last 10 years, it is estimated by DEFRA that 'food miles' have increased by 15% - i.e. comparable food volumes travelling further to their destinations, and that there is a hidden £9 billion cost in such wasteful transport, mostly due to supermarket convenience<sup>19</sup>

5.11 Studies also suggest heavy lorries can cause road damage of up to 100,000 times cars which merely shine the surface<sup>20</sup> UKIP will seek to ensure that all vehicles pay their true and fair costs.

5.12 The EU is to blame for this relentless, undemocratically decided rise in heavy lorry sizes, spurred on by unseen lobbying interests, and often at the expense of rail. Indeed, as soon as the UK joined the EEC in 1972, the Campaign for Protection of Rural England (CPRE) had immediately to oppose the EEC raising lorry weights<sup>21</sup>.

5.13 UKIP strongly opposes the ever increasing road weight limit imposed by the EU, particularly raising the proposed Gross Laden Weight ( GLW ) for 'superlorries' to 60 Tonnes and is against Longer Heavier Vehicles ( LHVs ) of an unwieldy and unsafe 25 metres ( 27.3 yards ) in length.

5.14 This is around one third heavier and longer than existing vehicles, and this move will lead to a totally undesirable switch from rail back to roads, increasing lorry movements. Superlorries would also require substantial additional investment in bridge strengthening and changing access ramps and slip roads. Yet the EU plans to overturn the current UK ban on tests, allowing them to travel freely across all EU nations, regardless of their safety, economic or environmental implications<sup>22</sup>.

5.15 UKIP rejects the EU model as destructive and undesirable, and will offer a totally different vision. UKIP advocates - over a suitable long term period such as up to 30 years - a mass transfer of goods from large heavy goods vehicles to alternatives such as long distance rail, maritime and smaller, electric lorries to free major roads up for cars. This notice will allow companies and distributors to adjust and invest in alternatives over the long term. Over this period, all large lorries would be required to pay their true costs, including actual road damage, though there would be dispensations for exceptional cargoes.

5.16 Further, UKIP will review the existing 48 tonne limit and may reduce it for UK roads, and consider a ban on twin trailers, or require additional payment for road damage.

5.17 UKIP recognises that an overwhelming 86% of the UK population wants to see more freight on rail, and 67% oppose 'super lorries' (as above) , but which will undermine rail freight as they are road trains. A YouGov poll in 2003 showed 79% of people identified getting freight off roads and onto rail as a Government priority. In 2002/03, rail freight moved the equivalent of 5.6 million lorry journeys.

5.18 UKIP is under no illusion as to the costs, technical and planning issues arising from such a radical transfer, but considers the savings in road damage, congestion, necessary roadworks, delays to other users and damage to street furniture and underground pipes will be considerable. UKIP will reflect such cost savings in grants to build rail and maritime freight transfer depots, sidings and freight yards, and new freight routes.

5.19 UKIP is against misguided and baffling emissions charging, which penalises older vehicles and many businesses, and is now being introduced in cities such as London. UKIP will abolish such charging, but require new build vehicles to reduce emissions significantly.

5.20 To better utilise major roads and assist car drivers, UKIP will consult on the benefits of prohibiting lorries with speed limiters and other slow moving vehicles from overtaking on dual carriageways, major roads and motorways at certain times, bar for emergencies, and lane discipline for all improved. Regarding caravans, UKIP supports the Caravan Club's responsible '85% rule' referring to a power: weight ratio for caravan towing to speed up traffic flows.

5.21 On independence, UKIP would repeal all EU-generated road related directives imposing unnecessary and expensive burdens on transport providers such as The Working Time Directive and Road Safety Directive, and replace the EU's Value Added Tax with a Local Sales Tax (LST).

5.22 Whilst UKIP does not accept current dogma about man made global warming, we will recognize and reward use of less polluting and more economical vehicles. We support the development of electric cars over time, with appropriate recharging facilities and incentives for night charging.

## **6. Buses & Coaches**

6.1 UK Independence welcomes the greater use of buses, and the levels of investment in modern bus and coaches, but feels standards are patchy outside of London. UKIP believes the system of bus franchising/ tendering used in London has worked well, and is a fair balance between competition by suppliers and the control and ensuring of standards and sensible oversight by local authorities. The same is not true for local services.

6.2 The 2009 decision of the Office of Fair Trading to refer rural bus companies to the Competition Commission, but not London buses, is illustrative of the differences.

6.3 The OFT was concerned with the prevention, restriction or distortion of competition by domination of local services by a small number of large bus companies, allegations of predatory behaviour to deter new entrants and the low number of bids for service contracts, with just one bidder for one quarter of tenders. The OFT felt at least £1.2bn in public support each year but this could represent "poor value for money for taxpayers".

6.4 Heather Clayton, OFT Senior Director, said: "One of the concerns that we think the Competition Commission should take a look at is the tendency for local areas to become dominated by a single operator. This is certainly not about a return to 'bus wars ' or unmanaged 'head to head ' competition on every route, but we do think large bus operators should face a healthy level of competitive constraints."

6.5 Whilst results of the inquiry are awaited, UKIP believes that local bus franchising will address these outline concerns, and must be explored as soon as possible (see below)<sup>23</sup>.

6.6 UKIP is concerned at the trend towards higher subsidy levels for buses: for example, a recent Transport Select Committee Chairman labelled bus companies “subsidy junkies”, with the five major companies who dominate the bus market receiving an annual subsidy of £2.5 billion a year, plus another billion in fuel rebates. She continued: “They are not only wantonly dictating terms & conditions but behaving in a manner that cannot be defended”. In London in 1997 there was no bus subsidy and an average passenger load of 13. In 2005 the average passenger load was 15, but with a subsidy of £572 million, 30p per fare<sup>24</sup>.

6.7 UKIP will introduce a simple, competitive ‘bus franchising’ tendering and operating process for bus services, particularly outside of London, overseen by local authorities, who are the main sources of support funding. Bus franchises would be far less detailed or restrictive than rail franchises, but would specify routes, vehicle quality, frequency, minimum service and timetable levels, information services such as ‘Countdown’ and specified liveries where important to a local area (such as the consistent red specified for London buses).

6.8 As with rail franchises, the key criteria will be customer satisfaction levels and good value for money. Better coordination with community bus services would be required. Competition and encouragement of smaller operators will be a priority. UK Independence will make returned capital funds from EU withdrawal available to supplement local funding for Park & Ride schemes where there is strong local support and proven benefits.

6.9 UKIP will replace national free bus passes with 50% discount travel (rail/bus/taxi) cards for senior citizens and others qualifying. Local councils may offer free services paid from local taxes. There is evidence local post offices have suffered from the availability of free bus travel into towns. Decisions on the levels of support will be made locally and paid from local taxes, so decisions on extending or reducing free or discount travel would be made locally.

6.10 UKIP values local bus and coach driving skills courses.

## **7. Trams, Trolley Buses and Light Rail**

7.1. UKIP welcomes safe, high quality, efficient and appealing Light Rail schemes, and believes the tram is generally a very pleasant and efficient way to travel. However, we accept that not all modern day streets can accommodate trams, and that the costs and scale of construction works can make schemes undesirable.

7.2. UK Independence will make returned capital funds from EU withdrawal available to supplement local funding for major Light Rail schemes where there is strong local support and proven benefits.

## **8. Taxis and Minicabs**

8.1. UKIP believes that taxi operation is not an area where government should intervene in too prescriptive a manner. Licensing should be confined to ensuring compliance with necessary technical and safety constraints – such as roadworthiness, ‘fit for purpose’ (such as taxibuses) and the driver’s competence. But UKIP does believe in a firm but fair approach to licensing with crackdowns on illegal minicabs using unsafe vehicles or unchecked drivers who may attack single passengers, and in ensuring standards.

8.2. Licenses should cover only the cost of testing taxis and approvals, and no limit should be set on licenses issued; that should be down to user demand. UKIP believes that fares regulation should be a matter for the licensing authority. However, some commercial conditions and operating practices need regulating to avoid a cartel-style application of unfair terms (exorbitant night rates, double on public holidays etc). A standard of dress and service code for drivers may be set by councils if there is local support.

8.3. Mini-taxi fleets for ‘private journey hire’ should be allowed to operate alongside normal ‘ply for hire’ fleets and be subject to the same licensing regime. Incentives may be needed for quality vehicles and services.

## **9. Motorcycles**

9.1 UKIP supports people’s right to enjoy the freedom and manoeuvrability motorcycling brings, but are concerned at those who abuse these rights and with the number of motorcycle fatalities - 569 in 2005, with motorcycle safety groups lamenting that their 1% of motorists suffer 18% of accidents involving injury<sup>26</sup>. UKIP supports the use of bus lanes by motorcycles where safe, and provision of reasonably priced motorcycle parking bays.

9.2 UK Independence would consult on the feasibility of new build motorcycles carrying identification front as well as rear to aid identification and deter speed abuse and from an additional noise control.

9.3 UKIP opposes EU legislation aimed at motorcyclists. Westminster is entirely capable of dealing with motorcycle licensing and regulations on British Roads. UKIP particularly opposes ill conceived EU plans to make daytime vehicle headlight use compulsorily. This threatens to increase motorcycle fatalities, as motorcycle daytime headlights will not be obvious and this will obscure emergency vehicle lights<sup>27</sup>.

## **10. Pedal Cycles**

10.1 UKIP supports pedal cycles as a healthy means of personal transport, but is concerned at the accident rate rising from 114 deaths in 2003 to 148 (2005), and the fall in regular cycling according to the Department for Transport, despite so much promotion.

10.2 We believe that there needs to be a better balance of rights and responsibilities for pedal cyclists, with too much aggressive abuse of red lights, pedestrian crossings and a lack of basic safety and road courtesy.

10.3 There is also substantial amounts of bicycle theft, as David Cameron can testify to personally. The British Crime Survey records c.440,000 bikes are stolen every year, but many thefts go unreported. Halifax Home Insurance estimates a bike is stolen every 65 seconds in the UK.

10.4 According to CTC, the national cyclists' association: "The police make almost no effort to catch bike thieves... What's more, the few who are caught face derisory sentences" and this is reflected in a clear-up rate of around 5%<sup>28</sup>.

10.5 UKIP's proposed new elected police boards could also put greater emphasis on tackling bicycle theft, particularly in theft hotspots such as London, Reading, Bristol and Oxford.

10.6 UKIP would consult on the desirability of minimum third party liability insurance cover for cyclists - a simple annual flat rate registration 'Cycledisc', stuck to the bicycle frame, to cover damage to cars and others, which are currently unprotected. The Cycledisc should also carry clear identification details, which will help counter bicycle theft, and deter dangerous cyclist behaviour. We support provision of cycle parking at reasonable charges.

10.7 UKIP believes that basic cycle and safety training should be made mandatory, and be funded in schools or via local authorities. UKIP supports the campaign work of national cycling organisations.

10.8 Cycling on safe cycle routes, lanes, tracks and trails should be actively encouraged, particularly as a leisure pursuit. UKIP believes off road dedicated lanes are preferable to a confusing maze of cycle lanes on unsuitable or dangerous roads, which is problematic for cyclists as well as other road users.

10.9 Local authorities should be given additional powers to enforce a 'cyclists dismount' or 'no cycling' regulation where there are safety concerns – such as on busy roundabouts, junctions or bus lanes, or where the road would be too narrowed by cycle lanes and cause unacceptable delays to traffic.

## **11. Rail - The Rail Network: General Principles**

11.1. UKIP believes that high quality, fast, reliable, affordable and extensive rail network is essential to providing people with real choices. We are prepared to invest substantial annual subsidies in rail whilst seeking to reduce the subsidy over time through investment in efficiencies and in generating new revenue-generating passenger and freight traffic.

UKIP would examine incentives to encourage employee 'home working' or 'flexitime', to ease rail and road overcrowding. UKIP would also seek to negotiate a strike free agreement for the national rail network, to minimise damaging disruptions to services.

11.2. UKIP enthusiastically supports the high speed rail concept, with trains travelling up to 220 mph, such as the new Beijing-Shanghai service which will cut journey times from 12 hours to 5 hours<sup>27</sup> and successful London-Paris/Brussels Eurostar trains that have cut journey times to under 2 hours, making rail highly competitive with short haul air travel. By 2003 Eurostar had already secured 65% of the London-Paris market and 55% of the London-Brussels market, whilst the French TGV system is impressive<sup>29</sup>. The high-speed line between Madrid and Barcelona took 46% of the market the year after opening, and China is now investing in 8,000 miles of high speed rail lines<sup>30</sup>.

11.3 As the boss of Arup, Mark Bostock argues, "upgrading the existing track, eliminating bottlenecks and improving reliability is not a better option. Consider the west coast mainline upgrade. Its eventual cost of almost £9bn dwarfs its benefits." The Department for Transport agrees, stating in a 2007 report: "The disadvantages of undertaking major new construction work alongside a working railway outweigh the advantages." This argument was central to Arup's successful lobbying of government in the early 1990s, resulting in the selection of our route for the Channel tunnel rail link. Building a new railway is actually cheaper and less disruptive than fiddling with the existing network – though it requires an un-British, strategic view of national spatial and economic planning. France exemplifies the potential success. Despite labour market inflexibility, hourly productivity in France stands at \$54, compared to \$45 in the UK, which is recognised as largely due to its excellent infrastructure... The British Chambers of Commerce and CBI unanimously back the idea of a national high-speed network"<sup>31</sup>.

11.4 UKIP will support 3 new 200 mph plus high-speed rail lines: 1.) London-Newcastle ( with some other faster sections such as Edinburgh-Glasgow ) and a link to Manchester/West Coast Main Line 2.) London-Bristol ( for South Wales ) - Exeter 3.) a linking high-speed line Birmingham-Great Western Main Line. The intention will be to reduce the number of short haul flights between London and UK destinations such as Manchester and Scottish cities, freeing up highly valuable runway capacity for long haul. The funds will come in part from net saved contributions to the EU budget – £6.4 billion a year. UKIP will not support MAGLEV lines as being too expensive and inflexible.

11.5 Whilst UKIP deplores some aspects of rail privatisation, particularly Railtrack's safety failings, we recognise that the extra investment under privatisation has led to real benefits such as a 42 per cent growth in passengers over ten years, a 60 per cent growth in freight, 20 per cent more passenger services, new trains, major safety investment and punctuality up from 75% in 2001 to 89% in 2007. UKIP will improve competitive rail franchises by making them work better for the customer, and encourage the flowering of open access, freight and other on rail competition. At a time when the number of air operators is increasing annually, and car competition is so intense, we believe it is destructive and backward to seek to put rail back under a single, inflexible operator<sup>32</sup>.

11.6 UKIP will also support new high-speed rail sections on existing routes, such as: 1.) Basingstoke-Southampton Airport 2.) (London Victoria - ) Selhurst-Horsham (to South Coast ) and Brighton 3.) London-Loughborough /Derby/Nottingham where a private infrastructure company or Network Rail are prepared to invest on basis of longer term returns. High-speed trains to Portsmouth, Exeter (via Salisbury on doubled track), Bournemouth, Gatwick Airport and the South Coast could all run into the former Eurostar terminal at London Waterloo which is currently abandoned. UKIP would consider using high-speed lines to boost the desirability of run down areas in the South East, South West and Midlands to aid economic regeneration and ease housing pressures on London.

11.7 In London, UKIP will cancel the Crossrail scheme, estimated to cost £16 billion, as unnecessary following the transfer of London's major airport to the East of London, in the Thames Estuary and transferring funds back to reduce Government debt. UKIP will investigate a more cost efficient alternative running express trains from Paddington to Aldgate over The Hammersmith and Circle Tube lines (originally Brunel designed rail lines), with grade separated junctions at Edgware Road and Aldgate.

11.8 UK Independence will support a major feasibility study into a round London rail scheme, a rail version of the M25 motorway – the 'R25'. The R25 would provide a 2 track railway, with 4 tracks on the busiest sections, running from Heathrow-Woking Gatwick-Sevenoaks-Ebbsfleet (CTRL and new Thames Estuary Airport spur)-South Essex-Epping-Potters Bar-St Albans- Watford- and round. There would be major interchanges with existing main lines, and junctions for through passenger and freight trains. The Western section would be built in cooperation with the Central Railways freight route, combine new build and use of existing corridors where feasible. The R25 would relieve pressures on the London tube by allowing passengers to avoid London and open up through services such as Nottingham-Brighton or Dover-Oxford.

11.9 UKIP will support Thameslink 2000 - the development of cross-London rail services, but look to see Thameslink 2000 works with the R25 proposals to funnel passengers in and around London far more efficiently, and that the rail proposals are acceptable architecturally within Central London.

11.10 UKIP supports a major electrification programme for the railways, particularly given the dangerous energy gap in the UK due to open up from 2015. Electric traction should replace diesel High Speed Trains ( HSTs ) on routes such as London Nottingham/Derby/Sheffield and the Great Western Main Line from London Paddington to Swansea and via Bristol ( now announced ) and via Taunton to Exeter ( with hybrid electric/diesel trains for non-high speed Devon/Cornwall routes ). Routes should be electrified such as Blackpool-Preston, Ipswich-Cambridge/Ely, East Coast Main Line Hull, also to Lincoln, Oxted-Uckfield-Lewes, Ashford-Hastings, Glasgow/Edinburgh Aberdeen via Dundee and Belfast-Dublin.

11.12 UK Independence will commission a major report – an ‘*un*Beeching Report’ – which will review all closed or disused rail lines or freight only lines for modern day use for passenger or freight services. Other existing lines requiring major upgrades, such as track doubling, will also be considered. Schemes identified as of major benefit will be progressed with more detailed engineering feasibility studies, and then be proposed for Government funding if there is substantial local support. Criteria will include economic benefits (including regeneration and employment effects), commuter use, local transport plan suitability, tourist potential, social benefits, and freight potential.

11.13 UKIP believes that historically the Government displayed gross short-termism and misjudgement in the mass railway closures (the 1960s ‘Beeching cuts’), and that this was one of the single worst public policy decisions ever. Many rail lines were closed despite being economic, or providing important transport needs. Today many of those closed lines would have a useful modern day role, particularly as many of the communities they served have greatly expanded in size and in their commuting populations.

11.14 UK Independence believes it is time to expand the rail network and to restore rail lines to divert both freight and passenger traffic away from overcrowded and unsuitable roads. Scotland has shown the way with schemes to reopen rail routes such as Stirling-Alloa (already popular), Bathgate-Airdrie and the approved Edinburgh-Galashiels route.

11.15 We will also vigorously oppose any policy of rail closures or ‘bustitution’ (replacing trains with buses), and regard the guided bus project between Cambridge and St Ives a poor concept, one which we would return to rail use.

11.16 UKIP enthusiastically backs ‘Community Rail’ schemes, which develop local community links and have developed rural lines through enhanced marketing and novel services and promotions, and supports micro franchising (see below).

11.17 UKIP will immediately pass legislation under planning laws immediately to protect disused rail infrastructure with potential for reuse from conflicting or unsuitable developments. We believe that failure to protect rail corridors can cost millions to correct, and is symptomatic of a damaging and endemic short-termist culture.

## **12. Passenger Rail Franchises**

12.1. UKIP would improve rail franchises by putting the customer first and introducing a commitment to quality, lengthening franchises to between 10 and 20 years to allow greater investment and stability, and by ensuring proper local democratic input into franchise approval. Franchises would be awarded on the basis of customer satisfaction, not on cost-saving criteria, forced overcrowding and the lowest common denominator. UKIP would end Whitehall micromanagement of franchises - we would provide an overview and direct but not manage.

12.2 Rail operators that are able to demonstrate highest levels of quality and customer satisfaction, such as the model Chiltern franchise and the sadly lost GNER East Coast franchise (owing to the finances of its owner company), should be rewarded by near automatic franchise renewal, and consideration for imparting successful ethos and management to other franchises in future bids. UKIP would legislate to enable companies with several franchises to lose one for non performance without losing others that are well performing.

12.3 Value for money should come once quality thresholds are reached - the Government needs to set standards, not just budgets. Franchising is a sound concept, but the Government has misunderstood its value, and has badly fumbled the aim and management of franchises. UKIP believes that the Government must confine itself to high level overviews and directing not hands on management: internal reports of secret meetings with train companies without minutes demanding cost cutting, allegations of collusion to hide true cancellation figures, and civil servant sign off of minor expenditure are disturbing.

12.4 Franchisees should have to demonstrate innovation and commitment to schemes such as high-speed rail sections or additional routes and services. The short lived Strategic Rail Authority even threatened First Group with loss of the Great Western franchise if it pressed for high-speed rail lines. The dead hand of bureaucracy has tempered the initial enthusiasm, innovation and expansionism of early franchise winners, and must be reversed.

11.2. On rail fares, UKIP welcomes the moves towards a much simpler and fairer rail fares system, with a few standard tickets such as Singles, Day Returns, Monthly Returns, but with discounts for railcards, off peak or pre-booked travel. UKIP will put long term economic interests before short-termist subsidy cuts. We are also concerned at the systematic abuse of Penalty Fares to extract maximum income at the expense of honest travellers. We will abolish the Penalty Fares regime, and require operators to provide proper ticket facilities and inspections, as has happened on the London Underground.

12.5 UKIP believes that the Government, who continue to own rail franchise rights, must insist on quality rail 'brands' being created or developed, whose ownership and value is left in the hands of the taxpayer when a franchise ends. The use of group corporate branding by groups such as First Group, National Express, Virgin and others should be downplayed. These companies are temporary custodians of franchise brands, and the emphasis should be on building those brands.

12.6 For example, the unseemly haste with which National Express destroyed the quality GNER brand by painting out its heraldry on service trains standing at rail stations was a disgrace. As with the iconic red bus in London, so the Government should insist on a modernised form of traditional branding - chocolate and cream for Great Western, scarlet red for Midland, Apple Green for the East Coast. These are icons of Britishness. Go-Ahead has shown the way with an excellent, tasteful branding of its 'Southern' network.

This has hints of the traditional Southern Railway heritage yet cleverly updated for modern trains. UKIP will also require franchises to examine the case for a return of a number of high quality, premium services, such as 'Pullman trains', to select routes. Pride in Britain's railways is an important part of British culture and its way of life, and should be reflected better through rail franchises.

12.7 UKIP knows that rail franchises need greater stability, and would extend 7 year franchises to a standard term of 10 to 20 years, allowing greater returns for investment in trains and stations by train operators (rather than just Network Rail), and proper opportunities to develop branding. There is too often a jumble of liveries and colours on franchised trains and stations which suggests division, despite the reality of cohesive national, integrated services.

12.8 UKIP will bring democracy and accountability into rail franchising, and reduce the role of short-termist Treasury cost-cutters. Future Franchises would be awarded on the basis of higher customer satisfaction in a '3 point' approval process: 1. national transport policy and economic aims, 2. democratically elected local authorities representing the communities served by the franchise and 3. customer satisfaction, independently assessed and rail user group opinion. Bidders would be short listed by these three groups before a 'value for money' test is applied. But quality would not be sacrificed for cost-saving.

12.9 With UKIP's proposals for greater resources to be controlled by local authorities, we envisage more 'add on' services paid for locally - such as £1 million over three years from Bristol City Council to invest in a 40 minute frequency as opposed to hourly services under the 'Half Hour Train Campaign', with funding now restored<sup>33</sup>.

12.10 UK Independence will seek economies but not at the expense of comfort, convenience and choice. UK Independence wants to see subsidy reductions over time, not from service cuts or extreme fare rises but from enhanced investment, more passengers and fares reflecting true user costs. The attitude expressed by a senior transport civil servant: that 'commuters shouldn't expect a seat for £5,000 a year' and that it is acceptable for season ticket holders to stand for half an hour is not acceptable to UKIP<sup>34</sup>.

12.11 UKIP believes that in a time when airport operators abound in terms of choice and services, the railways should encourage more on-rail competition to give consumers a real choice of services and fares. We oppose the Government's opposition to more than one operator at major terminals as anti-competitive, malicious and unnecessary. UKIP will revise franchise boundaries to inject competition between core destinations, proven to be successful for routes such as London-Birmingham and London-Gatwick. Franchise winners would also have to demonstrate adequate promotion of competitive products and services, through advertising for example.

12.12 UKIP would amend competition laws to allow greater cooperation, integrated ticketing and a 'door to door' journey approach and service arrangements when in the public interest.

However, UK Independence is unhappy at the operation of bus and rail services by the same companies in certain areas, and would strengthen monopolistic protection in franchise awards.

12.13 UKIP dislikes designs for new High Speed Trains (HST2) that remove comfortable table seating and opposes packed ‘airline’ style seating, dictated by Treasury pressures. This will significantly diminish rail’s appeal, and is hugely retrograde compared with HST 1 travel, as well as rail coaches of the past. UKIP supports HST2 trains being hybrids, with both overhead electric and diesel generation, for transfer between high speed 200mph plus electric lines and non electrified routes such as Exeter Penzance and Edinburgh-Inverness. The principle of requiring interoperable ‘standard’ trains is a good one.

12.14 UKIP regards the Government’s Community Rail initiative for rural railway branch lines as excellent, and would allow micro franchised operators to both run trains and manage the tracks on designated routes to drive up passenger use, boost revenues through imaginative marketing and leisure activities (e.g. steam-hauled wine and dine trains), and safely reduce running costs. UKIP would apply this concept both to existing rail lines and to selected reopened rail lines, and allow local authorities directly to micro franchise local rail operations where practical.

12.15 UKIP will publish a report into British Rail’s hidden wastage over Channel Tunnel services, such as the London Waterloo terminal (built in 1994, abandoned in 2007 ), the massive North Pole Depot London (empty), unused regional Eurostar trains and services, and European sleeper trains that went straight from factory to scrap yard.

12.16 UKIP believes the ‘Motorail’ concept, of trains carrying cars long distance, is a promising one but requires the right will, innovative thinking, possible shared or better utilised trains, and appropriate vehicles and loading points. Channel Tunnel freight trains can carry over 100 cars a time.

### **13. Rail Freight**

13.1. UK Independence would invest in an improved national rail freight network, providing capital funds saved from EU contributions for important new or reopened rail lines, such as a North-South freight line, proper access by rail to and from ports, and with freight concentration depots, yards, interchanges or sidings.

13.2. UKIP will publish a report into proposals (originally promoted by Central Railways) to build a freight railway carrying heavy trucks from the Channel Tunnel via the Midlands to Northern England to relieve motorways.

13.3. UKIP will fund innovative schemes that assist in transferring freight, particularly packaged goods, unit loads, bulk point to point loads and Wagonload loads from road to rail, and to improve the flows by rail of Channel Tunnel freight traffic. Ports without rail access, such as Newhaven, need rail links provided.

## **14. Underground and Subway Rail Networks (London Tube etc)**

14.1. UK Independence will back extensions to existing networks or new subway routes where there is a strong case for doing so.

14.2. UKIP will negotiate a ‘no strike’ agreement for the London Underground to prevent ongoing disruptive, damaging and unjustified stoppages by hard core rail unions due to often trivial disputes.

14.3. UKIP will consider franchising the operation of trains and tracks as one concern (as there is no realistic competition here), replacing wasteful and cumbersome PPP agreements.

14.4. UKIP will return London’s Circle Line to a circle - the complete circular service recently stopped. We will build grade separated junctions to improve the number of trains and their reliability at Edgware Road, Gloucester Road and Aldgate.

14.5. In London, UKIP would introduce a phased off-peak travel system - so that journeys starting before 06.30am would be entitled to a major discount on full fares - and allow timed tickets on single journeys within one hour.

## **15. Aviation - The Aviation Network: General Principles**

15.1. UKIP recognises that whilst aviation is currently suffering from high fuel costs and the economic downturn, that the growth of aviation is still set to grow massively with some forecasts to 2020 estimating a growth of 461 million passengers – up 127% from 2005. UK flights have already grown from 1 million a year in 1985 to 2.3 million in 2005<sup>35</sup>.

15.2 UKIP is not ideologically opposed to the growth of aviation, as long as air passengers fairly meet the external costs they impose on the wider community, such as the costs of noise and visual intrusion. UKIP is not opposed to aviation purely on AGW carbon-based and emissions arguments ( see Energy & Environment paper ), particularly as air accounts for such a small proportion of emissions, and airlines and aircraft manufacturers have constantly improved efficiency, cut weight and reduced noise in new aircraft.

15.3 UKIP believes that as long as users of aviation services pay their true costs of their choice – including externalities such as noise pollution mitigation measures in badly effected areas – then the market should be allowed to determine levels of growth.

15.4 UKIP is deeply concerned with the destruction of the successful and professional UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) by the EU in exchange for the untried and lower quality European Aviation Safety Agency, and by the loss of control over sovereign air space. As the Transport Select Committee reported in November 2006<sup>36</sup>, the EU Air Safety Agency “risks undermining the safety of planes flying over Britain” and is an “accident waiting to happen”<sup>37</sup>.

15.5 Much of the CAA's air safety role is being shifted to the Cologne-based European Aviation Safety Agency. The changeover took place on paper at the start of 2009, but has been slowed by funding and staffing snags in EASA - a body that was branded as not yet “fit for purpose” by a government minister in testimony to the committee. The MPs concern was the EU organisation’s search for consensus regulations would result in a “lowest common denominator” approach, resulting in lower standards than under the CAA. As the greatly missed Chairman, the late Gwyneth Dunwoody MP, remarked then, “Anything that lowered safety standards in the name of [EU] harmonisation would be unacceptable”<sup>38</sup>.

15.6 To rebalance true costs of flying, UK Independence would consider introducing a Local Sales Tax (which will replace VAT) on UK aviation fuel, which is currently untaxed - VAT on kerosene foregone is estimated at £0.58 billion p.a. and on new EU aircraft is equivalent to a European subsidy of £30 billion p.a..<sup>39</sup> Aircraft operators landing in Britain would be encouraged to purchase UK aviation fuel.

15.7 Should these replacement taxes be introduced, UKIP would scrap the Air Passenger/Per Plane Duty (APD) for all flights, which we regard as being an unfair £2 billion stealth tax on travelling.

## **16. Aviation Services ( Passenger Scheduled, Charters, Business Jets and Cargo freight services )**

16.1. UKIP will look seriously at proposals for new major airports that replace existing and overcrowded airports where the burdens on local communities from external costs such as noise and intrusion are too great.

16.2 UK Independence enthusiastically supports the building of a new London airport in the Thames Estuary off North Kent, linked with high-speed rail via the existing Channel Tunnel Rail Link to Stratford and London St Pancras, motorway connections to the M25 to relieve the relentless pressures on London Heathrow, and to a possible R25 orbital railway around London.

16.3 This proposal is very similar to the very successful new build airports such as Singapore’s Changi and Norman Foster designed Hong Kong International Airport. These are built similarly on reclaimed land and replaced airports in increasingly populated areas.

Indeed, the British engineer who built Hong Kong's island airport, Doug Oakervee, has been advising Boris Johnson, Mayor of London, on this commendable and bold initiative, and believes it feasible, and the advisory group is headed by the former London Minister Nick Raynsford<sup>40</sup>.

16.4 A feasibility study written by Doug Oakervee in October 2009 found there to be "no overwhelming constraints" and concluded that the project to build a new airport by 2030 was technically viable and that further detailed studies were urgently needed. The report did not favour a specific location, but said the Thames Estuary's weather, geology, hydrography, shipping lanes, fishing activities and leisure services presented no "insoluble issues".

16.5 UKIP does not wish to see the main Estuary area towards Essex used, but a site bringing major economic benefits to North Kent<sup>41</sup>.

16.6 UKIP opposes the addition of a sixth terminal and third runway at Heathrow, as it regards an increase of an extra third aircraft movements over London (from 480,000 in 2008 to 665-745,000 with third runway and an increase in passengers from 89 million in 2008 to 112-128 million with third runway) as being unsustainable and likely to destroy the property values of much of South and West London from excessive intrusion and turn many desirable areas into slums<sup>42</sup>. UKIP does not regard London Stansted as a realistic alternative to Heathrow, and will oppose the second runway proposals in favour of the new Thames Estuary airport.

16.7 If external costs (externalities) - of noise, intrusiveness, loss of property values - were factored in, there would be no question that a new airport in the Thames Estuary would be the best option, as most low flying air traffic would be over the sea, night flights would not be intrusive, and where there could be room for 4 runways. The cost of a sixth terminal and third runway at £13 billion is similar to a new Thames Estuary airport<sup>43</sup>.

16.8 Bird strikes are a hazard wherever an airport is located, and alternate bird breeding sites would have to be created. But many UK airports such as London City, Liverpool and Southampton are located close to large estuaries. The bird strike that brought down the Chesley 'Sully' Sullenberger's US Airways Airbus 320 plane before a controlled landing in the Hudson River in 2009 hit a flock of birds just after take off from LaGuardia Airport, located over densely populated Manhattan island in New York. Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted could continue to serve London, but in different capacities and without the requirement for major expansion. The support for a new airport also reinforces UKIP's call to scrap Crossrail, with the new airport being located much more conveniently for the City of London and Canary Wharf without travellers having to cross its crowded centre, and avoiding huge disruption such as the temporary closure of Paddington rail station.

16.9. UK Independence will develop a number of high-speed rail lines to reduce the need for short haul flights, freeing capacity up for long haul. The case has been proven by Eurostar and Virgin, where the upgrading of the London-Manchester railway to under two hours with Virgin tilting trains has led to 63% of the market now using rail<sup>44</sup>. In the first few months of 2008 Eurostar carried 21 per cent more passengers to 2.17 million from the newly reopened and highly impressive London St Pancras terminus, with the benefits of higher punctuality and quicker security than airlines (91.5% for Eurostar in 2006, compared to 70% London airports)<sup>45</sup>.

16.10 UKIP would seek to improve competition between airports saving similar catchment areas to benefit consumers. UKIP supported legislation to compel BAA to sell off one of its 3 London Airports, and would act to ensure Glasgow and Edinburgh, Birmingham and Coventry Airports, and similar airports, are owned by competing concerns.

16.11 UKIP would encourage the development of regional airports, including business jet airports, where this enhances consumer choice and reduces passenger and freight movements to airports outside the area. We recognise that certain direct business jet flights can be more efficient than scheduled flights.

16.12 UKIP recognises the downside of aviation - problems of aviation noise, particularly at night, and visual intrusion - and will establish new guidelines on necessary noise mitigation measures. UKIP strongly believes local councils representing effected local residents should be allowed to set reasonable limits on flight movements, insist on alternating the use of runways, and ban or restrict night flights where necessary, but that the decisions to build and expand airports be taken strategically in the national interest through Parliamentary Acts.

16.13 UK Independence would seek to reduce air freight through the promotion of UK-based local produce, whilst supporting free trade principles and the import of worldwide produce desired by British consumers. UKIP will seek to ensure that night flights pay their true costs in terms of noise and disruption, and to persuade mail companies to operate alternative night trains where feasible.

## **17. Maritime – The Maritime and Ports Network: General Principles**

17.1. UKIP recognises the importance of UK ports, as 95% of goods enter and leave the UK by boat. With UKIP's shift towards greater global trade and a revival in UK manufacturing, the role of UK ports will increase relative to Channel traffic.

17.2 In 2005 Britain exported around 60 per cent of its worldwide exports outside EU countries and around 40% to the EU 24. Since 2007 the UK traded more with the Rest of the World than the EU, and in the period 1999-2005 inclusive, UK exports to countries *outside* the EU grew on average 44 per cent faster than exports to other EU member states, and on present trends the proportion of UK exports going to the EU will shrink from around 40 per cent in 2005 to around 34 per cent by 2015. At that point, around two-thirds of all British exports will be going outside the EU.

17.3 The EU export figures are already distorted by any goods travelling via EU ports such as Rotterdam and Antwerp being considered as exports to the EU, even if their destination is beyond the EU. There will also be a shift in transported goods from pallets to and from the EU and the crowded South East towards international trade in ISO box containers, which are better suited to rail borne transport, and out of ports across the UK. This will require a reorientation of maritime provision over time.

17.4 UKIP will reverse the destructive impact EU directives have had on UK ports. A 2003 Transport Select Committee report found how the EU badly impacts the operational costs of UK ports, their investment and competitive position. They concluded: “A very large number of European Directives affect the ports industry... those Directives which cause particular problems to the ports sector” were listed as the Draft Directive on Market Access to Port Services, Birds and Habitats Directives, Water Framework Directive, Directive on Port Waste Reception Facilities and Sulphur Content of Liquid Fuels Directive.

17.5 They further observed: “of paramount importance, however, is the fact that some of our continental competitors appear still to be dragging their feet on implementing EU directives and regulations as diligently as we do in this country... UK ports should be able to compete on an equal footing with their direct rivals on the Continent, who are already differently subsidised and funded.” It is clear the UK currently loses both ways - it carries the cost of excessive EU red tape while not reaping benefits of EU grants that are paid for from UK contributions.

17.6 UKIP will introduce a national strategy for ports, as argued for by the Transport Select Committee, and a comprehensive freight distribution plan. These will take into account the shift in trade patterns in an independent Britain towards the Commonwealth and fast emerging economies such as India and China, whilst EU trade is maintained through a free trade agreement. It will also seek to ensure that business now being lost to rival ports on the Continent, with goods being delivered to the UK by feeder services is reversed<sup>46</sup>. This strategy will consider the desirability of foreign ownership of UK ports and what is in the national interest in terms of prioritised investment and land sell offs.

17.7 UK Independence is concerned at the shortage of UK port capacity, the risk of bottlenecks and congestion without proper planning and better transport connections, and the pressures on ports to pay for new infrastructure. UKIP will use savings from leaving the EU to build infrastructural works connecting ports where there is a strong case to do so and to switch traffic to rail<sup>47</sup>.

17.8. UK Independence will examine innovative port options, such as proposed for Orkney and the West of England, and encourage the development of existing facilities. We also firmly believe in retaining and improving vital ferry services to and from the UK's numerous offshore islands, such as the Outer Hebrides.

17.9. UKIP is concerned at some of the quality of training and expertise of seamen on ships passing through British territorial or managed waters, such as the English Channel. We will require higher standards amongst any ships entering or leaving British ports, or transiting British waters.

17.10. UKIP believes inland waterways have an important role, particularly regarding freight, and will support their growth under a strategic national plan. We will oppose the privatisation of British Waterways as being against the public interest, in terms of putting property interests before those of inland freight. UKIP will legislate to protect 'endangered' canals and waterways from development. The use of working wharves for increasing freight should be incentivised.

17.11. UKIP believes it is strategically important for the British Isles to retain its ability to construct its own military and commercial vessels, and we would encourage a return to UK-based shipbuilding.

## **APPENDIX ONE: POTENTIAL RAIL REOPENINGS**

This list is pooled from various local authorities and rail transport groups, such as the Campaign for Better Transport and Transport Britain website, is not comprehensive and open to discussion and feasibility studies. Where heritage railways are mentioned, the intention is to negotiate cooperative track access agreements for modern trains to run on heritage railway tracks, not to replace any existing operations.

### **South West**

Okehampton – Tavistock – Bere Alston, with new Lydford triangle and a reopened link to Launceston via former GWR branch / Axminster - Lyme Regis / Yatton - Cheddar ( for Cheddar Gorge ) / Newton Abbot - Heathfield and Moretonhampstead / Lynton & Barnstaple ( as tourist line ) / Barnstaple - Torrington and to Ilfracombe / Portishead – Bristol ( freight only line for additional passenger use ) / Stratford – Cheltenham via Gloucester & Warwickshire Railway ( GWR ) heritage line / Taunton-Minehead via West Somerset Steam Railway / Lostwithiel - Fowey ( freight only ) / Southampton - Hythe ( freight only ) / Frome - Radstock / Shanklin - Ventnor ( Isle of Wight ) / Bournemouth East- Poole-Blandford-Templecombe-Bath/ and Wimborne-Ringwood-Brockenhurst / Bournemouth-Bournemouth Hurn Airport / Bodmin Parkway - Bodmin - Wadebridge - Padstow via Bodmin steam railway / Maiden Newton - Bridport.

### **South East**

Aylesbury & Bicester – Bletchley / Haywards Heath – Horsted Keynes - East Grinstead via Bluebell Railway / Shanklin – Ventnor / Uckfield – Lewes / Eridge-Tunbridge Wells West - Tunbridge Wells Central via Spa Valley Railway ( Tunbridge Wells ) - Groombridge - East Grinstead - Three Bridges partly via Spa Valley Railway / Guildford – Horsham via Cranleigh.

### **East of England**

Braintree – Stansted Airport / Hitchin – Bedford / Spalding – March / Watford – Croxley Green / Cambridge – Bedford / Sudbury ( Suffolk ) – Haverhill / ( Marks Tey – ) Chappel & Wakes Colne – Castle Hedingham – Cambridge / Kings Lynn - Wolferton - Hunstanton / Norwich – Melton Constable –Sheringham ( Norfolk Orbital scheme via The Poppy Line steam railway ).

### **East Midlands**

Bedford – Northampton / Melton Mowbray - Oakham - Corby - Kettering ( - London ) ( passenger services restored from Corby now ) previously / Leicester – Coalville – Burton / Leicester-Aylesbury / Matlock – Buxton via Peak Rail railway.

### **West Midlands**

Hampton in Arden – Whitacre Jnc / Kenilworth – Berkswell / Longbridge – Frankly / Leek – Stoke / Rugby – Southam / Walsall – Lichfield / East West Route Oxford to Cambridge / Oxford - Princes Risborough.

### **Yorkshire & the Humber**

Harrogate – Ripon – Northallerton, including Harrogate / Oakenshaw South Jnc triangle – Goose Hill Jnc / Malton – Pickering / Swinton/Mexborough – Cudworth / Silkstone – Wath – Mexborough / Hadfield – Penistone – Deepcar (Woodhead route) / Redmire – Garsdale / Leeds - Wetherby / Leamside Line (Ferryhill – Washington – Newcastle) ( freight only line ).

### **North East**

Alnmouth – Alnwick / Ferryhill – Pelaw (Leamside Branch) / Ashington, Blyth & Tyne ( freight only line ) Sandbach – Middlewich – Northwich ( freight only line ) / York – Beverley – Hull.

### **North West**

Manchester – Sheffield (via Woodhead Route) / Penrith – Keswick / Partington – Glazebrook / Clitheroe – Hellifield / Skipton – Colne / Fleetwood branch of the Preston - Blackpool line / Ormskirk – St Helens Central & St Helens Jnc via Skelmersdal / Glassboro – Partington and Skelton Jnc / Ditton Jnc – Fiddlers Ferry – Warrington Bank Quay – Latchford – Dunham Massey – Skelton Jnc / Reinstate Burscough Curves north of Ormskirk / Halton Curve near Runcorn / Olive Mount Chord near Edge Hill, Liverpool.

## Wales

Amlwch branch ( on Anglesey ) / Bangor – Caernarfon / Blaenau Ffestiniog – Trawsfynydd / Llangollen – Ruabon via Llangollen steam railway / Gobowen – Owensboro - Blodwell via Cambrian steam railway.

## Scotland

Edinburgh South Suburban line ( freight only ) / Galashiels – Carlisle ( The Waverley Route: Galashiels - Edinburgh already due to reopen ) / Berwick upon Tweed ( ECML ) – Galashiels via Kelso and Melrose / Fife Circle line via St Andrews and Leuchars Jnc / Aberdeen – Ballater / Aberdeen – Dyce – Peterhead / Stirling – Alloa – Kincardine ( reopening in progress ) / Airdrie - Bathgate ( in progress ) / Dunblane – Callander – Killin ( as tourist attraction ) / Bridge of Dun – Brechin via Caledonian steam railway.

**New build rail lines:** Manchester Airport Western Rail Link / Glasgow Airport Rail Link / Edinburgh Airport Rail Link / BAA Heathrow Airtrack Network / Nottingham East Midlands Rail Connection.

## References

1. 'How Much does the European Union Cost Britain ?', Bruges Group, Gerard Batten MEP
2. Department for Transport figures [http://www.speedcameras.org/immigrants\\_untaxed\\_speeding.htm](http://www.speedcameras.org/immigrants_untaxed_speeding.htm)
3. 27.1.07 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article1265860.ece>
4. Government figures quoted in [http://www.speedcameras.org/speed\\_camera\\_facts.php](http://www.speedcameras.org/speed_camera_facts.php)
5. 26.3.08 [http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry\\_sectors/transport/article3621890.ece](http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/transport/article3621890.ece)
6. Transport Committee's 7th Report of 2006-07 Session, Novice Drivers (HC 355), Notice 43/2006-07
7. [http://www.24dash.com/news/Local\\_Government/2010-01-04-Councils-generate-1-9-billion-in-parking-fines-and-fees](http://www.24dash.com/news/Local_Government/2010-01-04-Councils-generate-1-9-billion-in-parking-fines-and-fees)
8. <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/speedmanagement/roadsafetycameras>
9. AA Populus Survey and Press Release, 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2008
10. 26.2.08 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1579488/Hearse-clamped-on-way-to-funeral.html>
11. Government figures quoted by the Association of British Drivers (ABD)
12. BBC News 29.2.08 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/6948886.stm>
13. <http://www.highways.gov.uk/knowledge/11528.aspx>
14. <http://www.tnn.co.uk/UKNews/plonearticle.2006-07-11.1164953853>
15. 29.3.08 <http://www.itv.com/News/tonight/episodes/KillerLorries/default.html>
16. 25.10.06 [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/real\\_story/6081596.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/real_story/6081596.stm)
17. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-488795/Please-arrest-beg-EU-truckers-drive-30-hours.html>
18. Department for Transport private study, quoted by Transport 2000
19. <http://www.rfg.org.uk/news/?pid=3158&lsid=3159&edname=19346.htm&ped=19346>
20. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2005/jul/15/food.greenpolitics>
21. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article6860143.ece>
22. CPRE <http://www.cpre.org.uk/about/achievements/1970s>
23. Transport for London \_annual travel report 2005 and [www.parliament.the-stationary-office.co.uk](http://www.parliament.the-stationary-office.co.uk)
24. Daily Telegraph 7/1/10
25. <http://www.ukip.org/content/latest-news/251-ukip-says-no-to-more-speed-cameras>
26. 27.7.08 Sunday Times <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/crime/article4407515.ece>
27. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/sport/olympics/article4442873.ece#cid=OTC-RSS&attr=797093>
28. Daily Express Tues Dec 29 2009 by Martyn Brown 'Crash Deaths Drop To Zero After Speed Cameras Axed'
29. <http://www.railfreightgroup.com/news/?pid=3158&lsid=3159&edname=25300.htm&ped=25300>
30. 7.8.08 Evening Standard 'Crossrail backers raise doubts over financing'
31. [http://www.rmtbristol.org.uk/2007/01/council\\_reinstates\\_train\\_subsi.html](http://www.rmtbristol.org.uk/2007/01/council_reinstates_train_subsi.html)
32. 18.1.07 Daily Mail

33. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1066581.stm>; [http://www.nats.co.uk/text/47/operational\\_and\\_safety.html](http://www.nats.co.uk/text/47/operational_and_safety.html)
34. <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmtran/61/61i.pdf>
35. 8.11.06 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-415280/EU-air-safety-agency-puts-jets-danger.html>
36. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jan/19/response-high-speed-rail-network>
37. The Myths of Flying, by Van de Pol, 1999 from <http://www.wlfoet5.demon.co.uk/archive/myths.htm>
38. <http://www.virgin.com/News/Articles/VirginTrains/2007/110907.aspx>
39. 14.4.08 Evening Standard
40. 2.3.08 Sunday Times
41. 10.2.08 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article3341751.ece>
42. [http://www.global-vision.net/facts/fact15\\_4.asp](http://www.global-vision.net/facts/fact15_4.asp) and <http://www.global-vision.net/perspectives10.asp>
43. <http://www.ukmajorports.org.uk/docs/TransportSelectCom-EUDirs.pdf>
44. <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmtran/249/24908.htm>
45. Transport Committee Report, HC 61-I incorporating HC 1700-i, Session 2005–06 Published 24.1.07
46. 24.1.07 <http://www.ferrynews.com/categories/strait-talking/stories/uk-needs-a-port-plan-> )
47. 24.1.07 [http://www.inthenews.co.uk/news/transport/mps-fire-port-bottleneck-warning-\\$1044849.htm](http://www.inthenews.co.uk/news/transport/mps-fire-port-bottleneck-warning-$1044849.htm)

### **Acknowledgements**

*This Report was prepared by the UKIP Transport Policy Group*

Members: David Campbell Bannerman MEP ( Head of Policy, Chairman, writer), Bruce Bolton, Richard Buckley, Andrew Moncrieff, Peter Mulley, Mike Natrass MEP (UKIP Transport Spokesman) , Alan Partridge, Stephen Peters, John Petley, Peter Treble, Tony Stone, Richard Wade and Alan Wheatley.

*Thanks to*

Michael McManus for editing



**Published by the UK Independence Party  
Lexdrum House, Unit 1, King Charles Business Park,  
Heathfield, Newton Abbot, Devon TQ12 6UT**