

ATOC RESPONSE TO CROSSRAIL CONSULTATION

Brian Hopkinson
Track Access Executive
Office of the Rail Regulator
1 Kemble Street
London
WC2B 4AN

20th September 2007

Dear Mr Hopkinson

This reply is written on behalf of ATOC, 'One' Railway, First Great Western, and London & South Eastern Railway.

Clearly the Access Option and Track Access Contract application covers a period well beyond any of the contracts currently in place for the train operating companies, so our comments are broad rather than detailed.

At the outset we would make it clear that we welcome the concept of Crossrail. Our comments about the Section 18 Application are by paragraph in the document.

- 3.1 We have some concerns that the frequency at Canary Wharf may not be high enough, both peak and off peak, if the development reaches the 200,000 workers predicted. We believe that there is a need for flexibility in this area to cater for the market that will have emerged by the time Crossrail is introduced.

The supplementary peak trains between Liverpool Street and Gidea Park are welcomed. They also provide for customers who do not want to use the new deep level station which is west of the present location and quick access for those who walk to final destination in the City and have no desire to use sub surface routes. These trains are likely to

operate on the E-lines and should probably be included in the Option for completeness.

It is most important that nothing in this Track Access Option should preclude the proposed extension of Crossrail to Reading.

We have major concerns about the quantum of trains proposed at weekends on both GE and GW routes. We believe there is a need for a Saturday/Sunday 'busy' period timetable needing 4 tracks open from 0700 Sat to 2200 Sat and 1200 Sunday to 2359 approx and a lower frequency Crossrail service which can be accommodated on 2 tracks with other residual and main line services at other times.

3.2 &

3.3 No comments

4.1 We would need to see the calculations on capacity before we could sign up to 21% and 54%.

If Crossrail benefits are to include easing platform capacity constraints at Liverpool Street to enable increased services to be run, then further investment will be required as the present E-line platforms (16-18) are 8 coach only while the mainline/Southend Victoria trains are 12 coaches in the peak.

Additional trains from the Lea Valley or GE Main line would require additional infrastructure between Pudding Mill Lane and Bethnal Green. Whilst congestion will be relieved in Central London, there may well be a clash between the needs of passengers there and at places like Brentwood and Maidenhead if the trains are low seating/high standing capacity.

4.3 More work is needed on the effects of the increased frequency of empty stock movements to and from Ilford/Gidea Park and also Old Oak Common both during construction and in the long term. At Ilford, for example, three quarters of train movements in and out of the depot are outer suburban trains. The availability of usable sidings during the building phase is also important.

At the time of writing we are not convinced that freight access to/from sidings on the GW line is optimised by the present layouts; this also affects the overall capacity of the GW Relief Lines. This is an outstanding issue for the timetable reference group at the time of submitting this response.

- 4.7 In addition to the locations mentioned we believe that there are to be stabling sidings at Westbourne Park and at the depot at Old Oak Common (the latter is referred to in 6.1)

We are not convinced that the proposed layout at Shenfield has been optimised and remain concerned about the conflict between services to Southend and Crossrail trains entering or leaving the berthing sidings from the current platform 5. We have some concern that the future stopping pattern of Crossrail is determined through a future TAA – it will influence capacity downstream, and will also influence the stopping pattern of other than Crossrail services on the route.

- 4.8 Early adoption of 240 metre trains would counter our comments at 3.1 on capacity.

6. Notwithstanding our understanding and concern that costs have to be contained, attempting to introduce selective door operation at busy stations like Forest Gate at the inner end of the route appears challenging; albeit it could be mitigated by wide 'walk through' facilities between coaches (as on line 14 of the Paris Metro).

It is noted that funding is still being sought for the station at Woolwich. If the funding is found there could be substantial alterations in the travel flows in the Woolwich, Plumstead and Abbey Wood area. We would have expected this to have been finalised prior to making the submission.

We are surprised that some stations are proposed not to be DDA compliant.

Platform extensions at Ilford and Romford should include all through platforms.

Additionally we have the following overarching points: and

- a) seek confirmation that franchised TOCs will be held harmless for the implications of the Crossrail project and its implications on their services through the combination of Network Change and the franchise agreement change mechanisms. We believe that these claims will be made and should be taken into account in consideration of the access option (as well as other projects which may impinge on operations and inter-relate with Crossrail during the construction period).

- b) Note that there are assumptions on the vehicles to be operated under the option. We would seek confirmation that the introduction of these vehicles or any subsequent alternatives will be subject to the Vehicle Change mechanisms, protecting train operators from any implications of their introduction. The specification of vehicles in the access option should be confirmed as not avoiding the requirements to comply with Part F.
- c) Seek confirmation that the requirements on being held harmless will extend to the period of testing pre-2016 of the new vehicles and the new and amended infrastructure.
- d) Seek reassurance that the Track Access Agreement will not exclude the flexibility for equitable access for all users to Main or Relief/E-lines in the case of engineering works or emergencies, so that services can be run in the best interests of passengers.

Yours sincerely

Chris Austin, OBE
Director, Public Policy
Tel: 020 7841 8066