



campaigning  
by the  
Railway Development  
Society Limited

## London and South East

London and South East RUS  
RUS Programme Manager  
Network Rail  
Kings Place  
90 York Way  
London N1 9AG

**Please Reply to:**

26 Millway,  
Mill Hill,  
London  
NW7 3RB

Tel: (020) 8959 7147

Mob: 07788 677103

E-Mail: keith.dyall@railfuture.org.uk

18<sup>th</sup> March 2011

Dear Sirs,

### London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy – Draft for Consultation

We are pleased to submit this consolidated national response on behalf of *railfuture*, which has been prepared after extensive consultations with the following branches: London & South East, Wessex, Thames Valley, East Anglia and East Midlands. The *railfuture* national Passenger Committee, and the Freight Services Development Committee were also consulted.

*railfuture* is a national voluntary organisation structured in England as twelve regional branches and two national branches representing Scotland and Wales.

The attached document has been structured to correspond with the structure of the RUS document.

We hope that the content of our response will contribute to the RUS process and we look forward to the production of the final document.

If you should require any further detail or clarification please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Yours faithfully,

*Keith Dyall*

Keith Dyall  
Chairman  
*railfuture* London and South East

[www.railfuture.org.uk](http://www.railfuture.org.uk) [www.railfuturescotland.org.uk](http://www.railfuturescotland.org.uk) [www.railfuturewales.org.uk](http://www.railfuturewales.org.uk)  
[www.railwatch.org.uk](http://www.railwatch.org.uk)

## Capacity gaps and options beyond existing strategy

### Gap A. Reading/Outer Thames Valley

*railfuture* would fully support the proposal outlined in Option A1 (to extend Crossrail to Reading), and as a necessary precursor to Option A6, which we also strongly support.

We would, however, question the practicality of operating the Heathrow Express service as part of Crossrail without a suitable rolling stock solution. The current low density Class 332 rolling stock is geared specifically towards the needs of premium fare air travellers, whereas the high density Crossrail Class 345 stock will not be.

*railfuture* would also strongly support the propositions in A2 & A3 as complementary measures in an overall strategy combined with A1 & A6.

### Gap B. East Coast Main Line – London Approaches

*railfuture* are content with existing proposals for enhancements. However we would sound a note of caution regarding the establishment of an ERTMS test facility on the Hertford North loop. We feel that this would unnecessarily limit operations on this line especially in view of its role as a key ECML diversionary route and would also inhibit future service enhancement.

### Gap C. Lea Valley Corridor

We strongly support 4-tracking between Coppermill Junction and Broxbourne as the primary solution to the capacity problems. In the event that the full scheme is not affordable in the short term, we emphasise the need to create sufficient capacity for an all stations stopping service, capable of meeting the demands arising from the development of Meridian Water at Angel Road, and able to co-exist with the fast Stansted Express and Cambridge trains.

Infrastructure improvements provided at Cheshunt and Broxbourne only, would not resolve problems closer to central London.

*railfuture* recommends reopening the Hall Farm Curve so that a new Chingford-Stratford service could be operated, thereby freeing up some additional paths from the Lea Valley line in to Liverpool Street via Hackney Downs and enabling some Hertford East trains to call at Clapton.

On the question of extending Stratford services to Liverpool Street following the completion of Crossrail, we take the view that a balance needs to be struck between the needs of Lea Valley and Great Eastern passengers. We note the potential to construct a new station at Stratford International, on the line between Temple Mills and High Meads, thus facilitating connections with HS1 and the DLR. This would provide additional terminal capacity at Stratford but also, if necessary, allowing for an alternative through route.

#### **Gap D. Great Eastern Main Line**

*railfuture* recognises the severe challenges in providing additional peak hour capacity. We support any detailed studies that would enable service enhancement on this congested route.

#### **Gap E. Brighton Main Line**

We would support the general thrust of Option E3. We would suggest that ultimately this tunnel forms part of the projected Crossrail 2, with the proviso that the northern outlet route of such a scheme forms part of a strategic southwest/southcentral to northeast axis. We fully recognise that this is a high cost and long term option; but given the need to provide relief on the BML and to provide an additional strategic cross-London axis, this, in our view provides the best possible solution. The combination of BML relief, cross-London axis (Crossrail 2) and distribution relief for incoming HS2 passengers at London Euston, would all make this a most persuasive and well-balanced project with a positive value for money business case.

*railfuture* are strongly supportive of that element of Option E4, which allows for electrifying and double tracking the Uckfield line, and reinstating the gap (also electrified and doubled) between Uckfield and Lewes. This would go some considerable way to providing an urgent element of relief for the Brighton Main Line but **not** the full implementation of BML2.

#### **Gap F. South West Main Line**

As with the Great Eastern Main Line, *railfuture* recognises the severe challenges in providing additional peak hour capacity. We note the conclusions reached in Options F1 – F3 and concur.

We note F4 and support any detailed studies that would enable service enhancement on this route, leading to the identification of evaluated and fully costed options. See also our more detailed comments on Page 5 and in Appendix B.

#### **Gap G. Windsor Lines**

*railfuture* endorses the approach taken in Options G1-4.

#### **Gap H. Elephant & Castle Corridor**

We recognise the limited options available for addressing the restricted capacity on this corridor.

#### **Gap I. Orbital Routes**

*railfuture* strongly and urgently supports Options I1 and I2 as proposed to increase the length of Southern services on the West London Line to 8-cars and to increase the peak Southern frequency to 2 tph. (We would **also** aver that off peak services justify a 2 tph frequency simply to match current demand)

We would agree that, prima-facie the North and East London lines are likely to require train lengthening to 5 cars early within the lifetime of the next Control Period.

## **Network Connectivity**

### **Gap J. Access to Heathrow Airport**

We strongly support the BAA Airtrack scheme as currently proposed. We would also advocate the logical development of this model to restore a connection with the GWML near Slough, which might, for instance, form part of an enhanced Crossrail (see also Gap K), or other enhanced GWML services.

### **Gap K. Maximising the benefits of Crossrail**

*railfuture* has already expressed its view about the operational practicability in terms of rolling stock suitability, of incorporating the Heathrow Express service into Crossrail. (see Gap A above)

We would support the concept of extending Crossrail onto the WCML Slow Lines as proposed for further investigation in K1.

In further developing K1, *railfuture* would urge the parallel development of the options mentioned in K2; specifically the re-projection of London Underground Bakerloo Line services to Watford Junction, and a Stratford to Harrow & Wealdstone London Overground service via a reopened Primrose Hill station. This latter suggestion would also release some additional capacity at Euston (2 platforms) by eliminating DC operations.

### **Gap L. Future Crossrail 2 (Chelsea – Hackney Line)**

*railfuture* believes that long term congestion projections and capacity requirements point to the need for a Crossrail 2 scheme by the end of this RUS period. In order to achieve that, we believe that a project must have reached GRIP 5 status by the end of CP5.

Responding to the issue highlighted in the draft RUS concerning a consensus regarding whether any future heavy rail-compatible tunnels across London are required, *railfuture* would refer to its remarks under Gap E and Gap M.

### **Gap M. Implication of High Speed 2 on the London Area**

The already strong case for a Crossrail 2 scheme to be completed by the end of this RUS period is now further strengthened by the need for additional distribution capacity at the London Euston Terminal of HS2.

### **Gap N. Capacity implications of the proposed link from HS2 to HS1**

*railfuture* would strongly oppose any development that would threaten existing or potential Overground and Freight services via Camden Road and Primrose Hill.

However, we would strongly support the development of an imaginative infrastructure solution to this potential pinch point.

## Gap O. Other connectivity schemes

The Croxley Link is an essential scheme, well overdue for implementation in view of the considerable connectional and operational benefits likely to result, for relatively low cost, combined with sale of surplus land for housing.

The East-West rail proposal for reinstated passenger services between Oxford-Bletchley-Bedford-Cambridge plus links with Aylesbury and Milton Keynes is also well overdue, and we strongly support early implementation of this scheme in CP5. We also strongly support the development of East-West rail as a **vital** component in rail connectivity from points beyond Oxford and Cambridge.

## Freight

*railfuture* notes that freight demand for the years 2019 - 2030 is developed using the Great Britain Freight Model (GBFM), which is designed to forecast freight to be moved within GB including to and from the ports and the Channel Tunnel. The GBFM forecasts that by 2030 (tables 9.1/9.10/9.11) 218 paths from the ports/CT will be needed plus 57 to/from London for domestic services plus 8 for through London for which “no other route is available” adding up to 283 paths required each way in the south east compared to the 71 currently.

*railfuture* recognises that changes to the network are vital if rail is to play an even more successful role in the movement of freight within the UK over the next 20 years. These changes must be to make sure trains can be longer, run faster, realising the potential of rail as **the sustainable mode**. We note that faster transits will enable rolling stock to be used more productively by getting more trips in and thus being available to carry more, bringing costs down to making the mode more competitive.

The mantra for rail freight must always be “**velocity and volume**”.

We further note that the “seven day railway” in itself will provide a large increase in capacity but in order to provide it, diversionary routes must be available to enable the rail freight industry to provide services that are resilient and reliable on a day to day basis in all circumstances and situations.

The prediction of a four fold increase in freight traffic passing through the London & South East region is to be welcomed but this increase will require iron timetable discipline and the early provision of additional gauge cleared infrastructure. By early, we mean well before 2030.

In the appendices below, we have emphasised by repetition where the additional infrastructure should be even if it is not strictly in the South East region.

We agree with the general tenor of the RUS that where it is not necessary for freight to pass through London, it should not do so. Vital to flexibility in routing in normal timetabling and during perturbation is the restoration of the full

*East West Rail Link* (EWRL) from Newmarket, Chippenham Junction - Cambridge – Letchworth –Sandy- Bedford Junctions - Bletchley Junctions – Oxford.

Additionally *railfuture* notes that the RUS predicts HS2 will create much more capacity on most existing routes north of London, which is to be welcomed. We would urge exploration of the synergy to be achieved by constructing a freight (and conventional passenger) route parallel to HS2, from Claydon Junction to Rugby and even Leicester along the ex-GC route.

Our detailed comments are contained in Appendix **A**.

## **Solent and South Hampshire**

*railfuture* welcomes the detailed examination in section 10 of the draft RUS for the Solent and South Hampshire area, particularly as it recognises the considerable shortcomings in the original SWML RUS (2006). Now that the predicted shortfall of capacity over demand has been shown to be one of the largest of any line into London, a strategy with committed schemes for CP5 and CP6 is a top priority.

We draw particular attention to the Portsmouth (Direct) Main Line, which was not fully covered in the original RUS, and hope that the feasibility/cost benefit of a flyover at Woking will be considered in further study during 2011.

Another key route that requires urgent attention is that linking Basingstoke and Reading. To meet future demand, speeding up of services could provide extra capacity.

We are very disappointed that proposals for South Hampshire do not appear very imaginative.

Our detailed comments are contained in Appendix **B**.

---

This consolidated national response has been prepared after consultations with the following *railfuture* branches: London & South East, Wessex, Thames Valley, East Anglia and East Midlands. The *railfuture* national Passenger Committee, and the Freight Services Development Committee were also consulted.

For further information contact Mr. Keith Dyll  
Chairman, *railfuture* London & South East  
26 Millway, Mill Hill, London NW7 3RB  
T: (020) 8959 7147  
M: 07788 677103  
E: keith.dyall@railfuture.org.uk

© Railfuture 2011

**[www.railfuture.org.uk](http://www.railfuture.org.uk) [www.railfuturescotland.org.uk](http://www.railfuturescotland.org.uk) [www.railfuturewales.org.uk](http://www.railfuturewales.org.uk)  
[www.railwatch.org.uk](http://www.railwatch.org.uk)**

The Railway Development Society Limited Registered in England and Wales No: 5011634  
A Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered Office: 24 Chedworth Place, Tattingstone, Suffolk IP9 2ND

## Appendix A – Freight – Detailed Comments

### 9.2 Southampton traffic

This traffic already follows a somewhat circuitous route to reach its main terminals compared to the adjacent trunk roads and thus is one that must be kept on the move.

We note that the main congestion points on the main route at: Basingstoke can be partially solved; at Reading will be totally solved.

However, the emphasis must be on providing a 7 day railway for this corridor, one which will provide secure transits during perturbation that is planned and unplanned and thus we support the provision of alternative routes via both Andover and Melksham. The current single line through Melksham will need re-doubling to ensure trains are not brought to a stand on the very busy routes at each end of it.

North of Didcot, the emphasis must be to get the traffic via EWRL to the WCML via the Bletchley grade separation and MML via the grade separation at Bedford to avoid crucial West Midland junctions. We note that this will incur a mileage penalty of 17 miles between Oxford and Nuneaton but will in most cases provide a quicker transit.

The route between Didcot and Oxford will need capacity enhancements in addition to the route listed below. Completion of EWRL for the final 6 miles to Sandy for the ECML flows would enable all Southampton traffic to avoid London.

#### **Routes needing extra track restored:**

Melksham

Syston Junctions – Leicester station - Wigston Junctions

Kettering – Corby

Huntingdon – Peterborough

#### **Full route restoration**

Oxford – Bletchley – Bedford – Sandy

(Will also enable flexibility of routing in time of perturbation.)

### 9.5 Essex Thames side (London Gateway)

We agree it is vital to use Barking – Gospel Oak **and electrify** and in general **avoid** GEML via Forest Gate – Stratford/NNL

For MML use EWRL via WCML and Bletchley/Bedford.

ECML traffic - note that a two way route from Upper Holloway to ECML could be achieved by track works and bi-directional signalling from Hertford loop via flyover at Bowes Park/Alexandra Palace over various down lines to Ferme Park and down to Upper Holloway. This is better than getting pathing problems via Cheshunt, Cambridge, Ely and March.

**Routes needing extra track restored:**

Syston Junctions – Leicester station - Wigston Junctions  
Kettering – Corby  
Huntingdon – Peterborough

**Full route restoration**

Oxford – Bletchley – Bedford – Sandy  
(Will also enable flexibility of routing in time of perturbation.)

**9.6. Haven Ports**

Agree with emerging conclusions.

General: Vital to keep as much freight traffic as possible off GEML south of Manningtree.

**Electrify** Felixstowe – Ipswich East Suffolk Junction and the projected Ipswich east - north new curve; Haughley – Chippenham Junction – Cambridge/Ely, Peterborough.

**Bi – directional all** track Ely West Junction to Ely Dock Jct and West Curve to enable maximum flexibility to keep freight and other traffic moving.

Complete total EWRL Cambridge – Oxford to keep increasing number of Haven Ports - West and other freight trains away from London area routes.

**Routes needing extra track restored:**

Syston Junctions – Leicester station - Wigston Junctions  
Cambridge - Dullingham

**Full route restoration**

Oxford – Bletchley – Bedford – Sandy thence ECML slow lines to Letchworth via north facing spurs off Hitchin flyover. Latter should be build with passive provision for double tracks.

(Will also enable flexibility of routing in time of perturbation.)

**9.7 Channel Tunnel/Kent Thames Gateway**

(Note: title of table 9.9 incorrect)

Generally agree with emerging conclusions although we note that all of this traffic will inevitably be routed via London.

We would urge a re-think regarding the route from Tonbridge to Reading via Redhill, Guildford for traffics that might develop from the CT to/from Bristol, the Southwest and South Wales. In particular protect the alignment at Redhill for a direct connecting chord between the Tonbridge and Guildford routes. In due course this lengthy route around western London from the north and west might be preferable to searching for paths nearer the centre.

**Routes needing extra track restored:**

Syston Junctions – Leicester station - Wigston Junctions  
Kettering – Corby  
Huntingdon – Peterborough

**Full route restoration**

Oxford – Bletchley –Bedford – Sandy - Cambridge  
(Will also enable flexibility of routing in time of perturbation.)

**9.8 Domestic Freight**

For ECML traffic – see note 9.5 re two-way access to Upper Holloway from ECML.

**Routes needing extra track restored:**

Melksham  
Syston Junctions – Leicester station - Wigston Junctions  
Kettering – Corby  
Huntingdon - Peterborough

**Full route restoration**

Oxford – Bletchley –Bedford – Sandy - Cambridge  
(Will also enable flexibility of routing in time of perturbation.)

Agree with emerging conclusions

**Via London**

If full EWRL restored there should be no need for non-London traffic to travel via London so do not agree with emerging conclusions.

**Routes needing extra track restored:**

Melksham  
Syston Junctions – Leicester station - Wigston Junctions  
Kettering – Corby  
Huntingdon – Peterborough

**Full route restoration**

Oxford – Bletchley –Bedford – Sandy - Cambridge  
(Will also enable flexibility of routing in time of perturbation.)

## Appendix B – Solent & South Hampshire – Detailed Comments

### 3. Current operations and train performance

Para 3.2.4. The CrossCountry service from the South Coast to the Midlands and the North is mentioned in passing, but not elsewhere (this is relevant to the Basingstoke-Reading line).

Figure 3.12. The all-day South West Trains ppm is good at around 93%. We ask what is considered to be the 'par' level. Is it 95% i.e. 19/20 on time, and does it mean < 5 minutes, or right time? However, given the fairly high level of ppm, speeding up of services should be one avenue to explore to increase capacity.

### 4. Morning peak to London – current demand

The current demand for journeys into London uses baseline figures derived from the DfT "Green Book". It is not clear how the baseline figures were derived for the original SWML RUS (2006). Within the Wessex area we have to consider both London commuters and other heavily used non-metropolitan services.

Para 4.4.5. For the majority of London-bound peak-hour services from the Wessex area, no allowance is made for standing and capacity is measured as the total number of seats within each train. Woking is outside the notional 20-minute acceptable time for standing and therefore for every fast train (remembering that in peak hours few trains stop at Clapham Junction) it is assumed there should be seats for every passenger. In practice, trains leaving Basingstoke (and Guildford) are just full but with a few standing passengers.

### 5. Morning peak to London – committed schemes and other existing strategy

Para 5.3.3. Despite 0.25m extra seats for commuters (3 hour morning rush hours) to London by 2031 being provided, none will be allocated to the main line services from the Wessex area to Waterloo, despite forecasts of substantial growth. This is confirmed in Fig 5.1 where the routes into Waterloo show one of the smallest percentage increases in capacity provided.

Table 5.13. This table confirms that the existing strategy for the main line from Waterloo is for no increase in capacity for the next 20 years.

Para 5.4.14. The expansion at Waterloo, taking over the former international platforms and extending all platforms to a minimum of 10 cars will provide improved operational conditions and this may help performance on the main line trains. However, *railfuture* is concerned that the proposal from the previous RUS to lengthen all outer suburban trains (Woking inwards) to 10 cars is still uncommitted in CP4.

## 6. Morning peak to London – future demand

Para 6.2.5. Is the use of TfL's multimodal model, the LTS model and Rail Plan for London in conflict with the Passenger Demand Forecasting Handbook (PDFH) used elsewhere? *railfuture* understands that the PDFH may be updated, as it appears consistently to under-predict growth resulting from new lines and new services.

Figures 6.5 and 6.6. Both 'capacity gap' and 'capacity utilisation' into Waterloo are predicted to be in excess of 100% (130% in both figures as no interventions for increased capacity are currently planned or committed).

## 7. Capacity gaps and options beyond existing strategy

Table 7.1. For main line services into Waterloo there is a predicted shortfall of 7100 seats in the peak hour. This is reduced to 6100 after taking into account the recommended (but not accepted or committed due to high capital cost) scheme to increase outer suburban train lengths to 12 cars. This will provide no relief for main line services, only those semi-fast inwards from Woking. Is there scope for a Woking-Surbiton-Waterloo 'fast' shuttle thus allowing more Portsmouth main line trains to run non-stop and be composed of suitable 2+2 rolling stock?

Para 7.3.1. Under 'Corridors not fully addressed by Generation One RUS' problems at Basingstoke and Guildford are mentioned as having capacity problems but the long journey times to Portsmouth are not.

## 10. Solent and South Hampshire

Para 10.2.1.1. We believe direct London to Portsmouth services should be accelerated by upwards of 15 minutes.

Para 10.7.3 Gap S2. We would wish to see a greater priority placed on options for the reopening the Marchwood line to passenger traffic. It could be run as a simple shuttle terminating at Southampton Central or integrated into the Salisbury-Eastleigh-Romsey service.

Para 10.8.2 Options S1.1 to 1.5. *railfuture* supports the proposal of an extra fast service between Southampton and Portsmouth; for the medium term the option to re-double the line and introduce a new platform at Eastleigh are supported but we note that this is not recommended due to cost. In the long term a chord to enable a line to run direct to the airport would shorten journey times for an 'express' South Coast service. Ideally, all Coastway and Portsmouth-Southampton services should be routed via Southampton Parkway to allow direct travel to the airport from the east.

Para 10.8.4 and Table 10.5 - many car parks other than the five mentioned are short of capacity.

Paras 10.8.5.1 to 5 responding to Gap S4. Network Rail and operators must be held to these statements of intent to improve journey times to Portsmouth and Alton.