campaigning
by the
Railway Development
Society Limited

Passenger Group

London and South East Market Study
RUS Planner
Network Rail
Kings Place
90 York Way
London
N1 9AG

Please Reply to:
5 Englefield Crescent
Cliffe Woods
Rochester
Kent
ME3 8HB

Tel: (01634) 566256
E-Mail: chris.fribbins@railfuture.org.uk

24th July 2013

Dear Sirs,

Long Term Planning Process – London and South East Market Study

Railfuture is pleased to submit this consolidated national response, which has been prepared jointly by the Passenger Group and with contributions from the London and South East, Thames Valley, East Anglia, East Midlands and Wessex branches.

Railfuture is a national voluntary organisation structured in England as twelve regional branches and two national branches for Scotland and Wales. We are Britain`s leading independent rail lobby organization with a large number of affiliated Rail User Groups. Being funded entirely from membership subscriptions and donations, Railfuture enjoys non-partisan status and has no connections with political parties or organisations, trade unions or commercial interests. Railfuture is pro-rail but not anti-car or aviation.

We are supportive of the core goals and conditional outputs, but would add some additional points and comments to these to provide some further emphasis and priority from our organisation.

Strategic Goals

- **Enabling economic growth**
  We appreciate that this is the key source for the additional funding required for the rail industry and accept the wider definition that includes leisure travel as well as travel for work and other business purposes. In the current economic climate there is likely to be an increase of holidays and leisure activities in this country. London will continue as the main economic driver, but consideration should be given to supporting existing and, planning for other, economic centres in the South East that could be served better by contraflow services, especially in the peak – this will mean more involvement in national, regional and local development planning.
- **Reducing carbon and the transport sector's impact on the environment**
  Although electrification is seen as the main driver here, there are benefits to ensuring that improvements in diesel locomotion should be supported as well such as driver behaviour in all fuel modes.
  With the majority of London and South East services already electrified, priority should be given to the remaining services (Great Western and EMT already planned). Efforts should also be made to reduce diesel powered 'running under the wires' in the London (and national) context – with Bi-modal trains and in-fill electrification.

A number of London termini suffer air quality issues or have significant operational constraints dealing with diesel exhaust.

- **Improving the quality of life for communities and individuals**
  It may prove difficult to quantify this in terms of financial benefit but is a key driver in many of the outputs. A number of cases can be made for enhancement to rail provision in London and the South East, although much of the emphasis is given to central London services, extensions from Uckfield and East/West Rail to Cambridge are schemes which need further investigation. There needs to be a clear template for communities to make their case (with minimal cost in the initial stages) and the criteria that it will be judged on.
- **Improving affordability**
  We would be concerned that this is just used to limit or reduce the income from government sources and would want to see some clear benefit to passenger fares.

Conditional Outputs (Starting Point)

London and South East (starting point)

1. **Sufficient capacity to accommodate demand**
   The distance/time expectation for having to stand is increasing and metro trains are now designed to accommodate a large number of standing passengers. Accepting that standing is required to cope with demand, a design limit does need to be agreed for both Metro and longer distance services. It would be useful to trial methods for directing passengers to lighter loaded carriages during CP5 or early in CP6.

   Over-crowded trains limit the opportunity for people to work on the trains. Access to wireless internet and power points is not going to be much use to standing passengers on overcrowded services.

   A general rule of thumb is that service frequencies on Metro services need to be maximised (within the constraints of other services where tracks are shared) with a minimum of 4 per hour. Longer distance services still require at least 2 per hour.
2. **Improved connectivity to central London**
   Metro services around London provide much better connectivity to other services (Tube, trams, buses and other heavy rail such as Overground, Thameslink and Crossrail) than longer distance services where the priority is to get to the London termini as quickly as possible.
   On-going heavy rail, tube, bus, taxi, pedestrian and cycle are common priorities that also need to be factored in.
3. **Improved connectivity within the market study area other than to central London**
   Connectivity to London will remain the main driver for some time, especially with the additional population growth, however this is resulting in a much larger region and connectivity to East, West, North and South London could be supplied via connections other than just termini (Thameslink, Crossrail, London Overground etc. and should be considered as additional connectivity). This is particularly an issue for North/South connectivity into London Docklands where growth is very large and plans are for this to continue.

   Further out, use of London Overground is proving very popular although connectivity from longer distance services is generally limited – leading to extra journeys into and out of central London.

   Further out East/West Rail will provide cross-country links, avoiding Central London (and connectivity to Cambridge and on-going destinations is a good example of this and should be considered for implementation.

   Improved services along Kent/Sussex/Hampshire (Coastway East/West Ashford/Hastings/Eastbourne/Brighton/Southampton) will also improve general connectivity for a number

of deprived areas and help stimulate economic growth, while reducing journey time (including to/from London). Further connectivity in East Sussex (Lewes/Uckfield) could further open up options for the wider area.

4. **Improved access to international gateways**
   Around London, connectivity to airports will remain a high priority (it is hoped that the uncertainty of future provision until after 2015 does not cause any stagnation here). North/South/West links to London Heathrow are a particular issue. Improvements to Gatwick and Stansted rail connections will also need improvements (services will also need to run earlier and later to reduce the need to access the airports by road). Luton Airport and Gatwick has also benefitted from Thameslink connectivity.
   Improvements to the proposed HS2/HS1 connection will be necessary to improve the international rail service provision (although it is appreciated that this is an HS2 issue and outside the immediate remit of this study, further domestic services between Kent, Ebbsfleet and Stratford to and from the national network could be provided).
   Access to international ferries has taken a step back in recent years, with use of cars encouraged – services need to be advertised and perhaps smart ticketing options provided for foot passengers.
5. **Improved connectivity to centres of service provision including retail, tourism and higher education**
   This outcome is supported. There are a growing number of examples where this is already providing real access and competition to vehicle traffic. Better advertising, ticketing options (perhaps smart ticketing), train stopping patterns and frequency will support this.
6. **Competitive services to abstract trips from congested roads**
   Both congestion and car running costs (especially fuel) are likely to continue to drive a growth in a switch to rail. In the main population areas we are likely to see the continued growth in households that do not even own a car (especially prominent in London)
   In London even off-peak, Saturday and Sunday are seeing a great deal of traffic congestion and rail has the capacity to provide – if priced and advertised accordingly.
7. **Improved access to the rail network**
   The Long Distance networks provide the trunk services, other services providing the branches. Connectivity should be both timely, with interchange stations having good quality services and staff cover wherever possible. Central London has a high level of connectivity to the national network with very few examples of more than one or two changes to almost anywhere – however this is not true for much of the South East and needs to be considered further.

   In addition an individual user's access to the rail network has been guided by regulation on accessibility for various disabilities and access issues and although there have been some major improvements (in particular at central London stations and across the market study area, there is still a lot more to be done. Everything from ticketing to signing and step-free (or minimal) access to the station, the platforms and the trains at all points of the journey. This is often alleviated by a trained staff presence at the station (with central London stations leading on this).
8. **Improved passenger satisfaction**
   Other outputs will be the main driver for this and, in addition, the quality of rolling stock will be a major factor. We would ask for consideration within this output or as additional outputs:

- Reduction in journey time (including the congestion at termini stations that often add significant time, and significantly reduce the overall perceived journey quality)
- Resilience of services (existing and new diversionary routes identified and used in place of bus replacement)
- Better disruption information on train, station and social media/Internet (Network Rail & TOC)

9. **Competitive prices compared to other modes and improved pricing and ticketing**
   Reducing the cost of the railway system is vital and we would want to see that reflected in car parking and

fares as well as a reduction in tax payer funding. Support for smart ticketing and increasing the purchase options are strongly supported. Further consideration to support better use of lightly loaded and off-peak service has been added below.

IN ADDITION

10. **London Termini Capacity**
    A major concern will remain with the capacity of London Termini and some key interchange stations to cope with normal rail services, let alone further growth and disruption. There is nothing more frustrating for a passenger than being stuck outside a destination station waiting for a platform to become available (and often within sight of the station itself). Operation efficiencies will be required to reduce dwell times (including termini stations) , seeking to turn terminating services into through services (e.g. Thameslink and Crossrail) and managing train flows from further away.
11. **Make better use of off-peak/lightly loaded services (TOC Driven)**
    Provide lower book ahead fares (but without reservations); improve effectiveness and scope of railcards and off-peak fares (such as the Network Card which has been devalued over many years with mid-week minimum prices increased and effectiveness for many users reduced or removed). Smart ticketing should help here - use of Oyster has demonstrated the popularity and effectiveness of this.
    This is particularly acute in the London area as capacity to support the peak hours means much more of the infrastructure and rolling stock can be underused off-peak. This had led to problems where very heavily peak hour used routes still require subsidy or premium payments are very low.
12. **Other aspects of connectivity**
    Multi-Modal (Bus, Tram, Taxi, Car, Cycle, Pedestrian) at station
    Pedestrian (and accessibility) within station and between connecting services
    Access to other rail services (built in flexibility for branch connections where possible in the event of trunk delays) Minimise and retime connections that are timed to depart a very short time before or at the same time – where possible (limit scope or remove perverse financial penalties). This adds to the effectiveness and total journey experience for passengers.

We trust you will find these suggestions helpful.

Yours faithfully,

CFribbins

Chris Fribbins
Railfuture
Head of Passenger Group