

Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between Network Rail Infrastructure Limited and First/MTR South West Trains Ltd (trading as South Western Railway) Industry consultation responses

17/08/2017	Alliance Rail Holdings to First MTR South Western Trains Limited
25/08/2017	First MTR South Western Trains Limited to Alliance Rail Holdings
29/08/2017	Alliance Rail to First MTR South Western Trains Limited
25/08/2017	Govia Thameslink Railway to First MTR South Western Trains Limited
25/08/2017	First MTR South Western Trains Limited to Govia Thameslink Railway
06/09/2017	Govia Thameslink Railway to First MTR South Western Trains Limited
29/08/2017	Transport Focus to First MTR South Western Trains Limited
29/08/2017	GBRF to First MTR South Western Trains Limited
05/09/2017	First MTR South Western Trains Limited to GBRF

From:

Sent: 17 August 2017 17:04

To:

Cc:

Subject: First/MTR South West Trains (trading as South Western Railway) and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited New contract

Dear _____,

I hope that you are keeping well. With regard to the new contract application, we will respond shortly but we have the following questions and comments:

1 The form P indicates that the TSS and Dec 2018 timetables are attached – I cannot see this – can you supply this please?

Timetables as requested are attached.

2 What is the start date of the new TAC and how does this align with the TAC which will transfer from SWT?

The existing TAC ends on 8th December 2018, the start date for the new TAC will be 9th December 2018.

3 There are a lot of square brackets in the contract – will you be reissuing this so we can see the end product?

We confirm these will be completed following consultation and prior to final regulatory approval and contract signing, where applicable and as indicated on a consistent basis with the current contract and applicable regulated values.

4 The form P identifies in para 3.1 *“For the avoidance of doubt, FMSWT is not seeking to continue with the other approved rights within Schedule 5 of the current TAC not mentioned above beyond December 2018.”* Please can you clarify which rights you will not be seeking ?

We are not seeking any of the current rights to transfer to the new TAC.

5 Under adequacy para 4.2 it states” *There are no implications for operational performance, with our plans for the franchise delivering more reliability and improved performance”* We understand that on some routes the new timetable will require a reduction in station dwell times. Please can you clarify how this has been assessed by Network Rail and if they are content with changes to reduce station dwells?

We have reviewed the current dwells and have proposed changes to a small number of them as a result of the reviews, discussions are ongoing with Network Rail

6 Form P 4.3 – It appears that your franchise agreement only allows a flex of five minutes – yet the track access contract you are seeking will allow unlimited flex. How do you propose to reconcile this mismatch? Why are you not seeking an equivalent flex in your TAC?

This mismatch will be managed through the timetable bid and offer process together with the usual timetable compliance processes contained within the franchise agreement.

7 Form P Para 6.1 Enhancements – Given the situation re the HLOS and SoFA are any of these enhancements at risk of non-delivery?

None of these are at risk of delivery, indeed during the current Waterloo Blockade the International Platforms at Waterloo along with the Windsor Line platform extensions have been in use.

8 Please can you advise of the status of the rights of SWT which were approved by the ORR as open access services under the 58th Supplemental agreement – are these now franchise obligations?

If you are referring to the services via Castle Cary / Yeovil Pen Mill these are now obligations, although the services between Yeovil Junction and Yeovil Pen Mill are still classed as experimental services.

9 I note that in the TAC one of the timing load is “120” – is this correct?

This is a typo, the correct timing load should be ‘455’

Best wishes

Head of Contracts



Alliance Rail Holdings
88 The Mount
York
YO24 1AR

www.alliancerail.co.uk
http://twitter.com/Alliance_Rail

Legal Disclaimer - Alliance Rail Holdings

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may be privileged and protected by law and are intended solely for the use by the named addressee (which may be different to the person or entity who receives this e-mail). If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail from your system. Please note that if you are not the intended recipient, disclosure of this e-mail and any files transmitted with it to any other person and copying of this e-mail is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please note that any views expressed in this e-mail may be those of the sender and do not necessarily reflect those of Alliance Rail Holdings.

Internet e-mail is not a secure communications medium. Please note this lack of security when responding by e-mail. Accordingly, we give no warranties or assurances about the safety and content of this e-mail and its attachments. Neither Alliance Rail Holdings nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan the e-mail and files transmitted with it for the presence of viruses. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and any liability of Alliance Rail Holdings arising to you or any third party acting on any information contained in this e-mail or its files is hereby excluded.

Alliance Rail Holdings Ltd. Registered Address: 1 Admiral Way, Doxford International Business Park, Sunderland, Tyne & Wear, SR3 3XP, UK Company Registration Number: 07026295

From:

Sent: 25 August 2017 11:48

To:

Cc:

Subject: RE: First/MTR South West Trains (trading as South Western Railway) and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited New contract

Thank you for your email. I've picked up on your points below in more detail with answers in red.

Attached are the timetables you have requested. Please note these will be subject to a full timetable consultation (towards the end of September) in line with our franchise agreement.

Regards,

Bid Train Planning Manager | First, Rail Division

4th Floor, Capital House | 25 Chapel Street | London | NW1 5DH |

e:

First Rail Holdings | Registered in England and Wales number 05154485
Registered office: 50 Eastbourne Terrace, London, W2 6LG

Bid Train Planning Manager
First Rail Holdings
Capital House
25 Chapel Street
London NW1 5DH
(By email only)

29 August 2017

Dear

Application for a Track Access Contract under Section 17 of the Railways Act 1993 between First/MTR South West Trains (trading as South Western Railway) and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on First/MTR's application for a new track access contract for South Western Railway services, and for your response of 25th August to Jonathan Cooper to his questions and request for further information.

Alliance's principal interest in the application is related to the Main Line service pattern proposed. We note that the pattern of Main Line services into and out of London Waterloo is substantially different from the current pattern, although the hourly quantum is mostly the same. We also note there is a significant change in the structure of the timetable between Southampton and Weymouth supported by an additional service between Portsmouth and Southampton.

In section 3.2 of Form P you state that Network Rail was not in a position to agree the incremental rights being sought due to the competing application for rights from Alliance Rail for services between London Waterloo and Southampton. We are surprised that this is the only reason for Network Rail not supporting an application under Section 18 of the Railways Act. As this suggests that Network Rail has assessed the capacity and performance impacts of the proposed increase in the level of service both to Portsmouth and on the Windsor and Reading Lines, we assume this has been done and Network Rail is comfortable with these additional services.

You rightly note that Network Rail was undertaking a capacity study of the Wessex Main Line for the December 2018 timetable. You will be aware that this study has been completed while this consultation was under way and that the report has now been submitted to the ORR. Alliance is pleased that the study has concluded there is

capacity for both the franchise proposals and (with the exception of a single contra-peak service) all of Alliance's proposals. In fact, the only conflicts identified by the report were between the proposed franchise service pattern and aspirations from freight operators for paths for longer trains operating out of Southampton.

You suggest in paragraph 4.2 that *"there are no implications for operational performance, with our plans for the franchise delivering more reliability and improved performance"*. Whilst Alliance broadly supports this view, it has been suggested that further assessment of performance impacts may be necessary following completion of the Network Rail capacity study. If any further performance assessment is undertaken we would expect this to consider all the implications of the timetable changes proposed by South Western Railway, including reductions in minimum dwell times that have not yet been agreed with Network Rail, as well as any impact of Alliance services. Alliance is, however, happy to support the proposed changes to minimum dwell times.

Alliance notes that, in your response to questions, you state that the services that operate between Salisbury and Yeovil Pen Mill via Castle Cary now form a franchise commitment. However, the Train Service Specification issued along with the franchise ITT stated that *"Bidders are not required to operate any service between these stations from December 2018...."* Publication of the franchise train service agreement will clarify whether these services should continue to operate on weekdays as 'open access', the designation given in the ORR's decision letter on SWT's 58th Supplemental agreement. Alliance also notes that any services operated between Yeovil Junction and Yeovil Pen Mill are still classed as experimental.

Alliance welcomes the First/MTR application, and the clarity it brings to the process of developing the December 2018 timetable. We look forward to working alongside South Western Railway, and closely with Network Rail, to develop a timetable that makes best use of the infrastructure whilst respecting all operators' track access rights and implementing the benefits of both the new franchise service and Alliance's own proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Head of Development

----- Original message -----

From:

Date: 25/08/2017 15:40 (GMT+00:00)

To:

Subject: Re: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

Thank you for consulting GTR on the proposed Track Access Contract between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail. Please find attached GTR's response to this.

In summary

GTR does not object to the the principle First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail entering into Track Access Agreement. However GTR does need assurances that the proposed additional services can be accommodated without the need to make changes to GTRs Southern Rail services before we can provide our support for this application.

Kind regards

Access Contracts Manager (Track)
Govia Thameslink Railway Limited

1st and 2nd Floor | Monument Place | 24 Monument Place | London | EC3R 8AJ
Tel No: 07976 112334



From:

Sent: 31 July 2017 16:11

To:

Regulatory

Reform New TAC/SA Info

Cc:

Subject: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

Good afternoon,

Application for a Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) under Section 17 of the Railways Act 1993 between First/MTR South West Trains (trading as South Western Railway) and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

First/MTR South West Trains Ltd (trading as South Western Railway) have requested that Network Rail carry out a pre-application consultation on their behalf.

Copies of the Form P application and proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) are attached to this email in PDF format. These documents will shortly be available to be viewed via the Network Rail website at the following link :

<http://archive.nr.co.uk/browseDirectory.aspx?root=&dir=%5cTrack%20Access%5c1%20Current%20Consultations>

In accordance with the Industry Code of Practice for Track Access application consultations, should you wish to comment on this application or have any questions you are invited to respond within the 4 week consultation period. The consultation period will be in place from Monday 31st July 2017 until Tuesday 29th August 2017 and responses should be addressed to Jon Hills, Bid Train Planning Manager, First Rail Holdings at j

If you no longer deal with industry consultations on behalf of your organisation, it would be greatly appreciated if you could respond with amended contacts details to
so that we may include them in this consultation and update
our records accordingly.

Kind regards

Programme Manager (Change) Business Improvement

Route Businesses E&W - Wessex

Network Rail | One Eversholt Street

London | NW1 2DN

Advance notice of annual leave : September 9th – 17th 2017

The content of this email (and any attachment) is confidential. It may also be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure.

This email should not be used by anyone who is not an original intended recipient, nor may it be copied or disclosed to anyone who is not an original intended recipient.

If you have received this email by mistake please notify us by emailing the sender, and then delete the email and any copies from your system.

Liability cannot be accepted for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of Network Rail.

Network Rail Infrastructure Limited registered in England and Wales No. 2904587, registered office Network Rail, 2nd Floor, One Eversholt Street, London, NW1 2DN

From:

Sent: 25 August 2017 15:48

To:

Subject: Re: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

We have been doing a lot of joint working with your colleagues at GTR strategic planning (James Harris and Peter Lane) to try and facilitate both the May 2018 changes on GTR (against the current SWR service and TAC) and Dec 18 for our new service and TAC. Indeed for Dec 18 in the Epsom area we have worked jointly with James to completely rewrite our bid timetable to facilitate GTR's aspirations alongside our own and also provide a regularly spaced timetable.

Best Regards,

Bid Train Planning Manager | First, Rail Division
4th Floor, Capital House | 25 Chapel Street | London | NW1 5DH |
e:

First Rail Holdings | Registered in England and Wales number [05154485](#)
Registered office: [50 Eastbourne Terrace, London, W2 6LG](#)



Access Contracts Manager (Track)
Monument Place
24 Monument Street
London
EC3R 8AJ

6th September 2017

RE: First/MTR South West Trains Section 17

Dear

Thank you for your e-mail of the 25th August confirming the joint working South Western Railway has been doing with GTRs Strategic Planning team.

Based on this GTR now gives its support for this Section 17 Application.

Yours sincerely,

Access Contracts Manager (Track)

Govia Thameslink Railway

Monument Place, 24 Monument Street, London, EC3R 8AJ

Registered in England under number: 7934306. Registered office: 3rd Floor, 41-51 Grey Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 6EE

From:
Sent: 29 August 2017 13:32
To:
Subject: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited. 0308b18

Transport Focus has received details of the Track Access Contract for which South Western Railway will be applying.

They note that:

a track access contract is in place until 8/12/18;
 this application seeks a new contract, to support SWR’s Train Service Specification (TSS), from then until the PCD in 2025, five months and 13 periods after the current franchise could end;
 it continues the current quantum and calling patterns;
 it applies for incremental rights for quantum and calling patterns only, and for the continuation of the existing connection rights for the branch to Lymington Pier;
 rights to operate updated Class 442 trains from December 2018 will be sought through a supplemental agreement, as will those for the new stock that is on order;
 the plans described in the Form P show these additional rights for the three hour morning and evening peaks: +17 in the a.m. peak, +19 in the p.m. peak;
 the changes for the peaks on the “SWML”, in December 2018, over May 2018, are:

Table 1

<i>up, a.m. peak</i>			<i>down, p.m. peak</i>		
<i>period</i>	<i>increase</i>	<i>new total</i>	<i>period</i>	<i>increase</i>	<i>new total</i>
7.00 – 7.59	2	9	16.00 – 16.59	2	8
8.00 – 8.59	1	9	17.00 – 17.59	-1	8
9.00 – 9.59	-2	5 ¹	18.00 – 18.59	1	8

Note 1: plus one for WoE line, no other peak changes for that route.

specific changes to services are:

Table 2

<i>comment</i>	<i>route</i>	<i>change</i>
1	WAT – WNR	increase to four/hour; two/hour via HOU
2	WAT - WYB	split into WAT – HOU, VIR - WYB
3	WAT – RDG	increase to four/hour
4	ACT - GLD	split at AHT, operate ACT – AHT, FNH - GLD
5	WAT – PMS/PMH	extend HSL off-peak stopper to/from PMS
6	PMS - SOU	additional hourly semi-fast
7	WAT - WEY	revise: POO stopper, WEY “semi-fast”; use paths for new PMH – WEY service

comments

1. Welcome the increased frequency and connectivity for the Windsor Riverside to Waterloo route; aspire for faster journey times: Riverside to Waterloo is currently c. 27 mph. The AA Route planner gives similar road journey times for Windsor Castle to the London Eye. Note plans for Hounslow, regret apparently not until 2020.
2. Regret this change, literally – which will add to the difficulty in marketing the service and reduce its appeal to passengers; note the implications re flexing for freight trains, but suggest that running the trains between Hounslow and Virginia Water as passenger, with a call only at Staines, would provide better value for money, especially for passengers.
3. Welcome the regular four/hour frequency; note plans for faster journey times: Wokingham to Waterloo is now typically only 32mph. The AA Route planner gives a road journey time Wokingham to the London Eye that is only three minutes longer than rail. As a rail comparison, Wokingham to Waterloo is 11 stops in 36¾ miles, Great Western's Reading to Paddington stoppers make 8 or 9 stops, and average 40 and 36 mph. Although described as "fast", the new services east of Wokingham omit only Martins Heron; west of Wokingham they are non-stop, on a section of route where geography suggests a more frequent service is required to expand demand from the intermediate stations.
4. Hope the split will allow closer connections at Ascot – they are now typically ten minutes, and up to 15 on Sundays – and at Aldershot, where these trains miss Alton trains by four minutes in both directions. Welcome the Guildford to Farnham connectivity.
5. Generous provision off-peak; will calling patterns be revised?
6. Welcome the improved connectivity; current all-stations service is 60 minutes, Great Western (3 stops) take 41 minutes; cannot the new semi-fast service run to Weymouth?
7. Note the lengthy stops – total of 37 mins. at Southampton Central and Brockenhurst – in the Poole service, which must impact on its attractiveness for certain flows. Welcome the improved connectivity for Portsmouth, but question how attractive its journey times will be overall.

Transport Focus also notes that:

Network Rail is "not in a position to agree to the incremental rights being sought"; the December 2018 timetable rights applied for are consistent with: the timetable that was developed for the franchise bid, the DfT's TSS issued for the franchise competition, Network Rail's maintenance and renewal plans known at the time; the timetable has been reviewed by Network Rail during the franchising competition and "there were no issues identified with the level of capacity required"; Network Rail is making a capacity study, for the ORR, of the Wessex Mainline, taking into consideration SWR's additional paths and Alliance's bid; SWR "will continue to work collaboratively" with Network Rail.

Alliance "Grand Southern Railway"

The reply (o/r 1011b17, on 8/12/16) to Alliance's application, as "Grand Southern Railway" for seven off-peak slots from the PCD 2017, and two down and one up peak slots from the PCD 2018, stated:

Transport Focus welcomes the additional capacity, although, of course, the new franchisee's plans are yet to be announced, and are broadly in favour of the new rights being granted, subject to the following:

'Network benefits' are important; competition must be delivered within a framework of co-ordination, there must be no significant disbenefit to any existing group of passengers. It is important to plan a route in its entirety; the granting of new track access rights should not significantly frustrate the industry's subsequent ability to develop a timetable that maximises capacity, and utility to passengers. Consequently Transport Focus looks forward to seeing how Grand Southern proposes to work with the new franchisee to fit the proposed new services into the South Western Main Line December 2018 timetable.

Grand Southern's plan for an extra 1,200 seats in the peaks is obviously welcome, but it is not yet clear how they fit with SWR's plans for more capacity on that part of their network.

Passengers' requirements

Research for Transport Focus's *South Western franchise: passengers' experiences and hopes for future services (SWF)* (11th. January 2016) found that, while punctuality and frequency could benefit from measures to improve them, capacity was, not surprisingly, in need of a lot of improvement:

Table 3

% satisfied	punctuality reliability	frequency	capacity	
			peak	off-peak
SWF	76	74	37	68

NRPS scores show an improvement over the four years 2013 to 2017 in the scores for: peak journey time, frequency, connections with other train services; and an apparently much better off-peak than peak performance. The improvement in satisfaction with capacity, even since late 2015 (when the SWF was surveyed), is noticeable, particularly in the peak, implying that capacity improvements have made a real difference, despite continuing growth in demand, and clearly marking the need to continue to increase peak capacity. Passengers would presumably expect "more of the same" from the new franchise.

Table 4 NRPS

% satisfied	journey time		punctuality/reliability		frequency		conns.		capacity ²	
	peak	off-peak	peak	off-peak	peak	off-peak	peak	off-peak	peak	off-peak
Spring 2013	70	83	72	78	72	74	67	76	32	70
Spring 2017	77	84	71	83	76	79	72	80	56	81

Note 2: measure in 2013 was "room to sit or stand"; measure in 2017 was "level of crowding".

Commentary

The Form P details measures that are being, or will be, implemented to maintain and improve performance on the SWR network, including alliance working with Network Rail, extended depot and stabling facilities, and a homogeneous fleet for suburban services. It is clear that a lot of effort is being expended to provide passengers with the sort of service they expect. Additional capacity, some faster journey times, later last trains, more frequent services on Sunday afternoons and some improved connectivity all match passengers' aspirations noted in the report *South Western franchise: passengers' experiences and hopes for future services*. As ever, passengers' main requirements are for a punctual and reliable railway which has enough capacity.

In conclusion

Transport Focus notes that a consultation on the TSS and December 2018 timetable is due to start soon, and looks forward to contributing to the debate.

As mentioned above, the rights sought do not appear to justify Network Rail's unwillingness to agree to the incremental rights. The application seeks rights that will grow capacity; Transport Focus supports South Western Railway's application.

Regards,

—
This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

—

From:

Sent: 29 August 2017 17:01

To:

Cc:

Subject: RE: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

Dear ,

GB Railfreight has one major concern, and two minor points, on this proposed Section 17 Application:

- 1) GB Railfreight notes that there are proposals to double the Waterloo – Reading (via Richmond) services to 4tph all day as well as doubling the Waterloo – Windsor (via Hounslow) services to 4tph all day. GB Railfreight is concerned that, with these levels of increased services, there may not be robust TPR-compliant paths to satisfy current freight rights. Given a selection of today's freight trains would need to run in one hit, from Virginia Water via Barnes, Clapham Junction and Factory Junction to Nunhead, due to there now being a lack of suitable holding points, I'd be keen to see any timetabling work that may be available to support your current rights proposal.

Now that additional LOROL services are running and are taking up far more capacity on the Clapham Junction – Longhedge Jct – Factory Jct – Voltaire Road – Crofton Road Jct section of line, it becomes all the more important to see how current freight rights are exercised.

- 2) On page 87 of the proposed Track Access Contract, the Waterloo – Shepperton services show a timing load of "120". Are you using a Swindon Class 120 unit or is this a mistake?
- 3) The contract states that Waterloo – Portsmouth Harbour "fast" services are proposed to call at Godalming as a regular calling pattern. Can you please explain why Godalming is to now be included on the "fast" services?

Please feel free to contact me if you need any further information.

Regards,

National Access Manager,
GB Railfreight Ltd.,
3rd Floor,
55 Old Broad Street,
London, EC2M 1RX.

GB Railfreight Ltd. Registered in England & Wales No. 03707899.
Registered Office: 3rd Floor, 55 Old Broad Street, London, EC2M 1RX.

From:

Sent: 31 July 2017 16:11

To: trackaccess@crosscountrytrains.co.uk;

Cc:

Subject: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

Good afternoon,

Application for a Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) under Section 17 of the Railways Act 1993 between First/MTR South West Trains (trading as South Western Railway) and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

First/MTR South West Trains Ltd (trading as South Western Railway) have requested that Network Rail carry out a pre-application consultation on their behalf.

Copies of the Form P application and proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) are attached to this email in PDF format. These documents will shortly be available to be viewed via the Network Rail website at the following link :

<http://archive.nr.co.uk/browseDirectory.aspx?root=&dir=%5cTrack%20Access%5c1%20Current%20Consultations>

In accordance with the Industry Code of Practice for Track Access application consultations, should you wish to comment on this application or have any questions you are invited to respond within the 4 week consultation period. The consultation period will be in place from Monday 31st July 2017 until Tuesday 29th August 2017 and responses should be addressed to Jon Hills, Bid Train Planning Manager, First Rail Holdings at j

If you no longer deal with industry consultations on behalf of your organisation, it would be greatly appreciated if you could respond with amended contacts details to

so that we may include them in this consultation and update
our records accordingly.

Kind regards

Programme Manager (Change) Business Improvement

Route Businesses E&W - Wessex

Network Rail | One Eversholt Street

London | NW1 2DN

Advance notice of annual leave : September 9th – 17th 2017

From:

Sent: 05 September 2017 17:38

To:

Cc:

Subject: RE: Industry Consultation on proposed Track Access Contract (Passenger Services) between First/MTR South West Trains and Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

Thank you for GBRf's response to our application. In answer to your concerns below; with regard to the increased traffic along the Windsor side, following the TAC application we have now worked on a proposal to divert the Waterloo to Hounslow stopping services on from Hounslow to Twickenham, terminating and starting back in platform 3 there. Previously, pending construction of new turnback facilities we had planned to run these ECS between Hounslow and Virginia Water, restarting in traffic there and running to Weybridge. The Weybridge to Virginia Water services now run as a self-contained shuttle service, shunting at either Virginia Water or Staines largely dependent on freight flows. Overall this now only provides a net increase of 2 trains per hour over the section between Feltham Junction and Staines/Virginia Water, which in our belief the most constrained part with the longer signalling headways. It should also be noted in several hours of an SX day there are currently more than 2tph Waterloo to Reading (mostly via Richmond).

As part of our timetabling work, which we are happy to discuss/share at a meeting we have ensured paths for all the existing freight services, as you note with the increase in LOROL services freight traffic often has to run in one hit all the way from Nunhead/Factory Junction through to Virginia Water before awaiting the path off the Byfleet curve onto the mainline. This is a principle we have largely adopted for accommodating the freight services with passenger services flexed accordingly.

In answer to your other points, no we are not planning the introduction of Swindon Class 120 units this is a mistake an instead the more common SR class 455s will be used on this service group.

For Godalming (and the wider Portsmouth Direct line), the aim of this timetable is a paradigm shift towards a faster and more regular pattern timetable with synergised calling patterns. 2015/16 ORR station entry/exit figures show on the section between Guildford and Havant (exclusive) show Godalming as the second highest on this section (1,385,590) after Haslemere (1,804,054) and ahead of Petersfield (where all fast services currently call at 1,380,900). Our Portsmouth Direct proposal provides these three of the busier stations, along with the important locations of Guildford, Havant and Portsmouth with a consistent 4tph off peak, using refurbished 442 rolling stock. This meets stakeholders aspirations for a gamechanger in terms of service provision, journey time and comfort. I notice GBRf do not currently operate any services on the Portsmouth Direct and would be keen to know if you have any aspirations to do so, in which case we would look forward to working collaboratively on this route to provide an optimised solution and avoid any potential risk frontiers in terms of network capacity.

Regards,

Bid Train Planning Manager | First, Rail Division
4th Floor, Capital House | 25 Chapel Street | London | NW1 5DH |
e:

First Rail Holdings | Registered in England and Wales number 05154485
Registered office: 50 Eastbourne Terrace, London, W2 6LG

