To: David Reed Andy Wylie

Senior Executive, Access & Licensing Head of Regulation & OA Contracts

Office of Rail and Road First Rail

25 Cabot Square 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, The Point London E14 4QZ 37 North Wharf Road

London W2 1AF

By email: Tel:

Email:

Date: 25 April 2025

## **Hull Trains 32nd Supplemental Agreement**

I attach a revised draft supplemental which addresses the drafting of NR as well as a "non-accommodation "letter, a response to the NR comments and, for information, our latest received version of the Dec 2025 SX Kings Cross Station platforming.

In 30 years, I have never experienced such resistance from the infrastructure provider to a train path being introduced. The point-blank refusal to even consider the southbound working carried on for about a year, it was excluded from the ESG T/T and when it was very briefly included in the timetable database, it was removed on instructions from more senior management. Even when it was formerly bid, it has been a struggle to see it being worked on, and we now have that "non-accommodation" letter.

It is hard to escape the conclusion that NR has decided which trains to include in its draft timetable and which not to include, based on their idea of what the ESG based December 2025 timetable should contain, irrespective of the applied rights position of participants and irrespective of the need to produce options for the ORR to consider as part of its decision on those rights. We believe the "non-accommodation" letter is part of a NR process of making the facts fit their pre-determined position.

We do not accept that that a train that was not included in the ESG specification should preclude it from consideration and that it could be accepted, especially when it seems to fit into the timetable without being "forced" en-route.

The platform graph for Kings Cross shows how "tight" the terminal workings are in the morning period concerned. Indeed, the use of the platform to accommodate both a Hull Trains and a Lumo unit is very much part of this. A Hull Trains unit sitting in one platform for the time concerned will affect the possibility of altering platform workings in times of perturbation and, given it can't be worked out to Ferme Park in the interim, it would seem far more logical to either bring the "second" unit in as a separate train or not have that 8th northbound train. Obviously, I would prefer the former.

The responses to the points NR raised is appended and I have little to add to them except to say that the absence of detailed NR performance analysis for Grantham to Kings Cross between 0630 and 1030 is regrettable and is a major gap in industry knowledge of how the ESG based timetable will perform in the morning peak (and shoulder peak) into London. Therefore, in the

absence of that detailed analysis, the decision to go ahead with this timetable and grant rights accordingly (to all relevant operators) could be classed as "brave".

The structure of the timetable, as admitted by NR, has troubling aspects and crude fixes, such as artificial "fire break" performance gaps, will not achieve the desired result. For instance, our proposed SO path through Woolmer Green follows the pattern at that time in the previous half hour so it would seem the issue of the 19<sup>th</sup> path lies elsewhere.

We contend that the southbound train as we bid it is compliant and will not lead to a significant degradation of performance. It will improve the situation at Kings Cross station (and we are well versed in 20-to-25-minute turnrounds there) and will provide a more coherent pattern of service.

(signed)

Andy Wylie