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Date: 29/04/2019

**Subject: Notification of intent to reject train slot in the New Working Timetable (December ‘19)**

**Schedule: 4M93PDAM, 13:13 Felixstowe North FLT to Lawley Street FLT, Operating MSX**

Dear Robin,

I am writing to inform you of our intent not to include 4M93 with a 1600 ton timing load in the NWTT in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Network Code.

The path contains several TPR non-compliances;

* Platforming clash with 1P40HA at Stratford platform 10.
* Insufficient headway with 2N92HP on EA1320, there is only one minute whereas three is required.
* Insufficient headway with 2K47NT from Harrow & Wealdstone to Berkhamsted. There is 2mins headway not the 4 mins required.

To resolve the conflict, I have looked at retiming 4M93, reviewing the required allowances and pathing I have been able to get the service to Stratford earlier, avoiding the clash with 1P40 and minimising, but not resolving, the issue with 2N92; the necessary retiming would additionally require 2L77, 4L17/75, 2N83 and 2L79 to be pathed later to Stratford. Unfortunately, I have been unable to find a solution to the clash with 2K47, even with all pathing removed 4M93 loses too much time to the passenger service. Flexing 2K47 would require 1.5min retiming to both the service itself and 2T83NT and 2M49BS which follow it.

I have looked for a path within the departure window of 13:00-14:00. Given the difficulty in finding a path from Stratford to Camden, the least disruptive alternative I have found would require a 28min increase to the dwell at Camden East Jn but this would still require significant retiming to other services. An earlier retiming would need to be applied to 2T49ES as well as 2J91NT and 2M49BS which precede it. Given the slower SRT of 4M93, 6X77LA, which follows 4M93, would also need to be timed later, pushing it into 9K70NT, requiring additional retiming to both this service and 2K95ES. The later timing to 4M93 would also create a direct clash with 1H02FV at Brinklow, ultimately I do not feel this alternative path is viable.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rights Table for affected schedules – D4.2.2 (d) | | | | |
| Headcode | Departure Time | Origin | Destination | Rights Level |
| 4M93PDAM | 13:13 | Felixstowe North FLT | Lawley Street FLT | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2N92HP | 15:36 | Stratford | Richmond | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2K47NT | 16:50 | London Euston | Milton Keynes Central | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2T83NT | 16:54 | London Euston | Tring | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2M49BS | 16:10 | East Croydon | Milton Keynes Central | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
|  |  |  |  | Choose an item. |
|  |  |  |  | Choose an item. |

As all schedules involved in the conflict have equal rights the determination not to include 4M93PDAM in the NWTT has been made in line with D.4.2.1 against the decision criteria. I believe the following applies:

Parts C & D. The retiming required to 2N92, and consequently 2L77, 4L17, 4L75, 2N83 and 2L79 would require otherwise un-needed pathing to be added, extending journey times to Stratford. With these points in mind I also feel that Part E applies; that an integrated system of passengers and goods be maintained and improved. The time provided for passengers to make connections with other services would be shortened at key station on the GE mainline.

Parts C & D would similarly apply to the retiming of 2K47, 2T83NT and 2M49BS, which would need to be pathed behind 4M93, would similarly increase the length of passenger journeys and degrading overall performance.

Parts A and J could be cited in favour of 4M93, as an increase in tonnage could fairly be viewed as an improved use of both operator assets and the Network, but I feel that the disproportionate number of timetable participants that would be affected weighs against this. Equally, any benefit of a 1600-ton path must be measured against the longstanding reduction in flexibility resulting from inclusion of a slower path.

Under Network Code D2.4.1(c) you are able to submit a further Access Proposal. Please be aware if you resubmit your access proposal it will be subject to the prioritisation specified in Network Code D2.4.4 and will only be incorporated into the New Working Timetable to the extent reasonably practicable.

Yours Sincerely,

Robert Storey

On Behalf of Network Rail