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Date: 01/05/2019

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

**Schedule: 4M93PDAM, 14:32 Felixstowe North FLT – Lawley Street FLT, Operating MO**

Dear Robin,

I am writing to inform you of our intent not to include 4M93EA with a 1600 ton timing load in the NWTT in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Network Code.

The path contains multiple TPR non-compliances

* Clash with 1P44HA at Stratford, due to Channelsea loop overhang during dwell. The loop is 65 SLUs but 4M93 is 100 SLU. 1P44HA would require 1min retiming, as would 1Y26HA and 1P34HA which follow.
* Headway violation with 2N02HQ from Lea Junction onwards, the service would require a 3min retiming.
* Headway violation with 1N71NT at Leighton Buzzard requiring 2min retiming and consequently a 2min retiming to 2M55BS.

To resolve the conflict I have looked at retiming 4M93 within the departure window of 14:00-15:00. Retiming earlier from Felixstowe is not viable due to a lack of capacity from Shenfield onwards. To resolve the problems listed above, I have instead tried to mirror the unamended path of 4M93 with the 1200 ton timing load. By removing pathing I have found a path to Stratford, but it would require 2min retimings to 5K72, 5W34 and a 1min retiming to 2W33. 2N02 would still require retiming by 1min, but this would avoid the clash with GA express services at Stratford.

Unfortunately, from Camden onward there would be additional clashes. 2J91NT would need a 1min retiming at Harlesden Jn, and to find a compliant path from Wembley onward, the stop in the sidings would need to be increased by 21mins. 9K72NT would require a 1min retiming at Harrow & Wealdstone for headway and 4M93 would itself require 1.5min pathing at Rugby for headway with 9K36NT. This would then exceed the arrival window specified in your rights table.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rights Table for affected schedules – D4.2.2 (d) | | | | |
| Headcode | Departure Time | Origin | Destination | Rights Level |
| 4M93PDAM | 14:31 | Felixstowe North | Lawley Street | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1P44HA | 16:30 | London Liverpool St | Norwich | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1Y26HA | 16:32 | London Liverpool St | Ipswich | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1P34HA | 14:00 | London Liverpool St | Norwich | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2N02HQ | 16:35 | Stratford | Richmond | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1N71NT | 18:16 | London Euston | Northampton | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2M55BS | 17:10 | East Croydon | Milton Keynes Central | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 5K72HD | 15:29 | Southend Victoria | London Liverpool St | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2W33RD | 16:04 | Shenfield | London Liverpool St | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2J91NT | 17:04 | London Euston | Watford Junction | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 9K72NT | 18:21 | London Euston | Rugeley Trent Valley | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 9K36NT | 18:13 | London Euston | Crewe | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |

As all schedules involved in the conflict have equal rights the determination not to include 4M93 in the NWTT has been made in line with D.4.2.1 against the decision criteria.

Given the time of day and changes required to passenger services particularly at Stratford, a key station, I believe parts A, B, C and D weigh heavily against 4M93. An earlier retiming to 2N02 would impact passengers time to make connections with other services, and I do not believe altering the spread of services in this way would match demand. 2N02 would also require pathing into Richmond for compliant headway, extending the overall journey time.

While the increased tonnage to 4M93 could be seen as a positive development for the Network I believe part A weighs heavily against 4M93 when measured against the retiming needed to 1P44HA, 1Y26HA,1P34HA, 1N71NT and 2M55BS.

The alternative path investigated is not viable as 4M93 would terminate outside it’s arrival window. Thought were it acceptable, it would again require retiming to a number of services from different operators. Again, I feel parts A, C, and D apply, as journey times would be affected and performance decreased. Similarly, I do not feel the benefit of increase tonnage outweighs the cost.

In either case, I believe that including 4M93 in the new WTT would impair the ability of a disproportionate number of operators to use their assets effectively and does not allow an efficient, integrated mix of passenger and freight services. Whereby I feel parts E and J also weigh against 4M93.

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