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Robert Storey

Willen Building
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Elder Gate

Milton Keynes

MK9 1EN

Date: 03/05/2019

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

**Schedule: 4S88, 14:33 Felixstowe North FLT – Coatbridge FLT, operating FSX**

Dear Robin,

I am writing to inform you of our intent not to include 4S88 with a 1600 ton timing load in the NWTT in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Network Code.

The path contains a multiple TPR non-compliances:

* Direct clash with 2Y53HA from Chelmsford to Stratford, 2Y53 would require 3min retiming for compliant headway.
* Junction clash with 1A86HA through Stratford platform 10. 1A86 would require 2min pathing.
* Direct clash with 2Y26HA from Lea Jn to Camden Rd East Jn.
* Headway non-compliance with 2K21ET at Watford Jn.
* Direct clash with 5N60EA, reoccupying platform at Milton Keynes Central. 3min required, currently less than 1 min

To resolve the conflict we have looked at retiming 4S88. However, this has not been possible due to the slower SRTs, for example, 4S88 could be amended through platform 1 at Shenfield to mitigate the clash with 2Y53 but 1K19 would catch it by Stratford and require pathing. It would also make the clash with 1A86 worse.

2Y53 would therefore require 3min retiming to avoid the clash, consequently 4M02 and 1K19 would also require 3min retiming. 1A86 would need to be retimed 2mins, as would the next to services, 1K02HD and 1F54HA. The clash with 2Y26 could be minimised if 4S88’s dwell at Lea was removed, but this would still entail a 3min retiming to 2Y26 and consequently 2N34HQ.

2K21 and 5N60 would require 3min retiming with no additional consequential retiming’s.

I have looked for an alternative path for 4S88 that would fall within the requirements of it’s departure and arrival window but have not been able to find a compliant path. The main constraint in this respect has been the volume of services running from Shenfield to Liverpool St.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rights Table for affected schedules – D4.2.2 (d) | | | | |
| Headcode | Departure Time | Origin | Destination | Rights Level |
| 4S88PDAM | 14:33 | Felixstowe North FLT | Coatbridge FLT | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2Y53HA | 18:22 | Ipswich | London Liverpool St | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1A86HA | 19:32 | London Liverpool St | Harwich International | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 4M02PD | 17:34 | Felixstowe North GBRF | Hams Hall GBRF | Expectation of Firm Rights |
| 1K19HD | 18:50 | Southend Victoria | London Liverpool St | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1A86HA | 19:32 | London Liverpool St | Harwich International | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1K02HD | 19:35 | London Liverpool St | Southend Victoria | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1F54HA | 19:38 | London Liverpool St | Colchester Town | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2Y26HQ | 19:42 | Stratford | Clapham Jn | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2N34HQ | 19:45 | Stratford | Richmond | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2K21ET | 20:24 | London Euston | Milton Keynes Central | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |

As all schedules involved in the conflict have equal rights the determination not to include 4S88 in the NWTT has been made in line with D.4.2.1 against the decision criteria.

Given the number of changes required to passenger services particularly at Stratford, a key station, I believe parts A, B, C and D weigh heavily against 4S88. Amending times 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, particularly in respect to the increased journey times that would be unavoidable to the class 1 services.

While the increased tonnage to 4S88 could be seen as a positive development for the Network, I believe part A weighs heavily against 4S88 when measured against the retiming needed to a disproportionate number of operators. Similarly I believe this would impair operators in using 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 4S88

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