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London
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Robert Storey

Willen Building

The Quadrant

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 FO**

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:

* Headway violation with 2Y53HA from Manningtree to Colchester. 3min is required but there is only 2min.
* Direct junction clash with 1A86HA through Stratford platform 10. 1A86 would require 4min pathing.
* Clash with 5N60EA, reoccupying platform at Milton Keynes Central.
* Direct clash with 6X65HD from Nuneaton.
* Reoccupation clash with 1U53NT at Rugeley Trent Valley
* Direct clash with 2K21ET from Watford Jn to Milton Keynes
* Headway violation with 1K77FW at Stafford.
* Direct clash with 9K92EK at Norton Bridge

2Y53 would therefore require 1min retiming to avoid the clash. 1A86 and the two services which follow 1K02 and 1F54, would require 4min retiming.

2K21 would require 2min retiming with no additional consequential retiming’s. 1U53 would require 4min retiming. The clash with 2K21ET would require the service to be completely retimed, consequently creating a new clash with 6M69 which follows. The clash with 1K77 would require 4S88 to be pathed later, ultimately requiring 9K92 to be retimed 6min.

To resolve the conflicts I have looked at retiming 4S88. However, this has not been possible due to the slower SRTs. 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 |
| 1K02HD | 19:35 | London Liverpool St | Southend Victoria | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1U53NT | 21:19 | London Euston | Crewe | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 2K21ET | 20:24 | London Euston | Milton Keynes Central | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 1K77FW | 22:00 | London Euston | Crewe | Firm Rights in force for the Timetable Period |
| 9K92EK | 20:51 | 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 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 long distance services, I believe parts A, B, C and D weigh heavily against 4S88. Amending times would extend journey times and I do not believe altering the spread of services in this way would match demand.

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