

Appendix 4.2

Record of the application of Network Code Part D4.6 Decision Criteria

Network Rail's decision on capacity allocation for 2230 Thursday 2nd April to 0500 Thursday 9th April for Week 53/1 Bridge renewal Redborough Farm (track off) and S&C renewal at West London Junction.

Objective (D4.6.1)

To share capacity on the Network for the safe carriage of passengers and goods in the most efficient and economical manner in the overall interest of current and prospective users and providers of railway services.

Decision Criteria Table

Consideration (D4.6.2)	Relevance (Yes/N/A)	Weighting	Evidence	Network Rail Opinion
a. Maintaining, developing, and improving the capability of the Network	Yes	High	Renewal improves structural integrity and track geometry, ensuring long-term capability. The justification for doing the works and our access footprint has already been shared with operators on proposal sent 16/08/24 and discussed at various Working Ops Impact Group meetings	<p>NR confirm that these works support maintaining, developing, and improving the capability of the network. These works are essential to maintain safe and reliable infrastructure.</p> <p>The Bridge renewal has to be delivered in one possession and cannot be split over multiple weekend possession due to the infrastructure being replaced</p> <p>This bridge has shown significant degradation over the past 10 years. Network Rail had to defer the work on this asset from the previous control period due to financial constraints and lack of access opportunities which has meant that further masonry defects have begun to form, and the existing ones have been able to deteriorate further. Fractures and loose brickwork around the piers have worsened, and a number of other defects within the arches are due to the ongoing ingress of water through the masonry from track above. The spandrel walls can be seen to be moving at various locations and need to be held back before they progress much further. At each corner of the bridge we are noticing ballast retention issues which require intervention to ensure track support is maintained.</p> <p>NR submit that once the works are completed, the capability of the network will be improved as there will be a reduction in failures due to poor asset condition and formation and the risk of</p>

Appendix 4.2

				<p>emergency speed restrictions or line closure will be substantial reduced.</p> <p>NR considers that this Consideration supports the taking of the possession.</p>
b. That the spread of services reflects demand	Yes	Medium	<p>Works scheduled during lower demand periods where possible.</p> <p>Easter has been deemed in previous years to be best time of year to deliver extended works Due to fewer movements on the infrastructure</p>	<p>Minimizes impact on peak services while addressing asset conditions.</p> <p>Operators will be able to operate services, albeit on a reduced timetable and with services diverted due to the nature of the planned blockade</p> <p>There is no long-term detrimental impact on demand.</p> <p>NR accept that there is an impact on demand, but are seeking to minimise this.</p> <p>NR submit that this Consideration supports the decision to take the possession (in the long term).</p>
c. Maintaining and improving train service performance	Yes	High	<p>Renewal will reduce the risk of asset failure impacting on performance and improves reliability.</p>	<p>Supports performance metrics and reduces future delays.</p> <p>Disruptive planned possessions are less disruptive than uncontrolled failures of assets.</p> <p>Without renewing the identified assets, the likelihood of incidents that cause more serious perturbation to the timetable will increase and potentially lead to TSR or PSR being applied or worst-case line signed out of use</p> <p>The bridge condition currently is suitable to maintain operation at line speed however continues to deteriorate between examinations. It is hard to identify when we would have to impose restrictions to the asset; however, this is usually our team's last resort. The main driver for speed restrictions would either be parapet movement to the point they become unstable and may fail, or scour damage identified at the underwater exams. As both of these issues continue to worsen while we wait for this renewal to be completed, we manage them via our examination regime. Based on what we have observed and the</p>

Appendix 4.2

				<p>number of defects on the asset I would predict some sort of restrictions would be required within CP8 if we are not able to renew this asset in CP7.</p> <p>As this is a masonry arch, the failure mode would likely be either hinge failure or sudden collapse likely due to foundation issues or impact. We would manage the asset through emergency remits or minor works to patch it up to make sure it doesn't collapse; the issue here is likely to be increased number of interventions. The reason for renewal now is that the number of defects have gone past the point of minor works, and they are unable to suitably fix all the issues.</p> <p>It is hard to predict the point at which the asset will no longer be usable, but without suitable intervention I would estimate 10-20 years. However as scour risk scores are based of 1 in 100yr flood events and these are become more and more frequent due to climate change the risk is that without mitigation there is a risk that the scour damage is realised in the next 5-10 years which could lead to failure of the asset before then.</p> <p>NR submits this Consideration supports the taking of this possession.</p>
d. That journey times are as short as reasonably possible	Yes	Medium	Temporary diversions may increase journey times during work.	<p>Disruption has been confined, as much as is reasonably possible, and is utilizing a time when traffic is at a minimum.</p> <p>The possession has been confined to 6 to avoid multiple mid-week disruptions.</p> <p>NR considers that the short-term impact on operators is outweighed by long-term benefits to the network.</p>

Appendix 4.2

e. Maintaining and improving an integrated system of transport for passengers and goods	Yes	Medium	Coordination with TOCs and FOCs to maintain connectivity.	<p>There is a need to maintain an integrated system of transport whilst Network Rail undertakes the work, and this applies to both long and short-distance passenger services and freight.</p> <p>By renewing these assets, reliability will be increased, thus minimizing the impact on GBRf in the long term. Without intervention, uncontrolled loss of capability becomes more likely.</p> <p>This is not supportive of integrated service delivery at any local or national level of passenger or freight operators and will indeed risk a wider impact of contagion on routes to which services are diverted in response. This is also material in the context of managing performance risk. Renewal of the assets will remove potential operational risks.</p>
f. The commercial interests of Network Rail or any Timetable Participant	Yes	Medium	<p>Renewal avoids costly emergency repairs and supports operator efficiency.</p> <p>Network Rail's commercial position is not influenced by maintenance costs, which would in any case be inapplicable.</p> <p>Failure of this route in an uncontrolled fashion will affect the ability to take engineering possessions without significantly affecting freight operations.</p> <p>The impact of such failure will be material to Network Rail's commercial contracts regarding compensation, but the impact of this in the current regulatory environment is less important than the wider impact to UK plc.</p>	<p>Commercial interests aligned with asset stewardship. All operators will be impacted commercially by this possession. Schedule 4 costs for WCS in this area.</p> <p>Network Rail notes that the detailed commercial costs for any given affected timetable participant are not reflected herein and that those parties may seek to apply a different weight regarding commercial impact.</p> <p>Network Rail motivation is driven more by safety than commercial considerations in respect of this decision. In reaching this decision, Network Rail has considered the commercial interest of the parties (as available) against the paramount objective within both Part A 1.1 to run a 'safe and secure railway' and Part D4.6.1.</p> <p>NR submits this Consideration does not support a decision to take the possessions</p>
g. Seeking consistency with any Long-Term Plan and relevant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Appendix 4.2

Development Timetable				
h. International Paths stability	N/A	N/A	No International Paths have been changed.	N/A
i. Mitigating the effect on the environment	Yes	Medium	<p>Loss capacity may lead to rail freight moving to road haulage that results in increases CO2 emissions</p> <p>Passengers moved to rail replacement coaches leading to increase capacity and strain on road network</p>	NR submits that (in the longer term) this Consideration supports the decision to take the possession.
j. Enabling operators to utilize their assets efficiently	Yes	High	<p>Planned possessions allow operators to plan rolling stock deployment.</p> <p>The current WTT is established with the objective of maximizing efficient operator resource usage, amongst others. Inability to operate the WTT because of infrastructure failure will therefore act against the interests of all affected timetable participants. The possessions will impact all operators on them being able to utilize their assets efficiently.</p>	<p>Supports efficient asset use post-renewal.</p> <p>NR submits that (in the longer term) this Consideration supports the decision to take the possessions.</p>
k. Avoiding changes to Strategic Train Slots	Yes	Medium	Some changes are unavoidable due to possession requirements.	Mitigated through early engagement and alternative paths to be offered through a Capacity Study.
l. No International Freight Train Slot changes	N/A	N/A	No trains within the IFCN are changed.	N/A

Decision Taken

Having considered all of the above and as detailed in Condition D4.6.2, Network Rail submits that the decision to undertake the bridge renewal with track off and S&C renewal at West London Junction is justified by reference to the Network Code and supports the Objective as detailed within Condition D4.6.1 to assist in achieving the safe carriage of passengers and goods in the most efficient and economical manner in the overall interest of current and prospective users and providers of the railway service.