

Response dated 2 March 2016 from Freightliner and Freightliner Heavy Haul to Directions Letter of 26 February 2016

Re 1.1

I am not aware that we have suffered any direct financial loss that is quantifiable. In terms of performance, we do not keep records other than destination arrival statistics. The concern here is not to demonstrate previous loss, but to look forward - our ability to retime trains or add new ones has been compromised by the (in our view unnecessary) SRT and margin extensions. Looking to the future we are expecting an increase in the quantum of services emanating from Felixstowe from the current 31 to at least 45 trains per day (across all operators) once the Felixstowe branch enhancements are completed - scheduled by March 2019. However, the accompanying capacity schemes on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton corridor were originally scheduled to be ready at a later date, and now following the Hendy review, have been pushed well into CP6. As the Felixstowe to Nuneaton route is currently capable of few, if any, additional daytime services, it falls to the Great Eastern Main Line (via Stratford) to take most of the excess demand, likely until at least 2024. Therefore we are keen to ensure that best use is made of the existing infrastructure (including definition and implementation of Strategic Capacity on this line) without introducing unnecessary constraints that do not necessarily lead to better performance.

Re 1.2

No operational problems have arisen that I am aware of, other than minor consequential delay that could have been avoided had the signal box been staffed. The point being raised is that NR is entitled to de-staff *any* signal box if it reasonably believes that it is not necessary for capacity or performance. It was stated by NR, as part of the Network Change correspondence, that this was not a permanent change in that it would, at its own cost, re-staff Craigo if capacity or performance needs arose.

The complaint here is that there is now a disjoint between NR's position as stated in the correspondence for the now-withdrawn Network Change and the entry in Section 2.2 of the TPRs. The TPRs have been amended to show "closed", so from a contractual point of view Craigo signal box is *permanently* de-staffed, and the cost of any future staffing requirement passes to Access Beneficiaries who may require it. In amending Section 2.2 of the TPRs, we believe NR has acted incorrectly.

Re 1.3

A longer reoccupation margin reduces the theoretic capacity of each platform. For example, London Victoria has a minimum (loaded-to-loaded) turnround allowance of 12 minutes for "Main Line" services. With a 3-minute reoccupation, this permits a maximum of 4 trains per hour per platform. With a 4-minute reoccupation, technically that works out to 3.75 per hour, which effectively reduces to 3 per hour in a standard-hour pattern. A longer reoccupation may drive a less efficient timetable design for any future change in service pattern. For example if a train departed London Victoria on the hour and the same platform was reoccupied at 4 minutes past the hour, in order to maintain journey times, the second train would leave its origin a minute later than it would under a 3-minute reoccupation; this in turn could require adjustments to other services to maintain headways and margins at other locations - possibly to the extent that fewer planned moves become available overall, or potentially trains become spaced at intervals which leaves an insufficiently wide gap to path a freight service.

Re 1.4

1. Platform reoccupation margins at Victoria and Brighton
2. Headways at South Croydon and Redhill
3. Planning note at Brighton