

WEST LONDON LINE GROUP

98 Manor Way, Beckenham, Kent BR3 3LR

020 8650 0667

18 March 2011

RUS Programme Manager
London & South East RUS Consultation Response
Network Rail
Kings Place
90 York Way
London
N1 9AG

Dear Sir or Madam

London & South East Route Utilisation Strategy

Introduction

1. I am writing on behalf of the West London Line Group to give the Group's responses to this welcome document. We would ask that these be read in conjunction with the Group's recent documents, "West London Line Developments – 2008-2015" (May 2008), "Development Proposals for the West London Line 2009-2019" (June 2009), and "Key Concerns regarding the L&SE and WCML RUS's" (February 2011), plus the Group's responses to the Electrification and the London & South East RUS documents.
2. Broadly speaking, the Group agrees with the present and future situation as described in this RUS (particularly in relation to the peak morning Milton Keynes – East Croydon service) and the recommendations proposed.
3. However, the Group would strongly urge that still greater advantage be taken of the opportunities offered by the West London Line (WLL) to future traffics on the West Coast Main Line (WCML), Great Western Main Line (GWML), Chiltern, Crossrail and the three southern networks. These would appear to be significant, especially in meeting:-
 - a) the forecasted capacity problems in the Euston, Marylebone, Paddington, Victoria and Waterloo areas;
 - b) the perceived need to provide strong, yet cost-effective, links between all of (i) these networks in the inner London area, (ii) these and Heathrow and Gatwick, (iii) all the foregoing and High Speed 1 (HS1) and High Speed 2 (HS2), and (iv) between HS1 and HS2 themselves without putting additional pressure on London termini and the tube network between them;
 - c) two-way demands arising from new local drivers on the WLL corridor, e.g., links to North Kensington, plus new and planned developments at Kensington Olympia, Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area and Imperial Wharf; and
 - d) the opportunities to extend the present London Overground WLL service both (i) beyond Clapham Junction to East Putney and Wimbledon, and (ii) with direct trains beyond Imperial Wharf between the WLL and Waterloo, Victoria, the East London Line Extension from Surrey Quays to Clapham Junction (ELLX2) via the South London Line (SLL) and/or other destinations on the Southeastern network.
4. The Group believes that now the opportunity should be taken to assess the cumulative benefit and costs of providing all these links, plus those that would arise from the interchange options between the WLL and (i) the District and Piccadilly Line Hammersmith lines at a point in the Earl's Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area that we have called 'Philbeach' and (ii) Crossrail 2 (Chelsea – Hackney) at both Stamford Bridge and Imperial Wharf (with the better to be developed). Providing most of these links would be relatively minor increments on top of projects already identified and /or underway.
5. We would also ask that the final version of this RUS and those for the West Midlands and Chilterns (WM&C) and the West Coast Main Line (WCML) includes a detailed and sensitive assessment of the best use of all these networks throughout the week and not just for Monday – Friday peak flows.
6. For example, we would hope that on the WCML there would be overall net social benefits of allowing the Friday evening, weekend and Sunday afternoon/evening timetable to incorporate stops at important intermediate points such as Watford Junction, Milton Keynes and Nuneaton, without completely overturning the desire for modal change from air or road to rail between London and Manchester or Glasgow. This appears to be directly in line with the objective stated in Section 3.7 (Second Bullet Point) in the draft WCML RUS.
7. Finally, it may be necessary to re-consider the relevant scenarios, gaps and options, should HS2 not proceed.

8. Our detailed comments are below

9. Foreword (page 3)

9.1 We note the RUS end date of 2031 and would say that all work done in relation to the West London Line (WLL) and elsewhere should not be wholly overshadowed by the existing economic situation but take a long view of the needs of this twenty-year period and make progress to deal with them, especially HS2 and the schemes that support HS2, at a rate that at least equals that of rail developments in our competitor nations elsewhere in the world. In relation to the WLL, we would urge the need for swift progress in view of:-

- (i) growth in the existing traffic generators at Shepherd's Bush, Kensington Olympia (i.e., Hammersmith Road/Broadway), West Brompton and Imperial Wharf;
- (ii) the in- and out-flows to and from the build-outs of proposed developments such as the major Earls Court and West Kensington Opportunity Area (EC&WKO), plus the Chelsea Creek, Lots Road and NW Warwick Road sites in the WLL corridor;
- (iii) the different combinations of the myriad of travel and interchange opportunities presented by:-
 - a) rail developments in the Old Oak Common area (we are assuming that these will include WLL/WCML platforms crossing over and interchanging with those for GWML, Heathrow Express, Heathrow Connect, Crossrail, HS2 and possibly Chiltern services) and their links with (i) the North London Line and Central Line and (ii) local communities presently poorly served by the National Rail network such as those in North Kensington;
 - b) a possible interchange, 'Philbeach', between the WLL and the District and Piccadilly Lines within the EC&WKO site; and
 - c) the options for interchange between the WLL and Crossrail 2 (Chelsea - Hackney) at either Stamford Bridge or Imperial Wharf;

and

- (iv) the growth arising from planned inner London orbital and other rail developments, principally:-
 - a) ELLX2 between Surrey Quays and Clapham Junction (N Side);
 - b) ELL extension between Crystal Palace and Clapham Junction (S Side) via Balham; and
 - c) platform extensions on the three southern networks to accommodate either 10- or 12-car trains that need to be matched by similar length platforms on the WLL;
- (v) further travel opportunities by:-
 - (a) extending the WLL and/or ELLX2 London Overground services between Clapham Junction (N Side), East Putney and Wimbledon;
 - (b) direct links between the WLL and ELLX2 towards Surrey Quays to link inner SE London (the area of highest estimated population growth by 2026 in Greater London), with the WLL corridor (the fourth most important employment area after the West End, the City and Docklands, with both areas as shown in TfL's document "T2025");
 - (c) direct links between the WLL and ELLX2 towards one or more destinations on the Southeastern network (e.g., Beckenham Junction via Penge East; Dartford/Ebbsfleet/Medway Towns via Lewisham);
 - (d) improvements to stations on this axis, such as the high level platforms at each of Brixton, Loughborough Junction and Brockley;
 - (e) direct links between the WLL and Victoria; and
 - (f) direct links between the WLL and Waterloo;

and

- (vi) the resultant knock-on effects of (v) (a) above, i.e.,:-
 - (a) the ability, subject to signalling constraints, to run a more intensive service north of East Putney to ease overcrowding on this section of the District Line; and
 - (b) Greater direct journey options, e.g., Wimbledon – Imperial Wharf; Southfields – Wandsworth Town; Wandsworth Town – Shepherd's Bush

9.2 Although this is an extensive list, and it would probably take some time to tease out the different benefit/cost ratios of each of very this large number of possible combinations, we feel that none of these should be overlooked in concept. We would also contend that none of them, given recent developments elsewhere on the network, seems overly ambitious in terms of feasibility or cost, given the step-changes in flexibility and capacity that many of them would provide.

- 9.3 The two areas of major rail development are Clapham Junction and Old Oak and brief details of our proposals for these are in our Appendices 1 and 2 to this response. Appendix 3 outlines the benefits of ensuring that there is an interchange between the WLL and GWML, Crossrail and HS2 services, with Appendix 4 indicating how resources on the WLL could be built up to meet the impacts of these arteries.
- 9.4 We would also strongly urge that our suggestion for a sole or an extra link between HS2 and HS1 via the WLL, Brighton Main Line (BML) and Redhill – Tonbridge – Ashford axes also be assessed, especially in view of the Sussex RUS's conclusion that the BML between Croydon and Clapham would reach capacity by 2019 – please see our Appendix 5.

10. Executive Summary

Scope and planning context (page 4)

- 10.1 Fourth Bullet Point – We believe that the future development of the Crossrail network must include the additional advantages it would bring for those who, under its current plans, would not yet be able to reach Crossrail (and key points on it such as Heathrow) from either north or south of London, but who could do so via connections and/or interchanges such as those that should be made with the WLL and WCML in the Old Oak Common area (Crossrail1) and the WLL at Stamford Bridge or Imperial Wharf (Crossrail 2 Chelsea – Hackney)
- 10.2 Fifth Bullet Point - We have already identified from the Sussex RUS the lack of capacity on the BML between Croydon and Clapham by 2019 (para 9.4 above) and also suggest that the WLL be used as an alternative for Euston, Marylebone, Paddington, and Victoria where capacity problems within the RUS period have been identified.
- 10.3 Seventh Bullet Point – We trust that sufficient assessment is made for freight on the WLL, especially Channel Tunnel freight, and that alternative routes, including the East London Line, Thameslink and those via the proposed Redhill flyover, are fully assessed for WLL freight movements that do not need to use the WLL.
- 10.4 Ninth Bullet Point - We trust that the additional advantages to both HS2 and the WLL are assessed within this RUS, as well as the HS2 – HS1 link via Merstham that we have proposed

2031 Commuter peaks to London: gaps and options beyond existing strategy (page 8)

- 10.5 We would ask that the ability for the WLL to act as a four-way commuter facility for through traffics on it be fully borne in mind during assessment of its role and capabilities, including its existing stations and future interchange possibilities.
- 10.6 There are strong in-and out-flows to and from the WLL corridor in both directions in both peaks, with key growth in all such movements expected from the developments mentioned in our paragraph 3(c) above.

Great Western Main Line peak capacity (page 6)

Marylebone routes peak capacity (page 8)

West Coast Main Line peak capacity (page 8)

South West Main Line peak capacity (page 12)

- 10.7 We would ask that the potential ability for the WLL to act as a “safety valve” for capacity problems at Euston, Marylebone, Paddington, Euston and Victoria, be fully borne in mind during assessment of its role and capabilities, including its existing stations and future interchange possibilities.

Orbital routes peak capacity (page 14)

- 10.8 We would ask that the impacts of both growth in the existing and development of all the proposed rail and other developments in the WLL corridor to get a truer, if more disconcerting, capacity gap beyond the 2500 passengers in the busiest peak hour on the route as quoted.
- 10.9 We trust that the 73-minute gap in the southbound Southern WLL service can be solved by a relatively small adjustment to the existing timetable and stock deployment. An option we have suggested is to continue whatever train is used to solve the Regional Link gap RL14 in the WCML RUS southwards to Clapham Junction and allow this (i) to return from Clapham to provide a new direct link to the West Midlands arriving by mid-morning and (ii) to reverse this working in the evening peak. What we fear is that, by highlighting this in detail in two RUS's, the ‘73-minute gap’ problem becomes elevated to a “far too difficult” status and thus will never be resolved. Instead, this should be dealt with as a priority.
- 10.10 With the main networks both north and south of the Thames about to accommodate 12-car trains, it would be imperative for all WLL platforms to accommodate the same train lengths, so that the WLL can act as an effective safety valve for capacity problems at Euston, Paddington, Victoria and Waterloo. Fully incorporating the four-way commuter flows on the WLL should raise the benefit/cost ratio of each of the WLL extensions significantly above those for platforms with only one-way commuter flows, e.g., those at most outer suburban stations on the three southern networks, where construction is underway or imminent.
- 10.11 We note the reference to the London Overground WLL services now having trains with a high standing capacity. However, we would ask that their extension from four- to eight-cars at least for journeys between Clapham Junction and Willesden Junction/Kensal turnback be assessed to-

- (a) Deal with expected exacerbation of existing crowding arising from implementation of development plans for the Earl's Court & West Kensington Opportunity Area;
- (b) Deal with ongoing demand growth on all orbital routes;
- (c) Deal with large numbers of people on local journeys to the proposed HS2/Crossrail/GWML station at Old Oak Common;
- (d) Deal with the pressures on the WLL that would be caused by the take up of paths by services diverted away from Euston, Paddington and Victoria;
- (e) Confirm the relatively small number of extra vehicles needed to deal with extending London Overground (LO) WLL trains to eight-cars (probably just two extra 4-car units, plus one spare)
- (f) Confirm the improvement to the BCR of the WLL platform extensions, so that all can accommodate 12-car trains, by virtue of the additional numbers of trains to/from different points of the network and their passengers each extension would carry as a result of such service enhancements

New options for the West London Line (page 15)

10.12 Here we would recommend that Option I1 be amended to read, "Increase West London Line – Milton Keynes Central all-day service to two tph." Not only would this address demand purely on the WLL, it would, via the new interchange that we are advocating at Old Oak Common, allow a one-change rail journey between Heathrow, the South Midlands and later, hopefully, the West Midlands. This would be in line with Option K1 below and paragraphs 50 to 52 in our response to the WCML RUS.

10.13 We would also recommend that Option I2 be amended to read, "Lengthen all WLL platforms to 12-cars." (see our sub-para (k)(vi) above and RUS page 101). We believe that a high BCR would be maintained, given the ability then for all of these to deal with capacity problems at London termini.

Connectivity – gaps and options (page 15)

Heathrow connectivity options (page 15)

10.14 We would strongly recommend that Option K1 is expanded to read "Increasing connectivity to Old Oak Common from WCML South and the WLL", with the relevant note amended to, "Passengers from WCML South and the three southern networks via the WLL would have a single change at Old Oak Common".

Maximising the benefits of Crossrail (page 16)

Crossrail extension and interchange (our addition) options (page 16)

10.15 A full list of Options under Gap I is given below at para 16.35

10.16 We would strongly recommend that three new options are included here.

10.17 Option I5 would be entitled, "New 12-car interchange platforms at Old Oak Common on WLL to provide shortest possible links with Crossrail, GWML, Chiltern, HS2 and other Lines here." We would strongly recommend that this option is fully investigated, given the full contents of our paragraph 7.1 above.

10.18 Option I11 would be entitled, "Establishing the engineering and operational feasibility of Stamford Bridge interchange (WLL and Crossrail 2 (Chelsea - Hackney))". This is less likely to be selected than Option I12 as this would result in another 12-car station having to be squeezed in between Imperial Wharf and West Brompton WLL stations.

10.19 Option I12 would be entitled, "Establishing the engineering and operational feasibility of Imperial Wharf interchange (WLL, Crossrail 2 (Chelsea - Hackney) and London River Services (Chelsea Harbour Pier))". This is more likely to be selected than Option I11 as the area would have a relatively poor PTAL score when taking into account all the local traffic generators and attractors. This site would also be very close to River Thames services at Chelsea Harbour Pier.

Implications of High Speed Rail demand on the London area (page 16)

10.20 In view of the potential of the WLL to link HS2 with the three southern networks in less than 15 minutes without having to traverse London's established terminals and the tube network in between, it should be a given that suitable connecting facilities will be provided at Old Oak Common between the two new 12-car high level platforms that would both serve the WLL and WCML and those platforms to be used by HS2, Crossrail, GWML, other Heathrow services, NLL, Central Line and (possibly) Chiltern services.

Future Chelsea – Hackney Line (Crossrail 2) (page 16)

10.21 We would refer to our paragraphs 7.1 (iii) (c) and 8 (o) above.

Capacity implications of the proposed link from HS2 to HS1 (page 16)

10.22 We would refer to our paragraph 7.4 above and would say that this is another viable route that would also seek to ease capacity problems on the BML between Croydon and Clapham which is due to reach capacity by 2019.

11. 1. Background (page 19)

11.1 We welcome the comment that the RUS is looking ahead as far as 2040 as we believe that this is a realistic timeframe in which to consider how the London rail network should keep pace with the continuing growth in demand.

12. 2. Scope and planning context (page 21)

2.3 Purpose of the London and South East RUS (page 21)

12.1 RUS para 2.3.3 Given that the wording in paragraph 7.12.1 of this RUS states, “there will continue to be a significant and increasing peak capacity gap on the WLL,” the West London Line Group would contend that, as Network Rail recognises that not only is there an existing serious problem but that it is also one which is expected to worsen, this situation should be relieved as soon as possible, i.e., before Control Period 5 starts.

12.2 We strongly urge that action be taken immediately to extend these platforms to 12-cars. At the very least they should be extended to 8-cars, on the clear understanding and commitment that they would be extended to 12-cars in line with the other extensions on connecting networks.

12.3 We truly believe that these extensions represent a project “which would be appropriate to implement in advance” (last line of RUS para 2.3.3).

12.4 RUS para 2.5.1 We note and welcome the time horizon to 2040 and the comments that this RUS will extend the planning horizons of older RUSs and that material changes in circumstances published in later RUSs will be revisited so that strategies are consistent.

12.5 We trust that comments and recommendations made here are reflected in Generation One RUSs, particularly those that would relate to the WLL and Old Oak Common in the developing WCML and West Midland & Chilterns RUSs.

2.6 Government strategy – Department for Transport (page 22)

12.6 RUS para 2.6.3 indicates a growth of 30% in rail travel in the period 2007 – 2017. We sincerely hope that this and the RUSs have fully considered the extrapolation of this growth throughout this RUS period to 2040 and the implications thereof.

2.7 Transport for London (Figure 2.1 – MTS proposals relating to the National Rail network (pages 23-25))

12.7 We believe that implementation of the projects that we have suggested will be needed to meet this growth in inner west London and in central London termini. Our proposal to link HS2 and HS1 via Merstham would meet the aspirations in Proposal 1 by allowing the possibility of through international trains, as well as serving NW London via Old Oak Common, to serve virtually all of West, South West and South London via stops at, for example, Shepherd’s Bush, Kensington Olympia, Earl’s Court (Philbeach Interchange), West Brompton, Clapham Junction and/or East Croydon with their interchanges with local tube, rail and tram services.

12.8 We fully support Proposal 3 here and ask that the feasibility of using for freight that can avoid the WLL via any of the ELL, Thameslink (both these may available be at night only) and the planned flyover at Redhill is fully evaluated.

12.9 In relation to Proposal 4, we believe that our proposal for an HS2 – HS1 link via Merstham could have merit either as a complementary scheme to on that which would focus on Euston or as a stand-alone, especially if the Euston scheme proves infeasible or too costly.

12.10 Also in relation to Proposal 4, we would urge that, in any case, full evaluations of the links between Heathrow and (i) London termini and (ii) other suburban areas possible via the WLL are pursued.

12.11 In relation to Proposal 5, we would strongly contend that, to ensure that Crossrail 1 and 2 are fully integrated with the rest of London’s public transport systems, the potential benefits of their links with the WLL at Old Oak Common and Stamford Bridge or Imperial Wharf are fully evaluated and pursued.

12.12 We welcome Proposal 6 in principle, but with the caveat that outlying schemes should not be proceeded with ahead of Crossrail’s interchanges with other key links, such as the WLL.

12.13 We support Proposals 7 and 8 and especially the priority being given under Proposal 8 to the London Overground and the BML. We believe that Proposal 8 and this RUS’s recommendation in the Assessment of Option I2 (page 101) are mutually supportive.

12.14 We welcome and support Proposal 9 and ask that the advantages of interchange in the Fulham/Chelsea area between services on this NE – SW alignments and those on the WLL (and, for Imperial Wharf, River Services at Chelsea Harbour) are fully assessed and included.

- 12.15 Broadly speaking, we support Proposals 10 to 14.
- 12.16 In relation to Proposal 11, (i) re para (a) we would ask that the options for congestion relief at and distribution beyond Central London termini include use of alternative facilities such as (in both directions) the WLL and its tube interchanges, e.g., Shepherd's Bush; (ii) re para (b) we very much welcome the priority given to Clapham Junction; and (iii) re paras (c) and (d) we would support the emphasis given to the stations listed here.
- 12.17 In relation to Proposal 12, we would ask that (i) full use is made of the bi-directional signalling on both tracks of the WLL to ensure that at least a 'skeleton' service involving single-line working is maintained at all possible times on the WLL, and (ii) on the occasions when a seven day railway is not possible, greater thought is given as to the content of poster and other information to ensure that intending passengers have full information about all travel options, including all alternative and/or replacement rail and/or bus services, at the point of use.
- 12.18 In relation to Proposal 13, we believe that before the Mayor is given greater control over suburban rail services, lessons should be learned from key 'gaps in the floorboards' in terms of seamless service, such as through ticketing to National Rail destinations, and especially the discounts that pertain to this ticketing, particularly to long-distance destinations, being unavailable from stations operated by the Underground, e.g., West Brompton.
- 12.19 We very much welcome Proposal 14 and would very much want to discuss with interested parties our suggestions as alluded to in our paragraphs 7.1(iv) and (v) above in greater detail.

13. 4. Morning peak to London – current demand (page 36)

- 13.1 RUS para 4.4.1. Although the WLL has been considered briefly in RUS para 4.10.5, it has been, wrongly in our opinion, omitted from Figure 4.3, (page 38), Table 4.1 (page 40), Figures 4.6 (page 42), 4.7 (page 43) and 4.8 (page 45).
- 13.2 In reassessing and including the WLL in all these Tables and Figures, separate presentation of the relevant data should be made for each of the WLL's northbound and southbound morning flows.
- 13.3 These omissions, without a clear and associated assessment of the WLL, run the risk of underplaying the present and potential role of the WLL in both directions in (i) dealing with its own traffic growth, and (ii) relieving the pressures on key terminals such as Euston, Paddington, Victoria and possibly Waterloo.
- 13.4 RUS para 4.9.1. No figures are given for PIXC on the WLL, either northbound or southbound. Both should be determined and separately identified. Thereafter, we suspect, this paragraph may have to be rewritten to include these among the list of routes with highest PIXC figures, as RUS para 4.10.5 includes the sentences, "Several trains [on the WLL] have severe crowding, with loads of up to 200 percent of the seated capacity. Whilst most journeys on this route are short duration in nature and London Underground services have significant standing space this is also recognised as a present day gap." (our underlining).

14. 5. Morning peak to London – committed schemes, etc. (page 46)

- 14.1 RUS para 5.1.1. While this RUS states that it is to pick up all outstanding recommendations from relevant Generation One RUS's, it is concentrating on morning peak flows to London. Therefore, while it includes mention of two WLL Southern trains per hour in the peaks, it omits mention of the second WLL Southern train per hour throughout the day between the Croydon area and Shepherd's Bush as recommended in the Cross London RUS (2006).
- 14.2 The entry "N/A" on the last line of Table 5.14 (page 58) is ambiguous and should be explained.
- 14.3 It is not clear whether or not any stock has been allowed for in the Thameslink cascade to meet this situation.
- 14.4 The forecast uplift figures in capacity in the RUS paras 5.3.3 and 5.3.4 of 50% and 75% are way below the present situation on the WLL as given in RUS para 4.10.5. Thus insufficient notice of the WLL's actual carrying capacity requirements, which are significantly above average, may (by these omissions and lower forecasts) lead to the WLL being overlooked in terms of (i) new stock, and (ii) service enhancements, even where these could simultaneously (i) aid capacity problems at a variety of London Terminals, (ii) provide greater connectivity, and (iii) assist dispersal from (and demand to) Crossrail and HS2 services.
- 14.5 RUS para 5.4.15 needs to include the proposed extension of the ELL from Crystal Palace to Clapham Junction via Balham. We anticipate that this would need two west-facing bay platforms south of Platform 17. Appendix 1 gives details of how this could be accommodated at Clapham Junction.
- 14.6 This para should also include the option for direct trains between the WLL and (i) other destinations on the Southeastern network, (ii) Victoria and (iii) Waterloo.
- 14.7 RUS para 5.5.2. While we welcome the inclusion of the latest position of HS2 in the baseline-plus for this RUS, given the enormous potential of more rail users interchanging between the group of (i) HS2, (ii) Crossrail 1 (for Heathrow), (iii) GWML (long-distance and local services) and (iv) Chiltern (possibly)

and the group of the (i) WLL/NLL (east and south) and (ii) WCML (north and south), the 12-car platforms served by the latter group (which would be above those of the former group) at Old Oak Common should also be included in the baseline-plus for this RUS.

- 14.8 RUS para 5.5.3. See the comments in our paras 12.1 and 12.2 above.
- 14.9 RUS para 5.6.2. Further train lengthening While we generally support the lengthening of trains, we note that this may cause increased logistical problems, e.g., altering signalling distances, depot and siding lengths, plus the removal of failed 10- or 12-car trains. We trust that sufficient thought will be given as to motive power units required to move such failed units and where spare siding/loop/depot capacity will be provided to accommodate them.
- 14.10 RUS para 5.6.3. Timetable changes We trust that within the 'baseline-plus' of this RUS are the two trains per hour on the Southern WLL throughout the day, as that between Shepherd's Bush and the Croydon area was a recommendation of the Cross London RUS and the two trains an hour between Milton Keynes and Clapham Junction in the peaks is a recommendation in this RUS.
- 14.11 RUS para 5.6.4. High Speed 2 – Bullet Point 3 We believe that the case for a direct link from HS2 to Heathrow can be tested first by ensuring enough WCML trains are diverted to Old Oak Common to serve our proposed 12-car platforms, with passengers interchanging there with Heathrow Express/Crossrail. This would at the very least prove the Birmingham and the WCML-south-of-Birmingham/Stafford/Stoke markets to Heathrow. (ii) We have set out proposals for our suggested HS2 – HS1 link at Appendix 5.
- 14.12 RUS para 5.6.4. High Speed 2 – Bullet Point 4 We trust that at least two of these trains per hour will operate between Birmingham and Brighton via the WLL.

15. 6. Morning peak to London – future demand (page 61)

- 15.1 RUS para 6.3.12 and Figure 6.2. We note that two areas of growth are likely to have significant impact on passenger demand on the WLL; (i) that in the Milton Keynes – Watford corridor and (ii) that in inner SE London, which could lead to demand for travel via ELLX2 and WLL either via (i) Clapham Junction, or (ii) more conveniently directly via Longhedge Junction.
- 15.2 RUS para 6.4.4. Figure 6.4 needs to show actual and forecast numbers for the WLL northbound and, separately, southbound.
- 15.3 RUS paras 6.5.4 and 6.5.5. We note in Figures 6.5 and 6.6 that the highest percentages (185%) quoted are on the WLL (i) are significantly higher than those on other routes and (ii) do not show a split between northbound and southbound. We would hope that both these aspects are dealt with in the final RUS.

16. 7. Capacity gaps and options beyond existing strategy (page 70)

7.2 Process for quantification of gaps

- 16.1 RUS para 7.2.2. Table 7.1 (last line) does not seem to take into account the recommendation of the second train per hour between the Croydon area and Shepherd's Bush in the Cross-London RUS 2006.
- 16.2 RUS para 7.2.5. Table 7.1 should also include future likely impacts, positive and negative, from the development of other routes and interchanges now expected within the life of the RUS, i.e., those that would become available at Old Oak Common between about 9 different services, others on the WLL, e.g., SWT diverted from Waterloo to Shepherd's Bush/North Pole Depot, plus those arising from the WLL/Crossrail 2 interchange at Stamford Bridge or Imperial Wharf.
- 16.3 We welcome multi-modelling being used. We hope that this will take into account the options as indicated in out para 7.1 above, including any re-workings on the corresponding abstractions from existing tube

7.3 Corridors not fully addressed by Generation One RUS strategy

- 16.4 RUS para 7.3.1. Bullet points 1, 2 and 8 We suggest that some of these capacity issues could be addressed diverting these services to/from the WLL.
- 16.5 RUS para 7.3.1. Bullet point 5 We can appreciate that this may be a complex theoretical exercise, but we feel that some attempt should be made to quantify present and future crowding on the WLL in each direction.
- 16.6 Future crowding would have to take into consideration (i) trains diverted from Euston and Paddington to Kensington Olympia, Clapham Junction, Victoria and Waterloo, (ii) trains diverted from Victoria and Waterloo on to the WLL to Shepherd's Bush (for reversal at North Pole Depot) or farther west or north on the GWML or WCML, (iii) new services from the Southeastern network direct via Longhedge Junction (needed as indicated by T2025) on to the WLL either just to Shepherd's Bush (for reversal at North Pole Depot) or farther west or north on the GWML or WCML, plus (iv) trains under (i), (ii) and (iii) returning to their origins.

- 16.7 In this regard, we have already suggested a link between HS2 and HS1 via Merstham. In view of the forecast of full capacity on the BML between Croydon and Clapham by 2019, this may have to be built and become operational between at least these two points before HS2 opens.
- 16.8 This link's extension northwards to Old Oak Common would also relieve future crowding on the WLL during this RUS period.

7.4 Gap A: Reading/outer Thames Valley

- 16.9 Above and beyond the assessments here, we would suggest the option of diverting some services onto the WLL to either Kensington Olympia, Clapham Junction, Victoria or Waterloo.

7.8 Gap E: Brighton Main Line

- 16.10 Above and beyond the assessments here, we would suggest the option of diverting some services onto the WLL either just to Shepherd's Bush (for reversal at North Pole Depot) or farther west or north on the GWML or WCML.
- 16.11 In relation to Option E2, we would urge that if any additional train paths are generated by the use of ERTMS then these would be used first to restore the broken link between Milton Keynes, the WLL, Gatwick Airport and Brighton.
- 16.12 In relation to Option E3, we would suggest that, instead of attempting to tunnel from Stoats Nest Junction to Central London, the capacity gap between Croydon and Clapham is dealt with by our suggested HS2 – HS1 link on stilts where necessary between the northern portal of a new tunnel through the North Downs south of Coulsdon above the existing lines to Clapham Junction. If built wide enough, this elevated railway could be four tracks wide (to deal with future growth) as far north as Clapham, with two tracks continuing to Victoria and/or Waterloo and two along the WLL axis. Outline details of this link are attached at our Appendix 5.
- 16.13 Pursuing Option E3 could remove the need to construct BML2 (Option E4), although there may yet be merit in considering this axis to reach Lewisham (for the DLR to Canary Wharf) and Cannon Street/Charing Cross if the Bakerloo Line was extended to Hayes, emerging from tunnels between Lewisham and Ladywell (see RUS para 7.11.4). Consideration would be needed as to stopping patterns between Addiscombe (Tramlink), Elmers End and Lewisham to integrate BML2 services effectively between Tramlink trams and Bakerloo Line trains and to keep the overall running time between Brighton and London on this route within reasonable limits.
- 16.14 Adjusting Option E4 in this way would give a new direct link between East Sussex, East Surrey and South East London.

7.9 Gap F: South West Main Line and

7.10 Gap G: Windsor lines

- 16.15 Above and beyond the assessments here, we would suggest the option of diverting some services onto the WLL either just to Shepherd's Bush (for reversal at North Pole depot) or Old Oak Common interchange or farther west or north on the GWML or WCML.

7.12 Gap I: Orbital routes

- 16.16 RUS para 7.12.1. We support this paragraph and note the wording, "there will continue to be a significant and increasing peak capacity gap on the West London Line (WLL), with an ongoing increase in demand on this key orbital route," from which one cannot infer anything but that there is already a significant peak capacity gap here now – unlike other gaps in the RUS which are due to appear in the future.
- 16.17 In Table 7.1 the WLL has the fourth largest capacity gap; however, we are concerned that this may be understated due to the present crowding dissuading other potential passengers – so this current gap may be considerably more than shown here.
- 16.18 We would therefore ask that, as a matter of urgency, if there is limited stock, plus the problems of limited capacity at key termini, consideration be given to diverting other trains from both north and south to the WLL and the relatively lightly-used tube connections at Shepherd's Bush.
- 16.19 RUS para 7.12.1. We hope that the crowding problems on the WLL can be alleviated by the lengthening of all its platforms to accommodate 12-car trains and to arrange for trains on the London Overground WLL service between Clapham Junction and Willesden Junction to comprise (at least in the peaks and other times of high demand) 2 x 4-car Class 378 units. Present options to deal with the fact that Willesden Junction High Level platforms are not included in Option I2 are:-
- (i) Include it in Option I2 or our suggested Option I4 (see our para 16.35 below)
 - (ii) Use Selective Door Operation at Willesden Junction High Level platforms
 - (iii) Only run in service between Clapham Junction and Shepherd's Bush and reverse either at North Pole sidings or Kensal turnback.
- 16.20 RUS paras 7.12.1 and 7.12.2. Other options include:-
- (i) lengthening the Southern WLL service (East Croydon – Milton Keynes) to 8- or 12-car trains, and/or

- (ii) diverting other Southern 8-, 10- or 12-car services from Victoria on to the WLL
- 16.21 RUS paras 7.12.2 Another option is to arrange for one or more London Midland 8-, 10- or 12-car services from Milton Keynes (or even Birmingham (see our Option I3 at para 16.35) to travel via the WLL to Clapham Junction
- 16.22 RUS para 7.12.3 We have suggested additional terminal facilities for trains from the north on the WLL as follows:-
- at Kensington Olympia
- (i) remodelling the southbound platform as an island to provide an additional platform face so that any of the three could be used for reversal in either direction;
- and at Clapham Junction
- (i) bi-directionally signalling Platform 16 and its approaches;
- (ii) fully restoring Platforms 1 and 2;
- (iii) building new platforms A and B to the north of Platform 1;
- (iv) remodelling platform 17 as an island (platforms 17 and 20); and
- (v) ensuring that Platforms A, B, 16, 17 and 20 can accommodate 12-car trains.
- 16.23 In relation to Option I1, the redoubling of Latchmere Curve (opening May 2011) should allow greater flexibility in the timetable for both the WLL Southern and London Overground services, with more opportunities for departures from and arrivals at Clapham Junction.
- 16.24 We are delighted to see Option I2 and its assessment. We note that under 'Operational Analysis' there are occasional problems of turning back at Milton Keynes. We would ask that the options of restoring this service to its old terminus at Rugby and, even better, of extending it to serve Birmingham New Street be explored.
- 16.25 Under 'Passenger Impact' we would comment that a 30 minute service is needed in the evening peak northbound from Shepherd's Bush. Arranging for another 4-car unit to reach Wembley Central's Platform 7 may be an interim solution.
- 16.26 We also note that Option I2 is the only one in this RUS (save those for the Solent and South Hampshire section) that has been costed. Moreover, the outcomes of its assessment are a BCR of 4.2 (normally projects only need a BCR of 2.0 to proceed) and the comment, "**This option represents very good value for money** (our emboldening)."
- 16.27 We would also cite both the opportunity and the need for the WLL to play a full role in relation to the Olympic Volleyball, due to the extant and expected overburdensome pressures on Earl's Court station, its environs and host community, plus the physical dangers to which 70% of the competition's international and domestic spectators of the majority of the sessions will otherwise needlessly face.
- 16.28 Extending the National Rail platforms at West Brompton in time for the Olympics would be essential to allow such initiatives as lengthening to eight cars both Southern and London Overground trains, plus encouraging other TOCs and charter companies to run services to/from West Brompton, so that between them all they may carry up to 50% of the 18,000 spectators expected for each of the 42 sessions, i.e., 378,000 in 16 days. There are likely to be more than this, as there is a general desire to re-fill seats that may be vacated before the end of each of these 3½ hour sessions.
- 16.29 We remain convinced that the necessary platform extensions, given the Workington experience, can take place before the Games. These extensions are exactly the kind of investment that is justified under the UK Government's pledge, broadcast worldwide, that should its Olympic bid be successful, London's public transport would be improved as a result.
- 16.30 In comparison to the millions that have been spent on transport in and around the Olympic Park, not one penny piece has been spent on the public transport to the Olympic Volleyball. While we recognise Stratford's economic plight and congratulate those there on securing such levels of investment, not all of it (£50 million to Stratford Broadway, intermediate stations on the new DLR extensions) is relevant to the Games themselves, whereas these platform extensions, here and elsewhere on the WLL will be.
- 16.31 Here on the WLL and especially at West Brompton, these relatively low-cost and physically feasible platform extensions would not only:-
- i. allow West Brompton to be served by several regular, special and charter rail services that will deliver, at the closest point to the Venue, up to 400,000 spectators over 16 days;
 - ii. raise the awareness among these spectators of the existence and facilities offered by the WLL and its stations and interchanges;
 - iii. effectively manage the movements of these spectators and obviate the risks to their health and safety on an unnecessary kilometre walk between two adjacent stations on the District Line;

- iv. reduce pressure on the District Line as this will be wanted to be used by spectators for the Olympic Tennis at Wimbledon;
- v. reduce the incidence of fighting between Volleyball spectators and marshals/Police on Earl's Court's crowded station platforms; and
- vi. ease congestion for local residents, commuters and visitors within Earl's Court station and its environs;

it would also:-

- vii. support the relief of the overcrowding on the WLL as cited and assessed in this draft RUS with these extensions overall having a BCR of 4.2 that is twice the minimum needed for implementing of Network Rail investment; and
 - viii. provide West London with an Olympic Legacy (commensurate with that in Stratford) in terms of improvements to London's public transport as promised by the UK Government to the entire world, should London's bid be successful.
- 16.32 In view of all of the above, NOW is the appropriate time to fulfil this pledge to the world (and NOT some unspecified point in Control Period 5 after the Games).
- 16.33 We would very much like to explore Option I2 further with Network Rail, especially in terms of costs and benefits to check just how far returns on investment here can be maximised by:-
- i. remodelling Kensington Olympia and extending all WLL platforms to 12-cars,
 - ii. relieving pressures on London termini,
 - iii. providing additional connectivity via these diverted trains, and
 - iv. developing other WLL interchanges, particularly at
 - a. Old Oak Common,
 - b. 'Philbeach' (if feasible),
 - c. Stamford Bridge/Imperial Wharf, and
 - d. Clapham Junction.
 - v. developing other WLL stations. Possible sites include:-
 - a. North Pole Road (for North Kensington (West) and Shepherd's Bush (North)) , and
 - b. Battersea High Street.

and

- vi. developing other stations that do or could have direct links to WLL. Possible sites include:-
 - a. Wandsworth Road (restore platforms for 8- or 12-cars)
 - b. Clapham High Street (restore platforms for 8- or 12-cars)
 - c. Brixton (build High Level platforms for 8-or 12--cars)
 - d. Loughborough Junction (build High Level platforms for 8- or 12-cars on Atlantic Lines)
 - e. Brockley (build High Level platforms for 8- or 12-cars)
- 16.34 We would earnestly request that the deficiencies in platform shelters on the two 'nearly new' WLL stations at Shepherd's Bush and Imperial Wharf are not repeated elsewhere on the WLL when planning and costing new and extended platforms. If, for example, WLL services to a number of destinations are only to be every 30 minutes (see our suggested service pattern at Appendix 4), then platform canopies (with waiting rooms and toilets), rather than bus shelters should be provided.
- 16.35 A list of other Options for assessment on the WLL would include:-
- I3 Establishment of turnback for the Southern WLL service north of Milton Keynes, preferably allowing it to serve Birmingham New Street.
 - I4 Ensuring 8- or 12-car turnback facility at Watford Junction.
 - I5 Restoration of Wembley Central Platform 7 and upgrade approach route for passenger use.
 - I6 Raise speed limits for WLL Southern service between Wembley Central and Mitre Bridge to at least 20 mph throughout.
 - I7 Willesden Junction Low Level (Southern service). New 12-car platforms linked to the rest of the station via the High Level platforms.

- I8 Willesden Junction High Level Platforms extended to 8-cars.
- I9 Alterations to SW Willesden Sidings to allow for turnback of 12-car trains from three southern networks, if turnback is not possible at Old Oak Common High Level (see I10 and I11)
- I10 New station on WLL at Old Oak Common High Level with 2-, 3- or 4-platform (all 12-cars) interchange to provide shortest possible links with Crossrail, GWML, Chiltern, HS2 and other Lines here.
- I11 Links from WLL via North Pole Depot to new GWML station, so that this station can be accessed by 12-car trains terminating from the three southern networks (if neither I9 nor I10 is to proceed).
- I12 New 12-car station at North Pole Road.
- I13 Move of electrical traction changeover point to Clapham Junction/or installation of both OHLE and DC throughout WLL between Clapham Junction and Old Oak Common WLL, GWML and HS2 platforms.
- I14 Remodelling Kensington Olympia southbound platform as an island platform that extends southwards to serve Hammersmith Road bridge and NW Warwick Road's four contiguous development sites
- I15 Establishing the engineering and operational feasibility of Philbeach interchange (WLL, District and Piccadilly Lines)
- I16 Remodelling trackwork between Kensington Olympia and West Brompton to allow for (i) 775-metre freight loop, (ii) material transfer facility for redevelopment of EC&WKOA site, and (iii) potential 'Philbeach' interchange.
- I17 Establishing the engineering and operational feasibility of Stamford Bridge interchange (WLL and Crossrail 2 (Chelsea - Hackney))
- I18 Establishing the engineering and operational feasibility of Imperial Wharf interchange (WLL, Crossrail 2 (Chelsea - Hackney) and London River Services (Chelsea Harbour Pier))
- I19 New 12-car station at Battersea High Street
- I20 Construction of 12-car Platforms A and B at Clapham Junction (in airspace north of Platform 1)
- I21 Restoration of Platforms 1 and 2 (both for LO WLL/ELLX2 trains) at Clapham Junction to 8- or possibly 12-cars, and joined at their western end to the Windsor Lines
- I22 Extension of London Overground services from Clapham Junction to East Putney and Wimbledon, involving restoration of Platforms 3 and 4 at East Putney to allow 8-car trains to call and reverse from either and with and without restoration of Point Pleasant 'Up' Viaduct
- I23 Bi-directional signalling of Platform 16 at Clapham Junction and both its approaches
- I24 Remodelling Clapham Junction 17 as an island (17 and 20), interspersed at the south end by two south-facing bay Platforms (18 and 19) for ELL service extension from Crystal Palace via Balham
- I25 Strengthening the present Parliamentary service between the WLL and SLL to provide peak and off-peak services, e.g., between Heathrow/Old Oak Common, the WLL, the SLL, Lewisham, North Kent Line (NKL) to Ebbsfleet and the Medway Towns (see our March 2007 paper on this scheme).
- I26 New or extended stations at Wandsworth Road, Clapham High Street, Brixton (High Level), Loughborough Junction (High Level) and Brockley (High Level)
- I27 HS2 – HS1 Link via Merstham (see Appendix 5)

This may not be an exhaustive list

- 16.36 RUS paras 7.12.4. We would support this option of dealing with a short-term tactical problem between the WCML and WLL.
- 16.37 RUS para 7.12.5. We fully agree that orbital rail demand is growing. We hope that implementing Option I2 and running 8-car London Overground trains on the WLL will lead to serious consideration of extending Platforms on the North London Line as well.
- 16.38 RUS para 7.12.6 We would also agree that specific focus should be placed on connections via Old Oak Common. For the WLL to meet the major challenge to feed effectively into and off from HS2 at Old Oak Common, we would suggest that consideration be given to terminating HS2 trains at Kensington Olympia, Clapham Junction and/or Waterloo until Euston is ready. In relation to future demand forecasting, we give our thoughts on the impacts on each other of (i) the WLL and (ii) HS2, Crossrail and the other services in the Old Oak Common area at Appendix 3.
- 16.39 Pleased as we are with the growing emphasis on the WLL, we believe that the following aspects of the WLL still need to be fully appreciated and additional cost-effective options be pursued.

- 16.40 The WLL is ALREADY experiencing continuing growth in demand and crowding for which there is inadequate provision.
- 16.41 This provision can and should be cost-effectively enhanced, BEFORE the Olympics.
- 16.42 The WLL can also be used to relieve present and future pressures elsewhere, such as Euston, Paddington, Marylebone and Victoria.
- 16.43 The WLL can also be part of the sole or alternative link between HS2 and HS1
- 16.44 This would open up direct access to both the international and domestic high speed rail networks at key nodes such as Old Oak Common, Earl's Court, Clapham Junction, East Croydon, Merstham Parkway (for M25 and Gatwick), Tonbridge and Ashford.
- 16.45 This Link would make both High Speed networks more visible, more accessible, offering more flexible route options, and therefore more usable for more of the UK population, leading to greater acceptance by UK taxpayers of the desirability to pay for such infrastructure.
- 16.46 In addition, the WLL is about to experience enormous step-changes in connectivity.
- 16.47 Present options include:-
- | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|
| a. | Watford Junction | London Midland services |
| b. | Willesden Junction | North London Line, Bakerloo Line, London Overground
Watford DC Lines |
| c. | Shepherd's Bush | Central Line |
| d. | West Brompton | District Line |
| e. | Clapham Junction | Other Southern destinations, South West Trains |
- 16.48 These are joined by a range of future possibilities including:-
- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--|
| a. | Old Oak Common | WCML, GWML, Chiltern, Heathrow Express, Heathrow
Connect, NLL to/from Richmond (all existing),
Crossrail 1 (2017), HS2 (2026), |
| b. | Philbeach | District and Piccadilly Lines, HS2 – HS1 Link |
| c. | Stamford Bridge/Imperial Wharf | Crossrail 2 (Chelsea Hackney) (2030?) |
- 16.49 Existing services into Euston, Paddington, Marylebone and/or Victoria could be diverted along part or the full length of the WLL.
- 16.50 New services could be introduced such as Heathrow – WLL – SLL – North Kent Line (NKL) – Ebbsfleet – Medway Towns.
- 16.51 With the HS2 – HS1 via Merstham Link there would be High Speed trains which, depending on the final selection of stops, would serve Old Oak Common, Shepherd's Bush, Kensington Olympia, 'Philbeach' or West Brompton, Imperial Wharf (for Crossrail 2), Clapham Junction, East Croydon, Merstham Parkway, Tonbridge and/or Ashford and link to Birmingham and (later) Manchester, Leeds, the North and Scotland. International trains would link to Paris, Brussels and are planned to serve cities in Germany.
- 16.52 The WLL provides good connections to Gatwick Airport and would be able to provide them to Heathrow Airport. If the WCML RUS (a Generation One RUS) has assessed and recommended a 74-mile link with direct trains between Derby and Manchester Airport, then this Generation Two RUS ought to include the same for the WLL and the two London airports, given that Milton Keynes to Gatwick is also 74 miles and that Old Oak Common to Heathrow is only 10 miles.
- 16.53 RUS para 7.13.2. We welcome and support the points made.
- 16.54 RUS para 7.13.3. We note and welcome the intention to take into account stakeholders' views.
- 16.55 Above and beyond the contents of these RUS paras in 7.12 and 7.13, we would strongly urge that, to cover the whole of this RUS period (to 2040), serious thought is given to the optimum service pattern on the WLL, to serve not only existing markets but to meet the demands and opportunities arising from:-
- | | |
|----|--|
| a. | the potential interchanges at Old Oak Common, Philbeach and Stamford Bridge/Imperial Wharf; |
| b. | the possibilities of additional through trains from the GWML, WCML and possibly Chiltern networks; |
| c. | the possibilities of additional through trains from all three southern networks; |

- d. the proposed extensions of the London Overground network to Clapham Junction and possibly beyond to East Putney and Wimbledon;
- e. the need for direct orbital links to the Southeastern network;
- f. the current calls from WLL passengers of direct trains to Victoria and Waterloo;
- g. the need to provide direct rail links from South East and South London to Heathrow;
- h. the need/desirability to provide direct rail links via the WLL from (a) as far north as Birmingham/Stafford/Crewe, (b) the west, possibly as far as Cornwall and South Wales, and (c) all intermediate points to South London, Gatwick Airport and Brighton; and
- i. the need to provide an HS2 – HS1 link via Merstham as an alternative to, or instead of, that via Euston.

This may not be an exhaustive list.

17 8. Network connectivity (page 103)

8.2 Gap J – access to Heathrow Airport (page 103)

- 17.1 RUS para 8.2.4. Omitted from this para are the strategic connectivity gaps between Heathrow and ALL of Southern and Southeastern London termini, South and South East London, Surrey and Sussex and Kent railheads that presently require at least TWO changes via the Piccadilly Line or Paddington. Only those served by Thameslink will be able to access Heathrow by a single change at Farringdon when Crossrail is opened and only then if it directly serves Heathrow (Option A6).
- 17.2 Why should passengers enjoy easier journeys to, say, Manchester Airport from its catchment when this large part of Heathrow's catchment is not even to be considered during this RUS period ending 2031?
- 17.3 It should be noted that the WLL, even if it does not carry direct trains to and from Heathrow, but if provided with an interchange at Old Oak Common to Heathrow services, would provide a shorter link (in distance, at least) between Heathrow and Gatwick Airports, BEFORE Crossrail is opened.
- 17.4 The WLL's Southern service already links South London and Croydon to the Old Oak Common area, and this RUS's Option I1 calls for a second train per hour on this service at least in the peaks. The outstanding recommendation in the Cross London RUS for a second train per hour on this service between the Croydon area and Shepherd's Bush, should also be amongst those taken forward into this RUS, even if lack of track paths prevent it being extended farther north.
- 17.5 The WLL's London Overground service is now operated by large capacity 4-car trains, whose frequency is 4tph in the peaks and 2tph in the off-peaks (3tph Saturday shopping hours) between Clapham Junction and Old Oak Common. The service is about to be enhanced in May 2011 so that its frequency will be 4tph throughout the day, with two of these extra trains extended to and from Stratford.
- 17.6 Thus they will strengthen the link (also omitted from consideration here) between Heathrow and inner North and North East and East London, already linked all day to the west side of the Old Oak Common area by London Overground's North London Line (NLL) Stratford – Richmond service and in the peaks to the east side of the Old Oak Common area by the London Overground's NLL/WLL Stratford – Clapham Junction service.
- 17.7 Beyond that, the WLL has easy direct connectivity to the Southeastern networks via Longhedge Junction, thus expanding significantly Heathrow's potential direct or one-change rail catchment across South East London and Kent to Ebbsfleet and the Medway Towns (see our March 2007 paper).
- 17.8 All the foregoing indicates that there would be significant advantages in ensuring that there are good connections between the present and future WLL and Heathrow services at Old Oak Common.
- 17.9 We would respond to the concern expressed in RUS para 7.12.6 over dispersal of Crossrail and HS2 passengers on to predominantly 4-car London Overground WLL trains.
- 17.10 At the current time (March 2011), there are 2 such trains per hour or 16 cars in total in both directions available for such dispersal. It should be noted that they have probably the highest carrying capacity per car, by some margin, of any rolling stock in the UK
- 17.11 They are augmented by 1 x 4-car Southern WLL train per hour, bringing the total to 24 cars per hour.
- 17.12 In May 2011, the London Overground WLL frequency becomes 4tph, with two of these trains providing direct links all day to and from the plethora of local centres on NLL. Thus the total number of cars on the WLL becomes 40 per hour.
- 17.13 What follows is an indicative timetable of a gradual build-up of resources in terms of additional rolling stock being made available for the WLL, as well as new or improved WLL stations, to meet the concerns expressed in this RUS para 7.12.6, viz., that the WLL would not be able to cope with dispersal from (and presumably demand for) Crossrail and HS2 at Old Oak Common. We have identified how the present situation of 24 cars per hour on the WLL for dispersal can be augmented between now and the opening of these two new arteries in 2017 and 2025 respectively.

- 17.14 Option I1 in this RUS seeks a second Southern WLL 1 x 4-car train at least in the peaks. If, by December 2011, this stock was to be available all day, this would provide a total of 48 cars per hour.
- 17.15 Option I2 in this RUS, with a BCR of 4.2, if implemented by May 2012 to meet the challenge of the Olympics, will allow the extension of all these trains except the two per hour running directly to or from the NLL, bringing the possible number of cars per hour to 80 cars, by May 2012.
- 17.16 If, by December 2012, all the WLL platforms have been extended to 12-cars to take the pressure off the other London terminals, this would bring the possible number of cars per hour to 96 cars.
- 17.17 If, by May 2013, the pressure at Euston is relieved by sending 2 x 12-car trains on to the WLL, the total becomes 144 cars per hour, possibly by May 2013.
- 17.18 If, by December 2013, the pressure at Paddington is relieved by sending, say, 2 x 12-car trains on to the WLL, the total becomes 192 cars per hour.
- 17.19 If, by May 2014, the pressure at Victoria is relieved by sending, say, 2 x 12-car trains on to the WLL, the total becomes 216 cars per hour.
- 17.20 If, by December 2014, the pressure at Waterloo is relieved by sending, say, 2 x 12-car trains on to the WLL, the total becomes 240 cars per hour.
- 17.21 If, by May 2015, it is decided to operate 2 x 12-car Medway Towns – SLL – WLL – Old Oak Common service per hour, the total becomes 264 cars per hour.
- 17.22 All the foregoing train enhancements assume that the WLL and the other lines on which these services run either already have 12-car platforms or will keep pace with the platform extension programmes north and south of the Thames.
- 17.23 Crossrail is not due until 2017 and HS2 until 2026. We feel that there should be enough time between then and now to provide the necessary stock and other infrastructure to permit such a service pattern by those dates, even allowing for some slippage in the programme.
- 17.24 Even when they Crossrail and HS2 do arrive, it is likely that only a proportion of their passengers will want to transfer between these and WLL services. However, if any of the stock is crucial for the efficient operation of Crossrail and/or HS2, then presumably its acquisition would be included in the costs of the project(s).
- 17.25 It should also be remembered that there will be the London Overground NLL crossing the western end of the Old Oak Common area and that it may also be feasible to interchange with the Central Line at North Acton or East Acton or at a new station between them.
- 17.26 Other connectivity options to and from Old Oak Common are listed at this RUS para 8.3.6. We note that these do not include any connections to the east for the Midland Main Line (MML) and the East Coast Main Line (ECML).
- 17.27 Therefore, we believe that the WLL will have the ability through increased services and lengthened trains and platforms to address the concerns expressed in this RUS para 7.12.6 and the feasibility of a WLL/WCML interchange with the GWML/Crossrail/other Heathrow services/HS2 and Chiltern should be assessed in this RUS.

8.3 Gap K – maximising the benefits of Crossrail (page 105)

- 17.28 Similarly to the points we have expressed above, we believe that interchange between the WLL and Crossrail in the Old Oak Common area would be advantageous to each, offering swift one-change connections between not only Heathrow and the WLL corridor north and south, but also from, say, inner west London and Farringdon, Milton Keynes and Slough, Harrow and Reading. All these links would also be achieved by the same infrastructure as above, i.e., new 12-car platforms on the WLL above and connected to the GWML/CRossrail/HS2 platforms at Old Oak Common.
- 17.29 Providing this infrastructure would allow good connections onto the WCML south, freeing up capacity for Crossrail to take some other option westwards; we would suggest, to expand the variety of longer-distance routes available from here, the option of extension via the Chilterns line towards High Wycombe (RUS para 8.3.6 Bullet Point 3).
- 17.30 RUS para 8.38. Again we would suggest that for trains unable to be accommodated at Paddington, the WLL be used as far south as Kensington Olympia, Clapham Junction, Waterloo or Victoria.
- 17.31 RUS para 8.3.11. We note the recommendation for further development work on linking WCML south to Crossrail. While we are supportive of such a scheme in principle, we would ask that this not be implemented if it were to affect adversely the present WLL/WCML services or restrict the WLL's capacity to aid the dispersal from Crossrail and/or HS2 at Old Oak Common.

8.4 Gap L– future Crossrail 2 (Chelsea – Hackney line) (page 107)

- 17.32 We would support these proposals. In relation to RUS para 8.4.6 and Figure 8.2, we would ask that these incorporate an interchange station with the WLL, either at Stamford Bridge, but preferably at Imperial Wharf. The latter would offer interchange with London River Services at Chelsea Harbour Pier.

- 17.33 If a more southerly route is to branch off the safeguarded route between Victoria and the King's Road, then this should go at least to Clapham Junction (Figure 8.2).

8.5 Gap M - Implications of High Speed 2 on the London area (page 110)

- 17.34 In relation to RUS para 8.5.4 Bullet Point 4, the case for GWML trains to call at Old Oak Common would be enhanced if good connections were available to our proposed WCML/WLL platforms here.
- 17.35 In relation to RUS para 8.5.3 Bullet Points 1 and 2 We would agree with both these and in relation to the second, we would again urge that full use be made of the connectional possibilities that would be offered by the WLL at Old Oak Common.
- 17.36 In relation to RUS para 8.5.4 Bullet Point 4, the case for GWML trains to call at Old Oak Common would be enhanced if good connections were available to our proposed WCML/WLL platforms here.
- 17.37 In relation to RUS para 8.5.4 Bullet Point 6, we note the anticipated need for an interchange station on the WLL at Old Oak Common, even if HS2 was not to be developed as presently proposed.
- 17.38 In relation to RUS para 8.5.5 we fully support further development of accommodating all HS2 flows south and east of Old Oak Common.

8.6 Gap N – capacity implications of the proposed link from HS2 to HS1 (page 110)

- 17.39 In relation to RUS paras 8.6.1 – 8.6.4, we would ask that our suggestion for an alternative or additional link between HS2 and HS1 via Merstham be considered.
- 17.40 In relation to RUS para 8.6.4 we would support running freight traffic via HS1 and HS2, as long as this option was used not only for new additional freight trains but also to divert freight traffic away from the WLL, despite the wording of RUS para 9.7.5.

8.7 Gap O – other connectivity schemes (page 111)

- 17.41 In relation to RUS para 8.7.4 we would reiterate our request that the WLL OHLE be extended south to at least Shepherd's Bush and preferably to Platforms A, B, 1, 2, 16, 17, 20, Y and Z at Clapham Junction. There may also be a case for it to be installed between the WLL and Waterloo and Victoria for LM and GWML trains diverted from Euston and Paddington respectively.
- 17.42 We have already advocated above improved and new platforms on the present SLL. Those at Clapham High Street, Brixton, Loughborough Junction and Brockley would enhance this axis' connectivity with the Northern Line, Victoria Line, Thameslink and London Overground, offering a step change in opportunities for direct or one-change travel across south and south-east London, e.g., Clapham HighStreet – London City Airport via Woolwich Arsenal, Forest Hill – Brixton via Brockley, Sidcup – Kensington Olympia via Lewisham.
- 17.43 We would also like to see Network Rail embark on a programme of reducing the often extreme heights between platforms and carriage doors. There are many glaring examples of this even at key stations such as Clapham Junction and Tulse Hill. Moreover, this phenomenon is often coupled with long carriages at platforms with too tight a curvature, a prime example being Platform 17 at Clapham Junction. We believe that there may be all too many similar instances and between them they will negate all the Access for All initiatives that only concentrate on the street/station interface and not the often more crucial platform/carriage interface. This will become a growing problem amongst an ageing population, whose members, discouraged by one or a series of bad experiences, will one-by-one all-too-quickly desert the railway, possibly never to return.
- 17.44 We would suggest that the ideal is the Japanese model, where platform surfaces are exactly the same height as the train door entrances.
- 17.45 We would also that sufficient care, thought and investment is put into ensuring platform shelter provision is large and comprehensive enough to deal with increasing numbers of travellers on extended platforms, especially where there are considerable intervals between trains to a particular destination.

18 9. Freight in South East England (page 112)

9.7 Channel Tunnel/Kent Thames Gateway traffic (page 123)

- 18.1 We note with concern the present forecasts for Channel Tunnel freight of 35 tpd and the present constraints on the two routes cited as possible alternative to the WLL. We would ask that any spare capacity on HS1 be used to divert freight away from the WLL (RUS paras 9.7.5 and 9.7.6). WE would also ask that the present constraints on developing the route via Guildford be seriously revisited in the medium term, with the dangers of impairing the WLL passenger service fully weighed against the extra mileage and infrastructure involved (RUS para 9.7.7).
- 18.2 In relation to RUS para 9.7.8 we would hope that electrification of the Redhill-Tonbridge line be undertaken as part of the installation of our suggested HS2-HS1 Link.
- 18.3 In relation to RUS para 9.7.9 we would agree wholeheartedly with Bullet Point 1 and say that this passenger demand growth could yet be substantial. In relation to Bullet Point 2, we would refer to the recommendation in the South London RUS of a 775-metre freight loop in the Kensington area. We

have not yet been able to identify the site for this, but we would say that this would be a key time to take this forward, in view of:-

- (i) the imminent constraints on the ability of southbound freight trains to be held on a freight-only line upon implementing the planned extension of the ELLX service via the South London Line (SLL) to Clapham Junction,
- (ii) the strong possibility that other passenger services may be introduced on this axis,

and

- (iii) development of detailed redevelopment proposals for the Earls Court & West Kensington Opportunity Area is now underway.

- 18.4 The latter involves, in the middle of a intensively-developed and primarily residential inner urban area, with a congested road system, the total demolition of one of the largest building complexes in Central London, viz., both halls of the Earls Court Exhibition Centre, plus the Lille Bridge LUL Depot, a substantial office block and two major housing estates.
- 18.5 This will be followed by the construction of a whole new urban area comprising new homes for 5,000 – 10,000 people and a commercial centre offering 20,000 jobs.
- 18.6 There is likely to be pressure on the planning authorities for as much material to be moved off- and then on-site as possible by rail. Therefore, this may be the opportunity to establish this 775-metre freight loop, with it first being used for the development site for waste removal facility, and then as a delivery facility
- 18.7 Therefore, in view of the constraints above, we would urge that other routes be investigated for north-south cross-London freight, such as the East London Line and Thameslink (outside the times of the intended 24 tph passenger services) for the ECML and MML respectively.
- 18.8 We note that no details are given on rail routes for domestic freight movements; it would be helpful if those relevant to the London area can be meaningfully summarised by route or axis, together with the same detail for rail freight movements presently proposed or anticipated. (Table 9.12).
- 18.9 We trust that as few of these movements as possible impinge on the WLL and we would ask for reassurance on that score.

19 10. Solent and South Hampshire (page 130)

- 19.1 We have no comments on this section of the RUS.

20 11. Emerging conclusions (page 162)

11.1 Existing strategy (page 162)

- 20.1 RUS para 11.1.2, Bullet Points 1 and 2. We welcome and support these recommendations.

11.2 Further development recommended by the RUS (page 162)

- 20.2 RUS para 11.2.1, Bullet Point 3. Platform lengths on the WLL must proceed in concert with platform extensions, i.e. to 12-cars (and not just 8-cars) at the same time as these are being installed on suburban routes so that, the WLL can:-
- (i) play a full role in meeting London's and its own corridor's rail needs; and
 - (ii) ease London termini capacity problems by receiving 12-car trains from south, west and north (Bullet Points 2 and 4 and as an option to Bullet Point 5, plus RUS para 11.2.2 Bullet Point 2);
- 20.3 Extending WLL platforms BEFORE the Olympic Volleyball would ease pressures on existing WLL users and, during the Event, on Earls Court station and environs, spectators and residents. They would then provide an Olympic Legacy, in line with the UK Government's worldwide pledge,
- 20.4 The extended WLL platforms would also allow for further capacity with 8-car trains able to be used on the London Overground WLL service between Clapham Junction and Willesden Junction (Bullet Point 3).
- 20.5 RUS para 11.2.1. The installation of 12-car WLL/WCML platforms above and linked to the GWML/Crossrail/HS2 stations, along with the general lengthening of WLL platforms that would permit longer trains to access the WLL, will:-
- (i) reduce need for option of linking Crossrail to WCML at Old Oak Common (Bullet Point 6)
 - (ii) improve connectivity across London and Home Counties to/from Heathrow and Gatwick Airports (Bullet Point 7)

(iii) aid dispersal from Crossrail and HS2 at Old Oak Common (RUS para 11.2.2 Bullet Point 5).

20.6 RUS para 11.2.2 Bullet Point 3. We have suggested an alternative or additional link between HS2 and HS1 (see Appendix 5)

20.7 RUS para 11.2.2 Bullet Point 5 See our para 19.2(iii)

11.3 Impact on London Underground (page 163)

20.8 We note the points made here. We would vigorously promote the WLL and the fact that the WLL works alongside the London Underground network. While having some connections between them in the WLL corridor, neither the WLL nor the London Underground overly impact upon each other. Most of the suggestions in this response seek to reduce the pressures on the Underground (save possibly those east of Shepherd's Bush on the Central Line in the peaks) especially in relation to the London Underground network from, to and between key London rail termini.

21 Appendix A : Stations (page 168)

Table A.2

London Victoria

21.1 At some point during the redevelopment, passengers will find they will have permanently a much longer subsurface dog-leg walk from the rail station to a point below Eland House before they will reach the down escalators to the platforms.

21.2 During the Victoria upgrade, we have been advocating that Southern strengthen their direct WLL services so that more of their commuters seeking the West End, use the WLL and Central Line as an alternative to the 73 bus or Victoria Line.

Table A.3

21.3 We would support all listed. However, we would welcome seeing in the final RUS inclusion here of all the WLL stations with platform extensions as these are needed BEFORE the Olympics. There is a major opportunity for Network Rail, the Olympic Delivery Authority and others to collaborate in achieving these improvements by June 2012. However, we would seek assurances that WLL platforms would be extended to 12-cars to keep pace with extension programmes north and south of the Thames and to relieve pressure on other London terminals. Key among immediate projects are:-

21.4 Clapham Junction

- (i) Restoration of Platform 1 to allow 8- but preferably 12-car Class 350 trains (with 3rd rail shoes (re-) fitted) from key points of origin on the WCML network.
- (ii) Bi-directional signalling on both approaches to Platform 16 to allow 8-car trains to run on the WLL to and from the Southern side of the station

21.5 Imperial Wharf

- (i) 4-car extensions with waiting rooms and WCs for both platforms; and
- (ii) A new footbridge between them; for Olympic Games family traffic via Chelsea Harbour Pier

21.6 West Brompton

- (i) 4-car extensions for both National Rail platforms; and
- (ii) A new footbridge between all platforms and Seagrave Road car park;
- (iii) New access behind Platform 4 and steps up to bridge outside Earls Court 2;
- (iv) New access from Platform 1 via EDF forecourt; and
- (v) New lift for Platform 1

21.7 Shepherd's Bush

- (i) 4-car extension to southbound platform; and
- (ii) A new footbridge between platforms

21.8 (North Pole Depot)

- (i) Restoration of all four sidings to accommodate trains for the Olympics

21.9 Other WLL stations at North Pole Road, 'Philbeach' Stamford Bridge and Battersea High Street

21.10 North Pole Road

- (i) 8-car platformed station to serve North Shepherd's Bush and North Kensington

- 21.11 Philbeach
- (i) Possible interchange between the WLL and the District and Piccadilly Lines intersecting in the middle of the EC&WKOA - to be assessed for engineering and operational feasibility
- 21.12 Stamford Bridge
- (i) Alternative location for WLL interchange with Crossrail 2 if latter does not go to Imperial Wharf. Imperial Wharf is preferred location.
- 21.13 Battersea High Street
- (i) An 8-car platformed station to be rebuilt in original location – may not be enough space to allow for 12-car platforms. We would also like to see installation of a passenger footbridge alongside Cremorne Railway Bridge, possibly as an alternative for North Battersea residents to access Imperial Wharf station.
- 21.14 Willesden Low Level
- (i) Two 12-car platforms to be reconstituted one each side of the Southern WLL service tracks below and linked to the High Level platforms
- 21.15 Willesden High Level
- (i) Both platforms to be extended to accommodate 8-cars
- 21.16 Balham, Clapham Junction and East Croydon
- (i) These stations and others on the WLL and BML between Clapham Junction and Coulsdon South and those between Godstone, Tonbridge and Ashford would be affected should our proposal for an HS2- HS1 Link via Merstham be developed, which would also involve a new IPS or set of IPS platforms and facilities at one or more stations on the WLL, plus Clapham Junction, East Croydon, Merstham Parkway and Tonbridge.
- 21.17 South London Stations
- (i) We would urge development of high level platforms with interchange with existing lines at Brixton, Loughborough Junction and Brockley (see our para 17.42 above).
- 21.18 West Hampstead Thameslink
- (i) We would support development of an interchange between the London Overground station and the Chiltern Line at West Hampstead.
- 21.19 (South West Willesden Area)
- (i) Turnback facilities may have to be secured for 12-car trains from the three southern networks north or west of Old Oak Common High Level platforms.

Please let me know if you or your colleagues would like any further background information on any of the above. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Mark Balaam
Chairman

WLLG SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERATIONS AT CLAPHAM JUNCTION

If Platform 1 is not restored for use by LO WLL trains before ELLX2 arrives at Clapham Junction and Platform 2 is reconfigured as planned for both LO's WLL and SLL trains, this will result in:-

- a) neither part of the reconfigured Platform 2 being able to cope with trains longer than 4-cars, when this strategy calls for 8-car trains on the WLL.
- b) dangerous levels of crowding on the reconfigured Platform 2 given the variety of conflicting passenger movements (i) between the different parts of Platform 2 and the two already-inadequate platform exits and (ii) interchanging between WLL and SLL trains. Such dangers would be augmented by the location of the refreshment facility in the building on this platform and would be further increased during any disruption of either service at this station.
- c) Platform 16 (extended if necessary to accommodate the lengthening of the Southern and other WLL trains) and both its approaches need to be bi-directionally signalled. This improvement would then allow these longer trains to terminate, or stop in either direction, at Clapham Junction.
- d) Beyond this we believe that two new terminating platforms (A and B) should be constructed parallel and to the north of Platforms 1 and 2 to accommodate WCML, GWML, Chiltern and/or other services that cannot be accommodated in their traditional London terminals. We believe that the interchanges at Shepherd's Bush, West Brompton and Clapham Junction would be attractive enough for sizeable numbers of passengers, especially given general growth in rail travel generally, to use these links instead of traditional termini and connecting tube lines to warrant investment in these two new platforms.
- e) Furthermore, on the south side of the station, we believe that Platform 17 should become an island platform with the two faces separated by two south-facing bay platforms to accommodate the proposed London Overground service from Crystal Palace via Balham.
- f) Finally, all these 22 platforms should be crossed at high level by Platforms Y and Z on our proposed HS2 – HS1 link via Merstham Parkway

WLLG SUGGESTIONS FOR LAYOUT AT OLD OAK COMMON

WLL through services between Shepherd's Bush and Willesden Junction/Wembley Central would have a high level two 12-car platform station above the east – west tracks and be connected by covered walkways to the east end of the platforms for the GWML, Crossrail and HS2 services.

The west end of the GWML, Crossrail and HS2 platforms would be connected by covered walkways to the platforms on the NLL, Dudding Hill Line (if it is proposed and feasible to run passenger trains between here and the Midland Main Line) and a new station located on the Central Line at a point between the present East Acton and North Acton stations.

WLL services that would terminate here would do so within the GWML station box. These would be 12-car trains from any of the three southern networks.

Our suggested HS2-HS1 Link via Merstham would follow or shadow the alignments of the entry and exit roads for North Pole Depot, as used previously by the Eurostar trains.

It is also hoped that, despite the proposal for HS2 to use the Chiltern Line alignment from here, a new alignment will be built to allow Chiltern Line trains to serve the interchange, with the option of continuing on the WLL.

IMPACTS ON EACH OTHER OF (I) THE WLL AND (II) HS2, CROSSRAIL AND THE OTHER SERVICES IN THE OLD OAK COMMON AREA

We strongly believe that the WLL has a major role to play in providing connecting facilities for both Crossrail and HS2 at Old Oak Common, with myriad connections being possible between a variety of rail and tube services in and around the site.

Both should have good connections with Clapham Junction, the UK's busiest rail interchange at present, with its extensive links across the whole of the affluent south and southwest suburbs of London and, beyond that, all of Southern England from Hastings to Exeter.

These links will be by virtue of the WLL, which also serves a number of major centres that are generators and attractors for rail traffic. Examples include Shepherd's Bush, presently the home of the BBC and associated media companies and Westfield, the third largest retail complex in the UK, with a large residential hinterland. Kensington Olympia lies between the commercial centres of Kensington High Street and Hammersmith, with the latter having a number of commercial enterprises located along the Hammersmith Road to Hammersmith Broadway and beyond to the Riverside.

We have also advocated the re-modelling of this station so that it better serves the main road between these two centres and the new redevelopment comprising four contiguous sites that between them will provide housing for about 6,000 residents.

Further south is the huge redevelopment site in the Earl's Court & West Kensington Opportunity Area, which when built, will have homes for about 5,000 -10,000 and a strong commercial emphasis with at least one new 5-star hotel and employment for 20,000 people, alongside the existing Empress State, which contains c4,000 Met Police administrative staff.

In addition to the recent developments around Imperial Wharf station are two major sites, the first being Lots Road Power Station, with a 37- and a 25-storey tower and a large commercial space inside the old power station building. On the other side of the railway will be Chelsea Creek with a 39-storey glass tower and, at its base, a number of waterside destination restaurants surround the re-excavated Chelsea Basin. This station has a large catchment area spread between Battersea and Wandsworth Bridges as far north as the King's Road/New King's Road.

A very large part of the market for GWML services to the West Country and South Wales, plus that for Heathrow and, via HS2, for Birmingham resides in the Southern and South Western district of the capital, also inner west London residents seeking a swift journey to places such as Tottenham Court Road, Farringdon and the City, will also want to take advantage of Crossrail. It would be iniquitous to deny these Londoners, who have contributed much to the public purse to pay for these projects, the relatively low-cost means to access them easily from within or close to their own localities.

**WLLG SUGGESTED MAXIMUM SERVICE PATTERN FOR WLL AT OLD OAK COMMON
FOR DISPERSAL**

Northbound						Now	May	Dec	May	Dec	May	Dec	May	Dec	May	
Time	TOC	Origin	Destination	Platform	Departing		2011	2011	2012	2012	2013	2013	2014	2014	2015	
				at OOC	Cars	17.11	17.12	17.14	17.15	17.16	17.17	17.18	17.19	17.20	17.21	
xx00	LO	Clapham Jn East	Stratford Milton	WLL	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
xx03	SN	Croydon	Keynes	WLL	12	4	4	4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	
xx06	LM	Clapham Jn	Birm NS	WLL	12						12	12	12	12	12	
xx09	SWT	Windsor	OOO	NPD/GW	0											
xx12	Space for recovery/perturbations															
xx15	LO	Clapham Jn	Willesden Jn	WLL	8		4	4	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
xx18	SE	Longhedge	OOO	NPD/GW	0											
xx21	GW	Clapham Jn	Slough	GWML	12							12	12	12	12	
xx24	HS Link	HS1	Birm IPS	HS2												
xx27	SN	Dorking	OOO	NPD/GW	0											
xx30	LO	Clapham Jn East	Stratford Milton	WLL	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
xx33	SN	Croydon	Keynes	WLL	12			4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	
xx36	LM	Clapham Jn	Birm NS	WLL	12						12	12	12	12	12	
xx39	SWT	Windsor	OOO	NPD/GW	0											
xx42	Space for recovery/perturbations															
xx45	LO	Clapham Jn	Wij	WLL	8		4	4	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
xx48	SE	Longhedge	OOO	NPD/GW	0											
xx51	GW	Clapham Jn	Slough	GWML	12							12	12	12	12	
xx54	Freight															
xx57	SN	Dorking	OOO	NPD/GW Sub-Total	96	12	20	24	40	48	72	96	96	96	96	
Southbound																
Time	TOC	Origin	Destination	Platform	Departing											
				at OOC	Cars											
xx01	LO	Stratford Milton	Clapham Jn East	WLL	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
xx04	SN	Keynes	Croydon Clapham	WLL	12	4	4	4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	
xx07	LM	Birm NS	Jn	WLL	12						12	12	12	12	12	
xx10	SN	OOO	Dorking	NPD/GW	12								12	12	12	
xx13	Space															
xx16	LO	Willesden Jn	Clapham Jn	WLL	8		4	4	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
xx19	SWT	OOO	Windsor Clapham	NPD/GW	12									12	12	
xx22	GW	Slough	Jn	GWML	12							12	12	12	12	
xx25	HS Link	Birm IPS	HS1	HS2												
xx28	SE	OOO	Longhedge Clapham	NPD/GW	12										12	
xx31	LO	Stratford Milton	Jn East	WLL	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
xx34	SN	Keynes	Croydon Clapham	WLL	12			4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	
xx37	LM	Birm NS	Jn	WLL	12						12	12	12	12	12	
xx40	SN	OOO	Dorking	NPD/GW	12								12	12	12	
xx43	Space															
xx46	LO	Willesden Jn	Clapham Jn	WLL	8		4	4	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
xx49	SWT	OOO	Windsor Clapham	NPD/GW	12									12	12	
xx52	GW	Slough	Jn	GWML	12							12	12	12	12	
xx55	Freight															
xx58	SE	OOO	Longhedge	NPD/GW Sub-Total	12										12	
				TOTAL	168	12	20	24	40	48	72	96	120	144	168	
				TOTAL	264	24	40	48	80	96	144	192	216	240	264	

WLLG PROPOSALS FOR HS2 –HS1 LINK via MERSTHAM (The Link)

With apologies for all those who may live, or have an interest, in properties that may be affected by this proposal.

From London (Old Oak Common) HS2 platforms the Link would diverge to the WLL, probably at a point south of the WLL/WCML platforms over the GWML and north of the site of the proposed North Pole station (WLL)

Options for the route the Link would take, apart from the existing WLL tracks themselves, may be limited north of Imperial Wharf.

The Link would most likely be a two-track railway either alongside or above (on stilts) the existing WLL as far south as Imperial Wharf.

We appreciate that throughout the length of the Link there may be particular engineering problems, such as building new tracks, possibly with OHLE, on stilts over a busy railway that needs to operate continuously during construction and occasionally is on a high embankment with limited widths

Possible Link station sites on the WLL are Shepherd's Bush, Kensington Olympia, 'Philbeach' or West Brompton, and Imperial Wharf (for Crossrail 2) and Clapham Junction. South of Clapham Junction, the candidates would be East Croydon, Merstham Parkway, Tonbridge and Ashford.

Alternative links that should be available between the HS1 and HS2 networks before the Euston tunnel is built would be (i) that via the WLL and reversal at Waterloo International, and (ii) that via the WLL and Longhedge Junction, and then both via the Chatham Lines.

South of Imperial Wharf the Link would continue SSE across the River Thames to follow an alignment just east of Plough Road. This may cause difficulties with the operation of Battersea heliport.

At Clapham Junction, the Link's two, three or four parallel platforms would cross the western half of the carriage sidings to the west of the domestic station. This should give enough space for any International station facilities here, while still maintaining a closer link between them and the domestic platforms and commercial centre than, say, that at Stratford.

This alignment through the proposed Clapham Junction IPS would appear to be the shortest and most direct trajectory to line up with the BML south of the domestic station.

The greatest demand on the BML is between Clapham and Croydon, with full capacity expected to be reached by 2019. Given this and other pressures, we would suggest that the stilts on this section carry four tracks, with two continuing north of Clapham Junction domestic platforms to Victoria and/or Waterloo. Two tracks only may need to be laid immediately, but the extra capacity should be built in at the earliest stage. The second pair of tracks could continue south as far as any of Croydon, Coulsdon, Gatwick or Three Bridges; the ccsts and BCR of doubling the Balcombe viaduct may not be persuasive enough before, say, 2050.

The need to cross over a number of overbridges crossing the BML may mean that the Link would run on stilts about 10 metres above the present trackbed and it would therefore be a new prominent feature across open spaces such as Wandsworth and

Tooting Bec Commons and from the back gardens in the streets that back on to the present BML between Wandsworth Common and Selhurst stations.

Enough headroom would need to be reserved for OHLE and/or double-deck trains on tracks at both levels

The only building that should be in the way of this trajectory, assuming all the other station entrances are low enough, or can be made so, is a smallish building above Thornton Heath station.

There hopefully will be enough flexibility in the schemes for East Croydon to accommodate the Link and IPS facilities here, possibly a little to the north of the existing platforms.

Between South Croydon and Coulsdon, again the Link on stilts would be a prominent feature, but here it may only need to be about 4 to 5 metres above the existing tracks as there are no overbridges to be crossed. Again, enough headroom would need to be reserved for OHLE and/or double-deck trains on tracks at both levels

We have not fleshed out proposals for the next stage of the Link, but one option could be a new tunnel, close to the existing two, through the North Downs and then to follow the alignment of the M23 (possibly on top of it). The best site for the new Merstham Parkway station would seem to be just south of the M23/M25 junction, with parking close to the west side of the M23. The Link would then continue to follow the M23 to the area east of South Nutfield where it would curve left to connect with the Redhill – Tonbridge line halfway between Nutfield station and the western portal of Bletchingly tunnel.

We have assumed that the 15 miles between here and Tonbridge is used lightly enough, yet with an alignment straight enough, to allow Link services, normal domestic passenger services and domestic and international freight services all to use it without any further major enhancement.

We have not reached a conclusion on whether Tonbridge should have an IPS, or, if not, what work would need to be done to allow trains on the Link to pass through or call at Tonbridge. A cursory glance at the timetable seems to indicate that there may be paths, even in the morning peak, for Link trains on the existing tracks between Ashford and Tonbridge without needing further intervention.

We are fully aware that there will be concerns expressed by those concerned with the environment and residential amenity, in areas as diverse as Wandsworth Common and the Eden Valley. However, we think that on balance, with (a) its opportunities for improved rail travel that are able to benefit more of those along its length than, say, along HS2 in the Chilterns, (b) the pressing need to increase BML capacity, (c) the advantages in bringing the international and domestic high speed rail networks closer to the Southern and South West parts of the country, and (d) its ability to act as an operational alternative to, and much more accessible for many Londoners and UK residents than, that via Euston, the case for the Link should be a positive one and should have lower costs and a higher BCR than a tunnel from Coulsdon to Central London.

MB
March 2011