



July 2014

SUPPORTING PAPERS FOR REBUTTAL OF CHALLENGE TO THE WEST LONDON LINE GROUP'S PETITION IN RELATION TO THE HIGH SPEED 2 (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Aim of this Presentation

The aim of this presentation is to confirm that the WLLG has locus standi in relation to its Petition, in terms of its own standing and in terms of loss for itself and for those it represents if the provisions of the Bill do not encompass the WLLG's proposals so that they are guaranteed to be implemented.

Introductory Statement

The West London Line Group (2004) is the rail user group seeking improved services and facilities at all West London Line (WLL) stations between Clapham Junction and Willesden Junction, with a wider concern for WLL passengers between Brighton and Birmingham.

The Group's Petition to secure proper interchange between the West London Line, HS2 and other services at Old Oak Common is directly in line with the Group's aims.

Present and future WLL passengers (and future Crossrail and HS2 users) will be injuriously affected by the lack of proper interchange and connectional facilities, especially since the WLL crosses these two axes less than 300 metres from the HS2/Crossrail/GWML complex at Old Oak Common.

If the West London Line does not act as a feeder to HS2, Crossrail and GWML, it is likely to result in significantly poorer rolling stock deployment and infrastructure (including new stations) on the WLL, to the dis-benefit of its users and others.

West London Line Group – 3 July 2014

Background Information – Why we submitted the Petition

91% of transport-related carbon emissions are due to road movements, while only 4% are due to rail. Thus there would appear to be a need and an opportunity for modal shift; this is best achieved by providing good access to and interchange between different public transport routes. Good interchanges work, especially elsewhere in the West London Line corridor, e.g.,

Earl's Court (one station)
Clapham Junction (one station)
West Brompton (one station)
Shepherd's Bush (two stations, but close together)

Opportunities such as Old Oak Common should not be missed.

Opportunities are only now being taken to address long-standing inefficiencies as a result of disparate networks, some being rectified at significant cost, e.g.,

Hackney Central/Hackney Downs (Greater Anglia/London Overground)

Opportunities already lost include

‘Philbeach’ in the Earl’s Court and West Kensington OA (District plus Piccadilly and West London Lines)

Opportunities still present, but which are not being fully exploited, include

Three West Hampstead stations (Jubilee Line, London Overground and Thameslink)

Clapham North/Clapham High Street (Northern Line/London Overground)

Lack of capacity of existing structures, e.g.,

Brixton (South Eastern, London Overground and Victoria Lines)

Common sense should tell us to look for interchange opportunities and, to quote Ruskin, from the base of the statue of Sir Robert Grosvenor, First Marquess of Westminster in Belgrave Square

‘When we build, let us think we build for ever’

We should learn lessons from such rail projects as Alloa, South East Wales Valley Lines and London Overground on the South London Line, where actual demands have far exceeded original forecasts

The number of passenger journeys made on the franchised rail network in 2013/14 was 1.6 billion, the highest recorded since the early 1920s, and a year-on-year rise of 5.7% from 2012/13, after only a 3.6% increase from 2011/12. Rail passenger traffic in London & the South East is growing at almost double the national figure – at 9% [RAIL 25 June 2014]

The Group would contend that demand for UK passenger rail services is continuing to grow at what appears to be an ever-increasing rate and the necessary infrastructure should be built to accommodate it. In the London context, this should be done so as to take pressure off the Underground and the M25, reduce car use and improve public transport access to London’s airports. A key project in pursuit of these three aims would be the formation of the right rail connections and interchanges at Old Oak Common so that this complex is large enough to accommodate growth in train lengths, frequencies and new routes.

We were also advised to submit the Petition by the Private Bills Office staff

Background to the West Brompton Station Users’ Group and the West London Line Group

For fifteen years, these have been proactive (as well as reactive) Rail User Groups, well-regarded by many relevant organisations in the rail and local authority spheres, with an increasing number of positive contacts within Central Government

The Groups have been concerned for all beneficiaries (principally passengers, but also businesses and educational establishments) of WLL stations and all services at them – as well as for future users in and outside the WLL corridor

Origins of the West London Line Group – the West Brompton Station Users’ Group

In 1999, colleagues and I in the local community established the West Brompton Stations Users’ Group.

This was as an exit strategy for the element of the ‘Earl’s Court : At the Crossroads’ Single Regeneration Budget Programme covering the restoration of the National Rail platforms at West Brompton station. These platforms were opened by Glenda Jackson, MP (then Minister for Transport in London) in June 1999.

The principal success of the West Brompton Station Users’ Group was the transformation of the station from

- for 30 years a Monday-Friday District Line station,
 - under threat of closure as the second least-used Underground station
- into
- a significant transport node and interchange
 - with three different sets of rail and tube services
 - all operating seven days a week
 - serving a plethora of new local and regional destinations.

Within just five years, the Station Users’ Group reached such a level of esteem among its professional contacts in many rail industry bodies that THEY encouraged US to expand into a line group.

Thus, we established the West London Line Group in 2004, with the primary aim of securing improved services and facilities for all users of West London Line stations. We also took a wider focus on the Brighton – West London – Birmingham corridor and our current time horizon is to 2080. We also encouraged non-rail users in the West London Line corridor to experience West London Line rail services.

The West London Line and the West London Line Group

A ‘roller-coaster’ existence Originally closed within six months of opening in 1844 due to insufficient demand, by the turn of the nineteenth century there were 240 trains a day through Kensington (Addison Road), which was renamed Kensington Olympia in 1946. Passenger trade fell away in the early part of the last century with the development of bus and tube radial services into Central London. During World War II, due to its strategic nature linking both side of the Thames, the Line’s stations were bombed and its passenger services wholly withdrawn in 1940.

In its heyday, a Paddington-Brighton service stands at Kensington (Addison Road) in about 1906, typical of other long-distance services at this time.



West London Line stations were bombed early in WWII and passenger services ceased. Battersea (below), along with other intermediate stations, was later demolished.



From 1946 for the next 50 years, the West London Line had only unadvertised passenger trains (two in each peak) between Clapham Junction and Kensington Olympia. In 1967 this became the last local service in London to be worked by steam on this now almost wholly freight-only backwater.

With the loss of nearly all passenger traffic, the WLL became a freight-only backwater, with a number of extensive goods yards and sidings. All have now closed, with no freight handling facilities currently on the WLL.

This is a 1948 view looking north over the LMS West Kensington Coal Yard (left) and Lillie Bridge Depot (centre) with the WLL passing between the two sets of Lillie Bridge Sidings. Beyond the bridge carrying the West Cromwell Road is Warwick Road Goods Yard, site of the former Kensington Canal Basin. Empress Hall is in the left foreground with a war-battered Exhibition Centre to the right.



The 'Kenny Belle' arrives at Kensington Olympia with one of the two evening peak trains, unadvertised for several years after WWII. In 1967 this was the last local service in London to be worked by steam.



The 'Belle' in a later guise, a diesel electric multiple unit at Clapham Junction in 1992.

A new 20-year renaissance This began in May 1994 when the local service was extended and strengthened to run between Clapham Junction and Willesden Junction, at first only during the weekday peaks. In 1997 Connex established a new commercial operation between Rugby, the West London Line and Gatwick; both these services were calling at West Brompton's new platforms as soon as the latter opened in 1999, with the West Brompton Station Users' Group forming the same year.

As well as overseeing the development of West Brompton, the Groups also supported the extension of the then Silverlink service beyond Willesden Junction to Stratford, first in the weekday peaks, and now daily. This service has greatly benefitted from being taken within the thriving London Overground network in 2007.

The WLL local service was operated first by Silverlink with Class 313 trains that eventually proved inadequate.



Southern have recently introduced longer versions of their successful Class 377 Electrostar units on the WLL.



In 2007 London Overground took over the local service, which has since gone from strength to strength, with refurbished stations, new Class 378 trains and becoming part of an expanding and thriving network.



Service cutbacks, restoration and strengthening, plus new stations Despite curtailments in 2002 due to the WCML upgrade and stock shortages, by 2007 the West London Line Group had persuaded the DfT and Southern (Connex's successor) to retain, restore, strengthen and lengthen trains on the important cross-Clapham service now running between Milton Keynes and South Croydon. Nevertheless, the Group still seeks rectification of service deficiencies.

For many years the Group campaigned for the early opening of stations at Shepherd's Bush (2008) and Imperial Wharf (2009).

Shepherd's Bush station opened in December 2008	Imperial Wharf station opened in Autumn 2009	WLL services are now restored to both Milton Keynes and Croydon
		

By 2009, after only 15 years of re-advertised trains, both services were suffering from severe overcrowding. Even after the introduction of new rolling stock, the present strengthening and lengthening of both services' trains is having to continue until late 2015.

A first for the Group – a visit by the Minister We were delighted to welcome Lord Adonis, then Rail Minister, as the first Government minister apparently to accept such an invitation from a rail user group, on a study tour of the WLL to see at first hand its problems and potential. This was followed swiftly by a visit by Stephen Hammond, MP, then Transport Opposition Spokesman and now Under Secretary of State for Transport, as Guest of Honour at the Group's Tenth Anniversary celebrations for the opening of the National Rail platforms at West Brompton.

Thus we have moved from an unknown minimal weekday peak-only service between two terminals to the West London Line now having six well-used stations at key traffic nodes and interchanges served throughout each day by direct trains to 37 stations and with one change to numerous others including Exeter, Liverpool, Fort William, Edinburgh and Hastings. Our contacts with Government continue to increase.

Background to the Petition

The Group has responded to many key consultations, particularly Network Rail's Route Utilisation Strategies. In this regard, we answered in detail to that for London & the South East, especially in relation to the West London Line and Old Oak Common, showing how, assuming that the connections we are now proposing would be in place, the former could play a full role as a feeder and distributor of HS2 and Crossrail passengers at Old Oak Common (pages 7-16).

Recently, the Group has become increasingly concerned with the potential lack of such interchange and connections at Old Oak Common, to the detriment of WLL users and others in the WLL corridor. Although TfL have produced three options for interchange, none seems to allow for expansion to meet future growth and not all accommodate Southern WLL services.

This has led to the Group's production of a number of key documents on HS2, Old Oak Common and Westway Circus (pages 17 – 46).

The Promoter's position in relation to the Group and its Petition

Upon receiving the Group's papers including its proposals, the Promoter invited the Group to a meeting at the Department for Transport as recently as 6 June 2014. This meeting was also attended by the key officials at HS2 and TfL. At that meeting, the DfT asked HS2 to undertake a feasibility study of the Group's proposals, which are now encompassed in the Petition.

The DfT has now written to the Group to say that HS2 is to give an update directly to the Group (page 47). We are assuming that DfT will also be receiving a copy of this.

Therefore, while the Promoter appears to be interested in the feasibility of the Group's proposals, it is still proposing that this Committee shall not hear the Petition which is to encompass the necessary changes.

The Committee's position in relation to the Petition

In addition, the website to which the Private Bills Office Guidance has drawn our attention clearly states that this Committee could modify the Bill to incorporate the Group's proposed changes.

The Petitioner's Responses to the Promoter's Challenge to the Petition

The Petitioner intends to give these orally to the Committee on Wednesday 9 July 2014

Other items

Photographs showing the proximity of the West London Line to Old Oak Common are on page 48.

The following pages are extracted from the Group's response dated 18 March 2011 to Network Rail's London & South East Route Utilisation Strategy Consultation Draft.

These comprise the opening page, those with our comments on Old Oak Common and four of the five Appendices addressing various aspects of HS2 and Old Oak Common.

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.

- 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

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	0											
					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 Jn	WLL	12	4	4	4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	
xx07	LM	Birm NS	Clapham 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 Jn	NPD/GW	12									12	12	
xx22	GW	Slough	Clapham Jn	GWML	12							12	12	12	12	
xx25	HS Link	Birm IPS	HS1	HS2												
xx28	SE	OOO	Longhedge Clapham Jn	NPD/GW	12										12	
xx31	LO	Stratford Milton	Clapham Jn East	WLL	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
xx34	SN	Keynes	Croydon Clapham Jn	WLL	12			4	8	12	12	12	12	12	12	
xx37	LM	Birm NS	Clapham 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 Jn	NPD/GW	12									12	12	
xx52	GW	Slough	Clapham Jn	GWML	12							12	12	12	12	
xx55	Freight															
xx58	SE	OOO	Longhedge	NPD/GW Sub-Total	12										12	
					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