

South Western Railway

South Western Railway
4th Floor, South Bank Central
30 Stamford Street
London
SE1 9LQ

19th February 2020

Clive Fletcher-Wood
c/o Access Disputes Committee
Floor 8
1 Eversholt Street
London
NW1 2DN

TTP1625 – South Western Railway response to 2nd Directions requested

Dear Clive,

Please find below in red a response from SWR to the 2nd set of Directions requested on 17th February 2020 in relation to TTP1625:

2. Both Parties refer to the Sunday Main Line Scheme having been approved by the Wessex TCRA, ‘...*subject to the outcome of risk assessments on the impact to track, category, power availability and track circuit reliability*’ (SWR 5.1.2, NR 4.1.3). None of these topics is mentioned again in either Parties’ SRD. **Will both Parties please either confirm by 1200 on Wed 19 Feb whether any of these issues is relevant to the remaining points in Dispute, or explain which points are relevant and in what way.** **Prior to the letter from John Halsall, SWR is not aware of NR providing any risk assessments in terms of the impact on impact to track category, power availability and track circuit reliability. At a Wessex Timetable Working Group meeting held on 30 October 2019, five days after the letter was received, it was fed back that the power supply was acceptable for the Sunday Main Line changes involving an enhanced frequency of service between Poole and Weymouth. Following a risk assessment, the only issue fed back at the meeting related to power supply concerns between Portsmouth and Southampton where SWR bid to operate an additional service per hour, seven days per week. No other feedback has been received in terms of the risk assessments into track category and track circuit reliability.**

However, SWR does not see this as relevant to the remaining points of the dispute.

The direction within the letter to base a revised May 2020 timetable based on a rollover of the December 2019 timetable wasn’t based on specific assessment of individual schemes proposed but was a generic application to all schemes.

South Western Railway

5. In 4.3.10 NR refers to a recommendation that an SWR representative with authority to make decisions on flexing should be present at Milton Keynes throughout the period in which the revised Access Proposal was being dealt with, but that this only occurred on 3 days during a 7 week period. **Will SWR please confirm at the hearing whether the recommendation to which NR refers was jointly agreed, or whether it was only a recommendation by NR, and whether NR is correct in saying that the representative was only present at Milton Keynes for 3 days during this period. The version of the paper NR has provided in their Sole Reference Document is a draft version to which I responded with a revised wording on the 13th November. The revisions were accepted by Matt Allen on the same day.**

The revised text stated "It is recommended that because of the level of resource required by Capacity Planning, there is an empowered SWR representative routinely in MK, or otherwise available, throughout the process who is authorised to make decisions on the flexes and amendments required in order to expedite the plan.

The first visit to MK was not productive where there were no NR managers or specialists present and the NR planners did not approach the SWR LTP Timings Manager in great numbers to work through issues identified. There were two more visits after this time which were more productive and a weekly telecon was established between the two teams. SWR fed back on this issue at the most recent Lead TOC meeting, minutes for which are yet to be issued.

There are Network Rail PCs and network connections at the SBC HQ where the SWR Train Planning Unit is based. There has always been an open invitation for NR planners to work from our offices. However, the NR planners have cited issues with graph setup in TPS when using a Citrix connection as a hurdle in doing this.

Yours sincerely,



Andy Roberts
Train Planning Manager
South Western Railway