

Network Rail Sole Reference Document

TPP2712

Attercliffe Blockade (Woodburn Junction walking route)

1 DETAILS OF PARTIES

1.1 The names and addresses of the parties to the reference are as follows: -

- (a) Cross Country Trains Limited (04402048) whose Registered Office is at XC Trains Limited, Admiral Way, Doxford International Business Park, Sunderland, SR3 3XP [XCTL] ("the Claimant")
- (b) Network Rail Limited whose registered office is at Waterloo, General Office, London, SE1 8SW ("Network Rail") or ("the Defendant")
- (b) Potential 'Involved Parties' to this dispute include Freightliner, GB Railfreight, DB Cargo, East Midlands Railways, Northern and TransPennine Trains.

2 CONTENTS OF THIS DOCUMENT

2.1 This Response to the Claimant's Sole Reference includes: -

- 2.1.1 Confirmation, or qualification, that the subject matter of the dispute is as set out by the Claimant in its Sole Reference, cross-referenced to the issues raised by the Claimant in the Sole Reference, identifying which the Defendant agrees with and which it disagrees with. (Section 3)
- 2.1.2 A detailed explanation of the Defendant's arguments in support of its position on those issues where it disagrees with the Claimant's Sole Reference, including references to documents or contractual provisions not dealt with in the Claimant's Sole Reference. (Section 4)
- 2.1.3 Any further related issues not raised by the Claimant but which the Defendant considers fall to be determined as part of the dispute.
- 2.1.4 The decisions of principle sought from the Panel in respect of: legal entitlement, and remedies.(Section 5)
- 2.1.5 Appendices and other supporting material (Section 6)

3 SUBJECT MATTER OF DISPUTE

3.1 This dispute relates to Network Rail's decisions in respect of a Restriction of Use (RoU) and associated Network Rail Variations to the timetable to facilitate a renewal of infrastructure in the Attercliffe area between Sheffield and Meadowhall. The issue relates to the construction of a driver walking route at

Woodburn Jn (*walking route*) in support of a 5-day RoU on Monday 2nd February 2026 – colloquially this ROU is known as Attercliffe blockade.

- 3.1.1 The Claimant's Sole Reference Document (SRD) states that the dispute is "regarding the construction of the Woodburn Jn walking route during the 5- day Attercliffe blockade". Network Rail believe this is incorrect and the Claimant's dispute is regarding the construction of the walking route prior to the Attercliffe blockade.
- 3.1.2 The walking route is being constructed, and XCTL representatives have continued to be informed of the progress. Site visits with nominated representatives from both Network Rail and XCTL have taken place are planned to continue and representative of XCTL have supported this process.
- 3.2 Network Rail does not accept the Claimant's right to bring this dispute as framed, or the remedy sought. There appears to be no challenge to Network Rail's decisions in relation to Part D of the Network Code (such that the decisions relate to the principles outlined within H1 of the ADRR), and the remedy sought is prejudicial to the operation of the processes and decisions underpinned by Network Code Part B (Performance Monitoring) and the relevant provisions of XCTL's Track Access Contract.
 - 3.2.1 The RoU has been established following the consultation processes outlined within the Conditions set out in Network Code Part D2.2, and Network Rail made decisions concerning Timetable variations in response to the RoU in accordance the Rules set out in The Network Code Conditions D4.1 and D4.4, and the application of the decision criteria under Condition D 4.6.
 - 3.2.2 The Claimant has not identified any procedural breach Network Rail has made, nor have they challenged decisions made by Network Rail and application of the Decision Criteria within D4.6 with reference to relevant provisions of Part D.
 - 3.2.3 The Claimant states exceptional circumstances apply as set out in Condition D5.3.1 of The Network Code but does not challenge any decision made by Network Rail or identify any procedural breach nor in the remedy sought does the Claimant propose an alternative decision to substitute Network Rail's existing decisions
 - 3.2.4 The Claimant's own processes appear to be the final determining factor in respect of the utilisation of a walking route that Network Rail is confident of constructing - Network Rail cannot be liable for costs associated with XCTL's processes or the performance thereof.
 - 3.2.5 XCTL have not requested a removal of or amendment of the RoU and the timing of their dispute in the Claimant's own words means that 'to remove access would not be a palatable option' – as a result the Claimant appear to seek to transfer all risk and cost to Network Rail despite being the sole arbiters of defining 'successful completion of the walkway'.

4 EXPLANATION FROM THE DEFENDANT'S PERSPECTIVE OF EACH ISSUE IN DISPUTE

4.1 Issues where the Defendant accepts the Claimant's Case.

- 4.1.1 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 4.4 and the Claimant's SRD Appendix L Network Rail accept this is an accurate list of events.

- 4.1.2 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 5.1 Network Rail accepts the date for completing the walking route construction has changed over the course of conversations relating to its benefits and funding arrangements.
- 4.1.3 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 5.1 Network Rail accepts the walking route is required to enable drivers to change ends at Woodburn Jn
- 4.1.4 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 5.1 Network Rail accepts the walking route is an asset that enables and supports the proposed timetable variations during the Attercliffe Blockade
- 4.1.5 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 5.1 Network Rail accepts that XCTL are the only operator running through services during the Attercliffe blockade.

4.2 Issues where the Defendant qualifies or refutes the Claimant's Case.

- 4.2.1 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 5.1 Network Rail does not agree that the walking route was the only means of ensuring a through service during the ROU.
 - i. An alternative route which negates the requirement to reverse (direct operation between Beighton Jn and Aldwarke Jn)
 - ii. Double sets could be operated without the walking route with an additional driver.
 - iii. A reverse move with single sets is available (XCTL have done this previously) albeit it is accepted that this reduces passenger capacity.
- 4.2.2 In response to the Claimant's SRD item 5.1 Network Rail does agree that XCTL have expressed a preference for the completion of the walking route prior to January 2026, however Network Rail note that;
 - i. Network Rail has provided progress against this aspiration throughout and XCTL were made aware at each stage of changes as they occurred;
 - ii. XCTL have provided evidence of their preference regarding completion dates, but not evidence of Network Rail's commitment to deliver; and
 - iii. Network Rail has provided progress against this aspiration throughout and XCTL were made aware at each stage of changes as they occurred; culminating in a strategy on the 7th January 2026 (**NRSRD Appendix 5**)
- 4.2.3 Network Rail does not accept an inference that the construction of the walkway, and timeline thereof, is a decision that is underpinned by the decision criteria (Claimant's SRD 4.2). Network Rail's decisions under Part D relate to the Restriction of Use and Network Rail variations facilitating the Restriction of Use. Both decisions remain consistent, and the walking route will be completed prior to the operation of services.

4.3 Issues not addressed by the Claimant that the Defendant considers should be taken into account as material to the determination

4.3.1 The Restriction of Use at Attercliffe is required to undertake a significant renewal of railway assets. The sleepers and ballast were installed in 1968 and the sleepers are exhibiting signs of failure (chair gall, cracks in the fastening/housing area and centre bound cracks). The ballast is poor, degraded and choked with fines which is impeding trackbed drainage. There are a number of registered faults (Twist Faults, Cyclic Top, gauge faults etc..) within this section which are predominately attributable to the poor ballast conditions. Monitoring systems of Track Quality demonstrates a degrading condition, with the likely imposition of a Temporary Speed Restriction within the next 12 months with significant adverse impacts to network performance. The rail is currently in a good condition (2018 CEN56 rail) but the driver for the track renewal is the sleeper/component condition and poor ballast condition.

4.3.2 Network Rail highlight that this hearing appears to be a reaction to events taking place during a 6-hour period on 7 January 2026.

- i. The Claimant's request for a formal hearing in relation to TTP2712 was made at 15:57 Wednesday 7 January 2026, the request specifies the reason as being 'due to failure of the walking route to be completed before Christmas' (**NRSRD Appendix 3**)
- ii. This is despite the Claimant being clearly aware, following a meeting on 17 December 2025, that the walkway would not be complete before Christmas (**Claimant's SRD Appendix H**)
- iii. At 09:59 on 7 January 2026 a XCTL representative contacted Network Rail via email requesting 'a set completion date of when the walking route would be fully complete'. (**Claimant's SRD Appendix I**)
- iv. This was responded to at 10:04 on the same date, this response (**Claimant's SRD Appendix I**) provided the schedule noting this did include some contingency and stated, that a XCTL rep 'was coming to site next week which will allow sight of the partially completed walkway' which was consistent with the output from 17 December meeting (**Claimant's SRD Appendix H**)
- v. At 10:51 on 7 January 2026 XCTL representative responds to confirm they understand the walkway will be completed by 31st January, but to ask for confirmation of 'how much of walkway will be built before 26 January' 'would it be possible to have the walkway built sooner?' and state 'As you are aware we did say that the walkway should be completed by end of December'. (**Claimant's SRD Appendix I**)
- vi. This email was responded to by Network Rail 1 minute later by Network Rail whose representative said they would 'pick up this detail with the team'. (**Claimant's SRD Appendix I**)
- vii. At 11:03 on 7 January another XCTL representative emails stating 'The dates to deliver the walking route are not acceptable. We agreed to be completed prior to Christmas with our H&S reps to sign this off in early Jan', 'Also stating 'This is stated in our CPPP response in order to agree the response'. The rep continued to request an urgent meeting. Network Rail assumes, absent any other documentation this XCTL

representative is referring to (**NRSRD Appendix 4**) when they reference the CPPP response.

- viii. Network Rail facilitated the urgent meeting request, held at 14:00 the same day. This meeting confirmed timeline for construction and site visit dates (**NRSRD Appendix 5**)

Furthermore, Network Rail believe more time than is necessary has continued to be spent on this dispute, as despite the request for a formal hearing, a significant amount of clarification and progress regarding delivery has been made (**NRSRD Appendices 6 and 7**). The construction of the walkway, with associated engagement with XCTL representatives, is progressing with confidence of delivery ahead of the Attercliffe blockade, and in line with the timescales agreed with XCTL's representatives.

- 4.3.3 The walking route was a preference for XCTL; a way of providing a 10 car through service during the restriction of use with the least constraints on XCTL's business. It was preferred over other alternatives proposed by Network Rail that would be within their direct control specifically.
 - i. Route Learning 'the old road' or being Route conducted via 'the old road' – between Brighton Jn and Aldwarke Jn directly (**NRSRD Appendix 2**)
- 4.3.4 Woodburn Jn walking route as a concept has been an ongoing discussion with representatives of XCTL since April 2024 although not initially because of the Attercliffe blockade. (**NRSRD Appendix 1**). It should be noted that Network Rail does not accept that a Timetable Participant can require Network Rail to construct new infrastructure in order to facilitate a Restriction of Use
- 4.3.5 The walking route in the context of this specific ROU (Attercliffe Blockade) is funded and constructed as a feature of enabling future Restrictions of Use to support enhancement of the network – currently planned for summer 2027. The acceleration of the walkway formed a fortuitous opportunity to facilitate the operation of services during the Restriction of Use at Attercliffe, overcoming XCTL's limitations in driver resource and route knowledge – and should be noted incorporate extra responsibility for Network Rail for the costs of prolonged asset maintenance prior to the planned use in 2027.
- 4.3.6 In August 2025 Network Rail approached XCTL to recommend the exploration of alternative means of operating 10 car through services owing to confidence in the construction of the walkway, including exploring the implications of doing so with two drivers, or securing route conductors via the direct diversionary route for which XCTL does not hold route knowledge. XCTL did not progress assessment of these alternatives.
- 4.3.7 During the time where the correlation between Attercliffe blockade and the walking route have been aligned XCTL have suggested various preferences for walking route completion dates. Network Rail has not formed any commitment in delivery timeline other than its availability prior to the Attercliffe blockade. Good progress has been made in constructing the walkway, and Network Rail thanks XCTL's representatives

in their engagement throughout January to progressively assure the construction in order to support XCTL's internal processes to approve the use.

- 4.3.8 Network Rail does not accept that exceptional circumstances apply, nor that TTP1706/1708 (Claimant's Supplementary SRD 6.2) offer relevant precedent. TTP1706/1708 explored the applicability of exceptional circumstances in respect of a late notice restriction of use for which the panel considered that the Decision Criteria had been incorrectly applied and a substituted decision was necessary. Network Rail's decisions have not been 'late' such that Timetable Participants will suffer from "...such a significant effect on [their] operations and businesses" (para 81. TTP1706/1708 determination) giving cause for exceptional circumstances to apply. Nor have XCTL requested remedy that involves a substituted decision.
- 4.3.9 In requesting the hearing using the rationale stated ("failure of the walking route to be completed before Christmas") on 7th January 2025 the Claimant has requested a hearing using despite evidence existing of XCTL being aware this was the case and having already agreed timeline for site visits based on the revised construction dates (**Claimant's SRD Appendix H**).
- 4.3.10 Network Rail does not accept that the remedy sought (in respect of costs) falls within the provisions of Chapter H of the Access Dispute Resolution Rules (H60).

4.4 Why the arguments raised in 4.1 to 4.3 taken together favour the position of the Defendant

- 4.4.1 No appeal to Network Rail's application of the procedures within Part D, nor application of the decision criteria in respect of decisions made pursuant to Part D is made. Network Rail remains committed to constructing the walkway prior to the Attercliffe blockade, and the Restriction of Use is necessary to maintain, develop and improve the capability of the network. XCTL representatives have agreed a strategy for approving the use of the walkway, and this is progressing in line with that agreement. Network Rail therefore expects that the Restriction of Use and associated Network Rail Variations will progress to operational implementation as planned.
- 4.4.2 Network Rail believes the walking route (and early construction of) to be collective endeavour between both Network Rail and XCTL. In delivering the walking route nearly a year earlier than first anticipated, this provides XCTL with greater flexibility to better serve customers during a critical ROU to support asset renewals in addition to any future requirement. Both parties have been required to provide information to ensure the funding for the works, and both parties were required to input in support of the design. Network Rail has a construction programme to deliver in line with that design, which meets XCTL's operational requirements.
- 4.4.3 Network Rail does not consider that decisions in respect of the design, construction or approval for operational use of infrastructure to fall within the purview of the Timetable Panel nor decisions that are underpinned by the Decision Criteria. Network Rail contends that the decisions made under Part D remain sound, and that the

infrastructure assumed to be available in making those decisions will be available for use.

- 4.4.4 The Claimant's SRD makes it clear that XCTL have been engaged in, consulted with, and regularly informed of progress relating to the walking route. XCTL seek a remedy that appears to seek that Network Rail is accountable for internal XCTL processes and the performance thereof, and by its nature is prejudicial to the provisions of Network Code Part B and the wider operation of XCTL's Track Access Contract.
- 4.4.5 Relevant provisions of the Track Access Contract with XCTL (notably Schedule 4 and Schedule 8) provide a framework by which planned disruption to train services arising from Restrictions of Use and associated Network Rail Variations are compensated, and entitlements in respect of compensation arising from operational performance impacting events that occur.

5 DECISION SOUGHT FROM THE CHAIR

- 5.1 Network Rail endorses XCTL's request that the Restriction of Use and Network Rail Variations facilitating the renewal of infrastructure at Attercliffe shall stand (**Claimant's SRD 6.1**).
- 5.2 Network Rail requests that the Hearing Chair dismisses the Claimant's applications for costs.
- 5.3 Network Rail makes no application for costs.

6 APPENDICES

- 6.1 XCTL Woodburn Jn Option
- 6.2 Old Road Route Learning
- 6.3 XCTL formal request for hearing email
- 6.4 XCTL CPPP Response (assumed reference)
- 6.5 XCTL Response to urgent meeting 7 January
- 6.6 Progress Update 15th January
- 6.7 Meeting notes 16th January

The Defendant confirms that it has complied with Access Dispute Resolution Rule H21.

All appendices and annexes are bound into the submission and consecutively page numbered. To assist the Panel, quotations or references that are cited in the formal submission are highlighted (or side-lined) so that the context of the quotation or reference is apparent.

Any information only made available after the main submission has been submitted to the Panel will be consecutively numbered, so as to follow on at the conclusion of the previous submission.

7 **SIGNATURE**

For and on behalf of Network Rail

Signed

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Toby Patrick-Bailey".

Print Name

Toby Patrick-Bailey

Position

Route Programme Director
Network Rail

Appendices

NRSRD Appendix 1 – XCTL Woodburn Jn option

Woodburn Jn - Walking Route



Nick Morgan-Watson [REDACTED]
To Ross Hardy



Thu 11/04/2024 10:41

Morning Ross,

As mentioned a couple of weeks ago, as part of the Eye of the Needle Blockade contingency in the event we are unable to train sufficient numbers of drivers on the 'Old Road' I have been asked to explore the option of a walking route being installed at Woodburn Jn.

This is a move we occasionally do with single Voyagers if there is disruption in the Sheffield area, however we can't currently reverse double sets there as a second driver would be required. The installation of the walking route would enable us to reverse Newcastle - Reading services at Woodburn Jn and route them via Broughton Lane if we aren't in a position where all required drivers sign the 'Old Road' during the Eye of the Needle blockade currently planned for 2027 and potentially the Coopers Bridge blockade in 2028 if required.

Additional benefits from this walking route, outside of TRU would be that it will provide us an additional diversionary option during Sheffield area access, for example:

- **Chesterfield - Sheffield blocks:** Anglo-Scots would be able to divert between Chesterfield and Sheffield as normal with the Newcastle - Reading services avoiding Sheffield by reversing at Woodburn Jn and running via Broughton Lane.
- **Sheffield Station blocks:** Anglo-Scots would be able to avoid Sheffield by reversing at Woodburn Jn and running via Broughton Lane.
- Provides additional options during service perturbation to keep customers moving.

We still aspire to learn the 'Old Road' for the TRU diversionary requirement, subject to discussions internally and with Network Rail over funding, however the Woodburn Jn provides the industry with an additional option for XC and some additional resilience. If it can be agreed and installed ahead of 2026 then it will start returning its investment early as well given the access requirements around Sheffield.

Having spoken to our Driver Standards Team, the specifications would be as follows:

- Width of 1m throughout.
- Foundation dug and hardcore dropped in, with hard, compacted fine type 1 gravel tamped in on top to create a flat, level walking route.
- Fully lit.
- Allows for 10m standage from the signal for reverse moves.
- Be able to accommodate a 10-car Voyager formation (233.3m+10m)

Hopefully this all makes sense, any questions you have let me know.

Kind regards,

Nick Morgan-Watson
Scotland & Eastern Region Project & Planning Interface Manager

NRSRD Appendix 2 – Old Road Route Learning

XC Old Road & Castleford Diversionary Capability



Nick Morgan-Watson [REDACTED]
To Ross Hardy; Rob Bozat



Mon 17/06/2024 16:17

(i) You forwarded this message on 17/06/2024 16:28.

Afternoon both,

Just to provide an update on where we are with internal conversations around route learning the 'Old Road' for the EotN blockade in 2027 and enhancing route knowledge via Castleford to be able to provide a service between Leeds and the North-East & Scotland during East of Leeds work.

The business has asked me to pull together a fully costed paper for both diversionary routes which I am hoping to get done in the next couple of weeks (pre-Version 4). There have been positive noises around both, although one of the key challenges (aside from crew availability to learn the routes) is that both diversions impact the same depots so it's potentially going to be a case of learning one or the other but that will be for the business to review.

I didn't want you to think this has been forgotten!

Thanks,

Nick Morgan-Watson
Scotland & Eastern Region Project & Planning Interface Manager

NRSRD Appendix 3 – XCTL formal request for hearing email

Re: TTP2712

 Tamzin Cloke [REDACTED]
 To: Andy Bower; Ross Hardy
 Cc: Matthew Higgins; Paul Howden; Tom Wyant; Bushra Kousar; Mark Sleet
 ⓘ You replied to this message on 07/01/2026 17:15.

     Wed 07/01/2026 16:01

On Wed, 7 Jan 2026 at 15:57, Andy Bower <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Tazmin

I would like to formal request a hearing for TTP2712 Network Rail's decisions in Confirmed Period Possession Plan for Weeks 45-48, 2025/26

Specifically relating to North & East Region and the walking route section of the below due to failure of the walking route to be completed before Christmas

NRSRD Appendix 4– XCTL CPPP Response (assumed reference)

Notice of Dispute - North West & Central, Western, Wessex and North & East Routes: CPPP Weeks 45-48

 Andy Bower
 To: Tamzin Cloke
 Cc: Katy Stawarz; Mark Sleet; EXTL: Engineering Access Team; National Access Planning Team;
 Michelle Gooch; Paul Higgins; Ben Perfitt; Jason Rayner; Matthew Higgins; Paul Howden; Tom Wyant
 ⓘ Follow up. Completed on 11 September 2025.

     Wed 06/08/2025 16:46

North and East Route

Week 45: Possession 4100921 (Item Number 146)

Week 45: Possession 4100921 (Item Number 147)

This possession is part of the Attercliffe blockade. XCTL service will divert via Beighton and terminate at Sheffield. XCTL will require NRIL to provide a full timetable study for the Anglo Scot services to divert via Beighton and terminate at Sheffield to ensure our services can be accommodated. Also XCTL will require a walking route at Woodburn Jn to allow a through route for XCTL between Chesterfield and Wakefield/Doncaster when Sheffield is not available. The walking route must be long enough to accommodate a 10 - car Voyager and will need to be in place for Autumn so it can be signed off with reps before Christmas. The walking route is vital in preventing huge passenger handling issues. XCTL will continue to work with NRIL on the completion of the study and the walking route but will hold this access in dispute pending an acceptable study and successful completion of the walking route that meets XCTL requirements.

NRSRD Appendix 5 – XCTL Response to urgent meeting 7 January

RE: Woodburn Junction Update

 Tom Wyant <[REDACTED]>
 To: Graeme Whitehead; Bushra Kousar; Andy Bower; Paul Howden; Duncan Grainger; Thomas Astle; Alex Richardson; Richard Scarff; Shaun Trickett; Jackson Brown; Adam Sharp
 ⓘ Wed 07/01/2026 16:35

    

Hi all,

Appreciate your time earlier.

Some key points I captured earlier:

- Delays in the material therefore it will not be started until the end of this week
- Work start this week - three weeks end date 31st Jan
- Two inspections from Duncan and the team at XC - next week wk/c 15th Jan, 22nd another visit, 26th visit - option for final sign off at the back end of that week. Meeting review on 16th, 23rd, 27th Jan post visits
- Confident walking route will be signed off with regular inspections to provide assurance
- Local issue so only needs to go through LLC and not DCC

Thanks,

Tom Wyant, Senior Timetable Program & Development Manager, CrossCountry

NRSRD Appendix 6 – Progress Update 15th January

RE: Woodburn Walkway - Site Visit 15/01

 Duncan Grainger <[REDACTED]>
 To: Thomas Astle; Shaun Trickett; Rachel Braid; Graeme Whitehead; Richard Scarff; Nicola Brookes; Jackson Brown
 Cc: Alex Richardson

    
 Thu 15/01/2026 13:41

OFFICIAL\Default

① You forwarded this message on 15/01/2026 13:41.

Hi Tom/Shaun

It was good to meet you both this morning and thanks for this update which accurately reflects where we are.

Kind Regards

Duncan

From: Thomas Astle <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 January 2026 12:59
To: Shaun Trickett <[REDACTED]>; Duncan Grainger <[REDACTED]>; Rachel Braid <[REDACTED]>; graeme.whitehead <[REDACTED]>; Richard Scarff <[REDACTED]>; Alex Richardson <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Woodburn Walkway - Site Visit 15/01

OFFICIAL

Hi All,

Just a quick update from the site visit at Woodburn this morning that was attended by myself, @Shaun Trickett, @Duncan Grainger & 2 other XC reps.

Cross Country are happy with the progress, the GRP walkway that is in and with the temporary lighting solution that will cover the first blockade from 02/02-06/02.

A few actions I've listed below came out of the site visit.

- Temporary lighting to be given final review at next weeks site visit when they will be able to see them fully lit in the dark.
- Shifts for temporary lighting to be from 0600-0900 and 1500-2330 to give us an hour contingency either side before the first train.
- Ballast to be raised slightly where drivers exit and enter the train to remove the drop from the edge of the walkway to the ballast (XC to provide distances where these will need to be).

Next site visit will be at 1630 on the 22/01.

NRSRD Appendix 7 – Meeting notes 16th January

RE: Woodburn Junction Update (Post initial walkout) 16/01/26

 Graeme Whitehead
 To: Bushra Kousar; Paul Howden; Duncan Grainger; Thomas Astle; Matthew Higgins; Richard Scarff; Rachel Braid; Ross Hardy; Jackson Brown
 Cc: Heather Pritchard; Adam Sharp; Shaun Trickett; Andy Bower; Alex Richardson; Tom Wyant

    
 Fri 16/01/2026 16:14

1

OFFICIAL\Default

 Outlook item

Good afternoon,

Thanks for your time earlier to run through progress following yesterday's site visit.

I referred to the meeting summary email from yesterday (attached for ref), regarding the progress made to date on the section of walkway and the temp lighting visited on site. **Key points from today's session:**

- We discussed the fact that the temporary lighting is to remain for the Attercliffe renewal, and permanent will be commissioned afterwards. It may be a while until the next usage of the walkway, so permanent lighting system not commissioned until nearer to usage next time (noting its in 2027).
- DG to share train length & cab door positions (post meeting note: this has now been shared)
- GW advised that a further 24m of walkway has been installed overnight, and JB advised that future nights should be more productive as last night required other works taking place with lighting & fencing.
- Approx 150m will be available (with temp lighting) for the next planned visit (22nd Jan).
- Visit on 22nd will also have 4 different permanent lighting options to be viewed, and best option selected on the night.
- We concluded that confidence remains that this walkway will be completed as planned.

Best regards,

Graeme