



[redacted]

Michael Davis  
Timetable Production Manager - Anglia & Network Services  
The Quadrant  
Elder Gate  
Milton Keynes  
MK9 1EN

5<sup>th</sup> June 2026

Dear Michael

### Anglia Timetable Planning Rules 2027:

#### Version 3.0

The comments below form the Freightliner response to the Anglia Timetable Planning Rules 2027 Version 3.0 published on 8<sup>th</sup> of May.

#### 1.3.3 Traction and Rolling Stock

NMT Description - should this be (2x Class 43 power cars and 5 trailers)?

#### 2.1 Planning Geography

EA1010 Liverpool Street to Seven Kings

Stratford Signal L251 - Uo Temple Mills should be Up Temple Mills?

Maryland are CODE S & X mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?

EA1050 Shenfield Junction to Southend Victoria

Billericay is CODE S mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?

EA1470 Norwich Thorpe Junction and Trowse Swing Bridge to Lowestoft

Reedham Swing Bridge - should this be shown as Reedham Swing Bridge?

EA1580 Ely North Junction to Trowse Junction

Shippea Hill is CODE S mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?

Lakenheath is CODE S mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?

Harling Road is CODE S mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?

Eccles Road is CODE S mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?

Spooner Row is CODE S mutually exclusive with a Mandatory Timing Point?



### 5.2.1 Headway Values

#### EA1161 Bishop's Stortford to Ely North Junction

Headway is 3\* with the exception 4 at Coldham Lane following a freight terminating in Chesterton Yard - can the supporting evidence for inclusion of this exception be provided?

### 5.2.2 General Capacity Constraints

We do not agree to the addition of this list of level crossings within this section of the TPR, for the following reasons:

- The statement that this is a list of level crossings 'which have been deemed high risk' adequately demonstrates the lack of an objective standard underpinning its compilation. A list which is derived from one or more subjective considerations is subject to constant change, making it unsuitable to form the basis of a TPR.
- In addition, this list of level crossings has been included in the TPR without any consultation of the supporting data or relevant standards and criteria. The only information provided in this regard is a single number relating to usage for each crossing by road vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; however, there is no clarity on timeframes over which these numbers apply, or how these have been considered alongside the wide variety of other affecting factors which could affect a level crossing's "risk category".
- Changes to TPR should be based on data, supported by evidence, with sources of information/evidence agreed by parties (typically via the TPR Forum): none of which can be said to be true of this proposal sent at Version 3.

In addition to the technical inadequacies within this 5.2.2 proposal, outlined above, it should be noted that the proposal does not constitute a "Planning Rule"; as such, it does not belong in the TPR. There is no "value" comprising a "Rule" which timetable planning colleagues can apply in order to assess the validity of a requested train slot. In this regard, it is not conversant with the proposed changes in Version 3 of the National TPR (themselves subject to disagreement elsewhere in our response) under Section 1.15.2 which states that 'General capacity constraints detail limitations on the quantum of traffic in a single direction'; but there is no quantified constraint or limitation on quantum identified in any of these proposals. Instead, there is simply reference made to a need for an Access Proposal to be 'risk assessed', itself a duplication of work which sits within the established industry "TCRAG" framework.

The changes proposed to Section 5.2.2 of the 2027 Anglia TPR in Version 3 should be removed and reissued under separate cover as guidance. Not only is such guidance not appropriate for inclusion in the TPR as it does not constitute a "Rule"; it is also unacceptable to impose conditions in the TPR, however these may be worded, which are based on information, which is neither verified nor properly consulted, and are therefore essentially subjective in nature.

### 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules



## EA1010 Liverpool Street to Seven Kings

### Stratford

#### Junction Margins for Stratford Central Junction West

Up depart/pass Platform 10A x Up arrive/pass Platform 10A Margin 4 - can the supporting evidence for inclusion of this margin be provided?

### Maryland

#### Junction Margins for Maryland East Crossovers

# add ½ minute where first movement is freight - should this value be based on the length of the freight?

Should 'Up pass Maryland on ML x Down conflicting movement depart Stratford Signal L295' be added to the table?

Should 'Up pass Maryland on ML x Down pass Stratford Platform 10A crossing to EL' be added to the table?

## EA1011 Seven Kings to Ipswich

### Ingatestone Down Passenger Loop

Down train arrive Ingatestone Loop x down train pass/depart Shenfield Margin Simultaneous - can the supporting evidence for inclusion of this margin be provided?

## EA1161 Bishop's Stortford to Ely North Junction

### Chelmsford

Down freight propelling movement departs towards Chelmsford Receptions x Down train pass/arrive Platform 2 Margin 5# - could this be amended to Down train pass Platform 2 & Down train arrive Platform 2 and the margin value recalculated?

### Chesterton Junction

#### Adjustments to Sectional Running Times

Trains travelling from Down Main into Chesterton Yard Approach control and position light signal {1} - can the supporting evidence for inclusion of this margin be provided?

### Ely

#### Junction Margins

# add ½ if first movement is freight - should this value be based on the length of the freight?

### Ely North Junction



### **Junction Margins**

Depart/Pass to Ely Papworth Sidings x Conflicting pass Margin 4 - can the supporting evidence for inclusion of this margin be provided?

EA1162 Ely North Junction to King's Lynn

### **King's Lynn Junction**

#### **Junction Margins**

Freight train pass to King's Lynn T.C. from Watlington x Passenger depart King's Lynn station / King's Lynn C.S. Margin 3½ - can the supporting evidence for inclusion of this margin be provided?

EA1310 Camden Road West Junction to Richmond

### **Kensal Green Junction**

#### **Junction Margins**

#### **Restrictions**

Should Standage at Kensal Green Junction on MD155 on the Up City Line is 392 metres. Trains in excess of this length will prevent another departure in rear from Harlesden Jn match the Planning Note in the NWC TPR A train over 306m departing/passing Harlesden Jn towards Kensal Green Jn via the Up City Line will foul Harlesden Jn in rear if a train is dwelling at or has not yet passed Kensal Green Jn ahead of it. Please refer to Anglia TPR rules for appropriate margins.

EA1580 Ely North Junction to Trowse Junction

### **Eccles Road Exchange Sidings**

#### **Planning Note**

No restriction is identified in the NESA - please confirm the if the Exchange Sidings are off network?

## **5.4.1 Loop Lengths and Standages**

EA1161 Chesterton Yard

Where is Chesterton Yard Arrival Line as only Reception Siding & Run Round Siding are shown in the published signal diagram and nothing reference in NESA?

## **5.4.2 Platform Lengths**

EA1010 Liverpool Street to Seven Kings

### **Stratford 10 - Down Main**



Why is the available length reduced to 190m when forward route is Channelsea?

I look forward to working with you, and your planning colleagues, to deliver a TPR document that meets all stakeholder requirements.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink that reads "John Sadler".

John Sadler  
Network Capability and Access Manager  
Heavy Haul Rail Limited

CC.

Megan Holman, Jason Carthy-Torbitt - Network Rail  
Chris Matthews - Heavy Haul Rail  
Robin Nelson - Freightliner