

From: [REDACTED]@networkrail.co.uk>

Sent: 03 September 2026 19:09

To: [REDACTED]@freightliner.co.uk; [REDACTED]@heavyhaulrail.co.uk; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@firstraillondon.co.uk>; [REDACTED]@gbrailfreight.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]greateranglia.co.uk>; [REDACTED]@networkrail.co.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@networkrail.co.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]gbrailfreight.com>

Subject: PLEASE READ: Key Notes 3rd Sept 26 Meeting May 27 TPR Disputes TT2861/2/4/5/6

OFFICIAL

**PLEASE READ: Key Notes 3rd Sept 26 Meeting May 27 TPR Disputes
TT2861/2/4/5/6**

Dear All

Many thanks for your time earlier today, detailed below are the key notes and actions I captured from the discussions.

MEA opened the call:

- Outlining that meeting is to explore opportunities of resolve the May 2027 TPR disputes ahead of ADC hearings scheduled for 2 and 5 October
- NR and Operators have agreed an approach of joint operator submissions and a single Network Rail response.
- It is hoped the meeting would identify areas where common ground could be found to reduce the number of items disputed before the hearing
- GWR originally a dispute have resent confirmed they have withdrawn their dispute, following confirmation that 5.2.2 of the TPRs do not apply to Short Term Planning process arrangements

In connection with National TPRs section 1.15 the meeting discussed:

- Objections to National TPR section 1.15, focusing on how level-crossing risk assessments relate to TCRAG, TPRs, forums, and potential capacity constraints. The main concern from the call is not necessarily the existence of the section, but the fact that the level crossing risk assessment process is subjective. Outcomes from the risk assessments are not based upon a binary mode
- There is a disconnect between the TCRAG process and TPR timescales
- Uncertainty regarding how risk assessments could ultimately affect timetable bid
- There was a general question why the level crossing information should be included in TPRs rather than remaining within existing TCRAG processes.

MEA outlined to the meeting:

- Guidance from determinations TTP 2687 and TTP 2690 and a observations from the from the Chair of the Access Disputes Committee that the application of capacity constraints is inconsistent across routes and lacks clarity within Train Planning Rules Section 5.2.2 and asked that a comprehensive and standardised set of route-specific constraints should be included in the Rules to improve transparency, support decision-making, reduce speculative access

applications, and minimise industry disputes. Network Rail via OPSG delivered a review of how 5.2.2 is used and implemented the OPSG recommendations for the May 27 TPRs

- MEA offer transparency of the level crossing risk assessment process, JB confirm that this had been seen but had not helped.
- TQ and JB raised specific queries:
 - Which forum information would be communicated through ?
 - How risk assessment outcomes are shared and used ?

In connection with Appendix J - 17 Planning Principles the meeting discussed:

- Freight operators highlighted concerns with the inclusion of the 17 planning principles
- Particular concern raised:
 - regarding the principle referring to access rights, which was described as a "red line" issue
 - Repetition of existing TPR content
 - Potential contradictions with existing rules
 - Whether the material implied the current TPR are inadequate
- Feedback that Appendix J reads more like an internal briefing document than timetable planning rules

MEA outlined to the meeting:

- That the 17 PP were an extract from a broader industry-wide set of principles endorsed by the Network Performance Board and applicable across DfTO Operators and Network Rail. They emphasise that these are guiding principles rather than mandatory rules, and therefore should not, in themselves, result in trains being rejected.
- MEA outline uncertainty about whether the matter can genuinely be disputed at ADC, as existing TPRs are unlikely to be perfectly aligned in all areas and does the planning community really want to air such topics at the industries formal dispute body ?

In connection with Section 5.2.2 Constraints the meeting discussed:

- specific section 5.2.2 entries, identifying missing or unclear data for LNE, a potentially over constraining WCML South constraints, and concerns about the technical evidence and review mechanics behind Anglia level-crossing entries
- Level Crossing time windows in Anglia it was questioned whether Anglia section 5.2.2 entries comply with the National TPR's hourly-window guidance, MEA agreed to examine the use of half-hour periods and explain how changing road, pedestrian, and rail traffic affects crossing risk
- Specific section 5.2.2 constraints raised on the call:
 - LNE at least one level crossing entry contains insufficient data, has no times or dates specified and appears not fit for purpose in its current form.
 - NW&C WCML South concern focused on the extent of the Camden to Hanslope Jn capacity constraint. Operators on the call indicated they were not opposed to the principle of the constraint but questioned the geographic scope. Suggestion that excluding the Camden Junction to Willesden/West London Junction area could resolve some concerns.

Discussion suggested an earlier alternative version may already have reflected this approach

- Anglia Level Crossings concerns around:
 - Transparency of risk assessment methodology
 - Justification for specific time periods
 - Use of half-hour windows compared with national guidance referring to hourly windows
 - Lack of visibility of underlying technical evidence and rationale.
 - Operators felt more technical justification and supporting evidence should have been available earlier in the consultation process
- MEA replied in connection with a concern that train planners may lack the specialist competence and expertise required to assess the adequacy of level crossing risk assessments, potentially limiting their ability to validate the associated risks effectively.

MEA outlined to the meeting:

- Current wording does not directly prohibit trains
- The information is largely intended to trigger reviews and transparency rather than introduce hard restrictions
- It remained unclear what direct business impact operators believed the current wording creates

Actions:

01/0309	Produce a timeline showing the relationship between TPRs and TCRAAG process.
02/0309	Review and clarify wording in Section 1.15 to specify: address queries around which forums will be used to communicate level crossing information. How stakeholders can access information.
03/0309	Appendix J feedback, re-read operator consultation responses and identify specific wording changes that could address concerns over duplication or conflicting statements.
04/0309	Review London North Eastern 5.2.2 entries where information appears incomplete or unclear.
05/0309	Review West Coast Main Line constraint boundaries and revisit previous versions that may already have addressed operator concerns.
06/0309	Review Anglia level crossing presentation and timing windows, including consistency between national guidance and route-specific entries.
07/0309	Arrange a follow-up discussion after operator SRDs have been completed, potentially on the Thursday or Friday following the SRD review.
08/0309	Operators share any specific wording proposals that could resolve concerns without materially changing intent.

Any queries, please let me know.

Regards



The Quadrant, Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1EN



System Operator