

GTR 2018 Timetable Consultation
East Side offices, King's Cross Station
King's Cross
London
NIC 4AP

please reply to:
Roger Blake
70 Dynevor Road
Stoke Newington
London
N16 0DX

For the attention of Phil Hutchinson

roger.blake@railfuture.org.uk

gtr.timetableconsultation@gtrailway.com

08 December 2016

Dear Mr Hutchinson,

GTR 2018 Timetable Consultation

Railfuture is the UK's leading independent organisation campaigning for better services for passengers and freight. A voluntary organisation to which many rail user groups are affiliated, the organisation is independent both politically and commercially.

This consultation response is made on behalf of Railfuture with the full support of its London & South East and East Anglia regional branches, and some affiliated rail user groups. The comments made are not confidential and we would be happy for them to appear on your website. We would also be happy to enlarge on any of the points made below if that would be helpful.

1. Name (optional)

Railfuture

2. Address (optional)

3. Email Address (optional)

londonandsoutheast@railfuture.org.uk

4. Local Station

5. How often do you use GTR services?

6. When do you usually travel

7. Do you use trains after 23:00?

8. How do you get to your local station?

9. Is this your nearest station?

10. Do you travel for

11. Are you responding as an individual or group?

Group

www.railfuture.org.uk www.railfuturescotland.org.uk www.railfuturewales.org.uk
www.railwatch.org.uk

12. How did you first hear about the consultation?

Email, website

13. How would you prefer to be alerted to future consultations?

Email

14. Do you support proposals to approach engineering works differently? Please select all options you support.

- Reduce frequency on some routes after 23:00 on Weekdays and Saturdays
- Earlier last trains on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays on some routes
- Later first trains on Sunday mornings on some routes
- I don't support proposals to change the current engineering works hours

Any further comments on this proposal? **Not supportive of a 'carte blanche' across the whole franchise as implied by the first three options, but willing to discuss changes on a specific route-by-route basis.**

15. Do you support the proposed frequency increase for Thameslink services at Luton, Luton Airport Parkway, Harpenden, St Albans City, Radlett, Elstree & Borehamwood, Mill Hill Broadway and West Hampstead Thameslink with the introduction of a new semi fast service? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes. This is essential to enhance this service all day. If it were not to be introduced the conversion of the existing Sutton Loop service to Class 700 from Class 319 could lead to standing on services during the off-peak. London Bridge is one of the prime demands from users of these stations.**

16. Do you support the proposal for Thameslink services on the North Kent line serving Greenwich, Abbey Wood, Dartford and Medway Towns? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes. We see three overlapping market segments for this innovative service: Medway Towns>Abbey Wood-Woolwich Arsenal-Greenwich for Crossrail/DLR connections; outer/inner south-east London>inner/central London; inner/central London>inner and outer north London and beyond.**

17. Do you support the proposed increase in frequency of Thameslink services on the Catford Loop line? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes. Long overdue!**

18. Do you support the proposal for Thameslink Maidstone East services to operate via London Bridge instead of Elephant & Castle restoring train services previously withdrawn in 2009? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes. Significant and welcome improvements for both outer legs of the route.**

19. On balance do you support the retention of Caterham and Tattenham Corner services as part of Southern South London Metro? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)
Proposed improvements for the Caterham and Tattenham Corner services include longer 10 carriage trains and other off peak enhancements (full details in Southern South London Metro section).

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes; we strongly support this and feel this is a very important change, as under the previous proposal these branches would have been susceptible to a complete loss of service due to disruption north of London Bridge. These services are naturally Southern Metro services and not Thameslink services.**

20. Any other comments in relation to the expanded Thameslink network from 2018?

Perhaps the single best strategic choice is to serve two major centres in Kent – the county town of Maidstone and the biggest population agglomeration of the Medway Towns – and leave Caterham and Tattenham Corner services to Southern Metro.

21. Now there's a chance to comment on any of the Thameslink routes

Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL1:

Support.

22. Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL2:
Support.

23. Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL3:
Support.

24. Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL4:
Support.

25. Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL5:
Support.

26. Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL6:
Support.

27. Comments on the Thameslink Mainline Route TL7:
Welcome connectivity gains.

28. The proposed Thameslink service between Cambridge and Maidstone East is only able to serve either St. Mary Cray or Swanley due to insufficient time to enable the train to arrive in time to start its return journey from Maidstone East. Please select which station you would prefer the train to call at. (optional question, please skip if not applicable)



St Mary Cray



Swanley, for probably better frequency and interchange possibilities.

29. Comments on the Thameslink Metro Route TL8:
Support.

30. Comments on the Thameslink Metro Route TL9:
Welcome connectivity gains.

31. Comments on the Thameslink Metro Route TL10:
Welcome connectivity gains.

32. Comments on the Thameslink Metro Route TL11:
Support.

33. Comments on the Thameslink Metro Route TL12:
Support.

34. Do you support proposals to change Sunday services between London Victoria and the West Coastway, to enable faster journeys between London, Chichester and Portsmouth similar to weekdays? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes.** This makes the services consistent all week and provides more direct journey opportunities on Sundays. We are concerned that trains are likely to stop at all stations between Barnham and Horsham, making it quite slow. Could consideration be given to splitting/joining at Horsham instead of Barnham?

35. Cooksbridge and Plumpton (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Do you support retaining the current hourly service at Plumpton.
- Do you support reducing the current hourly service at Plumpton to two hourly to enable a two hourly service at Cooksbridge on Monday to Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays

Any further comments on this proposal? **Support an all-day/every-day two-hourly service at Cooksbridge.** We understand that Network Rail have yet to complete line-speed improvements between Wivelsfield/Keymer Junction and Lewes; when done this might enable service levels at Plumpton to be restored. Strong preference for this alternating pattern to affect the Eastbourne-originating, not Ore/Hastings, services.

36. Please provide feedback on this proposal to improve the overall journey times between London, Eastbourne, Bexhill and Hastings. (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- I support this proposal
- I don't support this proposal

Any further comments on this proposal? **Support.**

37. In relation to trains between Lewes and Seaford, which option do you prefer? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Regular peak service between Brighton and Seaford with direct London to Seaford trains discontinued.
- Continuation of direct London to Seaford peak trains with a gap of one hour between Brighton and Seaford.

Any further comments on this proposal? **Need to balance value of some direct through peak trains against impact on wider performance and regular local service, so on balance prefer regular local service with direct London services discontinued.**

38. Do you support the proposal to operate Southern Mainline services between London Victoria and Hastings only?

If this proposal is supported these services would be replaced by an alternative Southeastern train from London Charing Cross which would be extended to and from Ore. (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes, but huge caveat about ensuring Southeastern can and will substitute; if they cannot/will not then No unless there are other substitutes such as all-day/every-day Ore stops in Southern MarshLink services [see Q52].

39. Do you support the proposals for Redhill (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. We strongly support these changes. However, we consider that there should be some through services between Redhill and Brighton at least in the morning and evening shoulder peaks. Redhill should have at least two shoulder-peak direct trains in the morning and afternoon/evening to and from Brighton to enable day trips to Brighton for business as well as leisure.

40. Do you support the proposals for Merstham and Coulsdon South (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. We strongly support these changes which reinstate local services to Reigate and Tonbridge and provide an all-day off-peak service to Victoria.

41. Do you support the proposals for Horley, Salfords and Earlswood? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. Horley needs an off peak service direct to Crawley and Horsham.

42. Do you support the proposals for Purley? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes. We strongly support these changes which reinstate local services to Reigate and Tonbridge and provide an all-day off-peak service to Victoria.**

43. Do you have any specific comments in relation to services between Redhill and Tonbridge?

We support stops at Merstham, Coulsdon South and Purley.

44. Which option do you support? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Regular shuttle (up to six trains per hour when combined with Great Western Railway) connecting with regular Thameslink and Southern trains to and from London.
- Direct peak services to London Victoria at half hourly intervals joining with other carriages at Redhill (passengers for London Bridge would be required to change at Redhill or East Croydon).

Any further comments on this proposal? **Support option 2 - direct peak services to London Victoria at half-hourly intervals joining with other carriages at Redhill.**

45. These proposals would remove the direct Monday to Saturday off peak journey opportunities from Gatwick Airport, Horley, Salfords, Earlswood, Redhill, Merstham, Coulsdon South and Purely to and from New Cross Gate. Passengers wishing to travel between the affected stations and New Cross Gate would be required to change trains at Norwood Junction.

How often do you travel between your station and New Cross Gate?

- Never
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Couple of times a year

Any further comments on this proposal? **This is only acceptable if more trains stop at Norwood Junction, AND platform 2 is made operational for London Overground West Croydon services, to enable cross-platform interchange from platform 3 avoiding the narrow stairs and subway, for interchange to the Overground which avoids having to change twice.**

46. In relation to Question 45 please tell us:

Which station do you travel from?

What is your ultimate destination?

47. Which option do you support? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Revising evening and Sunday services to be consistent with the proposed Monday to Saturday daytime frequency which would include direct trains between London Victoria, Reigate and Tonbridge.

Retain the current evening and Sunday train frequency with direct trains to Bognor Regis (evenings and Sundays) and Brighton on Sundays Only. Trains to Reigate and Tonbridge would be provided as shuttle trains starting from and terminating at Redhill.

Any further comments on this proposal? Support option 1 with more evening and Sunday trains from Victoria calling at Merstham, Coulsdon South and Purley to Reigate and an evening service from Reigate, important for those who attend night classes or work evenings.

48. Do you have any specific comments in relation to services on the Coastway West routes

Need to find a way to minimise use of inappropriate toilet-less Class 313s especially on longer-distance services, such as Brighton-Portsmouth Harbour.

49. Do you support this proposal? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Yes

No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. A most welcome development.

50. Do you support this proposal? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Yes

No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. Most welcome, but this must mean a regular hourly pattern until close of service, and in each direction. Furthermore, earlier first trains should be included too, especially in the Brighton>Seaford direction on weekdays where the current first train at Southease is not until after 09.30!

51. Do you support this proposal? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Yes

No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes, as with Q49.

52. Which option do you support? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Operate longer electric trains between Brighton and Eastbourne with connections to and from a two carriage diesel train between Eastbourne and Ashford International.
- Operate longer electric trains between Brighton and Hastings with connections to and from a two carriage diesel train between Hastings and Ashford International.
- Continue to operate through trains between Brighton and Ashford International with the understanding that current capacity issues on the route are unlikely to be addressed in the short and medium term.

Any further comments on this proposal? **Continue to operate through trains, with a different understanding.** Below is 'the fourth way' option, because we do not accept the premise that "current capacity issues on the route are unlikely to be addressed in the short and medium term". Support for continuation of the through service is directly associated with adding capacity by securing some 3- or 4-car Class 377 bi-mode trains, for which we are lobbying very hard through local MPs for delivery by May 2018. Otherwise, failing that, we support a mix of the first two options ie a 2-car Class 171 diesel Ashford-Eastbourne service plus a 3- or 4-car Class 377 electric Brighton-Hastings service. This overlapping combination to give Bexhill 4tph at more even intervals and improve connectional opportunities with Southeastern services on the Tonbridge route at St. Leonards Warrior Square. For passenger familiarity it should operate all week with a consistent service pattern.

On Sundays this would allow the stops at Pevensey & Westham, Cooden Beach and Collington to be removed from the MarshLink service by including them in the new overlapping Brighton-Hastings service.

In addition, take the opportunity to improve East Coastway services at Normans Bay by filling current gaps during Monday-Saturday evenings, and pilot for the three years until the end of the franchise an alternating 2-hourly summer Sunday [c.mid-March>late-October to include school holidays] service with Pevensey Bay, plus an alternate-hourly Monday-Saturday summer service at Pevensey Bay, retaining the current minimal all-year weekday service.

Furthermore, MarshLink services at Ore [for east Hastings and Ore Valley Sussex Coast College] should be timetabled to include a regular all-day/every day service ready for the line-speed improvement from 40mph to 60mph between Ore and Doleham which Network Rail are due to deliver in CP5 ie by end-March 2019 for public introduction in May 2019.

Finally, because the train would set off from Brighton before this consultation's timetable 'watershed' of 22.00, provide for an additional and one hour later last MarshLink train to enable later returns eastwards from Brighton/Lewes/Eastbourne/Bexhill/Hastings to Rye and Ashford, and westwards from Ashford/Rye back to Hastings.

53. Do you have any specific comments in relation to services on Oxted routes?

Wish to see an end to weekday Oxted shuttles to/from Uckfield and through services from London Bridge instead. We shall have something to say about improved Sunday services on the Uckfield line in the next consultation.

54. We propose to introduce a new all day direct train service between Epsom, Sutton, West Croydon and London Bridge; increase the train frequency between Sutton and Epsom Downs (from 1 tph to 2 tph all day) and continue four trains per hour between Sutton, West Croydon, Norbury and London Victoria.

To enable this we will need to remove the current direct train services between Sutton, West Croydon, Crystal Palace and Streatham Hill to enable these improvements.

Do you support this? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
 No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. This gives a better spread of services and more frequent services from Norwood Junction and West Croydon to Epsom and Belmont which is good for both Royal Marsden and Epsom Hospitals. It also improves connections to and from the East Surrey area at Norwood Junction during the day.

55. Do you support the proposal to improve overall performance of the network by reducing the number of Monday to Friday and Saturday daytime trains between London Victoria and Selhurst via Norbury from 6 tph (every 10 minutes) to 4 tph (every 15 minutes)? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
 No

Any further comments on this proposal? No; this is only acceptable if the West London service from East Croydon to Watford can be increased to 2 trains per hour.

56. Please answer as part of question 45 (repeated):

These proposals would remove the direct Monday to Saturday off peak journey opportunities from Gatwick Airport, Horley, Salfords, Earlswood, Redhill, Merstham, Coulsdon South and Purely to and from New Cross Gate. Passengers wishing to travel between the affected stations and New Cross Gate would be required to change trains at Norwood Junction.

How often do you travel between your station and New Cross Gate?

- Never
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Couple of times a year

Any further comments on this proposal? **This is only acceptable if more trains stop at Norwood Junction, AND platform 2 is made operational to enable step-free cross-platform interchange from platform 3 to avoid the narrow stairs and subway, for interchange to the Overground which avoids having to change twice.**

57. Please answer as part of question 46 (repeated):

In relation to Question 56 please tell us:

Which station do you travel from?

What is your ultimate destination?

58. Are you in favour of Monday to Friday and Saturday daytime trains between Streatham Hill, Crystal Palace and Norwood Junction serving East Croydon, Purley and Coulsdon Town instead of West Croydon? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes.** This reinstates 4 trains per hour at Coulsdon Town and Reedham. It maintains the same number of Metro services at Purley and provides new direct journey opportunities.

59. Are you in favour of introducing a faster all day service between Caterham and London Bridge instead of a stopping service via Sydenham? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes.** We are in favour of a faster all day service to Caterham.

60. Do you support the diversion of stopping trains between New Cross Gate and Norwood Junction via Sydenham from East Croydon to West Croydon instead? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Yes

No

Other (please specify) No. We are not in favour of diverting the London Bridge all-stations trains to West Croydon. We believe it should be terminated at South Croydon instead. This would maintain frequency of trains between East Croydon and Norwood Junction and reinstate 5 trains per hour at South Croydon. Money was invested to enable trains to turn back at South Croydon; we believe this facility should be used.

61. Do you support the diversion of stopping trains between London Bridge and Selhurst via Peckham Rye, Tulse Hill and Norbury from West Croydon to East Croydon, Purley and Caterham instead? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Yes

No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes. This will maintain 4 trains per hour on the Caterham branch and provide new direct journey opportunities.

62. Do you have any other specific comments in relation to South London Metro services?

The West London line service between East Croydon and Watford Junction should be increased to 2 trains per hour all day to add capacity and improve connectivity.

63. West London Line - Which proposal do you support? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

Extend services to and from Purley or Coulsdon Town

No longer operate beyond Selhurst

The proposed change does not affect me

Any further comments on this proposal? At least 2 trains per hour in the peaks should be extended to Coulsdon Town providing an improved peak service to South Croydon, Purley Oaks, Purley, Reedham and Coulsdon Town. Without this it becomes a reduction in the peak-hour service to these stations.

64. Do you have any specific comments in relation to West London Line services?

The Southern service needs to be at least half-hourly to provide more capacity, improve cross-London connectivity and relieve central London interchanges especially for those with luggage/mobility impairment/buggies etc.

65. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN1 (Brighton Main Line):

Support.

66. Comments on the Southern Metro Route SN2 (West London Line):

Support peak hour trains starting and terminating at Coulsdon Town and the off-peak service increased to 2tph.

67. Comments on the Southern Metro Route SN3 (South London Metro):

SN3.1 Support.

SN3.2/2A Support daytime service to Coulsdon Town.

SN3.3 Support.

SN3.4 Support.

SN3.5 Support increase in off-peak service to 2 trains per hour which will benefit Royal Marsden and Epsom Hospitals.

SN3.6 Support the introduction of off-peak service and increase to 2 trains per hour between West Croydon and Epsom. It will improve connections at Norwood Junction with trains from the East Surrey area.

SN3.7 Support faster off-peak service from Caterham Line and at Purley Oaks and South Croydon.

We would like to see later Tattenham Corner trains all week, we would prefer the Tattenham Corner section to be the front portion in the down direction, and we welcome the use of Class 377 five-car trains on each portion.

SN3.7A Support retaining a peak hour service to Victoria.

SN3.8 Oppose this as it should be diverted to terminate at South Croydon to maintain the frequency of Norwood Junction to East Croydon links.

SN3.9 Support.

SN3.10/10A Support as it maintains 4 trains per hour on the Caterham branch and provides new direct journey opportunities.

SN3.11 Support.

SN3.12 Support.

68. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN4 (Oxted): London to East Grinstead and Uckfield

SN4.1 Support improved Sunday service with 2 trains per hour later in the evening. Also a need for a later train from Victoria on Sundays.

SN4.2 Request consistent through trains on weekday evenings from London Bridge, instead of Oxted shuttles.

69. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN5 (Redhill):

SN5.1 Support with an evening and Sunday service to Reigate from Victoria calling at Merstham, Coulsdon South and Purley.

SN5.2 Support with an evening and Sunday service from Victoria.

70. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN6

(Mainline West):

SN6.1 Support standardisation of Sunday service.

SN6.2 Support, and we believe the route could now justify a Sunday service.

71. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN7

(Mainline East):

SN7.1 Support but query mention of only Cooksbridge as limited stops when the same could apply to Plumpton if the new alternating 2-hourly pattern is adopted.

SN7.1A Support but query mention of Horley as 'certain trains only' when there are apparently only three per weekday!

SN7.2 Support but query inclusion of Wivelsfield in this limited-stop Hastings service – does it really need more than hourly off-peak to/from Lewes etc, losing a journey-time benefit?

72. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN8

(Coastway West):

SN8.1 Support.

SN8.2 Support.

SN8.3 Support, but essential to ensure appropriate, quality rolling stock for such length of journeys between major centres.

SN8.4 Support, but essential to ensure appropriate, quality rolling stock for such length of journeys between major centres.

SN8.5 Support.

SN8.6 Support.

73. Comments on the Southern Mainline Route SN9

(Coastway East):

SN9.1 Welcome.

SN9.2 Support; Southeast 1tph must be regular all-day/every-day to attract custom.

SN9.3 Support; note comments on Normans Bay, Pevensey Bay and Ore in Q52 – we expect this opportunity to be taken to secure real improvements to their Southern services.

SN9.4 Note detailed comments in Q52, in which we advocate and are lobbying hard to secure a new option D as an alternative to option A. Failing that, and in combination as a package of improvements, we advocate option B's Ashford-Eastbourne MarshLink service together with option C's Brighton-Hastings service, with the former modified on Sundays.

74. Comments on the Gatwick Express Route GX

Passenger loadings on all services between London Victoria and Gatwick Airport continue to be badly unbalanced by the artificial distortion to the travel market caused by the premium fare charged on Gatwick Express services - 'premium' solely and for no other reason than because it's non-stop, but little if any quicker than many other limited-stop Southern services. The advent of Oyster and contactless payments at the airport now make this even more of an anachronism. Your DfT client needs to know that platform dwell-times at Gatwick for through services are unnecessarily prolonged, importing a performance risk, because far too many airline passengers are deterred from using the dedicated Gatwick Express by its anomalous premium fare. The under-used Gatwick Express services could play far more of a capacity role by alternating stops at Clapham Junction and East Croydon; we suggest CJ with its links with the South Western network for the airport-only services, EC for Brighton services to add capacity and attractive non-stop links between two major economic centres. This is likely to be further justified as Gatwick Express loses traffic to Thameslink for restored links to the City via London Bridge and for Crossrail via Farringdon.

75. Do you have any specific comments in relation to services between London Kings Cross and Kings Lynn?

We welcome the increase in services to 2tph from Ely to London King's Cross from May 2017. We especially welcome the increase in train length to 8 cars. We note that 1tph will call at Cambridge North from that date with an additional 1 tph from May 2018. We hope that should circumstances allow that this additional stop be inserted before May 2018.

We welcome the franchise commitment to run 2tph through to King's Lynn and understand the difficulties in doing so. We urge you to keep the pressure on Network Rail in conjunction with the LEP, the local authorities and now the Cambridgeshire/Peterborough devolved authority to get the funding for the Ely works with great urgency.

Between Cambridge and London King's Cross the journey time has gradually increased from the original 45 minutes non-stop. We urge that every opportunity is taken to use the higher top speed of the Class 387 units wherever possible to start to bring the overall time down towards 45 minutes once again.

We make the observation that north of Cambridge these trains call at all six intermediate stations (all railheads) and at Cambridge make well used connections from Newmarket, Bury St. Edmunds, March, before running non-stop off peak to London. We ask that you resist calls from groups at intermediate stations between Cambridge and London to make additional stops. These 8-car trains are very well loaded on leaving Cambridge and are in effect long distance services with many using the trains on 100-mile journeys because of the reasonable end to end timings. Additionally, many users are driving from distant non-rail-served towns in Norfolk and The Fens to a Great Northern railhead. More station calls that increase the rail time spent on that part of the journey will not make commercial sense.

On Sundays the current service of three trains an hour between Ely and Cambridge run within 10 minutes of each other. Please work with other operators to obtain a better spread of service.

76. Do you support the proposed frequency improvements throughout the Great Northern Metro [we suspect that you might mean Mainline] routes? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes, we do support the service frequency increases. These increases in frequency will allow local authorities and others to implement policies that enable a modal transfer from road to rail. The Cambridge to Gatwick Airport (and Brighton) and the Peterborough to Gatwick Airport services will be very important to the economy of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and North Hertfordshire as they make all the destinations served by Gatwick Airport instantly many times more accessible to this region. The simple change at Farringdon will make Heathrow Airport almost as accessible. These services will ease many daily journeys from the Great Northern lines to south London in a way that is not currently readily understandable as it will be so revolutionary.

77. Do you support the proposed changes which will see Knebworth, Welwyn North, Welwyn Garden City, Hatfield and Potters Bar served by half hourly trains to and from Cambridge trains instead of hourly trains to both Cambridge and Peterborough? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? Yes, we do support these proposals. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire served by stations in and near Cambridge are at the heart of the UK bio high-technology industry and extremely important for other elements of UK high-technology industry. All along the route from Hatfield through to Stevenage and Meldreth for Melbourn there is a high number of high-technology companies with work forces that have highly transferable skills. This work force lives locally as well as being dispersed over large areas. Having a high-quality, high-capacity and frequent train service on this route is essential, especially as it centres on Cambridge. It will allow the workforce to travel between their homes and the many various companies as well as allowing people to change jobs without necessarily changing residence. This service will also connect at Finsbury Park for the Old Street hi-tech hub and the Crick Research Institute at St. Pancras. There is an issue of relatively poor off-peak connections at Stevenage from/to the Peterborough line services. We would urge that every effort is made to improve these. During the peak travel to work times we assume that these connections will be better; it is important that they are.

78. Do you support the proposed frequency improvements throughout the Great Northern Metro routes and proposed changes to some calling patterns? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
- No

Any further comments on this proposal? **Yes, creating a proper turn-up-and-go service.**

79. These proposals would remove the direct service between the Welwyn Garden City route and Haringay and Hornsey during Monday to Friday peak times only. Passengers wishing to travel between Welwyn Garden City and Haringay or Hornsey during peak times would be required to change trains at Alexandra Palace for frequent connecting trains.

How often do you travel from stations between Welwyn Garden City and Haringay and Hornsey?

- Never
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Couple of times a year

What would be the impact to you of these proposals? **Accept albeit with some reluctance.**

80. In relation to Question 79, how inconvenienced would you be if a change of trains was required?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Significantly

Any further comments on this proposal? **Accept albeit with some reluctance.**

81. In light of these developments, on balance do you think curtailing the Moorgate to Stevenage services at Watton-at-Stone from May 2018 until further notice to protect proposed frequency improvements on the Hertford North, Cambridge and Peterborough routes is the right approach? (optional question, please skip if not applicable)

- Yes
 No

Any further comments on this proposal Yes, we do support these proposals, however reluctantly. We urge you to work with serious intent to resolve this conundrum. In liaison with the local authorities and LEP it should be possible to raise loans/grants to enable the work to be completed with any loan being repaid from the fare box over a period of time.

82. Comments on the Great Northern Mainline Route GN1 (Kings Lynn and Cambridge):

GN1 Support.

83. Comments on the Great Northern Mainline Route GN2 (Cambridge Local):

GN2 Support.

84. Comments on the Great Northern Mainline Route GN3 (Peterborough):

GN3 Support.

85. Comments on the Great Northern Metro Route GN4 (Hertford):

GN4.1 Accept temporary arrangements with obvious reluctance. Please make sure that the limited rail services which will run early-mornings, late-evenings and Sundays are extremely well-publicised throughout the route to maintain customer loyalty and public awareness.

GN4.2 Welcome.

GN4.3 Welcome.

86. Comments on the Great Northern Metro Route GN5 (Welwyn):

GN5 Support. We note that Hornsey and Haringay are the only stations identified on the final page 71 as not having a standard regular-interval 4tph all-day/every-day service. Hadley Wood users are concerned at an apparent proposal to reduce their off-peak service to 2tph, which if true we would strongly oppose in view of the lack of other public transport in the area.

87. Any final comments on the 2018 proposals?

One of the issues with Southern is their apparent culture of late running. It has been suggested that this is because the target in terms of tph is set too high so that staff believe that it is unachievable so have stopped trying. However passengers value reliability (performance in railway jargon) over absolute capacity, particularly with the increase that the Class 700s will bring. The solution is to reduce the target to a number of trains which staff believe is achievable, and then slowly increase it when the target is being regularly met.

Yours sincerely

Roger Blake
Railfuture
Director for Campaigns and Vice-Chair of London & South East regional branch