

# **██████████ response to Proposals to create a better integrated rail network in London and the South East**

**18<sup>th</sup> March 2016**

**Qu 1. Do you agree with the principle of a partnership to better integrate the specification of rail passenger services across London and the South East?**

Yes we very much agree with the principle. We would be keen to know how we could get involved with the specification. We would also like to see a mechanism within the partnership to deal with any disagreements between partners on key issues which may emerge due to changing and/or conflicting needs.

**Qu 2. Do you agree with the principles that the partnership will work to? Are there any specific issues that have not been captured?**

Yes we agree with the principles outlined. We would also been keen to consider safety, security of passengers and good maintenance of the infrastructure. We are mindful, as well, that with the radial nature of the network and the physical way the network works, more frequent services may not necessarily result in increased capacity for all areas. With this in mind we are keen to ensure that the partnership recognises the potential for an inequality in services levels across geographic areas and considers measures to tackle this.

**Qu. 3 Do you agree with the proposed governance arrangements?**

We do and it is important to us that local councils are included. The question we would pose is how will the governance arrangements “trade off different views” to ensure that all stakeholders preferences are taken into account?

**Qu 4. What form do you propose the input from Local Authorities and LEPs could take?**

Via a written partnership with round table meetings on a sub-regional basis. We would be keen to utilise seminars and workshops as well as written forms of communication.

**Qu 5. Do you agree with the safeguards for transfer of inner suburban services to TFL, as set out here?**

We do, but we are mindful that we would not want this to adversely affect Crossrail 2 and Brent Cross station proposals. We are also keen that there are no detrimental effects on fares and journey times. We would not want to

adversely affect innovative ideas that could benefit commuters in outer London Boroughs (such as better turn back arrangements) due to signing up to safeguards. Changes in local population or employment, for example those associated with major new developments, will also warrant a reconsideration of services over time.

**Qu 6. Are there other outcomes you might expect to see achieved?**

An aspiration that capacity is going to meet the future demand is certainly a key consideration for [REDACTED]. This is also linked to affordability of fares to discourage passengers to switching to less sustainable forms of transport.

The safeguards offered to communities outside of London that their service frequencies, journey times and stopping patterns will be protected should also work both ways. Londoners relying on local stopping services should not experience poorer services due to improvements to fast/direct services agreed by the DfT.