

[REDACTED]

Dear TfL and DfT,

I am responding on behalf [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this new approach. As the document itself points out, the context for rail investment in London and its wider economic area is that it is uniquely reliant among UK cities on rail travel. Of the 1.65 billion journeys taken in 2014/15, 1.15 billion were in London and the South East (almost 70%). London alone, excluding the South East or East of England regions, accounted for 835 million journeys (50%) in 2013/14¹. The growth in passengers in London has been dramatic over the last decade and more. For example, London Waterloo was the country's busiest station with 99.2 million entries and exits in 2014/15², nearly 60% up from the 62.4 million entries and exits in 2004/05.

We see the key opportunities for London's metro rail services as being:

- Responding to existing and near-term demand. This has been growing very strongly but often without a commensurate supply-side response
- The regenerative impacts of an enhanced rail service on a wider area, as witnessed with London Overground routes and referenced in the document;
- Improving London's ability to respond to future growth. In a context where London's existing transport systems, even with very substantial Tube upgrades and the advent of substantial new capacity such as Crossrail and the Thameslink Programme, is likely to be approaching maximum capacity towards the end of the next decade, London must maximise the potential of its existing routes;
- Rail playing its full part in an easy to access, mode-blind transport system that keeps the capital moving – by offering the more frequent and more reliable

¹ Rail Trends Factsheet, Rail Executive of DfT, available at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/487497/rail-trends-factsheet-2015.pdf

² Office of Rail and Road station usage data as summarised at https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/487497/rail-trends-factsheet-2015.pdf

services, better interchange, high customer service standards and increased capacity that your document references.

We would not however want to see these benefits for passengers within London come at the expense of passengers in the wider South East. The economic geography of global cities does not map neatly to their political or governmental boundaries, and this is patently the case with London. London's travel to work area goes far beyond the Mayor's jurisdiction and so both the needs of Greater London passengers and those from further afield must be better served.

Turning to the questions in your document:

Q1. 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. Given what we have said above, we are very pleased to see this partnership approach between DfT and TfL.

Q2. Do you agree with the principles that the partnership will work to? Are there any specific issues that have not been captured?

These principles are:

- More frequent services, better interchanges and increased capacity;
- Greater reliability for all passengers;
- High standards of customer service

We support these.

We note and support the proposed involvement of local authorities and LEPs. We also ask that [REDACTED] are part of the conversation as this partnership develops.

We note the reference to 'using the value in TfL and Network Rail property in and around stations or contributions from developers where improvements in transport unlocks housing and office developments'. At a principle level, this is a direction of travel we very much welcome, and would happily explore further with DfT, Network Rail and TfL. London has built up significant experience of mixed funding with projects such as Crossrail and the Northern Line Extension which can be useful wells of expertise to draw on for London and South East rail services.

Q3. Do you agree with the proposed governance arrangements?

We do. The distinction between TfL procuring Greater London services and the Department procuring services outside Greater London is the right one. Within this,

there are of course many details to be decided upon as to what the exact divisions are. On this, we encourage both DfT and TfL to focus on two principles:

- Prioritising what is feasible and pragmatic rather than simply what forms the most exact match to the Greater London boundary;
- Arrangements that will continue to respond to and foster economic growth into the future.

Q4. What form do you propose the input from local authorities and LEPs could take?

We agree it is valuable to have input from both these sources. We also encourage both DfT and TfL to cast the net more widely among relevant stakeholders in shaping these services, to further improve the network's ability to respond to demand and provide the maximum cost-effective capacity and performance to passengers in the South East.

Q5. Do you agree with the safeguards for transfer of inner suburban services to TfL, as set out here?

These safeguards are:

- No detrimental effect on fares;
- No adverse impacts on the frequency, journey times or stopping patterns of longer distance services.

This seems a reasonable starting point, but will need to be kept under review in light of evolving demand for different types of rail service.

Q6. Are there other outcomes you might expect to see achieved?

The highlights of these are: higher-performing trains; proposals to improve track and signalling to increase speeds and reduce bottlenecks; a service every 15 minutes for 80% of stations (versus 67% today); new interchanges; consistent stopping patterns; greater reliability; better information, including open data; greater physical accessibility; simple payment systems and a welcoming environment including all day station staffing and clean and refurbished stations.

These are all attractive features, and reflect the mix of ingredients that have made London Overground such a success. However, none come for free and so in determining the investment to translate these aims into reality, we encourage the Department and TfL to focus on:

- Tangible, near-term changes which are relatively swift and affordable to implement;
- In looking at longer-term investment, to prioritise those changes that deliver maximum results in terms of enhanced connectivity for the greatest number of

passengers, and to explore additional sources of funding to deliver these (as we have supported in our answer to Q2 above).

Much work now needs to be done on clearly specifying how services will be divided, including how this will integrate with Network Rail's management of the infrastructure and how enhancements will be brought forward to help deliver the vision described in your document.

In that context, we note the scale of the challenge. That said, we see the document's direction of travel as very much the right one, and want to continue to engage with DfT and TfL on this topic.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

[Redacted title]

[Redacted contact information]

[Redacted contact information]