

Transport for London  
Windsor House  
42-50 Victoria Street  
London  
SW1H 0TL

railprospectus@tfl.gov.uk

Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR

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?

We think it is important that the rail services should be very well integrated and thus partnership is very important to achieve that. However, this must be an equal partnership with clear goals to achieve on both sides.

Department for Transport is an organisation that implements Government policy plus providing funds for to implement those policies nationally within government funding levels, whereas TfL is set up to run Transport operations in London. The perspective of each organisation is different.

For us, just outside of London on a heavily used and overcrowded commuter service, we can see clearly the differences of the organisations. Just over the border we can see London with its simple cheap oyster zonal fares, regular services, good staffing and continued investment, whereas on our side of the border we have suffered from inadequately specified services, high (extortionate) fares, low staffing and lack of Investment in needed infrastructure.

In line with Government policy the DfT keeps its expenditure as low as possible; its first requirement is to minimise spending taxpayer's money as much as it can; thus it broadly specifies services and requires franchisees to provide them at the cheapest possible price, which in turn ends up meaning a poor service for the users. Whereas TfL specifies the best service for its users and then let's management contracts to provide that service at the lowest price.

[REDACTED]

So to enable the partnership to work DfT needs to move to become a transport authority rather than an administration unit. We have expanded on this idea below.

Additionally, we perceive that this partnership is aimed at providing the services and investment into metro services within London but that commuter town services (St Albans, Welwyn, Slough and Redhill) getting reduced services and increased costs despite the historic lack of investment.

If the TfL style of operating can be extended to the dormitory towns just outside London then it can be seen as positive, if however, the DfT will use the loss of its revenue inside London to cut services for the dormitory towns, then it is not a good partnership. This could happen if the revenue generated inside London is lost to the "TSGN franchise" overall and thus going forward more will be taken from the Dormitory towns services to fund services on little used branch lines like Uckfield or Marshlink.

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

We believe that more frequent services, better interchanges & increased capacity will be good for all passengers, but we still need to understand how this will effect Commuter services from just outside London and hence our presumption that this will provide better Metro services at detriment of commuter services from towns just outside London. It is important for example that we continue to have fast services to London as stopping services make commutes unviable due to extended journey times.

Greater reliability for all passengers is a good target but how will that happen. We expect a step change on our route in 2018 with the opening of the new London Bridge and Thameslink services but it is coming from a very very low level. How will this reliability be introduced without taking away other elements of service? We are also very concerned that inner London Services will be prioritised over Commuter town services?

Equally the principle of High Standards of Customer services is a great target but how will it be achieved without increasing staffing. Along the Redhill route we already have severe problems from under investment in staffing levels meaning long ticket office queues, unmanned gates and lack of communication. There is too much reliance on technology that many passengers do not have or lack the understanding to use, beyond that there is not an appropriate level of staff to make sure the technology is working. Broken ticket machines are a constant issue along our route, thus this high standard of service will need investment in better and more machines.

The biggest issue that has not been captured is the simplification of Fares and the creation of a fair fares system. Currently Redhill Station commuter fares to London require a 47% additional fare above Coulsdon South a mere 5 miles away. The difference is Coulsdon South receives a zonal fare and Redhill doesn't. This unbalanced logic is repeated around London, and is of great concern to many commuters. So this unfair pricing needs to be resolved. We are very concerned this partnership will result in a transfer of higher fares to Commuter Town services whilst cutting fares on London Metro services.

A fare simplification is urgently needed along the Redhill route, as we have Oyster Fares, Contactless Fares, Southern tickets, The Key, ITSO, Travelcards but no ability to buy tickets to London Stations only as we have to buy a more expensive London Terminals ticket. The fare structure is so complicated we do not know easily which ticket is cheaper and it takes huge amount of research just to work out the best ticket. It shouldn't be like that and this issue must

[REDACTED]

be addressed before this partnership is allowed to move forward or it should be a requirement of the partnership to resolve within 1 year of setting up.

Additionally, we do not benefit from competition further down the line in Sussex, so we don't have cheaper Thameslink fares that benefit commuters from further out of London. Where possible local users are driven to buy longer distance tickets as they are cheaper.

### 3. Do you agree with the proposed governance arrangements?

No, we do not agree with the proposed governance arrangements. The DfT has been very weak in responding to users' needs and does not have a clear mandate to run the services, whereas TfL has a very public face in the Mayor of London

The regions have to deal with faceless officials from the DfT but London has a Mayor whose role it is to provide transport services. The regions need to have persons who become visible and are given the same scrutiny as the London Assembly does to the Mayor and TfL. This clear public voice needs to be in place before any "partnership" is in place to ensure that the DfT acts appropriately for the regions.

This partnership also needs clear representation from the Commuter towns just outside London. In our dealings with the DfT we [REDACTED] have constantly faced the problem that they consider us as part of the Brighton Main [REDACTED] distance services to the coast. We are a route that those trains pass through non-stop and we do not get the correct consideration, thus ending up with unfair extortionate fares, poor services, lack of staffing and investment in our route.

The DfT is not a local provider like TfL and thus does not have the emphasis to concentrate on local issues. This needs to be resolved generally with Railways not just for this partnership. DfT focuses on long distance services and leave passenger transport committees to look after the towns (including TfL in London). This will be a major issue for the London Commuter towns and thus we believe that a new Outer London body should be formed taking in the regional councils bordering onto London (see next section).

### 4. What form do you propose the input from local authorities could take?

Local Authorities are very inefficient in respect of transport, their budgets are low and thus they cannot afford to look at the wider issues the way that TfL can. The partnership as proposed is between a Government Department and a local transport authority, it can only be seen as a one sided arrangement to TfL's benefit. This partnership could resolve much of that issue but with the strong public face that TfL has and the lack of understanding at the DfT mean this is unlikely to happen. Thus, at the very least, local authorities along the route should have full access to the partnership and the opportunity to veto proposals that reduce the regions buying power for services.

It would be better to create a new Transport Authority to take over the DfT's responsibility for services in the London Commuter Towns in neighbouring boroughs only (i.e. not including for example most of Sussex and its coastal services but perhaps including Crawley District). This authority could be responsible for the people of the region and be questioned by the local councils it represents and its head required to meet with its commuters and user groups in open forum regularly (at least quarterly in each commuter area). Thus providing a proper voice for this currently neglected region.

[REDACTED]

It needs a more local structure to maintain routes like the Redhill Route, where under current and proposed arrangements Redhill Route's needs are always lost in the more glamorous requirements of the Brighton main line, which has historically been a massive detriment to passengers along the Redhill Route.

Without this idea of a new transport Authority, it seems very likely there will be a two tier structure where TfL have finance to improve services and the DfT will not have. The DfT's position is further reduced due to the need to keep open small unprofitable routes at the periphery of franchises. The partnership needs to be clearly operated so that Outer commuters do not have their fares and service levels dictated to because of projects to keep branch lines operating etc.

There is already far too much subsidy being taken off Commuter Town users to subsidise small lines like Uckfield & Marshlink and a fair share of this subsidy must come from London Metro commuters too.

5. [Do you agree with the safeguards for transfer of inner suburban services to TfL, as set out here?](#)

No, we are very concerned as we have no proper consultation or service level targets, customer information targets or fair fares for our local route or a person clearly responsible for this, which needs to change before TfL can be considered to take over the London services

6. [Are there other outcomes you might expect to see achieved?](#)

The same standards of service (especially in relation to customer service, infrastructure investments and staffing) outside the TfL area as within. Especially for the areas directly bordering on TfL who have had a very low level of investment, poor services and degradation of service levels in the last 15 years. This needs to be brought up to current inner London levels before considering expansion of TFL rail.

Specific Trains for Outer-suburban services that meet the criteria for suburban services and not for inner short hop metro services. Example is Class 700 designed for the Thameslink core and totally inappropriate for outer suburban services for which most of its services will be used upon. This shows TfL's power in insisting the metro need in central London is taken over the needs of out of London customers

Thank you for reading our views and we trust that appropriate measures will be taken to ensure that any partnership will take in the political and financial fairness for commuters from dormitory towns, so they can stop being the cash cows for the rest of the services.

It is of vital importance that the thousands of Commuters and other passengers from the dormitory towns like those we represent in East Surrey are considered equally to passengers within London, as these very commuters are creating the very prosperity within London as much as the people who live in the Greater London Area, that is being used to fund additional services inside London.

This proposal does not respect a fair outcome for their needs against their contribution.

[REDACTED]