

## Comments on Network Rail’s responses to the Examining Authority’s written questions

Question number	Network Rail comment	My Response
1.11.12	When Phase 2A opens, there will be a more significant timetable change and a greater release of capacity on the WCML. As at that date, the majority of long distance passenger traffic will be moved to the HS2 line.	<p>While the majority of long distance passengers are expected to transfer to HS2, the majority of long distance “classic” services on the West Coast Main Line will not be withdrawn. Analysis of the HS2 PLANET Framework Model PFM v7.1 Assumptions Report (July 2017) provides the following data for a “Do minimum” scenario and a HS2 Phase 2b scenario. Classic long distance trains serving Euston at peak times: 10 (do minimum) and 7 (HS2 phase 2b). At non peak times, the numbers are 9 and 5 respectively.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Network Rail made the following remarks in their Northampton Loop Capacity report (13/9/2017) in the introduction on page 5 of this report. This report was submitted as part of the Statement of Common Ground between Network Rail and Roxhill. It states:</p> <p><i>“High Speed 2 is introducing 10 services of which 8 replicate current InterCity West Coast services. All 8 of these replicated services use the fast lines, therefore the capacity released by HS2 is only available on the Fast lines south of Rugby. It is likely that the services that use the released capacity available on the fast lines will need to cross over onto the slow lines for part of their path. Therefore post the implantation of High Speed 2 the slow line south of rugby are likely to see a higher utilisation than today”.</i></p> <p>Therefore the benefits to rail freight from the opening HS2 appear to be</p>

Question number	Network Rail comment	My Response
		somewhat limited or even questionable.
1.11.15	Any freight services which are added to the network will not be at the expense of passenger services and, accordingly, Network Rail confirms that the Proposed Development will not affect passengers.	<p>I draw attention to Network Rail's Northampton Loop Capacity report which contains the following in its introduction:  <i>"The analysis shows without significant infrastructure improvements a choice must be made between maximising freight paths and creation of additional passenger paths"</i>.</p> <p>I also draw attention to Northamptonshire County Council's written representation, chapter 4, which explains in detail the issues associated with adding additional freight trains to the Northampton Loop and their likely impact on rail passenger services. The council's analysis has the benefit of local knowledge and has also made use of the Network Rail West Coast Main Line Capacity Plus report.</p> <p>In the written answer which Network Rail has provided to question 1.11.15, no rationale has been provided to justify their view.</p>
1.11.16	There is no proposal to increase the maximum length of freight trains.	Please refer to my written representation paragraphs 105 and 106. Information sources: The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport and the Campaign for Better Transport.
1.11.35	<p>Network Rail has assessed the Roxhill Reports and the Ashfield Reports and is satisfied, subject to the caveats set out below, that there is sufficient capacity for each scheme to operate four trains per day into and out of each SRFI meaning eight train movements per day for each scheme. This statement is subject to the following caveats:</p> <p>1 That trains can enter and exit each SRFI at a speed of not less than 40 mph; and</p>	In the Northampton Gateway SRFI Feasibility Report (GHD) (July 2018) supplied as part of the Statement of Common Ground between Network Rail and Roxhill, the following statement is made in the Summary and Conclusions section: <i>"For reasons outlined within the report, the entry and exits speeds adopted are 40mph from the south and 20mph from the north. The proposals are achieved with the alterations to the existing</i>

Question number	Network Rail comment	My Response
		<p><i>infrastructure minimised where possible”.</i></p> <p>So at this stage, it appears that the first caveat cannot be satisfied.</p>
1.11.35	<p>2 The origin and destination of each train movement. This information will not be known until each SRFI is operational and therefore whether a path from the SRFI can be matched to a path at the origin/destination.</p>	<p>In the absence of origin or destination information, Network Rail has been unable to consider whether the relevant sections of its network have sufficient capacity to accommodate the freight trains to be generated by the proposed SRFI.</p> <p>As Roxhill has suggested that one of the aims is to serve the major container ports such as Felixstowe and London, consideration should have been given to assessing the available capacity on the North London, East London and Great Eastern Lines. To serve Scotland, then available capacity on northern parts of the West Coast Main Line needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>It is my view that Network Rail has not fully answered the first two elements of question 1.11.35.</p>
1.11.35	<p>The fluidity in that market means that Network Rail can only comment on activities at other SRFIs at a particular point in time; it cannot assess how other SRFIs will operate in the future. In short, Network Rail responds to the market but does not reserve capacity for specific SRFIs.</p>	<p>I would not expect Network Rail to reserve capacity for specific SRFIs. However these comments suggest that Network Rail has very limited ability to model future rail demand scenarios.</p>