

CRL/R/32

**Transport and Works Act 1992
Transport and Works (Inquiries Procedure) Rules 2004**

CROXLEY RAIL LINK ORDER

Mr Stephen Hunter

Mr Keith Foley

**Composite Response of Hertfordshire County Council and
London Underground Limited to
Cllr Derbyshire**

1 October 2012

Applicants' response to GD1:

Mr Hunter:

2 Trial split service

2.1 I have addressed the proposed trial split service in my proof of evidence (CRL2/2) particularly in part 7.3.

3 Impact of preferred scheme

3.1 My response to the matters raised by paragraphs 3.1 – 3.3 of Cllr Derbyshire's submission are dealt with in section 4.6 of my proof.

3.2 In response to the points raised in Cllr Derbyshire's paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5:

"3.4 The 2010 station user survey was undertaken BEFORE the September 2010 opening of the West Herts College building in Hempstead Road"

"3.5 In September 2011 the newly refurbished Colosseum entertainment venue opened for business",

my proof of evidence (CRL/2/2 paragraph 4.6.11) summarises the critical review carried out by the Promoters of the potential impact of the number of Grammar School pupils on the business case. The conclusion was that the number of Met Line users represented from the Grammar School has minimal influence on the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR). This conclusion holds for numbers of users at either of the destinations referenced or indeed for any other single destination. It is noted that both Watford Colosseum and West Hertfordshire College are better or equally well served from Watford Junction (CRL/2/3 Appendix 1, Figure 1).

3.3 In response to the point raised in paragraph 3.6,

"3.6 The increase in cost of travel and increase in journey time would affect all those Watford Met users for whom Watford Junction station would be their nearest CRL access station if Watford Met were to be closed",

the business case for the scheme (CRL/2/2 paragraph 6.2.4) takes into account both changes in the cost of travel and increase in journey time, and concludes that reductions in travel time materially outweigh the modest number of passengers experiencing increases in cost of travel costs or journey times.

3.4 In response to paragraph 3.7,

“3.7 ...in my opinion it would be sensible to trial a split service for 2 years as recommended by London Travel/Watch...”

the case for the closure of Watford Met is not based on the number of passengers forecast to use the station with a split service. My proof (CRL/2/2 paragraphs 7.3.4 – 7.3.5) shows that the main contributor to the poor business case performance of this option is the consequential reduction in service frequency to all Met Line passengers. This is a direct result of the service pattern operated, so there would be no benefit to a trial service, and it would merely cause detriment to passengers.

4 Case for retention of passenger service at Watford Met

4.1 In response to the point raised at 4.4.3:

“4.4.3 In my view retention of passenger service at Watford Met would be sensible as a way of protecting the viability of an Aylesbury/Watford link”,

my evidence (CRL/2/2 paragraph 3.3.1) sets out that the retention of Watford Met would amount to a material change to the scheme and require a resubmission to be made to the DfT. The BCR for either an even or uneven split service option (CRL/2/2 paragraphs 7.3.5 and 7.3.6) are well short of DfT’s target of 2 at which level the proposal is extremely unlikely to receive Central Government funding. Without the Croxley Rail Link an Aylesbury/Watford link is not viable. The Local Major Transport Projects funding side of DfT have now indicated in writing that they would consider that a split service proposal would be a material change to the scheme likely to affect the funding decision. I attach a copy of the DfT’s email to this response.

Mr Foley:

4.2 Service Levels

4.2 To the paragraphs under section 4.2 on Service Levels in Cllr Derbyshire’s submission I respond as follows:

4.2.1 A split service would increase the operational complexity of the service which in turn increases the risk of poor reliability across the entire line.

- 4.2.2 Service recovery following disruption takes longer with two terminus stations compared to just one, and thus causes more dis-benefit with a more complex operation. Any option that requires the need to ensure trains serve an additional terminus would reduce the flexibility LUL's service controllers have when trying to recover the services, which would mean it takes longer to return the service to normal operation. This is regardless of how the trains are split between the two terminus stations.
- 4.2.3 It also increases the complexity of the scheduled operation, introducing more interworking of services which are themselves a cause of poor reliability.
- 4.2.4 The references made to the wider Sub-Surface Upgrade are incorrect. The need for a 10 tph planned frequency departing Watford Met station is based on demand between Moor Park and Harrow-on-the-Hill. This service level is retained in all options post CRL and therefore has no impact on the Upgrade benefits. Reference is made to LUL having considered Watford Met to reverse 4 tph in order to achieve this, but Keith Foley's evidence outlines why this has been rejected.
- 4.2.5 It is also incorrect to state that the additional rolling stock is already allowed for in the Upgrade. The Upgrade caters for a new fleet to resource the planned frequencies under new operating conditions. This fleet serviced Watford Met with a shorter run time than Watford Junction thus the need for an additional train over and above the increased fleet size for the Upgrade.
- 4.2.6 The assertion that the terminus capacity at Watford Junction is a constraining factor is incorrect. There is sufficient signalling, track and platform capacity to run the full 10 tph Metropolitan line service to Watford Junction should LUL ever wish to increase the planned frequency from the currently envisaged 6 tph, whilst still catering for London Overground services.

4.3 Resilience

- 4.3 To the paragraphs under section 4.3 on Resilience in Cllr Derbyshire's submission I respond as follows:

- 4.3.1 It is incorrect to assert that the retention of Watford Met in passenger service would provide significant resilience to the train service in the event of problems at Watford Junction.

4.3.2 Trains will be able to reverse at Moor Park and also potentially on the line north of Croxley given the track is being maintained for stabling. There is no benefit in retaining a passenger service for wider resilience – in fact as stated above it introduces reliability problems.