



Crossrail line 1 - Round 2 consultation by Cross London Rail Links Ltd.

A response by the London Transport Users Committee

Published by the

London Transport Users Committee

6 Middle Street

London EC1A 7JA

Phone: 020 7505 9000

Fax: 020 7505 9003

October 2004

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

- A. LTUC supports Crossrail and consider all points in this paper to be aimed at improving the scheme, and not to hinder or delay its progress.
- B. LTUC objects to Crossrail's accessibility provision and want to see all stations fully accessible.
- C. LTUC objects to the omission of Maryland stops, and the proposal that some trains will omit Forest Gate and Manor Park stops.
- D. LTUC believes that stations at both Woolwich and Silvertown are important and ideally would like to see them provided as part of the initial scheme.
- E. Although LTUC does not support a third eastern branch of Crossrail, the Committee is concerned that there has been no provision made within the rail industry as a whole to meet the rail needs of Thames Gateway North.
- F. LTUC would like assurances from Crossrail for future meaningful consultation with us regarding the train service specifications, to secure acceptable levels of service for London stations.
- G. With Crossrail and BAA both planning to run to Heathrow Terminal 5, there should be agreement between them to ensure a through service from London continues to serve Terminal 4.
- H. LTUC and RPC Southern would like assurances about the availability of enough track capacity for running Crossrail and South Eastern Trains services beyond Abbey Wood to Dartford and Ebbsfleet.
- I. LTUC believes the Greenford branch should be converted to light rapid transit and included in the West London Tram scheme.
- J. LTUC welcomes the passive provision for 12-car trains and 30 tph, as well as assurances that three doorways per car remain under consideration.
- K. The passive provision for possible future south west and north west branches is welcomed.
- L. LTUC would like to see all London stations on the route to have 6 tph, as set out in our requirements for train services.
- M. RPC West of England welcome the provision of service between Bourne End and Paddington.
- N. There is some concern from RPC West of England about the level of capacity on the Great Western Mainline.

Crossrail line 1 - Round 2 consultation by Cross London Rail Links Ltd.

A response by the London Transport Users Committee

Introduction

1. In January 2004, the London Transport Users Committee (LTUC) published its response to Crossrail's consultation on line 1 – the benchmark scheme.
2. This paper follows on from LTUC's previous responses to the scheme, primarily focusing on issues from the Round 2 consultation document, as well as reiterating our previous concerns where these have not been resolved.
3. It is noted that the south west branch option of Crossrail has now been dropped.
4. LTUC also welcomes the fact that the western route now extends to the Committee's boundary at Slough.
5. LTUC encourages appropriate consultation with local residents who may be affected by construction works, in order to minimise objections to the scheme.
6. Within our response, there are also comments from RPC West of England and RPC Southern.
7. LTUC supports Crossrail and considers that the proposed tunnel alignments and new station locations should be regarded as settled so that the Parliamentary Bill and funding plans can be progressed without further delay. All points made in this paper are aimed at improving an already good project, and are not intended to hinder it in any way.

Accessibility

8. The proposed accessibility provision at stations (see Appendix), is totally inadequate for a scheme that will not be completed until 2013 – some nine years after the full implementation of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) and some 30 years after the importance of full accessibility in new public transport schemes was first recognised.
9. Although most of the stations to be served by Crossrail are existing stations, it does not alter the fact that the scheme is, from the passengers' point of view, a new railway, and should be fully accessible. Unless firm commitments are given that all stations will be made fully accessible, LTUC will petition against the Parliamentary Bill on this matter.

The Central Area

10. LTUC remain of the view that the trains will require at least three doorways per car and we welcome assurances from the Crossrail team that this option remains under consideration. LTUC would expect to be consulted on the design of the rolling stock.
11. We welcome the fact that the scheme continues to provide passive provision for 30 trains per hour (tph) and 12-car trains. LTUC would object to the Parliamentary Bill if these facilities for future service development were withdrawn.

Thames Gateway North

12. The Thames Gateway project promises to create, within the timescale of the Crossrail scheme, a huge increase in housing, employment and commercial development on both sides of the Thames Estuary – although, as yet, there is little firm demographic or travel demand data available. Crossrail's south-eastern branch would offer extra capacity for growth of rail traffic in Kent, but does little to improve rail facilities in Thurrock or South Essex, in that there would be no station east of Custom House and that the regenerated Stratford area would not be directly served. Although some may argue for a service to cover this area, LTUC would not be in support for a third eastern branch of Crossrail. It may be that the existing c2c route via Tilbury to Fenchurch Street can be developed to meet the rail needs of Thames Gateway North, but we are concerned that little work appears to have been done to verify this and that no section of the rail industry seems to be taking full responsibility for this issue.

The Western Route (Heathrow)

13. LTUC note that the draft train service specification for west of Paddington has few of the features of a metro service and some stations (e.g. Hanwell) with only 2 tph would have a service that is completely inadequate. LTUC do not regard this a reason for objecting to the Crossrail scheme, but we do need an assurance that there will be meaningful consultation with LTUC in due course in order to secure acceptable levels of service for all stations within London.
14. The Greenford line poses a problem, as the Crossrail team state that there is no capacity for this service to operate on the Crossrail tracks to Ealing Broadway or Paddington. They therefore propose to re-instate a bay platform at West Ealing, where the branch trains would terminate and offer cross platform interchange towards Paddington. Lifts would be installed for use by passengers travelling towards Greenford. In compensation for loss of through services to Ealing Broadway and Paddington, Crossrail propose to increase the peak service on the branch from 2 tph to 4 tph. This is unsatisfactory for the branch, but LTUC feel that the best solution is for it to be converted to light rapid transit and incorporated into the West London Tram scheme. Crossrail should seek assurances from Transport for London (TfL) that this will be favourably considered as part of a second stage development of the West London Tram scheme. As with all services that may be adversely affected by Crossrail, it is essential that they receive full consideration.
15. Crossrail plan to run to the new Terminal 5 at Heathrow. BAA also plans to run Heathrow Express to this terminal. LTUC believes that a through service from London must continue to Terminal 4 and agreement must be reached between Crossrail and BAA to guarantee this will happen.
16. LTUC welcomes the passive provision for possible future branches to the south west and north west areas.

RPC West of England response

17. We need to see full details of proposed improvements to infrastructure between Maidenhead and Paddington so as to improve capacity.
18. Increase in capacity must be sufficient to cater for existing long distance services and to build a provision for growth.

19. Burnham – current off-peak journey times to and from Paddington are 25 and 29 minutes respectively. Crossrail will increase the journey time to 38 minutes.
20. Taplow – improved service off peak from one train per hour to two per hour. Current off peak journey time to and from Paddington between 29 and 35 minutes. Crossrail will increase the journey time to 43 minutes.
21. With both Burnham and Taplow, there is a need to balance the disadvantage of longer journey times to Paddington with the convenience of through journeys across London.
22. Maidenhead – commuter through services between Bourne End and Paddington should be retained.

The Eastern Route

23. Regarding Crossrail's intention to omit stops at Maryland, LTUC view on this remains the same¹. Both Crossrail and Gidea Park local trains should all call at Maryland, with Crossrail using selective door opening if necessary. Suggestions put to us by the Crossrail team that some trains may omit Forest Gate and Manor Park, and that Maryland may be reduced to a peak service only, are not acceptable.

RPC East of England response

24. No comments.

The South-Eastern Route (Ebbsfleet)

25. LTUC wish to seek assurances about the impact of running Crossrail and South Eastern Trains services to and beyond Dartford to Ebbsfleet, without additional tracks through the complex and heavily used junction between Slade Green and Dartford.
26. LTUC strongly believes that a station at Woolwich should be built from the outset, rather than just passive provision made for it. The Committee believes this issue would merit an objection from LTUC to the Parliamentary Bill.
27. LTUC also believes that a station at Silvertown should be built from the outset, instead of passive provision. This would enable a short pedestrian link to London City Airport.

RPC Southern response

28. Overall we think that Crossrail will be welcomed by passengers as it opens up direct journey opportunities to the City, West End, West London and Heathrow (and even with just one change into Essex).
29. However there may be some resistance (as demonstrated by the IKF proposals) with the implied substitution of Cannon Street and Charing Cross trains, reducing access to Woolwich Arsenal, Lewisham and Greenwich. It looks like it is more of a replacement for the stopping service to Gravesend, so semi-fast services may need to make additional stops to compensate for this - extending journey times even further (the off-peak journey time from Strood to Charing Cross is already 1:15 - semi fast, as opposed to the slightly longer distance Chatham to Victoria at 44 minutes). Services to Gravesend may be

¹ See paragraph 40 in 'Crossrail line 1 – the Benchmark scheme – consultation by Cross London Rail Links Ltd., a response by the London Transport Users Committee'

reduced (but may be offset by CTRL Domestic trains, although they have different destinations).

30. On the positive side it has the potential to reduce congestion at London Bridge/Cannon Street/Charing Cross.
31. It may also create an element of rail heading as people drive to Ebbsfleet for connection to Crossrail, by the time of opening there is likely to be a very large amount of rail heading already for domestic and international services from Ebbsfleet. This may add to the problems of road congestion on the A2/M2 and their north/south connecting roads.
32. The indications in the document are that the rolling stock is likely to be similar to the Suburban Electrostar (376), which is a five coach train with more standing room than seats. We have some concerns regarding the running of trains designed and running at 70mph+ with many standing passengers (they are safer sitting down). However we will be able to assess this better after the introduction of the 376 on SET Metro lines (September to Early 2005).
33. The connection between Northfleet/Ebbsfleet International & Domestic/Ebbsfleet Crossrail is welcomed. This will provide an alternative to road access (point 31). However this is of less use if the services that feed Northfleet are being substituted by Crossrail! (point 29). Provision for a shuttle service to Northfleet/Ebbsfleet may be required to plug the gap (plans for CTRL/D indicate that this could provide that service, although a number of these were not going to stop at Ebbsfleet during the peak hours).
34. Disruption - There must be major efforts to restrict the impact of disruption during construction of this line. In our area the major construction is likely to be at Ebbsfleet/Northfleet. But there is also potential for problems at Dartford and Abbey Wood impacting on our services. Dartford is already a very busy station and there may be some concerns at the ability to service ON (Metro) services and Crossrail - except with significant substitution of services.

Any queries regarding this paper should be addressed to

Suzanne Fry
Research Officer
LTUC
6 Middle Street
London EC1A 7JA

Phone: 020 7726 9982
Fax: 020 7505 9003

sfry@ltuc.org.uk

Crossrail – stations which would have step-free access (proposals as at 9/04)****UPDATED****RPC WofE

Maidenhead	Yes – already available
Taplow	No
Burnham	No

LTUC

Slough	Yes
Langley	No
Iver	No
West Drayton	Yes

Heathrow T5	Yes
Heathrow T123	Yes

Hayes	Yes
Southall	Yes – to Crossrail platforms (other platforms not normally used)
Hanwell	No
West Ealing	Yes – to Crossrail platforms
Ealing Bdway	Yes
Acton ML	Yes

Paddington	Yes
Bond St.	Yes
TCR	Yes – passive provision for step free to LUL but funded by others
Farringdon	Yes – step free to Thameslink only post Thameslink 2000 works
Liverpool St./Moorgate	Yes – by default they provide step free from street to inner rail platforms at both stations
Whitechapel	Yes + interchange with District / ELL

Stratford	Yes – already available
Forest Gate	No
Manor Park	No
Ilford	Yes
Seven Kings	No
Goodmayes	No
Chadwell Heath	No
Romford	Yes – already available
Gidea Park	No
Harold Wood	No

Isle of Dogs	Yes
--------------	-----

Custom House	Yes
Abbey Wood	Yes – already available
Belvedere	Yes – already available
Erith	No
Slade Green	Yes – already available
Dartford	Yes – already available

RPC SofE

Stone Crossing	No
Greenhithe	No
Swanscombe	No
Ebbsfleet	Yes

RPC EofE

Brentwood	No
Shenfield	Yes – already available