

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

06 June 2007

Alastair McDermaid
Stansted Generation 2 Director
BAA
Freepost
CL 4055
Chelmsford Essex CM1 3BR

Dear Alastair

Stansted Generation2 – Surface Access Consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposals for improving Surface Access to Stansted Airport as a consequence of the Generation2 proposals.

London TravelWatch has no objection to the proposals for Stansted Airport provided that the following conditions are applied:-

- (a) The development is heavily predicated on the expansion of coach and bus services to and from the airport. We believe that this will only be viable in the long term if the quality and quantity of the services (in places served and frequency provided) is guaranteed by a Quality Bus Partnership, setting minimum standards of operation, (and providing for sanctions if these are not met). Establishing such a partnership should therefore be a condition of the granting of planning permission.
- (b) We understand that much of the increase in car travel is dependent on existing permissions for expanding car parking being acted upon. Therefore we would wish to see assurances from BAA to that effect.
- (c) Capacity on the rail network must be increased. This will require a commitment by BAA to funding quadrupling the track capacity between Copper Mill Junction and Broxbourne Junction (with consequential replacements of level crossings), and any other necessary line capacity increases, introduction of 12 car operation on Stansted Express services, appropriate lengthening of platforms and providing a second tunnel to and from the airport.
- (d) The figures previously provided by BAA show that over 20% of passengers using the Stansted Express service use Tottenham Hale station as an interchange with London Underground. This station does not have at present step free access from the platform where passengers get off trains from Stansted to the accessible lifts to the Victoria Line. This is a serious and long standing omission. Permission for increasing passenger numbers at Stansted Airport must include a commitment by BAA to fund/provide step free access at this location.

Contd/

- (e) The figures provided by BAA regarding the Central Trains (new Cross Country Franchise) service show that certain trains will need strengthening from 2 to 3 cars. In addition, its figures show that the area of greatest growth in percentage terms of usage of the airport will be from Cambridgeshire. One of the times of principal demand for travel from the airport is from 2300 to 2400. At present, the last Central Trains service departs at 2020 to Cambridge. We believe that on present and future usage a train service needs to be provided after the current close of service to between 2300 and 2400 – preferably the later the better, from Stansted Airport to Cambridge and Peterborough. Increasing the capacity of this service from 2 to 3 carriages and by an additional late night services should therefore be a condition of planning consent. We also have an aspiration to see the frequency of train services toward Cambridge increased from the current one train per hour to two, given the projected growth in population and usage from this area.
- (f) London TravelWatch would support the principle of charging road users to access the passenger terminal(s) at the airport, only if there is a guarantee that the revenue so raised is ring fenced entirely for the purposes of improving transport access (including public transport) to and from the airport, and that there are sufficient viable alternatives to the private car to access the airport prior to the implementation of any such charge, and it is not used as a more general means of generating cash for the airport business.

In terms of your consultation questions we would answer as follows:-

- 1 *Is there any other policy statement that should influence the development of our strategy?*

London TravelWatch is not aware of any other policy statement that has not been taken account of in preparing the Surface Access Strategy.

- 2 *Have we correctly summarised existing transport networks and travel patterns?*

The Surface Access Strategy document clearly summarises the existing transport network and travel patterns.

- 3 *Do you agree with our assumptions and forecasting methodology?*

London TravelWatch is not a competent body to assess the assumptions and forecasting methodology employed by BAA in this case.

- 4 *Do you agree with the approach we have taken to developing the rail strategy?*

The rail strategy is consistent with previous London TravelWatch policy, but is dependent on the commitment of Network Rail and the Department for Transport to implement the enhancements in respect of additional track and rolling stock capacity. Therefore there must sufficient planning safeguards to ensure that these commitments are carried out.

- 5 *Do you agree that the rail strategy for Generation 2 should focus on improvements to services and infrastructure on the West Anglia Main Line, rather than a separate new line?*

The proposals must also ensure that existing users of the rail network are not unfairly disadvantaged in terms of service provision and the cost of travel. The option for providing additional tracks on the section of line between Copper Mill and Broxbourne Junctions would according to the draft Greater Anglia Route Utilisation Strategy also enable the provision of a four train per hour local service from the Lea Valley route to Liverpool Street in line with the Mayor's aspirations. The provision of new line alignments from either the Chingford or Central lines would not necessarily bring this benefit.

- 6 *Do you agree that the growth of passenger demand on trains to Stansted should be met firstly by increasing the length of the trains?*

The lengthening of trains to 12 cars would be a passenger benefit as it would reduce current and potential overcrowding.

- 7 *(a) Do you agree in principle that at some stage in the future peak hour services to/from the Airport should be dedicated, stopping only at Tottenham Hale between the Airport and Liverpool Street?*
(b) Do you agree in principle with the proposals for separate peak hour provision for regional rail users from Harlow Town and Bishop's Stortford?

These proposals have a number of merits, however, London TravelWatch needs to be satisfied that sufficient capacity is available in addition to the proposed four tracking of the Lea Valley line to sustain additional trains across Broxbourne Junction and between Tottenham Hale and Liverpool Street, and provide a two train per hour local service calling at all stations between Broxbourne and Bishops Stortford.

- 8 *Are you aware of other plans that would affect the West Anglia Main Line that we have not identified and that could affect our preferred strategy?*

London TravelWatch is not aware of any other plans for the West Anglia Main Line that has not been taken account of in preparing the Surface Access Strategy.

- 9 *Do you agree with our proposals for enhanced bus and coach services?*

The formation of a quality bus partnership covering all coach and bus services to the airport, that London TravelWatch previously recommended has not been pursued as yet. It is therefore recommended that this should be made a planning condition.

- 10 *What are your views on charging Airport users to access the Airport?*

Please see condition (f) above .

- 11 *Which of the alternative local road alignments (Option a or Option b) near Tye Green do you prefer?*

- 12 *Which of the potential western alignments for re-reconnecting the B1256 to the Airport (Option c or Option d)) do you prefer?*

- 13 *Which of the Harcamlow Way Options (g or h) do you prefer near Parsonage Road?*

- 14 *Which of the Harcamlow Way Options (e or f) do you prefer near the Roding Balancing ponds?*

These detailed questions relate to the alignment of individual roads in the vicinity of the airport. These are located outwith London TravelWatch's remit and we have no view on these proposals.

- 15 *Overall, have we identified the correct surface access enhancements to support the needs of the Airport as it grows beyond the capacity of the single runway? Are there any enhancements you believe are necessary that have not been included, or are there enhancements that have been included that you believe are unnecessary?*

See preceding comments.

- 16 *Are there elements of the surface access enhancement costs that you believe should be estimated differently? If so please describe: (a) which cost elements cause you concern; and (b) how you believe those cost elements should have been estimated.*

London TravelWatch is not a competent body to assess the costing methodology employed by BAA in this case.

- 17 *Do you have any views on the approach taken to: (a) cost-sharing discussions with the DfT relating to M11 widening; (b) the costs of Airport access enhancements and the stopping up and diversion of local roads; and (c) funding discussions with the DfT relating to the costs of G2 rail enhancements?*

The remit of London TravelWatch does not cover parts (a) and (b) of this question. In relation to part (c), given the critical importance of the infrastructure improvements to meeting the need for enhanced surface to the airport, and that the benefits of such work would bring to the airport's operator, it appears reasonable that the bulk of these costs should be borne by BAA.

If you have any queries on this response, please do not hesitate to contact us at the address on page one.

Yours sincerely

Tim Bellenger

Director - Research and Development

Fax: 020 7726 9999

Switchboard Telephone: 020 7505 9000

Email: tim.bellenger@londontravelwatch.org.uk

