

From: [Buttigieg David \(LO\)](#)
To: [Kumapley Seyram](#)
Cc: [Brady Colin](#); [Porter Chris](#)
Subject: RE: Confidential - Draft Strategic Outline Business Case for the WLO
Date: 05 March 2019 10:05:50
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
Sensitivity: Confidential

Seyram

Apologies for the delay please see some initial responses in [red](#).

Happy to discuss.

Thanks

David.

From: Buttigieg David (LO)
Sent: 01 March 2019 12:27
To: Kumapley Seyram
Cc: Brady Colin; Porter Chris
Subject: RE: Confidential - Draft Strategic Outline Business Case for the WLO
Sensitivity: Confidential

Hi Seyram

I have just spoken to Chris I don't think there is anything too contentious here bearing in mind where we are with the development of this project. I will look to draft some responses back this afternoon. Chris is going to pick up the first point because the impact of an Overground station at OOC on the HS2/Crossrail/GWML station should have been picked up in the business case for the Overground station.

Thanks

David.

From: Kumapley Seyram
Sent: 28 February 2019 13:15
To: Buttigieg David (LO)
Cc: Brady Colin; Porter Chris
Subject: FW: Confidential - Draft Strategic Outline Business Case for the WLO
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Hello David

We have received feedback from [REDACTED] (Network Rail) on the WLO SOBC in the email below. Most of these relate to your input for the report. Are you able to review the comments and let Colin/I know what changes to make?

To keep to our programme we intend to circulate this document to Matt Yates & Geoff Hobbs early next week so would appreciate a response from you on this to let me know if you are able to make amendments to your section in the timeframe (or when we are likely to get it).

If there are any further questions please get in touch.

Regards

Seyram

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 February 2019 12:56
To: Kumapley Seyram
Subject: RE: Confidential - Draft Strategic Outline Business Case for the WLO
Sensitivity: Confidential

Dear Seyram,

Thank you for sharing the SOBC draft for consultation. The proposal covers 5 Network Rail routes. Please see below, some summary comments for consideration for your final document:

- A single programme level view of works in the Old Oak Common area needs to be taken for further development of the scheme. This is particularly the case in terms of the effects of interchange and increased demand on the Elizabeth Line and at Old Oak GWML station in the future.

Was this not done as part of the OOC Overground Stations Business Case – discussed previously with Chris.

- As a general point, the document is not clear how the capacity of the existing infrastructure to accommodate the additional services has been assessed. It is important for a clear description of this and what further assessment will be needed post SOBC to achieve more certainty in the cost and scope of the scheme.

Ensuring there is enough capacity of the existing line of route infrastructure to accommodate the proposed new service will be established through the timetable study. If existing line of route infrastructure can't provide the capacity required the NR team that does this could also propose potential additional infrastructure to resolve capacity issues.

With regards to station capacity this is covered in some respects by section 2.8.2. However relooking at this we could state that as part of GRIP 2 station capacity at existing stations will be tested to determine if capacity interventions are required to accommodate additional users of the station driven by the new WLO service. Any new stations proposed on the line of route will be designed to accommodate expected future demand of the WLO service.

- Reference 3.3.1.4 refers to "provision for infrastructure maintenance and renewals is at least part covered by the Fixed Track Access Charge (FTAC) included within operating costs". It's not clear where the balance of the additional maintenance costs of using the existing infrastructure have been obtained. It is important for this to be explained and note that it would be expected these additional costs include those for the future (CP6).

I understand that a proportion of the FTAC which an operator pays to NR is to cover maintenance and renewals of the infrastructure that it runs on. I'm not clear what balance James is referring to? My understanding is the FTAC changes from control period to control period (we will shortly be entering control period 6). However I must admit this is an area which I'm not too clued up on but Alan Smart should be able to help.

- The description of 'Heavy rail options' simply note that existing infrastructure on the MML will be used. No additional capital costs allocated above new platforms have been used (assume on the Hendon lines).

I'm not sure I understand this comment which section is it in relation to?

- It is important to recognise the interaction and any conflicts with the new Brent Cross station design.

Noted that could be added to Table 29 in section 2.7.7.1. I think the message is that the proposals of both schemes will need to integrate. I think a big risk is phasing as my understanding is that the new Brent Cross design is progressing and would need to ensure there is provision for WLO to be provided at a later date.

- There is no consideration of the on impacts on freight services of using the Hendon lines (and limited for the Dudding Hill line). This is particularly the case for regulation of services. It is important to acknowledge at this stage even if further work is planned.

The Operational Assessment in 2.7.8 focuses on areas where London Overground currently run only in the core route this was as discussed previously due to concerns that they shouldn't be commenting on other areas of the route where we don't already run. Maybe there should be a clear statement of this in the text.

Section 2.7.8.5 refers to undertaking a full timetable study to determine full operational feasibility this impact on freight using the Hendon Lines (along with all other areas of the proposed route) will need to be assessed as part of this.

- It is important to reference any risks to delivery and operation and any power supply assumptions.

The document doesn't have a specific section on risks I don't believe I could try and throw something together if needed?

The document states that traction power modelling is required to be undertaken. As this has not been done yet I guess we must assume that there is enough power for the extra services until the modelling proves otherwise.

- It should be noted that there are already other long term aspirations for greater use of parts of the route that should be acknowledged. In particular, the Hounslow loop for possible services to Heathrow airport in the future.

Maybe this aspiration should be specifically mentioned in section 2.8.4. If we don't already we should state that we will work with NR Long Term Planning to understand the viability of the scheme with their long term aspirations in mind. Although we have to be careful with this as a lot of NR aspirations never materialises mostly due to funding constraints.

I hope this is helpful. Very happy to discuss further or provide greater clarity.

Best regards,

[REDACTED] | Lead Strategic Planner [REDACTED]
cid:image003.png@01D44366.B18BC780

From: Kumapley Seyram
Sent: 19 February 2019 13:37

To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Paul; [REDACTED]
Cc: Porter Chris; Brady Colin
Subject: Confidential - Draft Strategic Outline Business Case for the WLO
Sensitivity: Confidential

Hello everyone

We now have a confidential draft of the SOBC for the WLO to share with you all. This has been developed to incorporate feedback from the sessions we have had with you over the course of this project. At this point we would welcome your comments before the document is finalised. We would also appreciate it if you could review Table 28 on policy alignment in particular and let us know if there's any additional policy that should be captured in this Table.

Please can you provide any comments or feedback on this document by [COP Tuesday 26th February 2019](#).

Warm regards

Seyram

Seyram Kumapley | City Planner | City Planning
9th Floor, 5 Endeavour Square, Westfield Avenue, Stratford, London E20 1JN
Tel: [REDACTED]

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at postmaster@tfl.gov.uk and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the

contents of this email and any attached files

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at 55 Broadway, London, SW1H 0DB Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses

The content of this email (and any attachment) is confidential It may also be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure
This email should not be used by anyone who is not an original intended recipient, nor may it be copied or disclosed to anyone who is not an original intended recipient

If you have received this email by mistake please notify us by emailing the sender, and then delete the email and any copies from your system

Liability cannot be accepted for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of Network Rail
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited registered in England and Wales No 2904587, registered office Network Rail, 2nd Floor, One Eversholt Street, London, NW1 2DN

Click [here](#) to report this email as SPAM