

Additional factors that should be addressed in any station modelling for a revised Transport Assessment

The following points have been highlighted in TfL response to the previous Transport Assessment and should be addressed in any future Transport Assessment on the impacts of the station.

1. The applicant's assessment assumes that the impacts of the development proposal on station congestion are treated as 'special events', thereby avoiding and reducing requirements and potential mitigations. The TfL Station Planning Standards Guidance sets out that *"If special events are a regular occurrence, such as football matches every other week, then station capacity and design shall reflect this situation"*. The 300 event days per year clearly must be considered to be a regular occurrence and should therefore be regarded as 'normal operation', with station capacity, design and management standards reflecting this situation.
2. The modelling assumes that some station gatelines are left open on events days. Having the gates open leads to higher flow rate (50 passengers per minute compared to 25) but will lead to revenue loss. This is not procedure for normal operation and the modelling should include gates operating in the normal way.
3. The modelling does not compare the proposed development flows with a comparable base. In creating their own model for the development scenario the applicant has made several Legion modelling adjustments to aid with the flow of passengers (such as use of drift zones and direction modifiers) and which were not retrospectively applied to the base modelling. If this was applied to the base it would improve the results for the base. This would lead to an increase in the change in crowding levels between the base and Momentum model. This can be addressed by running the revised model with the base demand to create a new base and compare results against this new base.
4. The reports on station congestion do not necessarily reflect the busiest time for the station. Maps used in the TA show densities experienced between 1730 and 1745. The maps for 1745-1800 should be provided; as this is when the modelled demand at the station is at its highest (we may also need other time periods subject to the refinement of the arrival profile).
5. The revised models assume the re-routing of passengers. This has an adverse impact on journey times for some background passengers which are not quantified in the TA. The applicant should therefore consider the effect on increased journey times from rerouting passengers and increased crowding.
6. It is unclear how event users have been assigned to the different train services serving Stratford station. This will need to be presented in more detail.
7. Further information is required as to how the ticket hall splits as shown in the model will be managed and mitigated. Without this, sensitivities on ticket hall proportions should be carried out.
8. While TfL's assessment shows that Stratford Station will need significant interventions by 2031, it is clear that the flows to and from the proposed development will materially shorten the period before further station control (including closure to entries) will need to be instigated. Therefore some level of future year assessment and interventions should be considered, and this will need to be agreed with Network Rail and rail operators. Network Rail to advise – we will coordinate a separate meeting with Momentum and ensure they are updated on our capacity enhancement proposals -> timeline, demand etc.

In addition to this the following should be generated

1. Any assessments should also be carried out considering different arrival profiles for MSG (including an arrival profile based upon O2 arrival profile- provided by TfL). This arrival profile should be used in all testing.
2. If the start time is adjusted then appropriate and justified adjusted arrival profile should be applied (i.e. moving event back by 30 minutes will not just mean people arrive 30 minutes later). Sensitivities, including 50%, should be carried out.
3. Analysis, such as crowding levels, should be provided for the key parts of the station. This should include all subways, all platforms and all the ticket halls.
4. It should be demonstrated that basic audit checks have been carried out on the model, to include a check of inputs against outputs (OD matrix export on running the model)
5. Consideration should be given to the variability of the train service during events such as cancellation/delays. Consider the impact of disruption has on train loading and station crowding levels.
6. The gatelines in the Northern TH are not shown as they are currently operated. This needs to be corrected in future models.
7. Ensure that they are using the correct Jubilee exit final destination splits in the OD matrix. Perturbation around these exit splits- for example changing what proportion of passengers from the Jubilee platform leave by the different ticket halls. Should state methodology will be used prior to modelling.
8. Should be testing with 2024/2025 background demand or whatever year the venue will be opening.
9. Should be testing with future years background demand to ensure the venue will work in future years. Network Rail will provide the appropriate data to enable this.