



Passenger Focus' response to Network
Rail's Kent Route Utilisation Strategy draft
for consultation

July 2009

Passenger Focus is the independent national rail consumer watchdog. It is an executive non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Transport.

Our mission is to get the best deal for Britain's rail passengers. We have two main aims: to influence both long and short term decisions and issues that affect passengers; and to help passengers through advice, advocacy and empowerment.

With a strong emphasis on evidence-based campaigning and research, we ensure that we know what is happening on the ground. We use our knowledge to influence decisions on behalf of rail passengers and we work with the rail industry, other passenger groups and Government to secure journey improvements.

Our vision is to ensure that the rail industry and Government are always

‘putting rail passengers first’

This will be achieved through our mission of

‘getting the best deal for passengers’

Contents

	Page
1. Executive summary	4
2. Recommendations	5
3. Introduction	6
4. Scope: Kent geography	7
5. General comments	
1. East Kent re-signalling	7
2. The full Thameslink programme	8
3. Ashford - Hastings	8
4. Intra-Kent links	8
5. Stations and interchange	8
6. Social inclusion	10
7. Getting to the station	10
8. Tourism	10
9. Growth	11
10 High speed	12
6. Analysis of options	
1. Gap A - between committed capacity and forecast future peak demand	15
2. Gap B - between the planned train services in Kent and the train service consistent with future demand across all modes of transport	18
3. Gap C - the accessibility of the rail network	22
4. Gap D - between evening, weekend and bank holiday train services and predicted demand for travel at those times	27
5. Gap E - between the network's current ability to accommodate freight and future demand	31
6. Gap F - between expected train performance and strategic level interventions to reduce major delays	32
7. Summary table of Passenger Focus' responses to RUS options	34

Appendices

A. List of consultees	36
B. Bibliography	37
C. Sample questionnaire used for Kent RUS passenger research	38

1. Executive summary

The numbers of people travelling by rail are increasing. Performance on the railways is steadily improving and passenger satisfaction is rising. Passenger Focus expects the programme of Route Utilisation Strategies (RUSs) across the rail network to build on this; to allow for continued passenger growth, to further improve performance and to improve passenger satisfaction.

The RUS objective is defined as “*The effective and efficient use and development of the capacity available, consistent with funding that is, or is reasonably likely to become, available during the period of the RUS and with the licence holder’s performance of the duty*¹.”

Passenger Focus has a wealth of research material regarding what passengers want, and adds to this as the RUS programme rolls out across the network. This evidence informs our input to specific RUS consultations at route level. Drivers of passenger satisfaction change over time, but punctuality and reliability have been the main drivers of passenger satisfaction since the National Passenger Survey (NPS) began in 1999. Issues such as facilities for car parking, frequency of train services and connections with other train services have also been clear factors in overall satisfaction ratings. Passenger Focus expects RUSs to address the link between passenger satisfaction and the development of capacity.

Our submission is based on comprehensive research with 4,914² passengers, looking from the passenger viewpoint at the options proposed for inclusion in the final RUS, as well as generic issues regarding the passenger viewpoint on fares, satisfaction and wider rail issues.

Economic growth across parts of the RUS area is evident with new building developments, job creation and improved focus on leisure and social opportunities. The South East Plan envisages the development of regional ‘hubs’ such as Ashford, Medway Tonbridge, Tunbridge Well, Canterbury and Maidstone. Also, the Thames Gateway and Ashford are two designated growth areas. However, there are many other towns and villages covered within the geographic scope of this RUS consultation that suffer from high levels of social and rural deprivation. Improvements to rail services in such areas are expected to play a key role in facilitating the regeneration required.

It is clear that the railways in Kent, operated by Southeastern, are performing with some degree of success, with Southeastern achieving an overall satisfaction rating of 76% (of 1,501 passengers surveyed)³. Performance has steadily improved over the

¹ Extract from Office of Rail Regulation Guidelines on RUSs (June 2005)

² 913 on the East Kent via Faversham, 802 on the Medway Towns, 776 on the Ashford via Tonbridge and 922 on the Ashford via Maidstone East lines, March 2009; 1,501 on Southeastern for the Spring 2009 National Passenger Survey.

³ National Passenger Survey, Passenger Focus, Spring 2009.

last three years and there are solid foundations upon which the RUS can build to achieve higher levels of passenger satisfaction.

The RUS proposes many sensible options to make “*efficient use and development of the capacity available*” which we support. However, our new research demonstrates some options which Network Rail propose to be considered further as part of the final RUS *are not supported by passengers*, and therefore alternatives should be considered, *ensuring the passenger viewpoint is at the heart of the decision-making process*.

This would ensure that train services meet passenger expectations, and avoids the scenario that the RUS provides an operational solution to improve capacity and performance that creates changes in service patterns that do not meet the needs of passengers.

Passengers will want to know what the RUS offers to those who use the railway – and who pay for it. Do the options provide benefits? Do they offer solutions to difficulties or shortcomings in the present service? Will they match passengers’ priorities and:

- increase frequencies
- increase connectivity
- increase reliability
- improve punctuality
- improve stations?

Passengers also want to know how the proposals identified in the draft RUS will be prioritised, delivered and funded. If the RUS is to avoid becoming just another planning document that sits on the shelf it needs to provide a mechanism for taking forward its longer term requirements and it must include an estimate of costings, when the work might be done, and possible sources of funding.

2. Recommendations

Our key recommendations for inclusion in the final RUS are:

- options that provide the maximum amount of capacity to address both current and future growth forecasts
- options that drive a real step-change in improved passenger services in terms of journey times
- options that will ensure the new High Speed Domestic services provide benefits for as many passengers as possible
- options that meet passengers’ aspirations and requirements for greater frequency and more reliable evening and weekend services
- options that maintain existing connections within Kent such as Maidstone to the City

- options to improve access to, and facilities at, stations
- options that are capable of integrating with other proposals for social and economic development in the region.

3. Introduction

Passenger Focus welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Kent Route Utilisation Strategy Draft for Consultation ('the Draft RUS'). Passenger Focus supports the broad objectives behind the RUS process and welcomes both the formal and informal consultative approach adopted by Network Rail.

Passenger Focus believes that the RUS is a vital component to inform the implementation of the Southeastern Regional Planning Assessment (RPA), the Regional Economic Strategy, Kent Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 and the Medway Local Transport Plan 2006-2011.

We understand there are practicalities around funding some of the proposed RUS options. However, we make no apologies for having an aspirational vision of the future of the rail network in the area covered by the Kent RUS. The total number of passenger journeys on services in the 2007-08 financial year was 62.8 million in Kent and Medway alone. Demand forecasts indicate up to 2.8% growth in passenger demand per annum over the next ten years, a total of 40%. An aspirational approach is required to manage current and predicted demand in growth and to meet the stated transport objectives to promote economic growth, social inclusion, health and protection of our environment through a safe, integrated, effective and efficient transport system.

Our response to this consultation is informed by liaison with stakeholders and user groups, our postbag, existing research, and bespoke research commissioned by Passenger Focus. As an evidence-based organisation, the Passenger Focus response to the consultation incorporates research with 4,914⁴ passengers, including findings obtained from new and comprehensive passenger research conducted on rail services in Kent⁵.

The priority generic issues for passengers from that new research can be summarised as:

- **punctuality and reliability of the train**
- **value for money for the price of the ticket**
- **being able to get a seat**
- **frequency of the trains on the route**
- **journey time.**

Further passenger issues:

⁴ *ibid.* footnote 2

⁵ Continental, for Passenger Focus, March, 2009.

- **personal security on trains**
- **provision of information about train times/platforms**
- **not having to change trains**
- **personal security at stations.**

4. Scope: Kent geography

The consultation document describes the Kent RUS as being of specific interest to passengers who use Southeastern's mainline services to and from Victoria, Charing Cross and Cannon Street. It also covers passengers who will use the high speed services to St Pancras and Southern Marshlink services into Ashford. The main purpose of most mainline passenger journeys is for commuting to and from London.

The Kent RUS has close links to both the published South London RUS and the Sussex RUS which is being consulted on. We note that Network Rail are treating the High Speed services as being outside their control for the purpose of the RUS whilst at the same time ensuring that its significance is properly factored into the RUS considerations.

5. General comments

5.1 East Kent re-signalling

We note the current plan to abolish the cross-over at the eastern end of the station. It is worth including the request we have made previously to retain the Eastern cross-over at Herne Bay and convert it to a facing crossover instead of the current trailing one.

This would have two major advantages. The first is that it would potentially make it possible for all off-peak trains to call at the 'down' platform, which is step-free. Other than this proposal being accepted it is difficult to see any way in which the DDA can be complied with at this station, even within the extended timescale that rail companies have been allowed to comply. Information from Network Rail is that this is not being pursued as South Eastern do not see a business case for it. This may be true within the short-term period of their existing franchise, but this route strategy is supposed to last for a longer period, so this objection should not rule the improvement out as it should be considered from a long term perspective.

The other advantage would be that single-line working could then be instituted between Faversham and Herne Bay and Herne Bay and Margate without trains having to reverse. This should enable trains to run in the late evenings and on weekends instead of buses when engineering work is taking place. There is, after all, a Network Rail commitment to run trains with fewer bus substitutions.

5.2 The Full Thameslink Programme

The proposal to remove direct Cannon street services from Hastings and the restriction of Hasting trains to eight car formations is unwelcome and Passenger

Focus recommends that the power on this line should be upgraded to facilitate 12 car train operations.

5.3 Ashford – Hastings

We note and support recommendations which are aimed at meeting the long held aspiration for faster journey times and better connections between Southern's Hastings to Ashford services and Southeastern services and especially with the new high speed trains.

5.4 Intra-Kent links

The RUS consultation document highlights the areas where rail links are weak or non-existent; for example there is no direct train link between Maidstone East and the Medway Towns. Passenger Focus believes it essential that inter-regional rail links are strengthened where they are deemed to be poor and established where they are currently missing to enable people to travel more easily between areas.

Intra-Kent links are currently mainly fulfilled by the good road network within Kent. Equally good rail links within Kent are required to meet the needs of passengers who would like an alternative to driving wherever possible. Rail passengers have an opportunity to work during their travel time on train journeys or simply relax, and improved technology has made it easier for laptops and mobile phones to be used on the train keeping passengers in touch and in easy contact whilst they are on the move.

5.5 Stations and interchange

The facilities and standards at stations are very important to passengers. The availability of car parks, as well as adequate capacity, plays an important role in passengers' decision to use the railways. The quality and convenience of the rail services on offer will also inform passengers' decisions to 'railhead' to stations and car parks other than those closest to their home.

Passengers must remain free to make their own choices as to which station they use. However it is very important to find ways of improving the quality of services offered on some railway lines (such as the Maidstone East Line) to encourage the full use of its available capacity.

Network Rail has developed its National Stations Improvement Programme as a means to improve the standard of stations. Stations in the RUS area range from barely improved wayside platforms such as Swale to largely rebuilt stations such as Ashford International.

The Kent Local Development Group is successfully implementing a programme of station improvements aimed at delivering better passenger satisfaction scores. Some fast-track improvements are already underway at Ashford International and Canterbury West stations aimed at providing much improved passenger facilities in time for the start of the high speed domestic service. The new modular station at

Greenhithe also provides a useful vision and template for possible future station developments within Kent.

Appendix B of the RUS consultation document highlights the station usage and facilities in the region. A balanced approach is required when trying to understand the reasons for stations having a low footfall. On the one hand demand for services at some stations is low, whilst on the other the service provision is low thereby reducing demand. The large number of stations, especially those which are quite closely spaced, has an impact on the overall journey times and speed.

The footfall figures released by the Office of Rail Regulation⁶ give an indication of patronage at stations – with some well-known caveats⁷ - and there is obviously a clear correlation between size of local population and footfall at the local station. However that link is not the only one, demand is also linked to service provision and reasons/need for travel. Demand is also linked to service provision and reasons/need for travel.

Northern, in their response⁸ to the Office of Rail Regulation regarding Network Rail's Strategic Business Plan, state (para 7.16):

“In terms of leverage of third party investment for station improvements, this should be considered an essential source of funding given the size, age and condition of the station portfolio. More should be done to encourage Councils and other local organisations to perceive the station as gateway to their communities and acknowledge the importance of rail to their connectivity and therefore economic well being. Third party funding for stations should not be seen as a “nice to have” but as a legitimate area of spend for local public and private organisations.”

That is equally valid for stations in the Kent RUS area. The RUS should begin the essential process of creating a strategy for improving stations and making the best use of them – both by and for the communities they serve.

5.6 Social inclusion

Kent's reputation as the Garden of England hides the contrasting fortunes of areas such as East Kent and coastal towns which have continued to lag behind the average social and economic development not only in the South East but also in England.

The Regional Spatial Strategy, which is being developed, and the Regional Planning Assessment highlight the importance of linking the RUS area to key urban centres to contribute to the regeneration of socially deprived areas by providing greater employment, education and leisure opportunities.

⁶ Office of Rail Regulation file “station_usage_2007_08”

⁷ Journeys using PTE and other “intermodal” tickets are hard to capture; not a problem at the stations listed here

⁸ Letter dated 8 January 2008, from the ORR web site

Improved connectivity is recognised in the RUS as important for attracting inward investment and facilitating the deployment of strategic employment sites. Passenger Focus believes it is essential that the need to improve social inclusion should be one of the drivers of this RUS.

5.7 Getting to the station

The RUS acknowledges the need to identify ways in which station accessibility issues such as rail heading can be properly addressed. We would support the development of station travel plans at relevant stations in addition to ensuring the service options are made as attractive as possible to encourage passengers to use the services closest to them where possible.

The cost of car parking also needs to be considered. For instance some stations that should be very popular are fairly empty (despite investment by Connex/SET/Southeastern in resurfacing/lighting/security and ticket machines). The primary reason for this low use must be the cost. As an example Higham has around 110 cars per day with people parking across the entrances, blocking in other cars and using every available space and sometimes affecting the bus turning circle.

It is too early to say how quickly car parking at Ebbsfleet station car parking will reach near full capacity but it is recommended that the RUS ensures that it factors in the development of facilities which meet passengers' needs.

5.8 Tourism

Within Kent, tourism is one of the mainstays of the economy and is a major source of employment and revenue. Bodies such as Visit Kent are doing a good job in promoting tourism. Encouraging more leisure travel especially during the off peak can play a major role in improving the efficiency of the rail services in Kent. In 2007 the total number of jobs supported by tourism was estimated⁹ to be 7.2% of all employment in Kent, and in 2006 47.7 million day visits were made to Kent.

“The advent of domestic services on the new high speed line at the end of 2009 will have a major impact on many travel times.....and make a dramatic difference to the rural and coastal areas¹⁰.”

Passenger Focus believes it is essential that the final RUS considers tourism as a relevant factor in planning the area's train services.

5.9 Growth

⁹ Kent County Council figures.

¹⁰ Kent and Medway Tourism Development Framework, Kent CC, July 2009.

The Kent RUS Draft for Consultation (page 82) suggests that passenger demand is expected to grow by 32% up to 2019. The following table shows stations where footfalls already show large increases over the three years 2005 - 2008.

Table 5.1¹¹

Station	Footfall			Change 06-07	Change 07-08	Change 06-08
	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8			
Appledore	20,718	25,693	31,457	24.01%	22.43%	51.83%
Ashford Intl.	2,408,539	2,606,065	2,819,499	8.20%	8.19%	17.06%
Bekesbourne	39,140	49,045	48,737	25.31%	-0.63%	24.52%
Borough Green	393,726	420,201	444,520	6.72%	5.79%	12.90%
Broadstairs	486,005	498,262	537,275	2.52%	7.83%	10.55%
Bromley South	4,474,726	5,735,906	6,286,468	28.18%	9.60%	40.49%
Farningham Rd.	178,361	197,952	222,565	10.98%	12.43%	24.78%
Faversham	1,365,823	1,461,177	1,545,110	6.98%	5.74%	13.13%
Gillingham	2,033,034	2,200,842	2,348,656	8.25%	6.72%	15.52%
Headcorn	564,892	621,876	651,630	10.09%	4.78%	15.35%
Herne Bay	736,048	762,109	808,957	3.54%	6.15%	9.91%
Kearsney	41,762	40,183	45,789	-3.78%	13.95%	9.64%
Lenham	164,524	168,332	193,168	2.31%	14.75%	17.41%
Cannon Street	17,613,560	21,106,127	22,177,065	19.83%	5.07%	25.91%
Charing Cross	28,562,268	34,779,287	39,063,680	21.77%	12.32%	36.77%
Victoria	47,859,728	66,749,335	77,462,118	39.47%	16.05%	61.85%
Marden	237,130	233,383	273,243	-1.58%	17.08%	15.23%
Margate	595,453	660,439	671,790	10.91%	1.72%	12.82%
Paddock Wood	1,091,477	1,138,011	1,195,185	4.26%	5.02%	9.50%
Rochester	705,227	760,800	853,460	7.88%	12.18%	21.02%
Sandwich	284,243	327,785	347,949	15.32%	6.15%	22.41%
Staplehurst	840,190	886,971	933,658	5.57%	5.26%	11.12%
Strood	694,422	764,396	892,705	10.08%	16.79%	28.55%
Westenhanger	29,954	42,240	60,110	41.02%	42.31%	100.67%
Whitstable	701,477	773,716	775,633	10.30%	0.25%	10.57%

The number of passenger journeys on the new high speed services from the new Ebbsfleet International station and existing stations such as Ashford, Dover, Canterbury and Folkestone is expected to rise considerably. Significant housing development is also planned for the Thames Gateway and Ashford areas.

It is essential that the Kent RUS is linked into these plans to ensure that rail services are developed in time to meet this expected population growth. If improvements to services are only available afterwards potential passengers will have already decided on their travel plans and fewer will choose rail.

¹¹ Ibid. reference 6.

Passenger Focus believes it is essential that overall population growth, as well as specific new housing and business developments, should be a major consideration in timetable and franchise planning. It is a fundamental requirement that good rail links are in place **before** new housing and employment sites are developed. This RUS needs to formally recognise that.

5.10 High Speed

Southeastern's new High Speed (HS) service will be a welcome addition for many existing passengers and is expected to attract many new passengers.

Figure 5.1 awareness of High Speed (HS) service

Route	Aware of HS service?	Consider using HS service?		
		yes	no	not sure
Faversham	60%	56%	22%	22%
Medway Towns	49%	58%	21%	21%
Ashford/Tonbridge	71%	47%	36%	17%
Maidstone East	54%	22%	22%	56%

There is a direct correlation between these results and the impact the new HS services will have on timetables and journey times. Perhaps a reflection of the publicity that the different routes have experienced, it is noticeable that the route with the greatest awareness of the HS service, Ashford - Tonbridge, has the second lowest intention to use it. The route through Maidstone has the lowest likelihood, but no direct connection to High Speed One (HS1), the high-speed line.

Passengers' reasons for not using the service again reflect the geography of each route and how they will be linked to the new HS services.

Figure 5.2 Reasons for non-use¹²

Route	St. Pancras not convenient	Too expensive	Other, inc. no station near
Faversham	34%	28%	18%
Medway Towns	25%	17%	53%
Ashford/Tonbridge	24%	22%	7%
Maidstone East	12%	8%	84%

The two routes which will gain least from the new services are notable in their negative responses. Asked in isolation, the question "Would London St. Pancras be a more convenient station?" resulted in very varied responses; less convenient: Faversham route: 27%; Medway Towns: 36%; Ashford - Tonbridge: 44%; Maidstone East route: 41%. The variability suggests that forecasted demand will be a pudding proven in the eating.

¹² Passengers who answered "no" to the question "would you consider using the HS service?"

Another unproven aspect is the proposed pricing; we asked passengers what levels of premium fare they would be prepared to pay.

Figure 5.3 HS premium fares: likelihood of use v. fare increase

Premium	Likelihood	Faversham	Medway	Ashford - Tonbridge	Maidstone East
up to 10%	likely	54%	55%	71%	51%
	unlikely	25%	26%	13%	22%
	neither	7%	9%	8%	9%
up to 20%	likely	23%	28%	41%	22%
	unlikely	51%	49%	41%	47%
	neither	14%	14%	12%	15%
up to 30%	likely	5%	7%	8%	5%
	unlikely	73%	76%	74%	70%
	neither	9%	8%	11%	8%
up to 40%	likely	4%	5%	4%	2%
	unlikely	78%	84%	83%	76%
	neither	4%	2%	5%	4%

It is too early to determine whether the actual use of the high speed service will be inhibited by the current level of premium fares charged. Our research¹³ shows that there is likely to be a high degree of price sensitivity by some passengers who would like to use the high speed service but who may need to be convinced of the full benefits or value for money. It will therefore be very important that any assumptions made should include lower fare options than the proposed premium levels.

Our evidence shows that over 50% of passengers would be willing to use high speed services if the premium fare is set at up to 10% of existing fares. The number drops very sharply to an average of just under 30% passengers willing to use high speed services if the increase is between 10 and 20%. Only 6% are willing to pay increases of 30% and fewer than 4% would be willing to use the service if the premium charged is 40%.

Passenger Focus sees this as strong evidence that the success of the high speed service is inextricably linked to applying a fair pricing policy which recognises the socio-economic circumstances faced by passengers living in Kent.

The scope for increasing high speed services has been recognised by this RUS and we will strongly support consideration of this option. However we still expect all necessary options to develop the infrastructure and services on the classic services to be fully pursued.

¹³ Ibid. reference 5.

6. Analysis of Options

Our response to this option, as with the others in the Kent RUS, is supported by the results of the interviews of passengers undertaken on four of the main routes in the Kent RUS area:

1. East Kent via Faversham
2. The Medway Towns
3. East Kent via Ashford and Tonbridge
4. Ashford International via Maidstone East.

A copy of the questionnaires is attached as appendix C, see page 35.

6.1 Gap A – between committed capacity and forecast future peak demand.

6.1.1 Option 1 additional high peak trains on the Tonbridge main line

Given the commitments under Thameslink and the South London RUS¹⁴, the conclusion that there is no affordable way to increase the number of peak services on the Tonbridge main line appears to be unarguable. However, if demand continues to grow, 'something will have to be done'. It is extremely likely that that something will be needed until after the period covered by the Kent RUS, but, given the long lead times involved in planning major infrastructure projects, it is essential that Network Rail, DfT and local government create the means to develop and maintain schemes that will be ready - and funded - for implementation when required.

6.1.2 Option 2 high peak train lengthening on the Tonbridge main line

Passenger Focus agrees that a priority in the Kent RUS must be to ensure twelve-car formations are provided for all the high-peak trains on the routes through Tonbridge. To achieve that we note that the electric power supply needs to be strengthened between Hastings and Tunbridge Wells, and the project to achieve that must be part of the recommendations of the Kent RUS.

We believe that other means to permit the operation of twelve-car trains - such as turn round drivers and selective door operation (SDO) - should also be included.

6.1.3 Options 3.1 - 3.3 running additional high peak trains via Bromley South

Each of these three options includes the words 'alleviate crowding in the Bromley South to London area' when describing the passenger impact. Additional capacity should be provided where it is most needed. Shorter-distance workings such as Bromley South offer the chance of more than one inbound trip during peak hours. We believe that option 3.3, additional services from 'a location in the Swanley area', is the best, as it concentrates the additional capacity where it is most needed.

¹⁴ South London Route Utilisation Strategy, Network Rail, March 2008.

6.1.4 Options 4.1 - 4.3 lengthening of high peak trains via Bromley South (post HLOS)

Passengers would expect some of the difficulties discussed in the assessments of these options to be designated as 'must do better', and not as 'too difficult' - consistent operation, day-in, day-out; fully developed and implemented HLOS plans and a close match between the network's capability and passenger demand. Platform extensions on the Maidstone East line and a turnback siding at Bearsted are a better match of passengers' requirements on that route than restricting its trains to eight cars.

We agree that all high peak services on the Chatham main line should be twelve cars.

6.1.5 Options 5.1 - 5.2 capacity in the shoulder peaks

Passengers expect their train to run on time; on all the routes we surveyed it came top, or second, in passengers' priorities for improvement¹⁵. Being able to get a seat is either third or fourth in their priorities. To help improve the value for money rating that passengers give the train service - always in the top two priorities for improvement - it is essential that on time trains provide enough seats.

Research¹⁶ into the willingness of commuters to travel in the 'shoulder' peaks typically finds that passengers require incentives such as discounts in the region of 25-30% before they are willing to consider travelling earlier or later. However, an annual season ticket typically already offers a discount on the price of a cheap day return¹⁷. Predicted growth in numbers travelling, coupled with the difficulty of persuading employers to move away from the traditional 'nine to five' approach to employment hours, means that it will be very difficult to produce a worthwhile shift in demand to travel at the high peak.

Passenger Focus therefore agrees with the conclusion that additional capacity in the shoulder peaks and the use of 'smart' ticketing technology (not necessarily 'smartcards' as noted in paragraph 8.8.7 of the Draft RUS) would not reduce the need for increased capacity in the high peak.

6.1.6 Options 6.1 - 6.6 providing further capacity on High Speed line services to St. Pancras

The difficulty of analysing future demand for services that are not yet operating is very great. The new High Speed services will provide opportunities for passengers from many places in Kent to access a wider range of destinations in London. They

¹⁵ Ibid. reference 5.

¹⁶ For example, "Edge of morning peak travel", Consolidated, for Passenger Focus, October, 2006.

¹⁷ For example, Maidstone East to London, assuming 230 days use of an annual season ticket is approximately £14.55 per day; off-peak return £15.60 (Source: Avantix Traveller).

will open up new opportunities in choosing employment, faster and easier connections for rail services and access to leisure activities.

On the other hand, the premium fares, and the fact that for passengers on the route through Faversham and the Medway Towns services to St. Pancras using the High Speed line will be less than ten minutes quicker than services to Victoria, make accurate predictions of demand for these new services particularly difficult.

Demand for access to the High Speed services from the Maidstone area at first sight makes option 6.4 - extending Ebbsfleet shuttles to Maidstone West - attractive. We question the appeal of a service that is inherently slow, but which charges premium fares. Passengers are more likely to respond to train services that offer significant benefits, and option 6.5, four trains an hour from Ashford, with the potential to further speed up trains from east of Ashford and provide 'meaningful crowding relief' for the Tonbridge main line, is welcome. We disagree with the conclusion to option 6.6, and state that we believe passengers will expect that HS1 is used to achieve the best benefits for passengers. Therefore analysis should be undertaken on the option and included in the final RUS because of the potential impact on the classic railway network in East Kent and through Tonbridge.

6.2 Gap B - between the planned train services in Kent and the train service consistent with future demand across all modes of transport.

6.2.1 Options 7.1 - 7.6 increasing off-peak frequencies

We asked specific questions about train frequencies in our survey. The responses to the question “How frequent should trains be outside peak times?” are shown below. The table shows weekday off-peak requirements; weekend frequencies are discussed in 6.4.1 on page 24, in our comments on option 11.

Figure 6.1 - off-peak requirements and current experience (as %)

Weekday off peak	Current frequency	Scored fairly/very good	Every 15 minutes	Every 20 minutes	Every 30 minutes	Total
E. Kent via Faversham	see Note 1	62	22	27	35	84
Medway Towns	see Note 2	73	26	28	30	84
Ashford - Tonbridge	see Note 3	63	14	25	45	84
via Maidstone E.	see Note 4	56	16	23	46	85

Figure 6.2 - off-peak frequencies

Note 1	Dover & Canterbury E. - Faversham/London	2 per hour
	intermediate stations	1 per hour
	Chestfield, Westgate	1 per hour
	all other stations Margate - Faversham	2 per hour
Note 2	to Victoria	4 per hour
	to Charing Cross	2 per hour
Note 3	Pluckley, Marden	1 per hour
	Ashford, Headcorn	2 per hour
	Staplehurst, Paddock Wood	3 per hour (irregular intervals)
Note 4	Charing - Bearsted, Barming, E. Malling, Kemsing - Victoria	1 per hour
	Bearsted, Maidstone E., W. Malling - Cannon St.	1 per hour
	Maidstone E., W. Malling, Borough Green - Victoria	2 per hour (irregular intervals)

To summarise the results of our survey, trains at least every half hour are the minimum requirement of more than four passengers in five. It is significant that on all four routes the frequency of trains is in the top four for priorities for improvement, and scores poorly (see figure 6.1) for satisfaction. Southeastern's average score for frequency is 73%; notably the same score as on the Medway Towns route, which has the highest, and most regular, frequency. Most stations on the two routes via Ashford have an irregular timetable with two trains per hour, approximately half an hour apart.

Another notable feature of the timetables for many of the stations we surveyed is the number of London terminals. With the introduction of domestic trains on HS1 in December 2009 St. Pancras will become another option for stations on all the routes except that through Maidstone East. Current proposals for the full Thameslink service are for that route to gain two trains per hour to Blackfriars and St. Pancras. However, it will lose its semi-fast train to Cannon Street in the December 2009 timetable. Stakeholders have made known their objections. Connections will be available at Swanley or Bromley South between trains on the Maidstone East line and Thameslink trains to Blackfriars, but main stations on the route will lose one of their three trains per hour.

Option 7.1 We urge Network Rail and Southeastern to undertake work to assess how a service to the City can be re-introduced as soon as possible.

Option 7.2 Usage of the stations along the route between Tonbridge and Redhill is low and unlikely to grow to levels that would support, by itself, two trains an hour. We note the difficulty of linking the Tonbridge to Redhill route to Gatwick Airport and Maidstone, as well as the small population of places between Tonbridge and Redhill.

Option 7.3 We note that the service will run between Tonbridge and Strood from December 2009. The easier links to larger centres could grow demand sufficiently to make two trains per hour viable, particularly if through services could be provided to Redhill and Gatwick Airport. However, we are aware of the severe capacity problems on the Brighton Main Line.

Option 7.4 We note the conclusion the Draft RUS reaches on the option to increase the service between Ashford and Hastings to two trains per hour. All options of this type, that require economic development and/or population growth to generate the benefits needed to justify their implementation, must be kept under review, and particular attention paid to potential development partners.

Options 7.5 and 7.6 We have commented in section 6.1.6 (page 14) on the extreme difficulty in assessing demand for domestic services on HS1. We agree that demand must be monitored and assessed so that action can be taken without delay when necessary.

6.2.2 Options 8.1 - 8.5 connectivity within and beyond the RUS area

Option 8.1 Passengers do not like having to change trains, neither do they like slow journeys. The existing Maidstone East to Canterbury West service is all-stations -

passengers rate journey time on the route at only 68% satisfied or good¹⁸. Aspirations for a Maidstone station on HS1, if fulfilled, would permit high speed services between Maidstone and Canterbury. Passenger Focus believes that the link between those places should be maintained. Our survey results show that passengers are more likely to reduce the number of journeys they make than they are to increase the number. Passenger Focus believes that the results warn Network Rail and Southeastern to avoid service reductions, *even if temporary*, as it will be difficult to return passenger demand to levels achieved before the change.

Figure 6.3 - propensity to travel

Route	Definitely travel more, if more frequent	Definitely travel less, if less frequent
via Faversham	6%	20%
Medway Towns	6%	16%
Ashford - Tonbridge	6%	15%
via Maidstone East	6%	15%

Option 8.2 Given the small demand and the operational difficulties in linking Medway Valley services to the Medway Towns via Strood, we agree with the conclusions reached in the Draft RUS.

Option 8.3 'Insufficient demand' has a strongly implied sense of finality, not always justified we believe. Attractive services that link people to areas of employment or leisure should be available to stimulate the area's economy. Again, Passenger Focus believes that the option should be kept under review, rather than closed.

Options 8.4 and 5 A similar comment applies here; our comments on options 7.2 and 7.3 are equally valid here. 'Keep under review' should be the conclusion, with potential development partners included in all reviews.

6.2.3 Option 9 reducing journey times

We agree with the comments in 8.14.9, page 141 of the Draft RUS, that improved frequencies can have the effect of reducing journey times because waiting time can be reduced. However, passengers can achieve the same result by checking their train times in a timetable.

Figure 6.4 - passengers' opinion of journey time

Route	Good or fairly good	Priority ranking
via Faversham	70%	5
Medway Towns	76%	5
Ashford - Tonbridge	62%	5
via Maidstone East	68%	5

¹⁸ Ibid. reference 5.

The whole range of measures listed in 8.14.3, page 140 in the Draft RUS, coupled with the analysis of station calls (8.14.10, page 141), should be used, to reduce journey times as much as possible. Sometimes passengers aspire to greater journey time reductions than it is possible to achieve. However, even when journey time savings are small, improved performance is possible, and would increase passengers' perception of 'value for money'.

6.3 Gap C - the Accessibility of the Rail Network.

6.3.1 Option 10 improving station accessibility

Car parking

Passenger Focus has undertaken various pieces of research into car parking; the work includes surveys for the Scotland RUS¹⁹ at a time charging was being proposed, and *Getting to the station*²⁰ which reported on work done to try to analyse how inadequate car parking capacity suppressed demand for off-peak services. It is felt that the availability of car parking can have far-reaching effects on patronage at certain stations, by skewing demand in favour of stations which have car park spaces available in the morning peak. Other factors are felt to act by artificially stimulating demand at some stations, and depressing it at others.

To try to get some current hard facts on the issue, we asked passengers a range of questions²¹ about their use and experiences of car parking. Dissatisfaction with car parking provision at stations is common; the overall NPS score for London and South East TOCs is only 41% satisfied, the lowest result for any station facility. Southeastern's overall score is even lower, only 32% of passengers rate their opinion of car parking facilities as 'satisfied or good'. However, the passengers questioned in our survey had a better opinion, scoring them from 53 - 63%.

The following section discusses the detail; information includes how many passengers use station car parks, the availability of spaces and ways people overcome the difficulties they experience.

Figure 6.5 - Percentage of passengers parking at stations in the peak

Frequency of travel	Via Faversham	Medway Towns	Ashford - Tonbridge	Maidstone East
5 days or more	13	12	13	17
3-4 days/week	5	5	5	3
1-2 days/week	4	3	6	4
few times/month	7	6	8	8
less often	11	12	12	11
never	59	61	56	56

The main reason for passengers' dissatisfaction with station car parks - lack of capacity - is shown by the results in fig. 6.6, which summarises their experiences. The results reflect the car park utilisation shown in figure 3.12 on page 37 of the Draft for Consultation.

¹⁹ Passenger Focus's response to Network Rail's Scotland RUS Draft for Consultation. Nov. 2006.

²⁰ SDG for Passenger Focus, March, 2007.

²¹ See appendix C, page 35

Figure 6.6 - availability of parking spaces

Availability	Via Faversham	Medway Towns	Ashford - Tonbridge	Maidstone East
always	30%	25%	52%	45%
most of the time	25%	25%	25%	24%
hardly ever	8%	7%	7%	11%
never	5%	5%	2%	4%

To try to understand the reasons for railheading, we asked passengers if they used the station nearest to their home, and if not, why that was the case. A small number of passengers never use their local station, typically because of issues with the capacity of the car park. It is important to note that passengers overcame the problem, apart from using a different station, by arranging lifts or walking. No route recorded passengers using a bus as an alternative way of reaching their local station.

Figure 6.7 - Reasons²² for non-use of station nearest passenger's home, because of issues with car parking (as %)

	Via Faversham	Medway Towns	Ashford - Tonbridge	Maidstone East
% not using nearest station	7	5	7	9
% ²³ citing car park problems	17	8	20	21
lack of space	45	62	57	60
too expensive	38	31	11	36
car park not secure	28	15	25	12

The lack of car parking spaces is one cause of the transfer of demand between stations. As noted in the Draft for Consultation and confirmed in our survey results, the route via Maidstone East has proportionately fewer car parking spaces, and there is high demand for spaces on the Ashford to Tonbridge line. The samples in our survey are too small to be statistically valid, but the results indicate that inadequate provision of car parking does influence the patronage of stations. Further work should be undertaken to properly understand the issue and the potential to use car parking provision to actively manage demand from stations where passenger numbers exceed supply to others with spare capacity. It is clear that passengers require expansion of station car parking to meet their requirements. The RUS must include positive measures to achieve that.

²² Note: more than one reason could be selected.

²³ That is, % of those not using their nearest station.

Local bus

Passenger Focus is not as sure as Network Rail appears to be that bus operators 'will be able to enhance their services' (Draft RUS, paragraph 8.17.1, page 142). Practicable bus routes to serve railway stations are not always easy to achieve, and provision for rail passengers is only one, usually minor, consideration for operators of commercial bus services. Our survey showed that from 7 to 11% of passengers used a bus to reach their station.

It is noteworthy that satisfaction with 'connections with other forms of transport' scored percentages only in the low 60s, apart from the Medway Towns route, where 73% of passengers ranked it good or fairly good.

On foot and by cycle

The results from the surveys we commissioned for our response to the Kent RUS show that on all routes the majority of passengers walked to the station at which they joined their train. The percentage varied from 50 on the route from East Kent via Faversham, a reflection of the geography of that route, with stations close to the places they serve, to 35 on the route via Ashford and Tonbridge, a route with stations more remote from many of the places they serve.

We agree with the conclusion that schemes to improve pedestrian access to stations are best addressed at a local level. Initiatives such as Station Travel Plans - 30 of which will be developed in Southern's area in the new franchise which starts in September 2009 - should be developed for all stations with significant usage.

Our survey showed that passengers using bicycles were a very small percentage of the total. On all routes 1% of passengers cycled to stations and left their bicycle there; those who took their cycle with them on the train formed less than 1% on all routes except that via Ashford and Tonbridge, where they formed 1% of passengers.

New stations

The Draft RUS devotes little space to the proposals for the four new stations it lists: Park Farm (Ashford South), Minster/Manston Parkway, Strood/Rochester and one for Maidstone on HS1. The first two are dismissed with brief comments about increased journey times. Given that both of them would be well located in relation to main roads and development areas, the superficial comments are totally inadequate. Passenger Focus expects that further development work should be undertaken, initially by those proposing the schemes, to thoroughly analyse the socio-economic benefits of the proposed new stations.

Our comments about Rochester station are made at the end of this section.

We note that HS1 is outside the scope of this RUS, but point out that if a station were to be built near Maidstone, Network Rail and Southeastern must be part of the project team, because of the impact such a station would have on existing services.

Station expansion

The Draft RUS devotes one paragraph to this issue, using Westenhanger as an example. Usage of Westenhanger grew by more than 42% between 2006/7 and

2007/8; its location close to Junction 11 of the M20 adding to its attractiveness as a railhead for surrounding towns and villages, such as Hythe and Lyminge. The RUS notes that additional calls would add to the journey times for Folkestone and Dover passengers. It should be remembered that during the peak hours and evenings all trains on the route already do call at Westenhanger.

There are numerous schemes and programmes underway to improve stations; the National Stations Improvement Programme (NSIP) is one of the latest of a constant stream of proposals over recent years. Passengers are telling us that too many stations do not match their needs and expectations. The latest NPS²⁴ scores show how poorly passengers rate stations:

Figure 6.8 station facilities

Attribute	National		Southeastern	
	Satisfied or good	Dissatisfied or poor	Satisfied or good	Dissatisfied or poor
Ticket buying facilities	72%	13%	65%	17%
Upkeep/repair of station	63%	15%	56%	21%
Facilities/services	50%	30%	46%	36%
Car parking	44%	38%	32%	50%

The RUS must acknowledge that dissatisfaction - as train reliability and punctuality improves, stations and the facilities they provide will figure all the more strongly in passengers' expectations. Plans to improve stations in the RUS area should be developed and included in the published RUS.

Access to Ebbsfleet

There are two sides to the 'gap' regarding access to Ebbsfleet. One is the need to improve access to international services from stations in Kent and Greater London, to reduce the need to travel into London to join international trains at St. Pancras.

The other is to improve access to the domestic services operated on the High Speed Line (HS1). Passengers will wish to transfer onto High Speed domestic services to complete their journey to St. Pancras or to stations in Kent; there will also be those passengers whose journeys will begin with a trip on HS domestic trains and then will require to transfer onto 'classic' services to complete their journey.

Of the four options listed in fig. 8.6 (page 145 of the Draft RUS) only A and B really address the need to improve access to Ebbsfleet. Apart from that from Dartford/Gravesend, the bus links in option A are lengthy. Bespoke bus links are expensive to operate because they must provide a frequent service in order to be attractive, but have only one market to generate income.

²⁴ Ibid. reference 3

It appears to Passenger Focus that option B, to provide a pedestrian link between Northfleet and Ebbsfleet stations, is likely to be the most attractive option to passengers, as well as the most effective and economic option. We believe that passengers would be best served by option B.

Location of Rochester station

Passenger Focus notes stakeholder aspirations for the relocation of Rochester station, but also notes the comments in the RUS that any such scheme 'cannot be considered in isolation'. Any scheme must result in not just a new station, but also improved accessibility and operational functionality.

6.4 Gap D - between the train service provided in the evening, at weekends and on bank holidays and predicted demand for travel at those times.

6.4.1 Option 11 evening and weekend services

Passengers expect to be able to use the railway at times that meet their needs, not ones convenient to the TOCs or Network Rail. Southeastern performs very close to the average for London and South East TOCs, with a 'satisfied or good' score for train frequency of 73% (type average 74%) and 79% for journey time (type average 82%). Passenger Focus has plenty of evidence that passengers prefer to travel by train, not rail replacement bus services²⁵.

We note the comments included in the extract from Network Rail's 2009 Route Plan (page 147 of the Kent RUS Draft for Consultation). The proposals for a single cyclical possession strategy, with a predictable possession pattern, should be implemented as soon as possible, so that the possessions can be integrated with the timetables and passengers always know when train services will be replaced by buses, and plan accordingly. The measures to improve the efficiency and productivity of maintenance and renewal activities are also welcome news.

Our survey²⁶ included five questions²⁷ that are relevant to Gap D:

- Q.12 how frequent should trains be on Saturdays and Sundays?
- Q.13 if trains were less frequent would you make fewer journeys?
- Q.14 if trains were more frequent would you make more journeys?
- Q.15 would you like trains to run earlier in the morning than at present?
- Q.16 would you like trains to run later in the evening than at present?

The strongest demand for trains later in the evening came from passengers travelling off-peak on weekdays and on Saturdays; on those days over 50% of passengers told us that they wanted later trains. However, even amongst commuters, the percentages were high, ranging from 44% up to 50% on the Maidstone East line. Providing later services in the evening obviously reduces the amount of time available - especially overnight Saturday/Sunday - for maintenance and renewal work.

²⁵ See, for example, *Passengers' attitudes towards engineering works*, RPC, August 2003.

²⁶ Ibid. reference 5.

²⁷ Question numbers are those used in the questionnaire (see appendix C).

Figure 6.9. - Q.16 trains later in the evening:

Route		Weekday peak	Weekday off-peak	Saturday	Sunday
1. via Faversham	yes	47%	54%	54%	43%
	no	26%	21%	19%	26%
2. Medway Towns	yes	44%	50%	55%	44%
	no	25%	22%	18%	26%
3. via Tonbridge	yes	44%	53%	52%	42%
	no	27%	21%	21%	29%
4. via Maidstone E.	yes	50%	55%	54%	40%
	no	24%	21%	20%	28%

We also asked passengers for their views about trains earlier in the mornings. Providing earlier trains also reduces the amount of time available for the engineers. The survey results show that demand for trains earlier in the morning is considerably less than the demand for trains later in the evening, even amongst regular commuters. On all the routes surveyed approximately a quarter of passengers required earlier trains, except on the Maidstone East route. On that route, where the earliest arrival in London is 7.08, at least half an hour later than the earliest arrival possible on the other three routes, 30% said they required earlier trains.

Figure 6.10 - Q. 15 trains earlier in the morning:

Route		Weekday peak	Weekday off-peak	Saturday	Sunday
1. via Faversham	yes	27%	23%	25%	26%
	no	40%	40%	38%	38%
2. Medway Towns	yes	29%	23%	25%	23%
	no	35%	37%	36%	38%
3. via Tonbridge	yes	26%	22%	18%	20%
	no	42%	39%	42%	40%
4. via Maidstone E.	yes	30%	17%	18%	16%
	no	41%	46%	42%	42%

There is close agreement amongst passengers regarding their preferred frequency for the weekend timetable - on all routes, for Saturday and Sunday, at least 75% of passengers expected trains to run at least half-hourly. It is noticeable that the frequencies required tend to reflect those operated on the routes surveyed - the Medway Towns have the highest frequencies, with a standard off-peak²⁸ service of four trains per hour to Victoria and two an hour to Charing Cross. Almost half the passengers on that route require trains to run at least every twenty minutes on Saturdays, with over a third requiring that frequency on Sundays.

²⁸ Mondays to Saturdays.

Figure 6.11 - Q.12 Weekend service frequency:

Route	Day	Every 15 mins.	Every 20 mins.	Every 30 mins.	Total 15 - 30
1. via Faversham	Saturday	18%	23%	39%	80%
	Sunday	13%	15%	48%	76%
2. Medway Towns	Saturday	19%	28%	30%	77%
	Sunday	12%	24%	43%	79%
3. via Tonbridge	Saturday	9%	20%	52%	81%
	Sunday	7%	15%	56%	78%
4. via Maidstone E.	Saturday	10%	19%	49%	78%
	Sunday	6%	13%	56%	75%

Passengers would be more likely to reduce their travel, if frequencies were to be reduced, than to increase it, if frequencies were to be improved. From 41 to 49% of passengers would be likely to make the same number of journeys, whereas 53 to 58% of passengers would be disinterested in an increase in frequency. The results suggest that reductions in services will have a negative impact greater than the positive impact of an equivalent increase in services.

Figure 6.12 Q.13 if trains were **less** frequent:

Route	Make the same number of journeys	Possibly fewer journeys	Definitely fewer journeys
1. via Faversham	41%	19%	20%
2. Medway Towns	44%	22%	16%
3. via Tonbridge	49%	22%	15%
4. via Maidstone E.	49%	22%	15%

Figure 6.13 Q.14 if trains were **more** frequent:

Route	Make the same number of journeys	Possibly more journeys	Definitely more journeys
1. via Faversham	53%	26%	6%
2. Medway Towns	53%	29%	6%
3. via Tonbridge	58%	26%	6%
4. via Maidstone E.	58%	25%	6%

The growth in the 'seven day' life-style, and the economy interdependent with it, must be matched by improved availability of services on the railway to meet the week-long

demand for travel. Passengers will expect Network Rail and Southeastern to use all available means to achieve that end.

6.5 Gap E - between the network's current capability to accommodate freight and future demand.

6.5.1 Option 12 freight capability

We note that there is still a need for “considerable analysis.....with respect to freight capability in the Kent RUS area”.²⁹ Options mentioned include gauge clearance and longer loops, both of which would require works that would cause disruption to passenger services. Passenger Focus believes that passengers expect such work to be carried out in ways that reduce the impact on passenger services, for example, by combining it with other engineering work.

The analysis should include how to ensure that the best synergies between engineering works are built into all proposed options when they are eventually published, to keep the impact on passengers to the absolute minimum.

²⁹ Para 8.24.11, page 150, Kent RUS Draft for Consultation.

6.6 Gap F - between expected train performance and strategic level interventions to reduce major delays.

6.6.1 Options 13.1 - 13.6 performance improvement

Passengers questioned in the survey³⁰ we undertook to inform our response to this RUS placed the punctuality and reliability of their train services either first or second in their priorities for improvement. For Southeastern as a whole punctuality and reliability scored 77% 'satisfied or good' in the Spring 2009 National Passenger Survey, two percentage points down on the results for the Autumn 2008 survey, and three points below the national figure. South West Trains, with the benefit of operating to only one London terminal, scored 90% 'satisfied or good'. Those results suggest that Southeastern's performance needs to be improved.

Measures to ensure the reliability of critical infrastructure, as well as robust timetables, (bearing in mind the changes in December 2009, and especially in the final Thameslink Programme) that are designed to improve and maximise performance levels, must be included in the options selected to meet gap F. We note that options designed to reduce the impact of major incidents (which should, of course, be reduced in number) have been considered. However, we also notice that the draft RUS recommendation for all of them is 'further development required'. Passengers will be dismayed that no decisions have yet been made regarding infrastructure schemes that promise to:

- improve performance; for example, between Orpington and New Cross
- increase or restore connectivity; for example between Maidstone and Canterbury
- increase capacity; for example through the Medway Towns.

We urge Network Rail to complete analysis work on the options in time for any additional works to be incorporated into planned schemes such as phase two of the East Kent Resignalling.

Of the schemes, these in particular appear to be the most important as means to improve passenger satisfaction and to meet aspirations:

Option 13.2 (paragraph 8.25.6) to increase platform capacity at Ashford

International: we suggest that speeding up the attachment/detachment of units would also help to increase that capacity.

Option 13.3 (paragraph 8.25.8) to provide a third platform at Canterbury West: this scheme is attractive from several points of view - in particular it would reduce occupancy of platforms at Ashford International, and help to restore connectivity between Maidstone and Canterbury (see page 17, option 8.1).

Option 13.4 (paragraph 8.25.9) to provide additional infrastructure in the Tonbridge area: given the importance of the area, and the demands made on the existing infrastructure, we suggest that this option is vital.

³⁰ Ibid. footnote 5.

Option 13.6 (paragraph 8.25.11) infrastructure changes to improve performance between Orpington and New Cross: we suggest that all renewals should be planned to improve the capability of the infrastructure.

7. Summary table of Passenger Focus' responses to RUS options

Gap	Option	RUS conclusion	Passenger Focus opinion Focus opinion
A	1	No capacity benefits identified	Develop for when required
	2	All high peak trains should be 12 cars	Agree
	3.1	Not recommended	Agree
	3.2	Not recommended	Agree
	3.3	Further consideration for Dec. 2015 timetable	Target additional capacity where needed
	4.1	Recommended: CP5	Agree
	4.2	Not recommended	Disagree
	4.3	Deferred for future operators	Agree, but develop now
	5.1	Not recommended	Agree
	5.2	Partial implementation recommended	Agree
	6.1	Not recommended	Agree
	6.2	Recommended for further development	Agree
	6.3	Not recommended	Agree
	6.4	Further development required	Agree
	6.5	Further development required	Agree
	6.6	Outside the RUS's scope	Disagree - should be within scope
B	7.1	Likely implementation in Dec. 2015	Should be reintroduced as soon as possible
	7.2	Not recommended	Keep under review
	7.3	Not recommended	Keep under review
	7.4	Not recommended - reopen if justified	Keep under review

Gap	Option	RUS conclusion	Passenger Focus opinion Focus opinion
		By area development?	
	7.5	Not required until 2019?	Agree
	7.6	Not required until 2019?	Agree
	8.1	Develop further	Maintain link
	8.2	Not recommended	Agree
	8.3	Not recommended	Keep under review
	8.4	Not recommended	Keep under review
	8.5	Not recommended	Keep under review
	9	Southeastern to do further investigation	Agree
C	10		
	car parking	Expand where possible	Agree
	local bus	Marketing initiatives	Employ all means to develop links and usage
	access by foot and cycle	Address by local schemes	Agree
	additional stations	None appraised	Disagree - develop
	Expansion of stations	Identify demand	Agree
	Access to Ebbsfleet	Pedestrian link from Northfleet	Agree
	Location of Rochester station	Possible opportunities	Agree
D	11	Some big schemes planned; 7 day workstream still being developed	Improve access to the network
E	12	Analysis still in progress	Minimise impact on passengers
F	13.1	Further development required	Develop quickly
	13.2	Further development required	Develop quickly

Gap	Option	RUS conclusion	Passenger Focus opinion Focus opinion
	13.3	Further development required	Develop quickly
	13.4	Further development required	Develop quickly
	13.5	Further development required	Agree
	13.6	Consider as renewals become due	Agree

Appendix A: List of Consultees

We invited comment on the Draft for Consultation, reminding that comments should be sent directly to Network Rail and or copied into Passenger Focus.

Railway User Groups

5. Sevenoaks Rail Travellers Association
6. Tonbridge Line Commuters
7. Malling District Rail Travellers Association
8. Bexhill Rail Action Group
9. Marshlink Action Group
10. North Kent Rail Users Group
11. Tunbridge Wells & District Rail Travellers Association

Individuals

- Peter Lee
- Chris Fribbins
- John Grubb

Appendix B: Bibliography

Edge of morning peak travel - Research findings prepared for Passenger Focus by Consolidated	October 2006
Getting to the station <i>Passenger Focus (Steer Davies Gleave)</i>	March 2007
Getting to the station, <i>London TravelWatch</i>	(undated)
Kent and Medway Tourism Development Framework Final Report <i>Kent County Council</i>	July 2009
Kent County Council Speed Rail Passenger Survey <i>ORC International for Kent CC</i>	March 2009
Mayor's Transport Strategy, <i>Mayor of London</i>	May 2009
Passenger Priorities for Improvements in Rail Services <i>MVA Consultancy for Passenger Focus</i>	June 2007
Passengers' attitudes towards engineering works <i>Rail Passengers Council</i>	August 2003
South London Route Utilisation Strategy <i>Network Rail</i>	March 2008
Thameslink Rolling Stock Qualitative research, <i>Passenger Focus, London TravelWatch and DfT</i>	August 2008

Appendix C: Sample Questionnaire

(Click to open as a PDF document)

Q11 How frequent should trains be on this route at peak times (Mon-Fri 07:00-10:00 and 1600-1900) to meet your needs?				
Every 10 mins.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Every 15 mins.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Every 20 mins.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Q12 How frequent should trains be on this route at <u>other times</u> to meet your needs?				
	Every 15 mins	Every 20 mins	Every 30 mins	Don't know
Monday to Friday (off peak).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Saturday.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sunday.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q13 If trains were LESS frequent on this route than at present would you?				
Make the same number of journeys.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Possibly make fewer journeys.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Definitely make fewer journeys.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Q14 If trains were MORE frequent on this route than at present would you?				
Make the same number of journeys.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Possibly make more journeys.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Definitely make more journeys.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Q15 Would you like trains to run earlier in the morning than at present on this route?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	
Monday to Friday (peak).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Monday to Friday (off peak).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Saturday.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sunday.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Q16 Would you like trains to run later in the evening than at present on this route?				
	Yes	No	Don't know	
Monday to Friday (peak).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Monday to Friday (off peak).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Saturday.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sunday.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Q17 How often do you travel in the morning peak (07:00-10:00) and park your car at the station?				
5 days or more per week.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
3-4 days per week.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
1-2 days a week.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
A few times a month.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Less often.....				<input type="checkbox"/>
Never.....				<input type="checkbox"/>



© 2009 Passenger Focus

Passenger Focus
FREEPOST (RRRE-ETTC-LEET)
PO Box 4257
Manchester
M60 3AR

0300 123 2350
www.passengerfocus.org.uk
info@passengerfocus.org.uk

Passenger Focus is the operating
name of the Rail Passengers Council