



London Assembly transport committee scrutiny – the case for rail devolution in London.

London TravelWatch welcomes the Committee's investigation into this issue. We have long been supporters of the principle of devolution of rail franchising to the Mayor and have been pleased with the achievements that the London Overground model of an operating concession has delivered for passengers. Devolution is not a 'cure all' for the shortcomings for the shortcomings of National Rail services in London, but does enable a strategic, long term approach to be taken by integrating such services with the rest of those provided by Transport for London (TfL). London's rapid growth in population and economic activity, and associated increases in congestion and crowding makes such an approach essential; in turn the National Rail network must be used as effectively and efficiently as possible. .

Our response to the Committee's key questions are as follows :

1. What are the key problems with National Rail services in London that need to be addressed?

Our areas of concern are poor performance and customer service, poor value for money for passengers, paucity of services (frequency) and station facilities, and the complexity of the pricing structure for fares and tickets.

Performance and customer service

Passengers using London's National Rail services have been experiencing a long period of poor performance, in terms of reliability and punctuality. This is demonstrated in London TravelWatch's National Rail Performance reports which are available at

http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3971&field=file . In this current year much of this poor performance can be attributed to problems within the control of the rail industry rather than weather or other outside factors. This has been reported in a special report for our Board that can be found at http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3948&age=&field=file

In contrast, performance of London Overground, as a TfL procured service, has vastly improved since the start of the concession in 2007 from being one of the worst performing operators (under the previous Silverlink franchise) to one of the best with, very high passenger satisfaction as a result. This improvement should be seen in

the context of considerable investment by TfL and others in the concession and the infrastructure that it uses. But many of the challenges the Overground has faced have been very similar to those facing other train operators in that period.

This difference in outcome for passengers is attributable to the different incentives and contracting arrangements that the devolved London Overground concession uses, rather than the conventional franchise arrangements. It does this by ensuring that the concessionaire concentrates, and is incentivised to focus, on the delivery and development of services, with the setting of issues such as fares policy and forward policy being dealt with by TfL centrally, and the commercial risks associated with ticket and other revenue are also borne by TfL rather than the operator.

The concession arrangements also incentivise the operator to manage its supplier of infrastructure (Network Rail) in a pro-active way, by anticipating problems at source and working collaboratively to resolve them. The concessionaire also has strong incentives to manage detailed aspects of service quality of a kind that are often very important to passenger well-being – such as the maintenance of stations and trains backed by objectives that can be measured in a qualitative way. In contrast National Rail franchises place more emphasis on financial performance and on perception based surveys of quality. It is noteworthy that the new TfL Rail concession by MTR Ltd includes financial penalties on the operator, where Network Rail is the cause of delays and disruption. This is a potentially useful innovation in ensuring that the operator effectively manages Network Rail as its supplier.

Standards of customer care and experience vary widely across the different franchised rail operators serving London. This suggests that it is not impossible for the franchising system to deliver passenger improvements; but such improvements are by no means guaranteed.

As a result it is not surprising that complaints about National Rail operators tend to be much higher in volume than for equivalent TfL services. TfL has integrated London Overground into its own customer service operation, and the use of automated refunds on Oyster and contactless cards when services are disrupted or where passengers have made a genuine one-off mistake has significantly reduced the volume of complaints and also improved overall levels of customer care.

TfL has also significantly improved the level of visible first to last train staffing of rail stations through the London Overground concession compared with previous and current levels on national rail franchises. This has increased passenger confidence in using these stations especially at less busy times such as evening and weekends, reduced fare evasion and crime / anti-social behaviour. TfL has also invested in automatic ticket gates, ticket vending machines and closed circuit television.

On the National Rail network within London there is a wide range of staffing levels at stations and on trains. There are examples of unstaffed stations, stations without any ticketing facilities at all and others with limited ticket office opening hours or staff

presence. Some operators have in the past been subsidised by TfL to provide enhanced staffing as part of their franchise. A devolution settlement would enable these issues to be addressed in a strategic way, based on priorities set across the capital as a whole.

Accessibility of stations is an issue which passengers want to see more investment and thought put into, even where they personally might not see the benefit. TfL has been successful in securing funding for a significant number of stations on the London Overground network to become step free from street to platform. This has been complemented by the provision of boarding ramps on a 'turn up and go' basis in addition to the conventional pre-booking service. Other train operators have also been successful in obtaining funding for step-free access, but have only introduced a limited 'turn up and go' boarding ramp service.

Regardless of whether services are devolved or not, there needs to be a commitment from DfT and TfL to further investment in step-free access at stations and towards 'turn up and go' standards for ramp service. In particular there needs to be a focus on smaller stations where works to provide this can be done more easily or cheaply. This would enable the network benefits of such works and previous investment in accessibility to be realised earlier.

Further devolution of responsibility for other rail routes should therefore also produce a similar improvement in passenger experiences.

Poor value for money

London National Rail passengers are amongst the most dissatisfied in the UK in terms of value for money for the price of their ticket. This National Rail Passenger Survey measure is shown in the London TravelWatch National Rail Performance Reports¹ and comparisons are shown with other urban rail networks in the UK and other types of rail service. In the third quarter of 2014-15 only 40% of London rail users were satisfied on this measure, compared to around 60% average of all other urban rail networks in the UK .

London TravelWatch has been concerned for some time that there has been no concerted attempt to address this issue. Accordingly we have commissioned external focus group research on the subject to find out what passenger thought constituted good value for money. This can be found at

http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3734&field=file.

This research then led TfL Rail to commission from us further funded work on value for money on London Overground. This can be found at http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3896&field=file . TfL has committed itself to implementing our recommendations, and using the research to

¹ http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3971&field=file

help in the specification for the replacement London Overground concession starting in 2016.

It is worth noting, however, that London Overground already has much higher passenger satisfaction with value for money than other train operators. This is attributable both to the investment that has been put into concession and to the incentives that are contained within the contract and the TfL set fares that are used. In the case of National Rail operators, whilst 'Value for Money' is a question used in the NRPS, we understand that the performance regime for most if not all franchises does not include any express requirement to improve passenger satisfaction in this area or contain any penalties should it decline. Consequently, train operators do not generally see the need to address this issue as a top priority.

Paucity of services (frequency)

With a number of notable exceptions, National Rail operator service levels in London generally reflect those that were provided by British Rail prior to privatisation in the late 1990's, or where TfL has previously funded enhanced levels of service e.g. Southern Metro. This reflects the tendency of franchise specifications to preserve current levels of service rather than consider active improvement. A risk averse attitude tends to prevail amongst franchisees, especially those spanning regional or longer distance services as well as Metro style services. In such circumstances, local services, even where they are heavily used, may be seen as unlikely to generate the level of financial return that could be obtained from running more long distance services.

The result is that there are significant areas of London where service frequencies are significantly lower than equivalent lines on London Underground - where frequencies have been regularly enhanced in line with growing demand and population over the same period. Many of these lines do not have particularly good alternative services. So passengers using them are often a captive market.

The table in Annex 1 highlights these lines with less than 4 trains per hour off peak or no evening or weekend service. In a major conurbation such as London, services need to be regular, frequent and comprehensive, with train frequencies allowing passengers to travel on a 'turn up and go' basis throughout the operating day (0600-2400), every day of the week. 'Turn up and go' normally would imply a train at least every fifteen minutes in each direction, with additional services at times of peak demand. Such frequencies allow passengers to travel without the need to refer to a formal timetable to make decisions about their journey choices especially in the evenings and at weekends. They also make it much easier to undertake journeys involving one or more changes en route (which is very common in London), because they remove the risk of being stranded for 29 minutes at the interchange point.

Our research on 'Value for Money' and the 'Travelling Environment' has shown that passengers consider low frequency services to represent poor value for money to

them. In terms of personal security and with it willingness to use public transport at evenings and weekends, low frequencies are also a major deterrent to using public transport at off-peak times. Data from London Underground indicates that parallel London Underground lines have increased off-peak usage at a much greater rate than those provided by National Rail operators² over the period between 2003 and 2010, and this trend has continued since then.

Pricing – fares and tickets

A further major issue for London's passengers is affordability of fares and tickets. Changes to the distribution of London's population means that more people on lower incomes are living in outer London. Travel costs can be a real barrier to their accessing jobs and services which remain concentrated in central London or Docklands. For people on lower incomes there is often a trade off between paying a lower fare by travelling by bus, but with a long journey time or paying the higher rail and or tube fare and enjoying a shorter journey time.

At present there are four separate pay as you go tariffs for Oyster / contactless:- TfL, National Rail, Through National Rail to TfL and TfL West Anglia / Great Eastern. However, even within these tariffs there are variations which are not always obvious e.g. all Oyster / contactless pay as you go journeys entirely on Great Western are charged at the TfL rate rather than the National Rail one.

Availability of travel concessions can also vary depending on which route or operator is used – for example Freedom Pass holders can travel before 0930 on Mondays to Fridays between New Cross Gate and Crystal Palace / West Croydon on London Overground but not on Southern services on the same route.

The transfer of West Anglia and Great Eastern services to TfL control has long had our strong support. But it also highlights and accentuates the growing disparity in the cost of travel between North and South London. South London passengers are largely dependent on National Rail services to access central London termini, but for a journey onward eg to the West End, Kings Cross, Liverpool Street or Canary Wharf they usually need to travel by a TfL mode which then attracts an additional charge of up to £2 per journey on an Oyster / contactless card. Underground, Overground and TfL Rail passengers do not need to pay this surcharge.

A single unified rail and underground fares structure would bring greater clarity and confidence to passengers that they are paying the right fare, and address the issue of disparity between fares charged for journeys from South London as against the North. The Mayor has the ability to address this through their powers to set TfL's fares and to negotiate with train operators to achieve this.

2. What changes to the delivery, funding or governance of rail services in London should be considered?

² Page 17 http://www.londontravelwatch.org.uk/documents/get_lob?id=3523&field=file

Services provided by TfL under its concession arrangements are the responsibility of the Mayor for delivery, funding and governance. There are clear arrangements for accountability built into this. National rail services, meanwhile, are provided under franchise agreements by the DfT. These do not have the same local accountability or concern with local needs of an arrangement through TfL on the London Overground model. The rail history and geography of London means that south of the River Thames there are significant areas where most rail services are not under the influence or control of the Mayor. This leads to major variation in the frameworks governing the services that these areas of London receive compared to those where the Mayor has direct responsibility for services through TfL.

This inequality needs to be addressed. Devolution of responsibility to the Mayor would allow consistent incentives, service standards, fares and accountability to apply throughout London.

In terms of coverage, we think TfL should procure most of the rail services in the London area through its concession arrangements. The key criterion should be intensity of use by passengers with journeys wholly or largely within the capital. This would mean including within the concession model some services that extend beyond the London boundary – as already happens with Overground trains to Watford Junction and Cheshunt in Hertfordshire.

An especially important question here is the governance of the future Thameslink service, where 24 trains per hour will run through the core central London area. There is in our view an overwhelming case for including this within the concession model. There are of course also many passengers would be making journeys from or to areas beyond Greater London, eg from Brighton, Gatwick, Bedford, Luton and Cambridge. But the best way to reflect their interests would be by developing a governance arrangement that would share responsibility for procuring and funding services between the Mayor and the appropriate local authorities outside of London. In the Thameslink example TfL would procure the service but governance would include oversight by the counties and councils of Hertfordshire, Luton, Bedfordshire, Surrey, West and East Sussex, Brighton and Hove, Cambridgeshire and Kent. This would effectively build on the existing Overground arrangements with Hertfordshire County Council.

The alternative, of continuing with a DfT based franchise once the Thameslink construction is complete (and also once Crossrail is in operation, with an important interchange at Farringdon) would in our view be highly unlikely to deliver the kind of integrated, high quality metro service that London's transport users need.

By contrast we recognise that there may be some lines within the capital where the concession approach will not make practical or financial sense. This applies especially to routes with very limited stops within the London boundary, and much larger numbers outside London. A case in point is the Chiltern route, which has only

five stations within the London boundary run by the train operator plus three other stations run by London Underground. Here we think the best course may be for TfL to become a co-signatory of a franchise agreement with the DfT.. This would enable TfL to play an active role in the service specification and standards of customer service expected of the successful franchised train operator, in turn providing an element of local accountability. Arrangement on these lines have been used extensively in other parts of the UK, eg for services in the Passenger Transport Executive areas such as West Yorkshire.

3. How does the current system in London compare to those in other world cities?

London TravelWatch is not able to comment on this question.

4. What would devolution mean for passengers, in terms of fares, reliability, crowding, information and so on?

As noted above, we think devolution on the London Overground model would lay the foundation for a significant improvement in the overall passenger experience.

In terms of fares, there are inevitably revenue constraints on what can be done to reduce absolute levels. But the creation of a single rail tariff for the whole of the capital in place of the existing four tariffs would provide a much fairer deal as between North and South London. It would also provide major simplification, aiding transparency and understanding by passengers of the cost of making journeys and it would consolidate the terms on which concessionary travel is available.

Reliability of metro style services would be subject to detailed and carefully specified concession provisions, with incentives to promote good performance and penalties for poor performance. These would have a much tighter focus on local services, than is possible when these services are part of a larger regional franchise.

As part of any future concession arrangements, we think the newly created incentives on TfL Rail to manage Network Rail as infrastructure provider (by carrying 10 per cent of the liability for any Network Rail performance shortfalls) are worthy of wider consideration. This innovative mechanism should focus attention on the need for the rail operator to work very closely with Network Rail, and to anticipate any problems.

We recognise that one concern that arose from the debate on devolution of the metro services within the Southeastern franchise was that this would diminish reliability of Kent services. We have always considered this fear to be groundless, as there have long been examples of different rail operators sharing stretches of track, and there are plenty of ways to safeguard train paths from outside London. In practice, to the extent that devolution promotes higher reliability of metro services, longer distance routes will actually benefit, as these trains would be less likely to be disrupted by delayed local services.

Our own investigations of problems on Southeastern and Southern has shown that delays and disruptions to long distance services arriving in London have an effect on local services (including those on existing Overground services for example between West Croydon and New Cross Gate), and therefore are in need of more management attention. For example a late running train from Kent to London Victoria would cause delay to local services at potentially seven locations between the Greater London boundary and London Victoria.

Crowding issues have a relationship both with pricing policy, reliability ,co-ordination of services and ongoing effective investment – in all of which the Mayor has or could have the ability to influence, and therefore improve the passenger experience. The long term and integrated perspective that TfL can bring allows planning and demand forecasting, encourages a clear focus on station upgrades and rolling stock requirements, that are expensive and require long term thinking. Pricing policy can be used to redirect use at the busiest times and sections of the network, thereby producing a crowding benefit. Crowding becomes a bigger issue when train services are disrupted, and so providing a more reliable service can reduce the impact and incidence of crowding.

5. What opportunities for additional investment and income growth could devolution bring?

This is not a question that can be answered by London TravelWatch.

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the London Overground model for delivering rail services?

This is largely covered under our response to question 2. However, objective measures of performance, incentives to run services reliably, to collect revenue that is due to the concession, and to innovate in customer service (e.g. the introduction of a ‘turn up and go’ disabled persons assistance service) are some of the strengths of the London Overground model.

The need for London Overground to use the National Rail Conditions of Carriage in line with other operators could be considered a weakness as this means it is difficult to achieve consistency with the Terms and Conditions for TfL that apply to other modes of transport. (See London Assembly report on TfL customer service³).

7. What are the strengths and weaknesses of different models of rail devolution?

This is not a question that can be answered by London TravelWatch from our experience. There are other examples of rail devolution such as franchising by the German ‘Länder’ authorities (including Berlin and Brandenburg), however we believe

³ <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/publications/tfl-customer-service-next-steps>

these largely tend to follow the London Overground model of service provision. We will however be interested to see any conclusions that emerge from this consultation.

8. What are the main barriers to further devolution?

These can be identified as practical, institutional and misunderstanding of risk.

Practical

TfL has been fortunate that the current devolved railway services are largely self-contained in terms of rolling stock and train staff. However, those of other train operators such as Southeastern and South West Trains have much higher levels of integration with services that run well beyond the London area. For example a Southern service from Victoria to London Bridge, may on arrival at London Bridge form a service to Brighton or Horsham. Devolution will mean the separation of rosters of stock and drivers. In the case of the recent takeover of the West Anglia routes, this resulted in the need to lease a further three train sets and recruitment of additional drivers.

Many train operators for operational and staffing reasons are dependent on railway sidings, and use depots some distance from the London area to serve their London 'metro' operations e.g. Southeastern has a large depot and sidings at Gillingham in Kent; Thameslink similarly at Bedford, Three Bridges and Brighton; Southern at Brighton; South West Trains at Fratton near Portsmouth. Often trains and drivers have rosters which include these facilities. There could be costs of relocating staff and stock to locations closer to or within London, and of acquiring of additional stock, and recruiting extra staff to meet the constraints that a new devolved settlement and consequent operational separation would create. Relocating depots and sidings to the London area could also pose practical problems because of the lack of suitable land that could be developed in this area.

One mitigation measure could be for trains and crews to operate with a degree of interchangeability between the concession operator and the adjoining franchisee. This is clearly an option that would need to be explored in more detail. But it really would be an example of 'the tail wagging the dog' if this proved a stumbling block to major reform of the system.

One other, more fundamental way round these issues could be to treat the London boundary with a degree of flexibility, with devolution according to service type and operational requirements rather than political boundaries. As argued above, any accountability and 'democratic deficit' issues could be mitigated by close working between TfL and the surrounding local authorities affected.

An example comes from Southeastern. Devolution of Southeastern services as originally envisaged would cover only those services terminating at Dartford or Sevenoaks. But if followed through, this model would require separation of services that run beyond Dartford. This might then result in some essentially suburban routes

to destinations such as Gravesend and Gillingham, via Sidcup and Bexley, still being provided by a franchised operator rather than TfL. Including the Gravesend and possibly Gillingham routes would reduce the impact of this – and might also be a fairer reflection of the nature of these services⁴.

Institutional

Devolution does require a considerable amount of work on the part of operators, TfL, Network Rail, the DfT and other government departments such as the Treasury. This will involve the disentanglement of staffing, rolling stock, station leases, union agreements, financial arrangements and a range of other services before devolution can take effect. These in themselves could present themselves as a barrier to change, although these processes often used when franchise boundaries are reworked. However, even with the considerable amount of work that this requires and an understanding of the risks financial and practical that are presented, the devolution as has been achieved by TfL for London Overground services has been a worthwhile investment, that has produced benefits for passengers.

Misunderstanding of risks

Previously when the Mayor proposed devolution of Southeastern services there was opposition from politicians and councils in Kent. The basis of this opposition was we think partly based on a misunderstanding of the Mayor's proposals, a lack of experience of dealing with TfL as an institution and a misunderstanding of who would control track access. We are pleased therefore with Kent County Councils' recent decision to support the principle of devolution of responsibility to the Mayor subject to a number of caveats and discussion over the detailed arrangements.

One point that may not have been clear is that the Mayor's proposals would have affected only local stopping services that operate mainly within the London area. Although places such as Sevenoaks and Dartford, both in Kent, would have been included long distance services through these stations would have remained the responsibility of the Southeastern franchise.

There was also a misconception that TfL would be able to block the use of lines in London by longer distance services because priority would be given in timetable planning to increased numbers of local services. This is not possible as long distance services have equal access rights and in any case it is Network Rail (and in the case of a dispute the Office of Rail and Road) who determine which proposals for track access are accepted rather than TfL.

It is important to note, in this context, that Essex and Hertfordshire have had long experience of dealing with TfL because the Central and Metropolitan lines have

⁴ We note that Kent County Council would like to extend Oyster / contactless ticketing to Gravesend.

served these areas for over 50 years. Hertfordshire also has experience of working with the Overground to Watford Junction and, more recently, to Cheshunt. Meanwhile the council is currently working with London Underground to deliver the Croxley link. Other councils however, may have less experience of cross border working with TfL. Building institutional confidence is therefore a significant activity that needs to take place before, during and after the establishment of devolution for services that cross local government boundaries.

9. Which rail franchises or routes should be the priority focus for the Mayor and TfL in devolution proposals?

In London TravelWatch's view Southeastern, South West Trains and Thameslink/Southern/Great Northern local stopping services should be the priority for devolution to the Mayor, working in concert with other local authorities where appropriate. These services offer by far the greatest scope for service improvement and reduction of consumer detriment. We would attach less importance to sectors where local services are provided by operators whose main business is providing longer distance services such as Great Western (which includes the Greenford branch), Chiltern (with stops at Brent, Ealing and Harrow) or Abellio Greater Anglia (the Lea Valley line). In these circumstances, as argued in our response to question 2, a co-signatory agreement might be more appropriate than full devolution.

10. How can the Mayor and TfL ensure that the interests of passengers outside London are reflected in any new rail devolution settlement?

London TravelWatch developed a protocol to address this issue, when previously devolution of Southeastern services was considered before. This is attached, for information, at Annex 2. This was accepted in full by TfL. We have not seen any arguments to change our view that this represents the most sensible way forward.

11. How can the Mayor and TfL improve their proposals for the devolution of the Southeastern franchise?

The Mayor and TfL should take more positive action to engage Southeastern stakeholders both within and without London to understand their concerns and aspirations for the services provided by Southeastern. In particular engagement with political leadership within Kent and East Sussex is an important factor in building consensus on how, where and when services as a whole should and could be developed. This engagement should demonstrate how improvements in reliability and quality of services within London have wider benefits to passengers in Kent and East Sussex. It should also show how TfL and the Mayor have been able to deliver similar benefits where devolved responsibility involving cross-border services has already taken place e.g. Watford and Buckinghamshire (Metropolitan and Euston – Watford DC lines), Hertfordshire and Essex (West Anglia, Central and Great Eastern Main Lines). In particular, we think it would be useful if the Mayor and TfL

commissioned an independent economic and social impact study of the recently transferred West Anglia and Great Eastern routes.

12. Could control of rail services also be devolved to other UK cities?

This is not an area within London TravelWatch's remit. But we note that Merseyrail is an existing example of devolved responsibility outside of London within England.

Annex 1

Passenger railway lines in London with less than four trains per hour off-peak

| Route / Service description | Operator | Trains per hour (off-peak) | Travelcard zones |
|---|--|---|---|
| Dagenham Dock - Rainham | C2C | 2 | 56 |
| Romford - Upminster | Abellio Greater Anglia (until 30/5/15) London Overground (from 31/5/15) | 2 (no late evening or Sunday service) | 6 |
| Stratford – Tottenham Hale | Abellio Greater Anglia | 2 | 3 |
| Hackney Downs - Tottenham Hale - Cheshunt | Abellio Greater Anglia | 2-3 (but only 1 to Northumberland Park and 0 to Angel Road) | 345678 |
| Edmonton Green - Cheshunt | Abellio Greater Anglia (until 30/5/15) London Overground (from 31/5/15) | 2 | 5678 |
| Enfield Town branch | Abellio Greater Anglia (until 30/5/15) London Overground (from 31/5/15) | 2 | 5 |
| Moorgate – Finsbury Park | Great Northern | 6 - but no service after 2200 or on Saturdays or Sundays* | 12 |
| Alexandra Palace – Crews Hill | Great Northern | 3 – reduces to 2 late evenings and Sundays | 456 |
| Alexandra Palace – Hadley Wood | Great Northern | 3 – reduces to 2 late evenings and Sundays | 456 |
| Euston – Watford Junction | London Overground | 3 – reduces to 2 late evenings and Sundays | 123456789W |
| Shepherds Bush – Wembley Central | Southern | 1 | 234 |
| Marylebone - Amersham | Chiltern | 2 | 123456789 |
| Marylebone – West Ruislip | Chiltern | Wembley Stadium 2 Sudbury & Harrow Road 0 Sudbury Hill Harrow 1 Northolt Park 1 South Ruislip 1 West Ruislip 1 Very restricted evening and weekend services | 1234 1234 1234 12345 123456 123456 |
| Paddington - Greenford | Great Western | 2 – no late evening or Sunday service** | 1234 |
| West Ealing -Hanwell | Heathrow Connect | 2*** | 4 |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|--------|
| - Southall – Heathrow Airport | | | |
| Hounslow loop | South West Trains | 4 – but reduces to 2 late evenings and only 1 on Sundays **** | 345 |
| Strawberry Hill to Fulwell | South West Trains | 4 am peak trains to Waterloo and 3 pm peak trains from Waterloo | 6 |
| Shepperton branch | South West Trains | 2 – but reduces to 1 late evening and Sundays | 6 |
| Hampton Court branch | South West Trains | 2 – but reduces to 1 late evening and Sundays**** | 6 |
| Chessington branch | South West Trains | 2 – but reduces to 1 late evening and Sundays | 456 |
| Wimbledon loop | Thameslink | 2 – no late evening or early Sunday service | 345 |
| Epsom Downs branch | Southern | 1 – no late evening or Sunday service | 56 |
| Tattenham Corner branch | Southern | 2 | 6 |
| South Croydon – Upper Warlingham | Southern | 2 | 56 |
| Tulse Hill – West Norwood | Southern | 2 | 3 |
| Crystal Palace – Beckenham Junction | Southern | 2 – but no Sunday service | 345 |
| Balham – West Norwood | Southern | 4 – but reduces to 2 on Sundays | 3 |
| Streatham – Streatham Common | Southern | 2 | 3 |
| Crystal Palace – Norwood Junction | Southern | 2 | 34 |
| London Bridge – Sydenham – Crystal Palace / Norwood Junction | Southern | 4 – 2 to Crystal Palace, 2 to Norwood Junction. No Sunday service to Crystal Palace | 1234 |
| Victoria - Orpington | Southeastern | 4 – but reduces to 2 late evenings and Sundays | 123456 |
| Catford loop | Thameslink | 2 | 123456 |
| Victoria - Lewisham | Southeastern | 2 – but no Sunday service | 12 |
| Surrey Quays – Clapham Junction | London Overground | 4 – but reduces to 2 late evenings | 2 |
| London Bridge – Hayes (Kent) | Southeastern | 4 – but reduces to 2 Sundays | 12345 |
| Lewisham - Dartford | Southeastern | All routes 4 per hour except Sundays when reduces to 2 | 23456 |
| Hither Green - Orpington | Southeastern | 4 – but reduces to 2 Sundays | 123456 |
| Bromley North branch | Southeastern | 3 – but reduces to 2 late evening and no Sunday service | 4 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|
| Orpington - Knockholt | Southeastern | 2 | 6 |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|

Note

* = Service will be introduced late evenings and weekends December 2015

** = service to Acton Main Line replaced with Crossrail in 2018, Greenford branch reduces to West Ealing – Greenford shuttle in 2016

*** = slightly enhanced Sunday service to be introduced December 2015

**** = slightly enhanced evening service to be introduced December 2015

In addition there are a number of other infrequently used passenger lines in the London area including

1. Forest Gate to Woodgrange Park (used by occasional c2c trains from Liverpool Street and Stratford to Barking).
2. Coppermill North Junction to Seven Sisters via South Tottenham (used by one Saturday morning London Overground).
3. Wandsworth Road to Battersea Park (used by one London Overground train in each direction Mondays to Fridays).
4. Tulse Hill to Streatham Hill (used by one Southern train each day Monday to Friday).
5. Beckenham Junction to New Beckenham (used by one Southeastern train per day Monday to Friday).

Annex 2

Essential passenger safeguards to ensure successful and fair devolution of rail services

London TravelWatch is seeking these to make sure that the interests of all passengers, regardless of where they are travelling to or from, are taken into account in any agreement to devolve more responsibility for train services to the Mayor of London through Transport for London (TfL).

1. **Guaranteed even handedness in track access** between continuing Department for Transport franchises and any devolved concession operations so as to ensure that the needs of all passengers are catered for equitably.
2. **Guaranteed interavailability of ordinary tickets over common routes** irrespective of operator.
3. **A commitment to work together with other operators in providing seamless information to passengers**, especially during times of disruption and at interchanges between services provided by franchisees and the concessionaire.
4. **A commitment to an operational agreement to work together in the best interests of all passengers**, sharing resources at times of disruption and where separate provision is not justified, to maximise efficiency.
5. **Separation of the formulae for setting fares** between franchises and concessions, to ensure that political or commercial decisions in either do not have unintended negative or anomalous consequences for the other.
6. **A commitment to regular and meaningful consultation** by all parties with London TravelWatch and Passenger Focus on all issues affecting passengers. This should be inclusive from the tender design stage by TfL through to day to day operation by the concessionaire, and should at a minimum be comparable to that currently required of train operating companies under the existing franchise arrangements and licensing regime.
7. **A commitment to regular and meaningful dialogue with passengers and user groups on issues affecting them.**
8. **A commitment to work with local authorities**, both inside and outside London, to ensure a better whole journey experience, by means of improved interchanges and through ticketing schemes with local public transport operators.
9. **A commitment to transparency of data**, on items such as delay attribution and service performance.

