



**Michael Lee**  
**Director, Railway Planning and Performance**  
Telephone 020 7282 2139  
Fax 020 7282 2042  
E-mail michael.lee@orr.gsi.gov.uk

3 September 2009

Paul Plummer Esq  
Director, Planning & Regulation  
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited  
Kings Place  
90 York Way  
London  
N1 9AG

Dear Paul,

**CP4 enhancements delivery plan**

We have now completed our consultation on and analysis of the revised (June) CP4 delivery plan for the enhancement programme.

There is recognition from across the industry that the plan is a substantial improvement over the March version. However, the consultation responses and our own assessment have shown that further changes are required. We have discussed and agreed these with you.

The attached annex sets out the issues that have been identified and the specific required changes to the plan. The June plan and this annex now form the baseline CP4 plan that we will monitor you against. Changes to your obligations set out in this plan must now be subject to the change control process which we will oversee. You will publish any agreed changes on your website.

When we consulted on the revised plan we noted that the independent reporter had reviewed your proposals to upgrade power supplies, an issue which cuts across many projects. You have since produced a plan to address the reporter's recommendations and we will be monitoring your progress on this. If this further work results in changes being needed to your delivery plan you will need to progress these through change control.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Michael'.

**Michael Lee**

Annex

**Required changes to the June 2009 enhancements plan**

Project	Issue	Required change
<b>Expenditure table, pg 8</b>	The table is not clear and could be taken to imply that certain funds have been reduced in size as only the capital elements have been shown	The total funding (09/10 prices) for the National Stations Improvement Programme is £165m and for the Performance Fund is £169m. The table should be changed to show these totals in the next update of the delivery plan.
<b>4.00 Performance fund</b>	Wording can be read as implying that the fund can only be used to improve passenger performance. This is not the case – the funding is available to meet all performance outputs specified in our determination	Under 'objective' Delete 'to achieve the performance targets for PPM and cancellations and significant lateness (CaSL)'. Insert 'to deliver the performance targets required by the 2008 periodic review'
<b>8.00 Access for all</b>	Text implies Network Rail can decide to vary which stations are to be improved, but these decisions are governed by a protocol between DfT/TS and Network Rail	Under 'key assumptions' Delete 'stations will be added or removed subject to available funding'

Project	Issue	Required change
<b>10.01 Bletchley remodelling project</b>	The obligation is to deliver the scope of work, but the functionality described in the outputs section implies a wider scope of works	The text under 'Outputs' is moved to 'scope of works' and becomes part of Network Rail's obligations. (This results in a duplicate reference to extending platforms 4 and 5 and hence one of the references can be deleted)
<b>10.02 West Coast traction power supply upgrade</b>	Network Rail's obligations in CP4 are not clear. Specifically it is not clear whether the obligation is project development or actual implementation	Under 'scope of works' delete 'forecast timetable changes on WCML from 2020' and insert 'operation of the DfT specified 2020 timetable for the WCML'. Under 'activities and milestones' the existing GRIP3 and GRIP4 milestones should be replaced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ GRIP 3 commences August 2009</li> <li>○ GRIP 4 commences June 2010</li> <li>○ Site works North Wembley – Ashton commence Aug 2012, complete October 2015</li> <li>○ Site works Hillmorton – Tamworth commence October 2011, complete Jan 2015</li> <li>○ Site works Brereton – Crewe commence October 2012, complete Feb 2016</li> </ul>

Project	Issue	Required change
<b>15.01 Waterloo International integration</b>	<p>It is not clear from the milestones that the integration of Waterloo International Terminal (WIT) will be completed ahead of the rest of the station</p>	<p>The description of scope of works must be split so that the scope for WIT that will be delivered earlier can be clearly identified. Delete bullet 'alterations to IECC systems' and add non-bulleted text 'The following items will be delivered to allow the conversion of Waterloo International station for use by domestic services' and then include the remaining 5 WIT bullets plus the following additional bullets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ an additional signal section to facilitate operation of WIT</li> <li>○ moving of buffer stops to create a larger level concourse.'</li> </ul> <p>In the activities and milestones table, add an additional line 'WIT operational – December 2011 timetable change'</p>
<b>15.06 Sydenham slow lines 10 car operation</b>	<p>The 10 car solution on the London Bridge to Epsom via Sydenham route is listed as being delivered by December 2012. However, it must be delivered by October 2012 (and earlier if possible) to mitigate loss of capacity at London Bridge during Thameslink work</p>	<p>Under 'activities and milestones' the completion dates for this work and commencement of 10 car operations should be changed to May 2012 and other milestone dates shall be amended to fit with this.</p>
<b>17.03 Seven Sisters improved access</b>	<p>There is currently no agreed scope of work</p>	<p>Scope of works should be changed to read "Work at Seven Sisters station will include widening staircases, extending canopies and providing additional seating, lighting and CIS equipment."</p>

Project	Issue	Required change
<p><b>18.03 Alexandra Palace to Finsbury Park up line improvements</b></p>	<p>Need clarity of scope of track work in the Finsbury Park area.</p> <p>There is confusion about whether the additional platform at Alexandra Palace is to be provided in CP4 or CP5</p>	<p>Under the specific requirements add additional bullets as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New crossover from Up Canonbury to Up Moorgate lines south of Finsbury Park station</li> <li>○ 'Reversal' of Up Slow 2/Up Slow 1 crossover north of Finsbury Park station so that it provides access from Up Slow 1 to Up Slow 2 instead.</li> </ul> <p>In 'outputs', delete 'Alexandra Palace' from the 3<sup>rd</sup> para (in the section that starts "Subject to funding in CP5...") as it will have been provided in CP4.</p>
<p><b>18.08 Shaftholme Junction</b></p>	<p>The plan suggests provision of a double track chord is subject to affordability but this is the baseline option</p>	<p>Under 'scope of works':</p> <p>Delete: 'A new non-electrified single (or subject to affordability) double track chord'</p> <p>Insert: 'A new non-electrified double track chord'</p> <p>Under 'outputs' in the specific requirements of the project, first bullet:</p> <p>Delete: 'provision of a single, or preferably double track, line'</p> <p>Insert: 'provision of a double track line'</p>

Project	Issue	Required change
<p><b>20.00 St Pancras – Sheffield linespeed improvements</b></p>	<p>Our 2008 periodic review determination specified ‘a package of track, signalling and junction remodelling to reduce journey times by around 10 minutes’. The June plan proposes improvements in sectional running times of 4 to 5 minutes</p>	<p>Under ‘outputs’ delete ‘the expected aggregate reductions in SRTs are 5 minutes in the down direction and four minutes in the up’ At the start of the outputs section insert ‘This project will improve the capability of the infrastructure to enable a minimum eight minute improvement in journey times between London and Sheffield for services calling at Leicester, Derby and Chesterfield.’ Under ‘key assumptions’ add an extra bullet:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Existing rolling stock (HST and class 222) will be used</li> </ul> </p>
<p><b>21.00 Nottingham resignalling</b></p>	<p>Platform works are not clear</p>	<p>Under ‘scope of works’ insert ‘The scheme will split the existing platform 4 to create a wing platform and a 6-car bay platform. It will also allow operations from the west to use existing platform 6. Passive provision will be made for a new platform.’  Delete ‘There will be...platform.’ [as this is now covered by the new text] and delete the row in the scope of works table referring to platform lengthening [as this refers only to the passive provision for the new platform and not actual works]</p>

Project	Issue	Required change
<p><b>22.03 Wrexham – Marylebone line speeds</b></p>	<p>The plan suggests improvements from this scheme which are too small</p>	<p>Under scope of works, delete existing text. Insert</p> <p>'The proposed project is one element of the wider Evergreen 3 project which aims to deliver the 100 minute journey time objective between the West Midlands and London Marylebone. This particular project focuses on raising the line speed at Aynho Junction (between Banbury and Bicester) in both directions. In the up direction (towards London) the line speed will be increased from 60 mph to 90 mph and in the down direction (towards the West Midlands) the junction speed will be increased from 40 mph to 85 mph. It is likely that the signalling and track elements will be separately managed by DB Regio UK Ltd as part of their Evergreen 3 project.'</p> <p>Under 'outputs' delete third para and insert 'Our initial analysis indicates that the infrastructure intervention will contribute between 1 and 1½ minutes journey time reduction towards the overall achievement of the 100 minute journey time objective between the West Midlands and Marylebone.'</p>