

1. Do our priorities correctly reflect your views?

Trains late at night, as well as staff, should be included. Metro services should run as late as London Underground.

2. Do you agree that more space is needed for passengers at the busiest times of the day?

Who doesn't?

3. What do you think of the options for providing more space on trains?

Increasing the proportion of second class seats is supported; fewer seats and more standing only if no-one is required to stand for more than 20 minutes.

4. Would you support removing First Class seating on the busiest routes to provide more space?

yes

5. What comments, if any, do you have on our plans to improve customer service and the overall passenger experience?

Too many people obtain the wrong ticket from machines, it is essential to have staff available to sell tickets. Where compensation is due, the railway is in the wrong and should facilitate whatever means the passenger wishes to use. Handing in paper claims, and providing a receipt is preferable to freepost when there is no proof that the claim has been received. Stations should be announced on approach and displayed on screen so that trains are accessible to blind and deaf people.

6. Do you have any other ideas or priorities for improving customer service?

Stops in zone 2 could reduce travel costs for those less able to pay and would achieve modal shift to buses in the zone where this is most desirable.

7. What changes to the fares structure would be of benefit to you?

Cheap fares should apply to counter-peak journeys (mainly out of London) before 9.30.

8. What else could be done to improve the way tickets are sold and provided?

There should be no price penalty for passengers who choose not to walk around with a portable telephone. It should be possible to pay for the whole journey by public transport in one contactless or Oystercard transaction

9. What further comments, if any, do you have on our plans to improve access and facilities at stations?

It is essential to provide toilet facilities at stations if they are not available on board trains

10. What more could be done to improve access and provide facilities for those with disabilities or additional needs?

See 5 – staff at stations and information on trains

11. How far do you support, or oppose, the extension of High Speed services from London St. Pancras to Hastings, Bexhill, and Rye, where this would represent value for money to the taxpayer?

Additional services to meet a growth in demand are not contentious. There is obviously a point at which the extent of premium fares on high speed services outweighs the benefits of shorter journey time.

12. How far do you support, or oppose, reducing journey times to key destinations in Kent and East Sussex, by reducing stops at less well used intermediate stations to create hourly fast services?

It may be possible to produce a shorter journey time by changing trains, if the fast train is closely followed by a slow.

13. If you support this proposal, which services do you think would most benefit from this approach?

14. Which journeys do you take today which are difficult: Metro/Mainline/High Speed

Late night Metro journeys into London

15. Which additional services would you wish to see provided in the next franchise?

Later last trains, especially into London zone 1. We are disappointed that the Metro services are not to be offered as a Concession through London Transport rather than a franchise. In particular, we feel strongly that the Hayes line should be **removed** from this franchise in order that it might be run into the London Overground at New Cross. This would bring several benefits. It would free space at Cannon Street, it would improve the service at New Cross (the only London Overground station with a poorer service at all times of day than thirty years ago), and it would provide good interchange to a plethora of Underground stations which would overcome the opposition to the loss of a direct service to Cannon Street

16. How far do you support, or oppose, options to simplify the timetable?

As far as Metro services are concerned, they should be turn up and go. Minimising the maximum journey time is more important than memorable departure times.

17. How far do you support, or oppose, options to reduce the choice of central London destinations served from individual stations with the aim of providing a more regular, evenly spaced timetable, and a more reliable service? (five point scale)

This is the critical issue. To some extent, the government has already sold out on this important principle, by backing down on plans to end through routes north of Blackfriars on Thameslink. People who cannot afford to live within walking distance of work choose their place of residence by the availability of through trains in the expectation that the current pattern of service will be maintained *sine die*. Opposition to change is therefore fierce. On the other hand, if there is no will to counter buy-to-leave, build on even brownfield sites in the "greenbelt", or otherwise reduce the need to travel measured in terms of distance per person, or even build the infrastructure we need rather than vanity projects or schemes that appear to attract private sector funding, it is difficult to see how overcrowding can be addressed without maximising use of existing infrastructure. Cutting the number of conflicting movements over flat junctions would undoubtedly increase the number of trains that could be operated, and reduce the knock-on effects that presently arise once one train is delayed. This last point, the potential to improve reliability, probably tips the scales in favour of the proposal, but we would urge that the other means of addressing congestion noted above are pursued as well.

18. How far do you support, or oppose, plans for the train operator and Network Rail to form a close alliance with the aim of reducing delays and improving performance? (five point scale)

Motherhood and apple pie.

19. What are your views on how this alliance should be incentivised and held to account for its performance?

Permitting Network Rail to make a successful bid for a franchise would be the most effective way of achieving this.

20. How would you prefer the next South Eastern operator to engage with you: Individual or Organisation

Organisation

21. What approaches to customer service in other companies could be adopted by the next South Eastern train operator?

Information on trains as noted above.

22. Where do you think private sector investment would be of most benefit to the railway? Metro, Mainline or High Speed.

We are opposed to schemes that encourage people to travel further to achieve the same end, and are therefore wary of private sector investment based on development opportunities distant from London. We are also concerned that the overprovision of franchises on stations (fast food outlets, etc.) increase clutter and reduce sight lines to the disbenefit of all passengers and particularly those with physical and mental disabilities.

23. Should we consider using the more lightly used sections of the railway in a different way? If so, how should this be done?

We would not wish to see services downgraded in such a way as to make their restoration difficult or expensive in the event that growth in use demanded it.

24. Looking to future, beyond this franchise, what, if any, benefits do you consider there would be for passengers from a franchise with a different geographical boundary?

Renationalising as the franchises come up for renewal would overcome all boundary issues.

Space for answers that over-run the box