Company Secretary  
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited  
1 Eversholt Street  
London  
NW1 2DN  

Network licence condition 7 (land disposal): Lease of 35 stations to Rail for London

Decision

1. On 5 May 2015, Network Rail gave notice of its intention to dispose of land via the grant of two multi locational station leases to Rail for London (RfL) in accordance with paragraph 7.2 of condition 7 of its network licence. The proposed disposal is described in more detail in the notice (copy attached).

2. We have considered the information supplied by Network Rail including the responses received from third parties you have consulted. For the purposes of condition 7 of Network Rail’s network licence, ORR consents to the disposal of the land in accordance with the particulars set out in its notice.

Reasons for decision

3. We are aware of the future transfer of responsibility for the operation of certain railway passenger services that currently form part of the Greater Anglia franchise from the Secretary of State for Transport to Transport for London (TfL). The transfer of 35 stations from Network Rail to RfL would facilitate this.

4. We note that RfL has created a new set of Station Access Conditions that will govern the contractual arrangements for the stations in two 125-year leases which will come into effect on 31 May 2015. MTR Corporation (Crossrail) Limited and London Overground Rail Operations Limited will operate the stations.

5. The transfer of station leases is intended to be covered by paragraph 1(b)(i) of our general consent under condition 7 of Network Rail’s network licence and in most circumstances an application for the specific approval by ORR is not required. However, since Network Rail proposed to lease the stations to RfL directly, rather than to a passenger train operator, the general consent does not cover these transactions. Our specific approval is therefore required.

6. We are satisfied that Network Rail has consulted all relevant stakeholders with current information. No alternative reasonably foreseeable railway use for the land was identified and there was no evidence that the proposed disposals would affect adversely railway operations.
7. Network Rail’s consultation raised one objection from NXET Trains Limited (NXET) on the grounds that the terms of the leases to RfL were more favourable than those in leases held by passenger train operators. However, the objective of condition 7 is to protect land which may be required for the future development of the railway network; it is not designed as a control for the commercial terms of proposed land transactions and does not form part of our decision criteria. Consequently, we cannot uphold NXET’s objection under condition 7 of Network Rail’s network licence.

8. Based on all the evidence we have received and taking into account all the material facts and views relevant to our consideration under condition 7, we are satisfied that there are no issues for us to address.

9. We have had regard to our decision criteria in Land disposal by Network Rail: the regulatory arrangements, December 2013,¹ and balanced our section 4 duties given to us under the Railways Act 1993. In doing so we have given particular weight to our duty to exercise our functions in a manner which we consider best calculated to “protect the interests of users of railway services”.

10. We have therefore concluded that the proposed disposal is not against the interests of users of railway services and that our consent should be granted.

Les Waters

Duly authorised by the Office of Rail Regulation

¹ Available from www.rail-req.gov.uk/server/show/nav.150
Proposed Property Disposal Application by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited to dispose of land in accordance with the Land Disposal Condition of the Network Licence

### 1. Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site location and description</th>
<th>The following stations, the extent of which is defined by blue edging on the Station Plans, and will be incorporated in the proposed Head Lease to Rail for London.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transferring to:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Grove</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush Hill Park</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Heath</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingford</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapton</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Green</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Park</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield Town</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gidea Park</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodmayes</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney Downs</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wood</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highams Park</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilford</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fields</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectory Road</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romford</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Kings</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Sisters</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Street</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbury</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Street</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford Hill</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Newington</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theobalds Grove</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Street</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walthamstow Central</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Lane</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Street</td>
<td>London Overground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plans attached: (all site plans should be in JPEG format, numbered and should clearly show the sites location approximate to the railway)

See plans attached which indicate the proposed lease areas edged blue and Network Rail’s ownership shaded green. In addition a set of Agreed Principles for the allocation of maintenance and repair responsibilities has been agreed. The plan for Ilford was updated following further discussions and this was recirculated to all relevant parties on 24/03/14.

Clearance Ref:

Clearance applications have been submitted for all the stations listed above.

Project No.

Not used

Ordnance survey coordinates

Not used

Photographs (as required)

Not used

2. Proposal

Type of disposal (i.e. lease / freehold sale)

125 year Long Lease Disposal on FRI terms.

Proposed party taking

Rail for London (RfL)

Proposed use / scheme

Continued use for Station purposes in accordance with the terms of the Headlease. It is intended that RfL will grant underleases to the operator of the relevant rail concession which will be subject to regulated Station Access Conditions.

Access arrangements to / from the disposal land

As indicated on the respective plans

Replacement rail facilities (if appropriate)

Not applicable

Anticipated Rail benefits

Long term lease to continue existing use, encourage investment in Stations, simplify repair and maintenance responsibilities, and improve customer experience.

Anticipated Non-rail benefits

N/A

3. Timescales

Comments on timescales

Consent is sought with a view to completing the leases no later than 31 May 2015

4. Railway Related Issues

History of railway related use

The stations are currently let to Abellio Greater Anglia. It is proposed that these leases will be terminated (there are provisions in the leases to facilitate this). The new lettings to RfL are for continued use for station purposes. The sites have been used as stations since privatisation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When last used for railway related purposes</th>
<th>Currently under railway use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any railway proposals affecting the site since that last relative use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on current railway related proposals</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for future railway related use</td>
<td>Continued use for Station Purposes is envisaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any closure or station change or network change related issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether disposal affects any railway (including train operator) related access needs, and how these are to be addressed in future</td>
<td>The disposal will not affect the current or future provisions for railway related access. Network Rail has reserved appropriate access rights to the retained network through the lease areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position as regards safety / operational issues on severance of land from railway</td>
<td>1. The disposal does not include any requirement for new fencing of the railway boundary, as they are lease grants of existing stations 2. The disposal is on a basis under which Network Rail has had due regard (where applicable) to impact of the disposal on lineside works, including railway troughing, signalling and their maintenance. 3. The disposal is without prejudice to Network Rail’s safety obligations, with which Network Rail will continue to comply. Network Rail’s network licence requires compliance with Railway Group Standards. These set out requirements for – amongst other things – fencing, access and signal sighting. In addition, the Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 require Network Rail to have a safety management system and safety authorisation in respect of its mainline railway system and its railway infrastructure. These, in turn, require Network Rail to comply with Railway Group Standards as well as its own internal standards; and also continually to monitor changes to the risks arising from its operations and to introduce new control measures as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Planning History and Land Contamination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning permissions / Local Plan allocation (if applicable)</th>
<th>Not relevant to this disposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contamination / Environmental Issues (if applicable)</td>
<td>Not relevant to this disposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railway (internal – Network Rail)</th>
<th>Anglia Route has been consulted and supports the proposal. Internal clearance for the disposal is being progressed and the disposal is subject to satisfactory internal clearance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of position as regards external consultations</td>
<td>41 parties (including 14 Local Authorities) were consulted on the proposal. 29 consultees had “no comment”, 4 consultees supported the proposal, 9 consultees failed to respond, and 1 consultant has objected. Please see the consultation report attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of any unresolved objections together with recommendation by Network Rail as regards a way forward</td>
<td>There is one unresolved objection from National Express. The objection is based on the commercial terms of the disposal rather than the principle of the disposal itself. Network Rail has attempted to resolve this by further correspondence (see attached e-mail correspondence) but the consultee has not withdrawn its objection. Network Rail’s opinion is that this consultation is in respect of Network Rail’s consent to make the disposal under the terms of its Network Licence land disposal condition. The Licence Condition is about protecting assets for the future use of the railway. This is not prejudiced by the length of the lease or the commercial terms negotiated with RfL. Therefore the objection is not valid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- unresolved objections;
- steps undertaken towards seeking resolution;
- reasons why it is appropriate for application to be presented to ORR for decision while objections remain unresolved]

delete / draft as necessary

7. Local Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names &amp; Email Addresses:</th>
<th>14 Local Authorities were consulted on the proposal. Please see the consultation report attached.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Authorities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relevant Local Authorities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Internal Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leasing Manager Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Head of National Customer</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED LAND DISPOSAL CONSULTATION REPORT
relating to

APPLICATION BY NETWORK RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED FOR REGULATORY CONSENT
UNDER THE LAND DISPOSAL CONDITION OF ITS NETWORK LICENCE

This report is provided as a supplement to our forms for the proposed disposal of land at:

Site location and description:

The following stations, the extent of which is defined by blue edging on the Station Plans, and will be incorporated in the proposed Head Lease to Rail for London.

Bethnal Green
Brentwood
Bruce Grove
Bush Hill Park
Cambridge Heath
Chadwell Heath
Chingford
Clapton
Edmonton Green
Emerson Park
Enfield Town
Forest Gate
Gidea Park
Goodmayes
Hackney Downs
Harold Wood
Highams Park
Ilford
London Fields
Manor Park
Maryland
Rectory Road
Romford
Seven Kings
Seven Sisters
Silver Street
Southbury
St James Street
Stamford Hill
Stoke Newington
Theobalds Grove
Turkey Street
Walthamstow Central
White Hart Lane
Wood Street
We have consulted in relation to this evaluation, and summarise the results of this as follows:

Summary of position regarding responses:
41 parties (including 14 Local Authorities) were consulted on the proposal. 27 consultees had "no comment", 4 consultees supported the proposal, 9 consultees failed to respond, and 1 consultee has objected.

There is one unresolved objection from National Express. The objection is based on the commercial terms of the disposal rather than the principle of the disposal itself. Network Rail has attempted to resolve this by further correspondence (see attached e-mail correspondence) but the consultee has not withdrawn its objection.

Network Rail’s opinion is that this consultation is in respect of Network Rail’s consent to make the disposal under the terms of its Network Licence land disposal condition. The Licence Condition is about protecting assets for the future use of the railway. This is not prejudiced by the length of the lease or the commercial terms negotiated with RfL. Therefore the objection is not valid.

The full list of external consultees is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External party (name)</th>
<th>Whether response received (y/n)</th>
<th>Date of response</th>
<th>Details of response (e.g. “no comment”), with reference to any accompanying copy representation in annexes to this report</th>
<th>Comments (e.g. as regards endeavours to obtain response where none given)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Department for Transport</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>01/04/15</td>
<td>the Department has no comment on this proposal</td>
<td>Response from xxxx on behalf of DfT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Transport</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>01/04/15</td>
<td>the Department has no comment on this proposal</td>
<td>Response from xxxx on behalf of DfT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arriva Trains Cross Country</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/15</td>
<td>XC Trains has no objection to this proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NXET Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15/04/15</td>
<td>Responded with additional queries on 26/03/15. These were replied to on 26/03/15. Chased for confirmation of NX position on 14/04/15. NX confirmed they would respond by the end of the consultation period. NXET responded again on 15/04/15 objecting to proposal. NR replied on 16/04/15 stating that in its opinion the objections were not valid (see e-mail attached).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chiltern Railway Company Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25/03/15</td>
<td>There are no comments from Chiltern Railways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Eurostar International Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>26/03/15</td>
<td>No issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 First Great Western Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27/03/15</td>
<td>We have no comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Grand Central</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Chased by e-mail on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External party (name)</td>
<td>Whether response received (y/n)</td>
<td>Date of response</td>
<td>Details of response (e.g. “no comment”), with reference to any accompanying copy representation in annexes to this report</td>
<td>Comments (e.g. as regards endeavours to obtain response where none given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Company Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31/03/15 and 14/04/15. Telephoned and left message 15/04/15. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Anglia (Abellio)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Chased by e-mail on 31/03/15 and 14/04/15. Telephoned 14/04/15 and asked if could respond. E-mailed again 06/05/15 to confirm that no objection unless hear to contrary by 08/05/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Overground Rail Operations Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>06/05/15</td>
<td>LOROL’s position is that we have no comment to make.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; South Eastern Railway Limited (Southeastern)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/04/15</td>
<td>Southeastern have no comment on this proposal.</td>
<td>Response from xxxx on behalf of SouthEastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyrail Electrics 2002 Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/15</td>
<td>Merseyrail have no comments to make on the proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rail Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24/03/15</td>
<td>Northern has no objection to the leasehold disposal of the 35 stations on the GA route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR Trains</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11/04/15</td>
<td>MTR Crossrail is involved in the changed station leasing arrangements affecting the Crossrail stations and supports the proposed disposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLAS Freight</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27/03/15</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Rail Services Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24/03/15</td>
<td>Direct Rail Services have no objections to the proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of the greater Anglia Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB Schenker (Formerly EWS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/15</td>
<td>DB Schenker has no objection to the proposed land disposal as described</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15/04/15</td>
<td>FTA has no comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freightliner Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/15</td>
<td>No comments from Freightliner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External party (name)</td>
<td>Whether response received (y/n)</td>
<td>Date of response</td>
<td>Details of response (e.g. “no comment”), with reference to any accompanying copy representation in annexes to this report</td>
<td>Comments (e.g. as regards endeavours to obtain response where none given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB Railfreight Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>09/04/15</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB Railfreight Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>03/04/15</td>
<td>No issues from GB Railfreight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight Group</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/03/15</td>
<td>Ok with RFG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Railway Company</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14/04/15</td>
<td>Initial response was that WCR could not see the advantage of disposing of 35 (or any) actively operational NR assets to a sub-subsidiary company of TfL, especially at a time when NR has just bought out a raft of long-lease freight sites. Whilst it won't directly affect WCR, who, presumably, will continue to gain access via its agreement with the relevant SFO, it does not appear sensible for the longer term and merely introduces another tier of management/liability/bureaucracy - unless I have missed something. Network Rail responded with a further clarification e-mail on 27 March 2015 and WCR responded on 14/04/15 that they still don't really see the point but, so long as it doesn't put any further complications in our way, ie. we only need to deal with the SFO for access they won't object. Network Rail confirmed on 14/04/15 that WCR will still only need to deal with the SFO for access and the lease to RfL will not impact on this. On this basis it is considered that the objection has been withdrawn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Malcolm</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/03/15</td>
<td>WH Malcolm has no objections to the proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Community Rail Partnerships</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/03/15</td>
<td>ACoRP have no objection to these disposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Transport Police</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15/04/15</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossrail</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>26/03/15</td>
<td>Although some of the stations on the list have areas safeguarded for the Crossrail project, the leasehold</td>
<td>Response was from xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External party (name)</td>
<td>Whether response received (y/n)</td>
<td>Date of response</td>
<td>Details of response (e.g. “no comment”), with reference to any accompanying copy representation in annexes to this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>London Travelwatch</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>09/04/15</td>
<td>London TravelWatch has no objection to the aforementioned proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15/04/15</td>
<td>TFL have no comment on the proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Essex County Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30/03/15</td>
<td>No objection raised, but identified aspiration to jointly develop plans for how existing highway and rail facilities at and around Brentwood Station can be enhanced to provide a more suitable and welcoming environment for not only rail users, but local residents and businesses in the immediate locale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hertfordshire County Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/04/15</td>
<td>We would support the proposed disposal by way of a grant of 125 year FRI long leases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Broxbourne Borough Council</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>London Borough of Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13/04/15</td>
<td>We are supportive of the transfer of control of the Chingford line stations from Greater Anglia to LOROL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Brentwood Borough Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15/04/15</td>
<td>BBC has no specific comments at this stage re Brentwood station but would reserve the right to make appropriate representations in the future regarding this stage once more detailed information comes to light re actual proposals for the site identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>London Borough of Hackney</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/15</td>
<td>London Borough of Hackney has an immediate interest in six stations – Clapton, Hackney Downs, London Fields, Rectory Road, Stamford Hill and Stoke Newington. We are very happy to support this proposal as we believe it is an important basis for RRL to improve the quality of our local stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>London Borough of Haringey</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24/03/15</td>
<td>We do not have any comments on the plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Enfield Council</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>External party (name)</td>
<td>Whether response received (y/n)</td>
<td>Date of response</td>
<td>Details of response (e.g. “no comment”), with reference to any accompanying copy representation in annexes to this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>London Borough of Newham</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>London Borough of Havering</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/04/15</td>
<td>No particular comments with regards the proposals within Havering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>London Borough of Redbridge</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17/04/15</td>
<td>Responded to consultation on 17/04/15. No Comment reply in respect of Network Rail’s proposed course of action with regard to Chadwell Heath, Goodmayes and Seven Kings Stations. In respect of Ilford firm opinion is that the blue line of the Head Lease transfer boundary (to Rail for London) should be extended to include the former ticket office building at the York Road/York Mews Entrance. NR replied that Ilford boundary had already been amended to include this land and this had been advised to all interested parties on 24/03/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of responses are given in the annexes to this report, as indicated above. A copy of the consultation request (before customisation for any individuals) is given in Annex 2.
Annex 1 – Stakeholder responses

1. **DfT**
   - From: [mailto:railexecutive.gsi.gov.uk]
   - Sent: 01 April 2015 06:59
   - To: [mailto:]
   - Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER
   - the Department has no comment on this proposal (in fact, we welcome it!).

2. **CrossCountry Trains**
   - From: [mailto:crosscountrytrains.co.uk]
   - Sent: 23 March 2015 11:50
   - To: [mailto:]
   - Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route
   - XC Trains has no objection to this proposal.
   - Regards
   - CrossCountry
   - Phone: 0121
   - Mobile:
   - Fax: 0121 200 6007
   - Address: 5th Floor, Cannon House, 18 The Priory Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6BS

3. **National Express**
   - From: [mailto:networkrail.co.uk]
   - Sent: 16 April 2015 17:26
   - To: [mailto:nationalexpress.com]
   - Cc:
   - Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route
   - Thank you for your reply and further information regarding your objection. To address further the points you have made:
   - This consultation is in respect of Network Rail’s consent to make the disposal under the terms of its Network Licence land disposal condition. The Licence Condition is about protecting assets for the future use of the railway. This is not prejudiced by the length of the lease or the specific terms negotiated with RfL.
   - Whilst your comments regarding the commercial terms are not considered material to the principle of the land disposal, the point you make about RfL being in occupation essentially in perpetuity (somewhat akin to Network Rail) is quite correct but the difference to the 99 year lease terms is that RfL will not be the SFO. That is one of the reasons why development rights (including the right to grant a long lease at a premium) are being granted to it. I agree that one of the purposes of the 99 year FRI Franchise lease was to encourage longer term investment in stations, but this should also (as you have stated) secure residual value for the future franchises/industry.
   - I will refer your comments to the ORR, the DfT, and RfL as the other interested parties in this matter.
   - Regards
   - The Quadrant: MK
Elder Gate  
Milton Keynes  
MK9 1EN  

From: [mailto:@nationalexpress.com]  
Sent: 15 April 2015 17:06  
To: @networkrail.co.uk  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route  
Importance: High  

Having discussed further with colleagues, I confirm that our objection to this disposal remains.

Our reasoning is the lack of parity of treatment between public sector and private sector SFOs. Station leases let on a long leasehold FRI basis should be for the same length of term and let on the same terms and conditions, regardless of whether the Lessee/SFO is in the private sector (e.g National Express) or public sector (RfL.) If RfL get a lease of 125 years, then state or public sector Station Lessees/SFO’s have an advantage that the private sector is denied, with no recourse to appeal.

In addition, we also believe the second point you make regarding development rights is not valid, the reason being that Network Rail are attempting to create or draw an artificial distinction when you argue that RfL would essentially be there in perpetuity as the Station Lessee (somewhat akin to Network Rail,) whereas private sector SFO’s wouldn’t be there for the full 99 years due to franchise length. One of the key ideas of the 99 year FRI lease is to encourage private sector SFOs/TOC’s to behave like long leasehold tenants including making capital investment (which may indeed include some form of development) with paybacks longer than 15 years thereby securing residual value for the future franchises/industry. The length of a rail franchise in this respect is irrelevant.

I trust this clarifies our position.

Rgds

From: [mailto:@networkrail.co.uk]  
Sent: 14 April 2015 14:06  
To: mailto:@nationalexpress.com  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route  

Further to my e-mail below I would be grateful if you could confirm what National Express’s position is on this matter. The closing date for the consultation is this Friday 17th April so if possible please can you respond before then.

Regards  
The Quadrant: MK  
Elder Gate  
Milton Keynes  
MK9 1EN

Tel 07718 004672

From: @networkrail.co.uk  
Sent: 27 March 2015 12:21  
To: @nationalexpress.com'  
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route  

Dear  

Thank you for your response to our consultation on the proposed disposal of 35 stations forming part of the Greater Anglia Route.  

In response to your questions:

This is a consultation in which we have requested your views on our proposed disposal by way of a grant of 125 year FRI long leases of the stations. Therefore if your views are those as stated below they will be
considered by Network Rail and we will seek to resolve these issues with you. If they cannot be resolved
the ORR will consider them and make the final decision.

If these are the confirmed views of National Express my response is set out below

In respect of your first point, the 125 year lease is to RfL who will then underlet to the respective SFO.
Unlike the 99 year lease granted to NXET the RfL lease will not be assigned between SFO’s on a change of
concession. To encourage long term investment in these stations a term of 125 years was agreed between
the parties.

In respect of your second point the reason that RfL is being granted development rights is because they
will have a long term 125 year interest in the properties and therefore they will be best placed to secure
long term investment in the stations and improve the customer experience. This would include the right
to grant a lease at a premium (up to the expiry date of the RfL lease) because RfL will be the lessee for the
entire period of any such lease granted. This is different to the NXET 99 year lease where the current
lessee may not be in occupation for the full term of an underlease granted at a premium. This restriction
is imposed in the NXET 99 year lease to ensure the value of any commercial opportunity is amortised
fairly over the period of the head lease.

In the light of my explanation above I would be grateful if you would confirm whether the objection by
National Express still remains or is withdrawn. If you would like to discuss further or require any further
explanation please do contact me.

Kind regards

The Quadrant: MK
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN
Tel

From: [mailto:@nationalexpress.com]
Sent: 26 March 2015 11:09
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia
Route

I assume we are able to lodge an objection on the grounds that:

a) RfL are getting a longer leasehold interest than TOCs (125 years v 99 years that the rest of us get?)
and

b) RfL are getting development rights (and pass the right to lease for a premium) that TOCs don't get?
Pls confirm

xxxx - are RDG aware of this?

Rgds

4. Chiltern Railways

From: EXT:
Sent: 25 March 2015 13:47
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia
Route

Hi

There are no comments from Chiltern Railways.

All the best,
5. **Eurostar**
   From: [mailto:@eurostar.com]
   Sent: 26 March 2015 09:30
   To: @networkrail.co.uk
   Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - Ilford Station
   No issue for EIL,
   Thanks
   Eurostar International Limited
   Times House | Bravingtons Walk | London N1 9AW
   T +44 (0)20
   M +44 (0)7
   eurostar.com

6. **First Greater Western**
   From: @firstgroup.com
   Sent: 27 March 2015 16:30
   To: @networkrail.co.uk
   Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route
   Hello again
   We have no comment thank you.
   First Great Western
   3rd Floor | Milford House | 1 Milford St | Swindon SN1 1HL
   e: @firstgroup.com | m:
   First Greater Western Limited | Registered in England and Wales number 05113733
   Registered office: Milford House, 1 Milford Street, Swindon SN1 1HL.

7. **Grand Central Railway**
   No response

8. **Greater Anglia (Abellio)**
   From: 
   Sent: 06 May 2015 12:44
   To:@greateranglia.co.uk'
   Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER
   Importance: High
   Dear xx
   I refer to my e-mails of 20 March, 31 March, 14 April, and our subsequent telephone conversation on 14 April. Whilst you indicated during our telephone conversation that Abellio had no comment on the proposals I have not received this confirmation in a formal written response to my e-mail. Therefore unless I receive any formal written response by 12:00 p.m. on Friday 8th May I will report a "no comment" response to the ORR.
   Kind regards

9. **London Overground**
   No response
   From: mailto:@lorol.co.uk]
   Sent: 06 May 2015 13:59
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - URGENT

I responded via TfL some time ago, at TfL's request, which is customary for matters such as this where LOROL has an interest in the matter at issue. LOROL's position is that we have no comment to make. As you note, below, LOROL will have a contractual interest at some of the stations in question from 31/05/2015, and we therefore feel that it is inappropriate to make further comment on the consultation.

---

10 SouthEastern
From: [mailto: @southeasternrailway.co.uk]
Sent: 16 April 2015 12:07
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Good afternoon
Thank you for the opportunity to review the below.
Southeastern have no comment on this proposal.

Kind Regards
Southeastern
Floor 3 Friars Bridge Court
41-45 Blackfriars Road
London
SE1 8PG
@southeasternrailway.co.uk

---

11. MerseyRail
From: [mailto:@merseyrail.org]
Sent: 23 March 2015 07:57
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Hi
Merseyrail have no comments to make on the above proposal.

Regards
Merseyrail

Tel
Mob
Email @merseyrail.org
Web www.merseyrail.org

---

12. Northern Rail
From: [mailto:@northernrail.org]
Sent: 24 March 2015 14:40
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - Ilford Station

Hello
Northern has no objection to the leasehold disposal of the 35 stations on the GA route
13. **MTR CrossRail**  
*From:* Sent: 13 April 2015 09:56  
*To:*  
*Subject:* RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER  

xxxx  
Thanks for this. The lease plan does show the fast line platform (attached) but this does appear to have been left off the disposal plan. I will get this amended.  
Regards  

---  

14. **Colas Freight**  
*From:* [mailto:@colasrail.co.uk]  
*Sent:* 11 April 2015 08:51  
*To:*  
*Subject:* RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER  

Thank you for sharing this with me. MTR Crossrail is involved in the changed station leasing arrangements affecting the Crossrail stations and supports the proposed disposal.  

One point of detail, the plan for Brentwood doesn’t appear to include the fastline platform on the south side of the site.  

Regards  

deel
d

**Kind regards**

**Northern Rail Ltd**  
**Northern House**  
**York**  
**YO1 6HZ**  
**T:**  
**M:**  
**E:** @northernrail.org  
**W:** http://www.northernrail.org

---

**Colas Freight**  
*From:* [mailto:@colasrail.co.uk]  
*Sent:* 27 March 2015 17:03  
*To:* @networkrail.co.uk  
*Subject:* RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route  

Dear  
I have no comment.  

Kind regards

---

**Colas Rail LTD**  
Dacre House - Floor 2, 19 Dacre Street, London, SW1H 0DJ, United Kingdom  
www.colasrail.co.uk
15. Direct Rail Services Limited

From: [mailto: drsl.co.uk]
Sent: 24 March 2015 15:06
To: networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - Iford Station

Direct Rail Services have no objections to the proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of the greater Anglia route.

Regards
Tel:
Mobile:
E-mail: drsl.co.uk
Direct Rail Services Limited
Kingmoor TMD
Etterby Road
Carlisle
CA3 9NZ

16. DB Schenker Rail (UK) Ltd

From: EXTL:
Sent: 23 March 2015 11:10
To: networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

I can confirm that DB Schenker has no objection to the proposed land disposal as described.

Yours,
DB Schenker Rail (UK) Ltd.
310 Goswell Road
London EC1V 7LW
Tel:
Fax:
Mobile

17. Freight Transport Association

From: [mailto: fta.co.uk]
Sent: 15 April 2015 18:23
To: networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route – REMINDER

Thanks, can confirm FTA has no comment on this one.
Regards,

Freight Transport Association
Mobile:

18. Freightliner

From: [mailto: @Freightliner.co.uk]
Sent: 23 March 2015 16:05
To: networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route
No comments from Freightliner
Regards
19. **GB Railfreight**

From: [mailto: @gbrailfreight.com]
Sent: 09 April 2015 08:08
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

No comment.

From: EXTL:
Sent: 03 April 2015 17:43
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

No issues from GB Railfreight.

Regards

GB Railfreight Ltd.,
3rd Floor,
55 Old Broad Street,
London, EC2M 1RX.
Tel: 020
Mobile: 
E-mail: @gbrailfreight.com.

GB Railfreight Ltd. Registered in England & Wales No. 03707899.
Registered Office: 3rd Floor, 55 Old Broad Street, London, EC2M 1RX.

20. **Rail Freight Group**

From: [mailto: @rfg.org.uk]
Sent: 20 March 2015 17:34
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Ok with RFG
Rail Freight Group
@rfg.org.uk

21. **West Coast Railways**

From: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: 14 April 2015 14:24
To: @aol.com
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part o...

Thank you for your response. I confirm that you will still only need to deal with the SFO for access and the lease to RfL will not impact on this.

Kind regards
The Quadrant: MK
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN
Tel 07718 004672
From: @aol.com
Sent: 14 April 2015 14:13
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part o...
I still don't really see the point but, so long as it doesn't put any further complications in our way, ie. we only need to deal with the SFO for access, I won't object.
Best
TM
E: @aol.com
In a message dated 14/04/2015 14:08:43 GMT Daylight Time, @networkrail.co.uk writes:
Dear
Further to my e-mail below I would be grateful if you could confirm what WCR’s position is on this consultation. The closing date for the consultation is this Friday 17th April, so if you could respond before then I would be grateful.
Regards

The Quadrant: MK
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN
Tel
From: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: 27 March 2015 11:47
To: @aol.com'
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part o...
Dear
Thank you for your response to the consultation.
You are correct that WCR would continue to gain access to any of these stations via a Station Access Agreement with the relevant SFO.
In respect of your other comments, the benefit of transferring these assets to RfL on a long lease are as follows:
• The existing use as a station will be continued for the long term
• By granting a long lease to RfL this will encourage investment in the stations. Unlike the existing long lease to AGA this lease will not be transferred between SFO’s on a change of franchise/concession. It will remain with RfL for the full 125 years which will provide them with a long term interest which will enable a longer term investment strategy to be developed.
• Under the terms of the lease all maintenance and repair obligations will transfer to RfL, which will simplify responsibilities.

If you have any other queries or require any further clarification please do not hesitate to contact me.
Regards

The Quadrant: MK
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN
Tel
From: @aol.com
Sent: 20 March 2015 16:58
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part o...
I cannot see the advantage of disposing of 35 (or any) actively operational NR assets to a sub-subsidiary company of TfL, especially at a time when NR has just bought out a raft of long-lease freight sites.
Whilst it won't directly affect WCR, who, presumably, will continue to gain access via its agreement with the relevant SFO, it does not appear sensible for the longer term and merely introduces another tier of management/liability/bureaucracy - unless I have missed something.

Best

WCR
T
M
E: @aol.com

22. Malcolm Group

From: [mailto: @whm.co.uk]
Sent: 20 March 2015 17:38
To: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

WH Malcolm has no objections to the proposal.

Malcolm Group, Block 20, Newhouse Industrial Estate, Old Edinburgh Road, Newhouse, North Lanarkshire, ML1 5RY
Tel: | Int: Mobile:
Email: @whm.co.uk Web: http://www.malcolmgroupeco.uk

23. ACoRP

From: [mailto:@btconnect.com]
Sent: 20 March 2015 22:11
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Hello

ACoRP have no objection to these disposals.

Regards

24. British Transport Police

From: [mailto:@btp.pnn.police.uk]
On Behalf Of SDD Business Support
Sent: 15 April 2015 14:01
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

No comment

Strategic Development Department
British Transport Police
25 Camden Road,
25. **CrossRail**

*From:* [mailto: @crossrail.co.uk]

*Sent:* 26 March 2015 10:37

*To:* @networkrail.co.uk

*Cc:*

**Subject:** RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Thank you for the consultation. Although some of the stations on the list have areas safeguarded for the Crossrail project, the leasehold disposal will have no impact. Crossrail therefore has no comments to make.

Regards

---

26. **London TravelWatch**

*From:* [mailto:@londontravelwatch.org.uk]

*Sent:* 09 April 2015 12:30

*To:*

**Subject:** RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Dear ,

London TravelWatch has no objection to the aforementioned proposal.

Regards

---

27. **TFL**

*From:* [mailto: @tfl.gov.uk]

*Sent:* 15 April 2015 10:06

*To:* @networkrail.co.uk

**Subject:** RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

Hi

TFL have no comment on the proposals detailed below.

Kind regards,

Rail Development Team | Rail & Underground Transport Planning

Transport for London

---

28. **Essex County Council**

*From:*

*Sent:* 15 April 2015 16:28

*To:*

**Subject:** RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route
I confirm that I have forwarded your e-mail below to the Property Team at TfL who will no doubt be in contact once they become the lessee of the station (if not before). I have also passed it onto Network Rails Property Development Team.

From your comments below I take it that Essex County Council has no objection to the proposed long lease disposal?

Kind regards

From: [mailto: @essex.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 March 2015 10:36
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Cc:

Subject: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Dear

I am writing further to your recent email entitled, as above, dated 20th March and the subsequent conversation that you had with my colleague xxxx on 24th March 2015.

As xxxx explained, Essex County Council (ECC) and Brentwood Borough Council (BBC) have been working with Crossrail Urban Realm Designers to develop plans for how existing highway and rail facilities at and around Brentwood Station can be enhanced to provide a more suitable and welcoming environment for not only rail users, but local residents and businesses in the immediate locale. This will form part of ECC & BBC’s commitment to working with Crossrail to ensure that their ethos of improved local station gateways is realised in Essex (similar plans exist for Shenfield).

With this in mind, there is an aspiration to investigate the potential for decking part of the existing Brentwood Station Car Park – potentially self-funded by selling off the remaining land for development. In order to progress this aspiration, it is likely that the new car park structure would overlap a large proportion of the eastern end of the main car park and the disused NR compounds adjacent to Kings Road, which are outside of the ‘leasehold disposal area’ (to be retained by Network Rail).

The purpose of this email is to ensure that this aspiration is relayed to Rail for London, as we would be keen to enter into early discussions with them and Network Rail to establish how we might best progress this scheme.

I understand that you have provided xxxx with initial contacts in this regard; however, I wanted to ensure that our aspirations are documented. For whilst both Crossrail and the existing TOC (Abellio Greater Anglia) are supportive of these plans, I am mindful that this may be new information to Rail for London and the new Crossrail TOC (MTR).

Regards

Essex County Council
Telephone: | mobile
Email: @essex.gov.uk | www.essex.gov.uk

29. Hertfordshire County Council

From: [mailto:@hertfordshire.gov.uk]
Sent: 20 April 2015 13:08
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Cc:

Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

Given that we sent a letter of support to the Secretary of state for the proposed devolution of inner services (and therefore relevant stations) to TfL in April 2013, we would support the ‘proposed disposal by way of a grant of 125 year FRI long leases of the stations listed above to Rail for London’ as set out in your e-mail below, which would for us would only apply to Theobalds Grove station.
30. Broxbourne Borough Council

No response

31. Waltham Forest Council

From: [mailto:@walthamforest.gov.uk]
Sent: 13 April 2015 12:39
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

Dear

Thank you for email of March 31st consulting us about the disposal/transfer of station leases on Greater Anglia lines. We are supportive of the transfer of control of the Chingford line stations from Greater Anglia to LOROL. We have no further comments to make on this other than to request a legend to explain the different shadings and colours used on the plans of the station lease areas in Waltham Forest, including the plans for St James Street, Walthamstow Central, Wood Street, Highams Park and Chingford.

Yours sincerely

Waltham Forest Council

32. Brentwood Borough Council

From: [mailto:@brentwood.gov.uk]
Sent: 15 April 2015 13:12
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

Dear

Please see below sent on behalf of Brentwood Borough Council’s Head of Planning and Development;

BBC has no specific comments at this stage re Brentwood station but would reserve the right to make appropriate representations in the future regarding this stage once more detailed information comes to light re actual proposals for the site identified.

Kind regards,

Brentwood Borough Council

33. London Borough of Hackney

From: [mailto:@Hackney.gov.uk]
Sent: 23 March 2015 13:56
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Dear
London Borough of Hackney has an immediate interest in six stations – Clapton, Hackney Downs, London Fields, Rectory Road, Stamford Hill [which we have sometimes had reason to remind ORR is NOT in LB Haringey], and Stoke Newington.
We are very happy to support this proposal as we believe it is an important basis for RfL to improve the quality of our local stations.
Regards,

34. Haringey Council
From: [mailto: @haringey.gov.uk]
Sent: 24 March 2015 15:39
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Leasehold disposal of 35 stations Greater Anglia
Dear
I refer to the consultation on the above. We do not have any comments on the plans.
Regards

6th floor south
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ
Tel: 020
Mobile:

35. Enfield Council
No response

36. Tower Hamlets Council
No response

37. Newham Council
No response

38. London Borough of Havering
From: [mailto: @havering.gov.uk]
Sent: 20 April 2015 13:43
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route
HI
Thank you for your voice message and Apologies for not getting back to you by your 17th April
deadline. I have discussed this with colleagues and we have no particular comments with regards
the proposals within Havering.
regards,

London Borough of Havering | Regulatory Services
Town Hall, Main Road Romford RM1 3BD

39. London Borough of Redbridge
From: [mailto: @redbridge.gov.uk]
Sent: 17 April 2015 16:35
To: @networkrail.co.uk
Cc:
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia
Route - LB REDBRIDGE RESPONSE
Importance: High
Dear
I am writing to convey the London Borough of Redbridge response to your email below. I confirm that we submit a “No Comment” reply in respect of Network Rail’s proposed course of action with regard to Chadwell Heath, Goodmayes and Seven Kings Stations. However, in the case of Ilford, this Authority’s firm opinion is that the blue line of the Head Lease transfer boundary (to Rail for London) should be extended to include the former ticket office building at the York Road/York Mews Entrance. Such inclusion is completely consistent with extensive discussions LB Redbridge has been having over a long period with Crossrail and Rail for London and Network Rail representatives regarding improved station access arrangements in connection with the introduction of Crossrail services and potential installation of an additional footbridge across the railway between York Road/York Mews and Ilford Hill.

Achieving greater passenger usage of an upgraded station entrance from York Road/York Mews (open beyond just the peak hours only current operation) is important in delivering local accessibility improvements and assisting regeneration as well as helping to reduce the passenger and pedestrian pressure in and around the congested main station entrance area in Cranbrook Road.

Yours sincerely
London Borough of Redbridge
12TH floor (Rear), Lynton House
255-259 High Road, Ilford IG1 1NY
Tel. No. 020
Email: @redbridge.gov.uk
Web:www.redbridge.gov.uk
Twitter: @RedbridgeLive
Facebook: www.facebook.com/redbridgetlive
Save time, go online: www.redbridge.gov.uk

40. City of London
No response

41. Barking and Dagenham Council
No response.
Annex 2 – Network Rail’s consultation email

From: [mailto:@networkrail.co.uk]
Sent: 20 March 2015 16:45
To:
Subject: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route

Dear Consultee,

Property: Stations as listed below

Bethnal Green
Brentwood
Bruce Grove
Bush Hill Park
Cambridge Heath
Chadwell Heath
Chingford
Clapton
Edmonton Green
Emerson Park
Enfield Town
Forest Gate
Gidea Park
Goodmayes
Hackney Downs
Harold Wood
Highams Park
Ilford
London Fields
Manor Park
Maryland
Rectory Road
Romford
Seven Kings
Seven Sisters
Silver Street
Southbury
St James Street
Stamford Hill
Stoke Newington
Theobalds Grove
Turkey Street
Walthamstow Central
White Hart Lane
Wood Street

We seek to consult you as regards your views, please, on our proposed disposal by way of a grant of 125 year FRI long leases of the stations listed above to Rail for London.
We attach a draft application form to the Office of Rail Regulation which, with its related plan(s), explains the proposal in detail. Subject to the outcome of our consultation, we may make a formal application to ORR for consent to make the disposal under the terms of our network licence land disposal condition. We would expect to make an application based on this form, updated in the light of consultation responses.

Alternatively, if in the light of the consultation responses, the proposed disposal would qualify to be made under ORR’s general consent, we may complete it accordingly.

ORR reviewed our land disposal arrangements so that from 1 April 2008, ORR will no longer launch any separate consultations when we apply for consent to dispose of land. The arrangements are that we will consult and report the results to ORR in conjunction with our application. It is therefore important that we have your views, so that these may be considered in ORR’s decision.

We request your comments, please, by 17 April 2015 (including any “no comment” response). It would be helpful if your response is provided by email. A “no-comment” response can be provided by simply clicking the “No Comment” voting button at the top of this e-mail.

If you have any queries as regards this proposal, please direct them to xxxx, (tel., @networkrail.co.uk ). If future consultations of this nature should be directed differently to your organisation, please advise us of the appropriate contact details, so we may amend our records.

Yours faithfully,

The Quadrant: MK
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN
Tel

Reminder consultation email 1

From: Sent: 31 March 2015 15:53
To: @networkrail.co.uk)
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

Dear Consultee,

Property: Stations as listed below

1. Bethnal Green
2. Brentwood
3. Bruce Grove
4. Bush Hill Park
5. Cambridge Heath
6. Chadwell Heath
7. Chingford
8. Clapton
We seek to consult you as regards your views, please, on our proposed disposal by way of a grant of 125 year FRI long leases of the stations listed above to Rail for London.

We attach a draft application form to the Office of Rail Regulation which, with its related plan(s), explains the proposal in detail. Subject to the outcome of our consultation, we may make a formal application to ORR for consent to make the disposal under the terms of our network licence land disposal condition. We would expect to make an application based on this form, updated in the light of consultation responses.

Alternatively, if in the light of the consultation responses, the proposed disposal would qualify to be made under ORR’s general consent, we may complete it accordingly.
ORR reviewed our land disposal arrangements so that from 1 April 2008, ORR will no longer launch any separate consultations when we apply for consent to dispose of land. The arrangements are that we will consult and report the results to ORR in conjunction with our application. It is therefore important that we have your views, so that these may be considered in ORR’s decision.

We request your comments, please, by 17 April 2015 (including any “no comment” response). It would be helpful if your response is provided by email. A “no-comment” response can be provided by simply clicking the “No Comment” voting button at the top of this e-mail.

If you have any queries as regards this proposal, please direct them to xxxx,(tel. xxx, @networkrail.co.uk ). If future consultations of this nature should be directed differently to your organisation, please advise us of the appropriate contact details, so we may amend our records.

Yours faithfully,

Reminder consultation email 2

From: 
Sent: 14 April 2015 13:47
To: @networkrail.co.uk) 
Cc: @networkrail.co.uk) 
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed leasehold disposal of 35 stations forming part of Greater Anglia Route - REMINDER

Importance: High

Dear Consultee,

Property: Stations as listed below

1. Bethnal Green
2. Brentwood
3. Bruce Grove
4. Bush Hill Park
5. Cambridge Heath
6. Chadwell Heath
7. Chingford
8. Clapton
9. Edmonton Green
10. Emerson Park
11. Enfield Town
12. Forest Gate
13. Gidea Park
14. Goodmayes
15. Hackney Downs
We seek to consult you as regards your views, please, on our proposed disposal by way of a grant of 125 year FRI long leases of the stations listed above to Rail for London.

We attach a draft application form to the Office of Rail Regulation which, with its related plan(s), explains the proposal in detail. Subject to the outcome of our consultation, we may make a formal application to ORR for consent to make the disposal under the terms of our network licence land disposal condition. We would expect to make an application based on this form, updated in the light of consultation responses.

Alternatively, if in the light of the consultation responses, the proposed disposal would qualify to be made under ORR’s general consent, we may complete it accordingly.

ORR reviewed our land disposal arrangements so that from 1 April 2008, ORR will no longer launch any separate consultations when we apply for consent to dispose of land. The arrangements are that we will consult and report the results to ORR in conjunction with our application. It is therefore important that we have your views, so that these may be considered in ORR’s decision.

We request your comments, please, by 17 April 2015 (including any “no comment” response). It would be helpful if your response is provided by email. A “no-comment” response can be provided by simply clicking the “No Comment” voting button at the top of this e-mail.

If you have any queries as regards this proposal, please direct them to xxxx,(tel. xxxxx, @networkrail.co.uk ). If future consultations of this nature should be directed differently to your organisation, please advise us of the appropriate contact details, so we may amend our records.

Yours faithfully,