

# THE JOURNAL OF THE LONDON UNDERGROUND RAILWAY SOCIETY

Issue No 154

Volume 13 No 10

October 1974

## QUESTIONS - AND ANSWERS

Some years ago the Society ran a Questions and Answers service in the Journal, but this was restricted to the tube lines. Since then, a number of questions have been posed, and they have been dealt with mainly through the correspondence columns. In some ways this has been satisfactory, and in a number of cases the number of replies has helped to elucidate various aspects of the question being answered. In other cases, however, the results have not justified the space taken up in the Journal. Therefore, it has been decided to attempt a more comprehensive service than the earlier one to cover the whole Underground system. The first batch of questions and answers follow, and the feature will appear whenever there is a reasonable number of items to deal with.

QA1 Apart from 013144D and 013260D (which was recently a *temporary stores car at Acton*), what other cars became de-icing units?

COP de-icing cars were: 013080, 013090, 013091, 013144, 013272, 013172 & 013260

QA2 Is it true that a CO/CP car had rubber suspension?

No COP cars have had rubber suspension.

QA3 What are the identification letters for Shoreditch signal cabin?

There is now no signal cabin at Shoreditch, the area being controlled from Whitechapel. In the days of the Metropolitan, there was a cabin at Shoreditch, and this had the code letter 'A'.

QA4 Why does LT still use bull-head rail?

Most LT track is still fitted with bull-head rail because it is lighter and cheaper than flat-bottomed rail. As axle loads on LT lines do not exceed 16 tons there is no need for the stronger flat-bottom rail used on BR main lines.

QA5 Does LT use as much long-welded rail as it could?

Long-welded rail is standard on all LT lines except at certain locations, i.e. curves of less than 15 chains radius, through points and crossings, where there are alternate open and covered sections and in cuttings where clearances are very tight and do not allow long rail adjustment during traffic hours. The sound of rail joints at many places is also due to block joints for signal circuits, and there are a great many of these, particularly approaching, and in, station platforms.

QA6 How are the number of trains needed for service calculated and what spare units are allowed for?

The number of trains needed for service are quite simply calculated, e.g. the Hammersmith and Circle Lines :-

	No of trains for peak service	No of C69 trains	% Spares
Circle	14 )		
H & C	17 ) = 31	35 1/3	
		(106 x 2-car units)	12.3

To give a complete list for all lines would not give a true position, even if services were at their normal level, as some stocks were built when more trains were required for service than now, e.g. A60, 1962 stocks. It is believed that it is planned eventually to reduce spares to 12½% or less on all lines. This is as low as can be reasonably expected, especially as there are at present more damaged units than was formerly the case - and the shortage of maintenance staff is almost as serious as that of train crews.

QA7 Why have 7-car trains been adopted on the District Line? (this question received before the recent correspondence).

It reduces the number of crews required as it cuts out uncoupling at Ealing, Upminster and Parsons Green; it also reduces the number of trains required - once again saving crews; it reduces the need for station staff at the short-platform stations with catwalks; and it has also reduced the number of cars needed, which has given LT the opportunity to scrap the worst of the CO/CP cars.

Further questions to the Editor at 62 Billet Lane, Hornchurch, Essex, RM11 1XA.

## THE FIRST OF THE NEW STOCK DELIVERED

The first train of 1973 tube stock was delivered to Ruislip Depot on 16th August 1974. As has been explained previously, there will be six long cars in a train, which will consist of two 3-car units. There are three types of unit, made up as follows :-

	<u>Car Numbers</u>
<u>'A' Unit</u>	
DM at West End, without autocoupler	100-252 even only
Trailer with two compressors	500-652 " "
UNDM with autocoupler	300-452 " "
<u>'D' Unit</u>	
UNDM with autocoupler	301-453 odd only
Trailer with one compressor	501-653 " "
DM at East End, without autocoupler	101-253 " "
<u>Double-ended Unit</u>	
DM with autocoupler	854-894 even only
Trailer with two compressors	654-694 " "
DM with autocoupler	855-895 odd only

This makes a total of  $87\frac{1}{2}$  trains to be delivered. Each car is 6 feet longer than the present longest tube car, making them the longest vehicles on LT. They are also 6" narrower than the widest tube stock. It is understood that these dimensions will render modifications necessary to the structure and equipment in the lifting shop at Acton Works before the cars can be accepted there.

The LT standard Westinghouse and e.p. braking are replaced by the 'Westcode' electric braking system and, as a result, fault location equipments, known as 'Fault Annunciators' are installed in the motor cars.

Externally, the cars are in aluminium finish with a red apron around the cab front; the duty number display is on the opposite side to the driver below the cab window, and the 6" difference in width is noticed because of the sharper slope of the cab window tops. Internally, the cars are finished in grey with yellow ends and a white roof (Passengers with hang-overs are advised not to look at the ends!) and the seats are upholstered in blue moquette.

The traditional red alarm handles are replaced by a red button with a yale-type lock within, all recessed into the ceiling, and alarm

indicator lights are situated at the 'A' ends of the cars above the centre door. Once the alarm has been operated, it can only be reset by the use of the guard-held key in the lock.

Each door engine operates one pair of doors, and there is an access panel beside the doors approximately 50mm above the floor.

The extra length of the cars leaves more standing and/or luggage space which should make them ideal for rush-hour workings.

At the recent public open days at Ruislip, unit 301-501-101 was available for inspection by visitors.

#### A 1955 ACCIDENT

P.R. Davis

On several occasions a few years ago this Journal criticised LT for serious delays in rescuing passengers from stranded trains. This does not seem to happen now to anything like the extent that it used to, but a re-reading of the Accident Report on the collision at Bromley in 1955 shows that the fault existed then. It is ironic that the collision which is the subject of this report took place at the end of the delay, and was not the cause of it.

The facts were as follows. During fog on the evening of 1st December 1955, there was a serious disruption of services on the Upminster section of the District Line - which was then owned by British Railways, Eastern Region. Current was cut off, and at about 20.30, the 17.00 ex Wimbledon for Upminster was standing empty in the eastbound District platform at Bromley (now Bromley-by-Bow), the passengers having been detrained. Behind it, held at the Bromley Down Home signal, was the 17.04 ex Acton Town, also bound for Upminster, but this was not empty; it was fully loaded with about 800 passengers, and had been standing at the signal for about 2½ hours. The Report states that "it was not safe to detrain passengers at this point" but does not say why this should have been so - though possibly it was because there was then a double-line junction trailing eastbound from the District lines to the North London Line, and a pair of facing crossovers between the District lines and the London Tilbury and Southend (then steam) lines (both have since been removed).

Because the current was off, the Westinghouse brake was out of action, and the second train was held at the signal on the handbrake only.

Between the Down Home and the station, the line is on a falling gradient for eastbound trains, mainly at 1 in 93 but with a short stretch at 1 in 148. So, it being unsafe to detrain at the signal, the driver received a message from the signaller at about 20.30, delivered by the station foreman, authorising him to run his train by gravity into the station and up to the ex-Wimbledon train standing there if he was prepared to do so.

The driver decided to run in with his 8-car R stock train full of passengers, made the appropriate arrangements with his guard, and after some trouble in releasing the brakes got the train moving. Unfortunately, once in motion it could not be stopped in time, and it collided, at slow speed, with the ex-Wimbledon train - a 6-car R stock formation. The damage was slight, but 44 passengers suffered minor injuries, though only two of them were badly enough hurt to be detained in hospital.

Colonel W.P. Reed, the Inspecting Officer, in his conclusions gives it as his opinion that the driver was fully justified in deciding to run his train into the station, even though he had not carried out such a movement before, because he (i.e. the driver) fully appreciated how important it was for the passengers to be released.

The Inspector continues by saying that he believed the train could have been brought safely to a stand if the guard had applied the brakes in the rear car with vigour and had then manipulated them as the motorman had intended, it being said that the motorman did not spend long enough in making sure that the guard understood what was required of him.

Comments on other points are equally, if not more, interesting. The line was then under the control of BR's Fenchurch Street Controller in conjunction with the District man at Leicester Square. Eastern Region admitted the inadequacy of the telephone arrangements at Fenchurch Street, but the Inspector held the view that sufficient information could have been obtained to allow the train to move into Bromley before the current was cut off.

Colonel Reed also comments that there was some criticism that the passengers were not informed about what was happening and he remarks "motormen and guards on the London Underground system are not enjoined to keep passengers informed about the progress of delays; their duties on these occasions consist primarily in taking such

action as may be necessary to ensure the safety of their trains and to start again as soon as conditions permit". The conclusion he came to is that during such an exceptionally long stoppage, it would have been common sense to have given information to passengers if it had been possible - but he adds that it was probably not possible because of the crowded conditions in the train.

And the cause of all the trouble? At 17.55 there had been severe arcing under a westbound District train at East Ham - so severe that the signalman there decided to stop all traffic, on the steam lines as well as the electric. By about 18.25 it was deemed safe to restore the steam service, but the half-hour delay had caused much work in the Fenchurch Street Control Room in rearranging the steam services; arrangements were made with District Control at Leicester Square to reverse eastbound District trains at Bow Road, and westbound ones at Barking and Dagenham.

All this took a great deal of time, and there was considerable confusion in the control rooms, both of which seem to have been inadequately informed of what was going on "at the scene of the crime".

Arrangements for dealing with such emergencies were thoroughly overhauled as a result of this Report, by both BR and LT.

Altogether, the event produced a report with an interest out of all proportion to the seriousness of the accident, and the changes then made in control arrangements as a result of the occurrence have effected permanent improvements in control procedures.

It would be interesting to know how much, over the years, has been learnt from accidents, and how many present regulations have been introduced as the direct result of experience gained from such occurrences. We know that much of the law regulating railway operation was passed as a result of the disasters in the early days of rail travel, but the Underground must be able to provide other instances.



# THE POWERS OF LONDON TRANSPORT TO ACQUIRE LAND FOR THE PURPOSES OF THEIR RAILWAY UNDERTAKING

V. Badman

II

## WHAT CAN BE ACQUIRED: LAND AND EASEMENTS

At this point it is appropriate to consider the meaning of the word "land" in relation to the acquisition for which compulsory powers have been obtained. The expression "land" in this context is not, of course, confined to undeveloped sites, but includes buildings and other structures upon and below it, and includes lands of any tenure - freehold, leasehold, etc. As a result it will be seen that there may be more than one "owner" of any particular piece of land.

Now it is a general principle of British law that, unless there is any evidence to the contrary, and subject to certain statutory exclusions, e.g. coal, the over-flying of aircraft, etc., the ownership of land extends both upwards and downwards from the surface of the land; the lawyers have, needless to say, a Latin tag to describe this principle: "Cujus est solum, ejus est usque ad coelum et ad inferos" - he who owns the soil is presumed to own everything up to the sky and down to the bowels of the earth.

Next the word "easement" must be considered. In common law parlance it may be defined as a right enjoyed by an owner of land over the land of another. Typical examples of easements are rights of light, support, air, way and water; such easements are often referred to as "Gale easements" after the author of the standard text-book on the subject. However in the case of a railway undertaking, the expression refers to a "statutory easement" which is the right, authorised by the Special Act, to construct a tunnel below an owner's land and to operate a railway service, entirely without interruption from that owner.

It is important to note, therefore, that the Courts have held that, by themselves, the Clauses Consolidation Acts contain no power to compel an owner to grant an easement over his land (though he may agree to do so if he wishes). In such circumstances, the railway undertaking has no alternative but to purchase the whole of the land. This is highly inconvenient and costly, to say the least, particularly where a major part of the railway is underground. This led to the necessity in the interests of economy, of constructing the early London

tube lines beneath public streets, though, of course, it was not practicable to run the entire line in this way. Such a policy has left London Transport with a legacy of a number of tight curves (often as tight as 5 chains - 330' - radius), the siting of some running tunnels one above the other, or rolled right over to produce "right-hand" running, etc. The resulting waste of running time through speed restrictions, coupled with additional wear and tear on the rolling stock, are too well known to require elaboration in this article.

Modern Special Acts, however, expressly give London Transport the necessary powers to compel the grant of easements, so that it is unnecessary for them to have to acquire the complete interest of the land beneath which the tunnel is to be built.

### THE EXERCISE OF STATUTORY POWERS

Having obtained the statutory powers to acquire land, it is now necessary for those powers to be exercised. Normally such powers are obtained as soon as the Special Act is passed, or within the time stated therein. These powers do not last for ever but their limits are specified in the Special Act. Should the powers not be exercised within that period but are nevertheless required in the future, then an extension of time will have to be obtained - again by going through Parliament.

Powers of acquisition are exercised by the service of what is known as a "Notice to Treat" upon various landowners. As its name suggests, it is a document served upon the landowner by the acquiring authority, setting out its powers, stating that it requires to acquire the land (or easement) and confirming its willingness to treat, or negotiate, for the compensation to be paid for the financial loss arising out of the acquisition. Such a notice is usually a short printed form addressed to each owner and attached to which is a claim form upon which the owner is obliged to state what compensation he requires. When returned to the acquiring authority, this claim form is the basis of subsequent negotiations.

### COMPENSATION

Now a brief note about compensation. The calculation of compensation for land acquired is very complicated and



no attempt will be made in this article to go very far beyond the elementary principles involved.

An owner who is deprived of his interest in land by an acquisition under statutory powers is entitled, as a matter of right, to compensation for the loss of that interest, unless the Act authorising the acquisition expressly deprives him of that right - happily a rare occurrence.

The early rule in compulsory acquisition was that compensation should be paid, to the owner who was dispossessed, according to the value of his interest in the land; in other words compensation meant "value to the owner". This rule has been tightened up so as to exclude any element of additional value to the owner, and the present day basis, so far as this kind of compulsory acquisition is concerned, is "open market value".

The claim for compensation is divided into a number of heads and, depending on whether the whole land is acquired, or only part of it, and also depending on the nature of the interest to be acquired and whether or not the owner is in occupation, will comprise one or more of those heads, namely :

1. For the value of the land or easement purchased by the acquiring authority.
2. For "disturbance", namely the compensation for the loss or injury sustained by the owner totally dispossessed from his property, including his removal costs, temporary and permanent loss of trade, etc.
3. For "severance". This is the compensation for loss of value of the owners' land where it has been divided into two by the land acquired.
4. For "injurious affection". Where only part of the land is taken, the value of the remainder may be seriously depreciated in value due to the exercise of statutory powers; such depreciation in value is termed "injurious affection".

In the case of tunnel works, of course, the payment for the easement is small, and the value of the remaining items is nil, unless the subsoil is being used commercially by the landowner, e.g. for the working of gravel.

Where no land at all is taken, there can, of course, be no claim for items 1, 2 and 3. A landowner's rights to claim for the remaining head of claim - injurious affection - is strictly limited, and much depends on the provisions of the Special Act, and it is necessary to distinguish between depreciation in value caused by the construction of the works and their subsequent use. In the case of all modern London Transport Acts, there is provision for compensation under this heading, but this is subject to a time limit being imposed upon the period during which a claim can be made, usually 2 years from the opening of the line.

Readers will undoubtedly have noticed from the Press in November last year, and briefly referred to in NF 1328 in the April Journal, that the owners of the 4-star Westbury Hotel in the West End are claiming £1m compensation from London Transport for structural damage and noise allegedly caused by vibration from the Victoria Line which runs beneath the hotel. It is understood that this claim is to be heard by the Lands Tribunal early next year (1975). The following day it was reported that London Transport also faced a claim from the Royal Over-Seas League and the Royal Ocean Racing Club for cracks in their buildings in St. James's, beneath which the northbound Fleet Line tunnel has been built.

When the Victoria Line was opened, there were a large number of complaints from householders, particularly in the Islington area, who claimed to be affected by noise from the trains running in the tunnels below. The only claim to reach the Courts was one decided by the Lands Tribunal last year (*Pepys v London Transport Executive*) in which the owner of a Georgian terrace house in Gibson Square, Islington, claimed £2,150 compensation for injurious affection from the noise of the running of trains in the tunnels 70 feet below the surface. The claim was based on a prospective purchaser withdrawing an offer of £18,000 for the ~~lease~~-after realising the extent of noise and vibration, and the house was subsequently sold to someone else at £15,850. London Transport carried out noise and vibration tests at the house; the noise produced by the trains was described as similar to the level produced by passing road vehicles in the Square, and became audible only when there was little or no background noise in the house. Vibration was imperceptible. After considering expert evidence from valuers, representing both

parties, and after making its own inspection, the Tribunal decided that the original offer of £18,000, and the subsequent purchase by another party at £15,850 was insufficient proof upon which to base a claim for depreciation in the value of the house by the running of trains; so the claim failed.

Having submitted the claim for compensation, negotiations then take place between the landowner or his representative (usually a Chartered Surveyor) and London Transport's Estates Department. Failing agreement, there are statutory provisions for referring the claim to the Lands Tribunal, which is the highest Court in the land for the settlement of property value disputes of this kind.

### ENTRY UPON LAND

The next question to consider is when the acquiring authority may enter upon the land to begin construction work. The normal rule is that entry cannot be made until the amount of compensation has been settled and paid. However the Special Acts expressly give London Transport the powers to enter on to land prior to the agreement, subject to prior written notice.

### LEGAL TRANSFER OF LAND

The legal formalities in connection with the transfer of the land, or grant of easement, to London Transport follow the customary procedure relating to such transactions, and all costs are borne by L.T.

### REHOUSING OBLIGATIONS

As a statutory undertaking, where dwellings occupied by 30 or more persons are acquired in connection with any of their works, London Transport is obliged under the Housing Acts to prepare a scheme for the rehousing of those persons elsewhere.

### THE MONEY TO PAY FOR IT ALL

The financing of London Transport is a subject worthy of a separate article, and certainly outside the scope of this article. However, the wherewithal to pay for the cost of acquisition and construction is an important aspect of the matter, so a few words are warranted.

Prior to the take-over of London Transport by the G.L.C. on 1st January 1970, the whole of the cost of new works was

paid for by the Government, though, of course, the financing of the original tube lines was by means of shares raised by the original companies. Since 1970, however, London Transport has to apply to the G.L.C. for the money. In turn the G.L.C. generally looks to the Government for at least a part of the cost. Thus in the case of the Heathrow Extension, after initially refusing any grant at all, the Government is to pay 25% of the capital cost. The Greater London Council are paying a further 50%, leaving L.T. to pay 25% out of its ordinary revenue. In the case of the Fleet Line, the Government is paying 75% of the cost of the first stage (Baker Street-Stand), and the G.L.C. is paying 25%.

### CROWN PROPERTY

An interesting feature of L.T.'s powers of acquisition concerns Crown Property. It is, of course, well known that Parliament cannot bind the Crown, and the effect of this is that, generally speaking, L.T. has no powers of compulsion in respect of Crown Property. In order to obtain the right to acquire Crown land or an easement, it is necessary to negotiate separately with the Sovereign and evidence the agreement by means of a licence. If the Sovereign says "no" that is the end of the matter. Reference to a map shows that Buckingham Palace is in a direct line between Green Park and Victoria, nevertheless the Victoria Line is obliged to skirt the Palace and in fact runs below the Queen Victoria memorial outside the Palace. It is believed that this is a case where consent might have been refused.

### OVER TO THE ENGINEERS

Having taken possession legally, the site is then passed over to the Engineer so that construction works may proceed. In this connection, there are two matters which are of importance to the dispossessed owner, namely fencing and accommodation works. All railway undertakings are, by statute, obliged to properly fence their land; in addition all gates, bridges, drains, etc. constructed are to be maintained by them. Accommodation works are additional works carried out by the undertaking for the convenience, benefit or protection of owners whose lands adjoin the railway. For example, where a proposed railway bisects a farm, bridges, accommodation level crossings or cattle creeps are constructed, to give access from one side of the farm to the other, or a belt of trees or other screen erected to mitigate any possible nuisance arising from the running of the railway.

## CONCLUSION

When I set out to pursue this topic, I had no idea of its complexity; indeed, it was my intention to write a single article not a serial.

It is clear that obtaining the necessary powers to acquire land and easements is as mammoth an operation as the planning and designing of the works themselves, and this accounts partly for the seeming delay between the announcement of proposals and the actual completion of the schemes.

London Transport is a statutory body; its powers are, therefore, limited by statute and it must obtain Parliamentary authority before doing anything. This is a product of the British Parliamentary system, which has evolved over many centuries, and is designed to protect the individual against being ridden over roughshod by the "big boys". This is not necessarily a criticism of L.T. who, I am sure, act with the best of faith in these matters.

So there we are: I have learned a great deal in the past few weeks on this little-explored but essential subject. If I have contributed something to somebody else's knowledge I shall be well pleased. However if there are any incorrect statements of fact, then I apologise in advance and shall be glad to be corrected.

## NEWS FLASHES

1380 The BR Crosstown leaflet circulated with the August issue of the Journal was already out of date when it was sent out; fares were increased to 28p Adult and 14p Child from 23-6-1974.

1381 Mr R.P. Joiner has been appointed Electrical Engineer (Generation) by London Transport. He joined LT in 1953 and has recently been Generating Station Superintendent successively at Greenwich and Lots Road.

1382 The New General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, Sidney Weighell, who will succeed Sir Sidney Greene in February 1975, is also Secretary of the pressure group Transport 2000. He is on record as saying that one of the things he wants to see is an expanded London Underground system with better links with British Rail.

1383 London Transport took second prize in a horticultural competition for local authorities at Greater London Horse Show.

1384 It was noticed that by 28-8-1974 the ornate semi-circular sign over the entrance to High Street Kensington station had been replaced by a blank board. It is believed that this sign, which read "Metropolitan & District Railways High St. Kensington" will be erected over the entrance to the London Transport Collection at Syon Park.

1385 Due to there being several defective units on the East London Line, a hurriedly prepared Bakerloo Line unit of 1938 tube stock was sent to New Cross Depot on 1-7-1974. The unit was 11110-12069-012190-10110 and carried East London Line route maps, but no 'step up to platform/step down into train' notice on the doors. It went into service on the Line of 2-7-1974 and remained in use until it sustained a broken window on 14-7-1974. This was repaired at New Cross Depot, and the unit returned to service on 17-7-1974.

1386 From 17-7-1974 there were only two 1938 tube stock available for service on the Piccadilly Line. These were:

10035-012468-11023-10034-012180-12011-11036 and  
10029-012470-11029-10026-012214-12002-11026

The latter of these two was last used for passenger service on the Piccadilly Line as train 347 on Friday 26-7-1974, by which time the other one was already out of use. All the 1938 tube stock, taken out of service from this line has been put into store at Northfields or Cockfosters Depots, and will be withdrawn for scrap unless the staff situation improves sufficiently to allow more trains to run, when they will be required once again.

1387 On the night of 13/14-8-1974, the mobile welding plant wagons WPW1000 and WPW1001 were moved between battery locomotives from Willesden Green goods yard, where they have stood since returning from use by the Southern Region for work on the Bournemouth electrification, completed in 1967. They are now at Neasden Depot.

1388 The last 1972 (Mark 2) tube stock train was delivered to Ruislip on 28-6-1974.

1389 1972 (Mark 2) tube stock driving motor car 3363 has light-weight aluminium bogies. These are believed to be the ones originally fitted at the outer ends of the articulated unit L14A-L14B.

1390 Two trains of C69 stock were involved in a collision at a pair of converging points in Hammersmith Depot at about 10.15 on 26-4-1974. The cars involved included 5502, 6502, 5530, 6530, 5554 and 6554.

1391 Due to the difficulties being experienced with wheels during recent months, four vehicles have had their bogies removed, and the wheelsets used to ease the situation. The vehicles are 54052, 014089, 53052 and F318, which are now on accommodation bogies on 'the Alps' at Ealing Common Depot. It is believed that they were lifted by the Permanent Way steam crane C606 at the beginning of the year, the accommodation bogies having been brought from Acton Works.

1392 A sand drag and buffer stops were added to the East London Line road at New Cross Gate on 5-5-1974. At the same time the track was relaid and raised in the platform to ease entry to, and exit from, the 1938 tube stock now in use on the line.

1393 Since the recent bomb explosion at the Palace of Westminster, the police have made recommendations for increasing security. One suggestion is that there should be only three entrances to the Palace; one of those which it is thought should be kept is that through the cloisters from Westminster station.

1394 A 'do-it-yourself' protester, after waiting half an hour for a train at Kennington, grabbed a red lamp and made off down the tunnel! On 29-8-1974 at Camberwell Court he admitted being drunk and disorderly and was fined £3.

1395 A Conservative Member of Parliament for one of the Hampstead constituencies has complained in the press about LT's waste of labour in instituting a dial-a-bus service in the area, suggesting that the staff would be better employed running the present unfulfilled basic services on the buses and tubes.

1396 Another suggestion in the press was for trains moving against the rush-hour flow of traffic to stop at every other station, consecutively alternating - thereby reaching the outer terminus quicker and being ready to return with the passenger flow earlier than they would otherwise be.

1397 There was a bomb scare at Liverpool Street on 18-7-1974 which caused a one-hour delay. On the same day there was also an alert at Ilford BR station.

1398 On 18-7-1974 in an effort to combat the long intervals in the Metropolitan service, a C stock special was run from Baker Street to Uxbridge. This arrived at Rayners Lane at 23.43; the running number was 205, and it was presumably a Circle train running an extra trip en route to Neasden Depot.

1399 Sir Richard Way, retiring Chairman of London Transport, is to be the next Principal of King's College, London, in succession to Sir John Hackett on his retirement in July 1975.



19.00 for 19.15 Friday 11th October at Hammersmith Town Hall; President's Address for 1974; Harry W. Paar will present a Paper entitled "Some Ramifications of Railway History". To hear the President on such a subject, when he is so well-known a railway historian will be both entertaining and instructive.

Wednesday 16th October An all-day visit to the Works of the Westinghouse Brake and Signal Company Limited at Chippenham. It is understood that the party will be shown the brake demonstration room, will see Supervisory and Automation Equipment and will be given a general tour of the brake and signal division. Lunch will be provided and the party will leave for the return to London at about 16.00. Applications at once please to P.R. Connor, 8 Drayton Avenue, London, W13, accompanied by a first class stamped addressed envelope.

Saturday 26th October Visit to Oxford Circus station. Applications to S.E. Jones, 113 Wandle Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 6AD, accompanied by a first class stamped addressed envelope.

Saturday 26th October Stand at the London Omnibus Traction Society Transport Sale - to be held during the afternoon at Caxton Hall, Westminster.

Sunday 27th October Open Day for our Society members at the Ashford Steam Centre, Ashford, Kent. This will be from 12.00 to 16.00 approximately, and will give members their first opportunity to see the Society's Q Stock trailer car under ideal conditions at its permanent home. To reach the Centre from the station, turn left out of station, take the first turning left; the Steam Centre is about 15 minutes' walk, and the entrance is on the left over the level crossing. Take current membership cards to gain admission.

Saturday/Sunday 2nd/3rd November Stand at the annual Norbury Exhibition; details next month.

19.00 for 19.15 Friday 9th November at Hammersmith Town Hall; Mr. G.H. Hafter will be speaking on the 1973 Tube Stock; this is a most important address from such an authoritative speaker as Mr. Hafter, and should not be missed.

Saturday 16th November Visit to Northumberland Park Depot. Applications to S.E. Jones as above with s.a.e.

19.00 Wednesday 20th November at Caxton Hall - by courtesy of the Stephenson Locomotive Society and the Railway Correspondence and Travel Society, members are invited to attend a Talk by A.W.J. Reeves, Deputy Chief Architect, LTE, with a Film Show on the Construction of the Victoria Line