

# SOME FURTHER S-STOCK THOUGHTS

by John Hawkins

Having viewed the new pictures, the only new feature I noticed since the last pictures is the 'Door not in use' illuminated notice over each doorway, which I presume will light for end-door cut out, which will probably be used rather than the cost and time of lengthening platforms. Slower dwell times may be acceptable on the section with lower service intervals.

I also notice that the 6-car line diagram is shown on this Hammersmith train, which will presumably no longer be required.

Counting the seats in the photos confirms Piers Connor's figures in his article No.12 in *Underground News* No.534, June 2006 – 8 cars = 304 seats.

There appear to be four double transverse seats in a bay opposite 4 fixed longitudinal and 3 folding seats = 15 seats. With three doorways per car side there are two of these bays, so 30 seats. At a gangway there are only 2 longitudinal seats on each side = 4 seats at each car end, or 8 more seats.

$30+8 = 38$  per car x 8 cars on Met = 304. This confirms that the passenger seating bay behind both cabs is the same as at other car ends, i.e. 2 per side (just like C-stock). The wheelchair bays do not sacrifice seating, but just have all 7 longitudinal seats folding to the wall.

If Metronet honour their promise to increase seating on the Metropolitan (see below, already reported in *Underground News* No.533, May 2006, NF 40/06), I imagine it would be by widening the transverse seats to 3 persons each, i.e. 4 extra seats per car or 32 per 8-car train (+10.5%). I feel that modern safety requirements need wide aisles for emergency evacuation of a full train by rescue services in full chemical protection suits (chemical, biological, nuclear contamination, etc) – which could be explained as wheelchair access throughout the train.

My article "Will They Stand For It" was written on this basis, and calculated that only 3 additional seats per car would allow an enhanced service north from Baker Street to offer more seats than currently, still with current services working through to Aldgate/Barking.

Transverse seats at car ends would not increase capacity, and would block the wide gangway. All transverse seats in the mid-sections of cars would only increase capacity by 2 seats per car, and this would not happen at wheelchair locations. The lower seating capacity results from wider seats for wider passengers, wider doors for quicker dwell times and with stand back areas by each doorway. I don't think 3+2 transverse seating would allow as wide an aisle as current A-stock.

7 longitudinal seat bay in S-stock is  $7 \times 495\text{mm} = 3,465\text{mm}$

8 longitudinal seats for A/C-stocks would be  $8 \times 430\text{mm} = 3,440\text{mm}$ , i.e. an extra seat and still 25mm shorter. (This must be why C-stock seating remained unchanged on revision from transverse to longitudinal seating).

3+2 transverse seats on A-stock is  $5 \times 430\text{mm} = 2,150\text{mm}$

3+2 transverse seats on S-stock would be  $5 \times 495\text{mm} = 2,475\text{mm}$ , i.e. 325mm narrower aisle, even if car body is as wide as A-stock.

D-stock had already grown to 480mm seats, so I don't think a return to the old dimensions is likely. I presume this is due to widening passengers due to richer

diets – it might also be that people are less willing to snuggle in with strangers than in the past!