

IN THE MATTER OF THE TRANSPORT WORKS ACT 1992  
AND THE APPLICATION BY CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD  
IMPROVEMENTS) ORDER

RE: THE PROPOSED CLOSURE OF THE PEDESTRIAN LEVEL-CROSSING  
AT THE TRAP GROUNDS OFF ARISTOTLE LANE, OXFORD

*Department of Transport Reference TWA/10/APP/01/OBJ/5*

SUBMISSION TO PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY

---

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF CHILTERN RAILWAYS' REBUTTAL PROOF  
OF EVIDENCE

---

*Made by:*

Ian Salisbury  
24 Lathbury Road  
Oxford OX2 7AU

tel: 01865 250777

[ian@salisbury.eu](mailto:ian@salisbury.eu)

fax: 01865 250999

DX: 145844 Oxford 6

## *Request*

- 1 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.12. Please explain how “all” of the ‘mitigation’ measures proposed by Chiltern Railways will improve accessibility for allotment holders.
- 2 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.12. Please explain all the criteria used in the assessment of “improve”.
- 3 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.14. Please explain the criteria and values used to assess the conclusion “disproportionate inconvenience”.
- 4 *Andy Coates.* Re: 3.15. Regarding the “Objector’s concerns” being overcome, is his objection concerning changes to the drainage of Port Meadow and the consequential effect on the meadow ecosystem been included in this assertion?
- 5 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.21. Please provide the gradients of each section of the ramp and demonstrate the accuracy of the stated average gradients.
- 6 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.21. Please say what limits are included in the words “in the region of”.
- 7 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.22. Please describe the criteria employed to ascertain the “limits of acceptability”. Would such a limit include the prerequisite of consent from the ‘Overseeing Organisation’?
- 8 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.22. Does the ‘Overseeing Organisation’ include the Secretary of State for the Environment and the Freemen of the City of Oxford?
- 9 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.24. Please explain the relevance of actual equestrian usage, rather than “designated” equestrian usage in this context.
- 10 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.26. Is it implied that there are relevant statistics relating to injuries sustained by pedestrians from trains on the Aristotle Lane level crossing?
- 11 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.40. Please explain whether “reasonably practicable” implies or provides justification for the operation of the exclusion of “exceptional circumstances” of the National Policy on Level Crossings published by the ORR.
- 12 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.45. What is the “traffic moment” for the Aristotle Lane level crossing?
- 13 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.45. What “sighting times” has Mr Nelson employed in the formulation of his evidence?
- 14 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.49. Why is it “appropriate” to “aggregate” private footpath level crossings with public footpath level crossings?
- 15 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.51. Please explain in what “near misses” means, whether such criteria can be objectively obtained, and whether it is

objectively recorded and tested.

16 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.53. Would Mr Aiden Nelson explain the criteria he has employed while cab-riding to assess crossing misuse, and whether he classifies such misuse as near misses that have been under reported.

17 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.53. Would Mr Nelson please explain whether his evidence in this paragraph is derived from the Aristotle Lane level crossing.

18 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.54. What are the national regulations referred to? Are they in evidence?

19 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.56. Please explain how small a risk must be before it can be discounted?

20 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.57, 3.77-3.79. Mr Nelson asserts that “there are no circumstances” showing it would be impracticable to close the crossing. Please explain whether “no circumstances” includes wheeling a trolley-stretcher up and over the Aristotle Lane Bridge while carrying out continuous cardiopulmonary resuscitation?

21 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.48. Please explain how the cost of installing miniature warning lights is set off against risk, making the cost “disproportionate”

22 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.68. What, precisely, are the “data” referred to? What are their values?

23 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.68. Are these data incorporated into ALCRM or are they obtained from SMIS or any other source? Please identify that source.

24 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.85. When was Thames Water given details of the project?

25 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.85. When will drawings of the new alignment be produced?

26 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.86. Has the size of maintenance and access chambers been taken into consideration?

27 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.88. In reaching his conclusion that there is no problem with the sewer, has Mr Barker taken into account access to that sewer?

28 *Stephen Barker.* Re: 3.102. Please explain the absence of a drawing stated here with the details referred to at 3.85.

29 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.113. When will this information be provided. Meanwhile should any other ALCRM result be ignored?

30 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.122. What is the definition of a “near miss”?

31 *Aiden Nelson.* Re: 3.122 and 3.129. What is the personal information contained in these records that makes it inappropriate to produce them?

Ian Salisbury.. . . . . 3 November 2010