

**PROPOSED CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD IMPROVEMENTS)
ORDER**

CHILTERN RAILWAYS' REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

**IN RELATION TO
THE OBJECTION AND EVIDENCE OF
MS SUSHILA DHALL**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This rebuttal proof of evidence has been prepared on behalf of the Chiltern Railway Company Limited (Chiltern Railways) to respond to particular aspects of the objection and evidence of Ms Sushila Dhall.
- 1.2 In particular, Ms Sushila Dhall has raised new points in her proof of evidence provided for the inquiry that Chiltern Railways had not previously addressed in the proofs of evidence prepared by their witnesses, which were submitted to the Inspector and to certain objectors on 1 October 2010.
- 1.3 It is not intended that this rebuttal proof should repeat material that witnesses for Chiltern Railways have already covered in their evidence. Cross-references to relevant paragraphs of those witnesses' proofs of evidence are given below, where appropriate.
- 1.4 It is intended that this rebuttal proof should be a composite response by Chiltern Railways to those new points raised in the evidence of Ms Sushila Dhall and referred to above. In this respect, for cross-examination purposes, the name of the Chiltern Railways witness who is responsible for each aspect of this rebuttal proof is given at the beginning of each section below.

2 Defined Terms

- 2.1 The following defined terms are referred to throughout this rebuttal proof:

"the Correspondence" means correspondence in the form of emails and letters exchanged between Chiltern Railways and Ms Sushila Dhall dated 15 February 2010, 17 February 2010, 5 July 2010, 2

August 2010, 8 August 2010 and 18 October 2010 attached as Appendix A to this rebuttal proof;

- “the Objector”* means Ms Sushila Dhall;
- “the Objector’s evidence”* means the proof of evidence of Ms Sushila Dhall;
- “the Order application”* means the application for the proposed Order submitted on 6 January 2010 and the Proposed Modification dated 9 September 2010; and
- “the proposed Order”* means the proposed Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford Improvements) Order.

3 Chiltern Railways’ Rebuttal of the Objector’s Evidence

Context

- 3.1 The Objector lives at 12 Stable Close, Rewley Park, some 35 metres from the railway line.

Noise and Vibration Impacts from Trains, Michael Fraser

- 3.2 The Objector is concerned about an increase in the number of idling trains outside her property and in particular freight trains which the Objector states, causes high levels of noise and vibration in her house and garden. The Objector notes that her existing double glazing does not mitigate existing noise and vibration.
- 3.3 The Objector notes that in a letter dated 5 July 2010 she was told by Chiltern Railways that *‘timetables can be arranged so that there is no need for additional trains to wait outside the station, therefore there will be no increase in idling trains outside your property’*. The Objector contends that Chiltern Railways has not addressed the issue that trains will be stopping adjacent to her property.
- 3.4 Chiltern Railways’ trains will not be stabled or serviced in the carriage sidings at the north end of Oxford station. Drivers will be instructed to shut down engines if the train is not to be moved within five minutes of arrival at Oxford station, and all Chiltern trains are equipped with automatic systems to shut down the engines if the train has been standing for more than 15 minutes. This commitment is given in the Noise and Vibration Mitigation Policy [CD/1.29].
- 3.5 We have followed the methodology in Calculation of Railway Noise issued by the Department of Transport (CRN) [CD/5.12], which does not include idling noise at stations. It states, in the additional procedures in paragraph 36, *“the noise from trains stopping at the station and then moving away under full power will normally be accounted for by including their contribution in adjacent segments”*. Coupled with the commitment to reduce idling times, Chiltern Railways believes that the assessment is robust, and that idling trains are unlikely to be a major feature in the noise environment.

Noise Mitigation, Michael Fraser

- 3.6 The Objector is concerned that the proposed increased frequency of trains will mean an increase in noise unless appropriate mitigation measures are put in place. The Objector states that there is no space to accommodate screening bunds, though the Objector would welcome landscaping along the railway if this could be proven to mitigate the noise impacts.
- 3.7 The Objector states that in response to her concerns about noise, Chiltern Railways appear to be claiming that because noise levels are already high in the vicinity of her property, additional noise will make no difference. The Objector challenges the validity of this assumption, as increased frequencies of trains will mean a greater number of times when there are noise impacts in the day.
- 3.8 Chiltern Railways is not claiming that there will be no difference between noise before and after implementation of the Order Scheme. However, the use of objective noise assessment techniques including the number of trains using the station, has confirmed that the noise changes will not be significant.
- 3.9 Whilst the Noise and Vibration Mitigation Policy [CD/1.29] considers railway noise and noise from PA systems at stations, other noise sources, such as noise from people and low level noise from idling trains at railway stations do not fall within the scope of established prediction or assessment methodologies. Chiltern Railways recognises that there is a unique situation at Oxford station where there will be an increase in the effects of these sources (which is difficult to quantify, but which is larger than at other stations), and that there are a number of properties relatively close to the station. To mitigate the noise from these sources to which the Noise and Vibration Mitigation Policy does not apply it is proposed to upgrade the proposed fence along the western edge of the car park to form an acoustic barrier, which will be developed during detailed design, and will be subject to Network Rail approval.

Consultation, Ian Gilder

- 3.10 The Objector states that she found it difficult to contact the consultation team via the consultation hotline and that the consultation took the form of a presentation of an already agreed scheme rather than a truly consultative process. The Objector states that she attended a meeting held for North Oxford residents on 25 March 2010, but that it did not address the concerns of Rewley Park residents close to Oxford station.
- 3.11 A consultation hotline and email address was set up in March 2009 and is still active to allow stakeholders the opportunity to register their views, opinions and concerns about the proposals and to ask specific questions in relation to impacts etc. These have been active throughout the design and TWAO preparation period to allow stakeholders to make inputs into the scheme design as well as to raise concerns over the proposals, and the perceived environmental impacts; to raise concerns over impacts to their homes and properties; and to discuss mitigation measures for any such impacts. The hotline and emails are checked on a regular basis and responses provided within a reasonable timescale.

- 3.12 Chiltern Railways has been in correspondence with the Objector since her original objection letter of 17 February 2010 as shown in the Correspondence in Appendix A. In March 2009, early in the project development a flyer was sent to households along the route alignment including those such as the Objector who have a OX1 2 postcode. The aim of the flyer was to introduce the proposed route, stations and the reason behind the scheme as well as announce the time and location of the public exhibitions. The flyer included a schematic of the route as well as details of the website, email address and telephone number to allow stakeholders to register their responses.
- 3.13 Chiltern Railways held two meetings with the Rewley Park Residents (16 July 2009 and 17 September 2010) when there were opportunities to discuss the Order Scheme in detail with the Chiltern Railways team. Where residents were not present, Chiltern Railways understood that Rewley Park Committee Members present would report back to residents about the outcome of those meetings.

Vibration Impacts, Michael Fraser

- 3.14 The Objector states that she accepts that there will be no structural damage to her property as a result of the Order Scheme, but continues to object on the grounds of impacts on her quality of life. The Objector states she currently experiences the effects of vibration in her living room, bedroom and garden which face the railway. The Objector appreciates that mitigation measures are being offered but is concerned about the impacts on properties in the area even though vibration felt inside residential properties is kept to below a very strict limit, which is defined in British Standard 6472 as a 'low probability of adverse comment'. The Objector recognises that if vibration mitigation is not practicable, the levels could be such that 'adverse comments are possible'.
- 3.15 Although it is stated in the Environmental Statement page 6-62 [CD/1.16] that the highest vibration levels would be such that 'adverse comments are possible', it is noted that this is only in the unexpected situation that vibration mitigation is not practicable, and where levels might therefore be above the stringent 'low probability of adverse comment' category.
- 3.16 Since speeds in the area are low, the effect of vibration is not expected even to be in the 'low probability of adverse comments' category at the Objector's property.

Air Quality, Ian Gilder

- 3.17 The Objector requests clarity on how there can be predictions of no adverse impact in local air quality when the proposed trains are not electric.
- 3.18 As stated in paragraph 10.2 of Ian Gilder's proof of evidence [CRCL/P/12/A] the conclusion of the Environmental Statement (ES) is that pollutant concentrations at residential properties closest to the railway are such that residents will not experience significant air quality impacts from either rail movements or idling trains. The conclusion in Section 13.4.4 of the ES Volume 2 [CD/1.16] is that emissions from freight and passenger rail sources will not have a significant impact on residential properties in the closest proximity to the railway for a fully operational dual track

system between Bicester and Oxford in Phase 2 of the Order Scheme. The evidence that supports this assessment can be found in Section 13 of the ES.

3.19 *Loss of Light from the Development at Oxford Station, Ian Gilder*

3.20 The Objector is concerned that she will experience a loss of light, particularly in winter, as a result of the construction of a new platform on the site of the existing parcel depot at Oxford station, based on the assumption that there will be a requirement for some form of building on the platform.

3.21 The proposed design for the works at Oxford station is best illustrated in Annex D to the Design and Access Statement [CD/1.19]. The works at Oxford station will involve the demolition of the existing substantial parcel depot to be replaced by open platforms with a small accommodation building. The new building will be up to 7 metres in height above the existing car park level. The nearest part of this building is some 35 metres from the Objector's property and viewed, if at all obliquely. Much of it will be obscured by the existing boundary fences. There will be no loss of light to the Objector's property and no adverse visual impacts, taking into account the removal of the present buildings.

4 Conclusion

4.1 This rebuttal proof responds comprehensively to the evidence presented by the Objector.

4.2 The particular concerns raised about noise and vibration mitigation have been addressed. Chiltern Railways has adopted an effective Noise and Vibration Policy for delivery of noise mitigation for Phases 1 and 2 [CD/1.29] which will be implemented through planning condition 16 [CD/1.12/1]. Chiltern Railways' evidence is that measures are to be put into place to prevent noise from idling trains at Oxford station.

4.3 As reported in the Environmental Statement [CD/1.16], air quality impacts on residential properties are not predicted to be significant.

4.4 Chiltern Railways has designed the proposed works at Oxford station in such a way that there will be no loss of light to the Objector's property and no adverse visual impacts, taking into account the removal of the present buildings.

4.5 Chiltern Railways has undertaken a comprehensive consultation programme to ensure that the public has had opportunities to discuss the proposed Order Scheme with the public. Two meetings with local residents in the Rewley area were held.

Appendix A

CRCL/R/OBJ235

Relevant Correspondence
between Chiltern Railways
and the Objector

Sushila Dhall
12 Stable Close
Rewley Park
Oxford OX1 2RF

February 15th 2010

To Whom It May Concern

Re: Chiltern Railway Proposal, Oxford Station

My name is Sushila Dhall. I live at the address above with my 11-year-old daughter, and am the manager of the counselling service at Refugee Resource, Oxford. I am also an elected City Councillor, although it is in my capacity as a local resident that I am writing this letter. I am writing to express my disquiet at the proposal to extend the railway line and buildings nearer to the back of my house at the address above.

Whilst supportive of the general principle of extending public transport I do not support it at the cost of residents' quality of life. Where I live the noise and vibrations from trains stopping for a few minutes at a time already means we cannot sit out in the garden a lot of the time, and we often have to keep windows and the back door shut even in the summer. The sound is a very loud reverberating one which is of far too high a volume to ignore. When the breeze blows from the west at such times the house smells of diesel fumes.

I have tried to therefore object to the proposal by Chiltern Railways to build new tracks even nearer to our house, and to have more trains stopping there. It will make living here impossible, and at the same time is likely to threaten the value of the house so we will not be able to move anywhere else.

However, I keep telephoning the consultation line Chiltern Railways advertises, and emailing the address they advertise, and nobody gets back to me. I read the proposal today in Ramsey House, Oxford City Council's planning department, and noticed that although Chiltern Railways say they are listing all concerns raised they do not include mine (as above), given by phone, last October. Because they do not include mine they do not answer it. I do not believe therefore that my concern, which is valid and considerable, will be taken into account.

One of the saving graces of living here is the sunlight which comes into the back of the house late into the afternoons and in summer into the evenings.

I am concerned that at the same time as increasing the noise and vibrations and to a lesser extent (because it is only when the breeze blows from the west) the diesel fumes, the proposal will block out the sunlight that we enjoy during the late summer afternoons.

I also mentioned this in my phone-call to the Chiltern Railway proposal consultation line last October, and this also is not even mentioned as a concern raised in the current proposal.

12 Stable Close represents to me very many years of hard work and saving and negotiating viable loans.

I ask that my urgent concerns, as one of the residents living very close indeed to this site, be given due consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Sushila Dhall

OBJ/235

Angela Foster

From: Sushila Dhall [sushila@greenoxford.com]
Sent: 17 February 2010 10:57
To: TRANSPORTANDWORKSACT
Subject: response to consultation by Chiltern Railways

Attachments: letter to GOSE re Chiltern Railway proposal Feb 2010.doc



letter to GOSE re
Chiltern Rail...

To Department of Transport,

Please find attached my response as local resident to the Chiltern Railway consultation.

As you will see I note that the concerns I raised at the start of the consultation don't appear in the current consultation document which purports to represent all concerns raised.

I have asked Oxford City Council's environmental health dept to conduct a survey of current train noise from the back garden which they have not done to date as the only way to do this is to go through a house to a back garden. However they will do this in the near future.

I hope that my concerns as a local resident living a few meters from the proposed line will be taken seriously.

Yours sincerely,

Sushila Dhall

Sushila Dhall
12 Stable Close
Rewley Park
Oxford OX1 2RF

5 July 2010

Miss Dahll
12 Stable Close
Rewley Park
Oxford
OX1 2RF

Direct lines
Telephone +44 20 3206 5661
Facsimile +44 20 3206 5440
Email ian.gilder@erm.com

Our Ref: 0110147/OBJ 235

Dear Miss Dahll,

Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford Improvements) TWA Order Application

Thank you for your letter dated February 15th sent to the Department for Transport regarding The Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford Improvements) Order which the Secretary for State TWA Unit has given the objection number OBJ 235. You have raised a number of concerns to which we have responded below.

Stopping Trains

Since the additional trains related to the Scheme will use an independent track into Oxford Station, timetables can be arranged so that there is no need for the additional trains to wait to access the station. Therefore, there will be no increase in idling trains outside your property.

Consultation

You state that you have tried to contact the Chiltern Railways consultation line and have not received a reply to your questions. Chiltern Railways has been committed to engaging local residents throughout the process of preparing the application for the Scheme. An extensive public consultation exercise has taken place including exhibitions, newsletters, infomails and a website. A hotline has been made available so that residents can contact a dedicated consultation team. The consultation team had detailed discussions on specific points with many residents who live close to the Scheme, before the application was submitted.

Since submission of the application to the Department for Transport in January 2010, there has been continued consultation with local residents. This included a meeting held for north Oxford residents on 25th March 2010. Chiltern Railways has and will continue to address specific concerns that residents raise.

We apologise if we have not registered some of your earlier points, but I hope that we now have a good understanding of the issues that concern you.

Your concerns over the potential environmental impact of this scheme are addressed below.

Noise

The Environmental Statement (ES) that was submitted with the Transport and Works Act Order Application considers the areas that are likely to require mitigation to reduce noise (and vibration), and further work will be carried out as part of the detailed design studies to refine the proposed mitigation measures discussed in the ES.

Since noise from the Scheme will affect people both in terms of how noticeable the noise changes are and how loud the noise is, noise has been assessed taking both of these factors into account. The factor that best describes the effect of the noise from the trains in the area being considered is used to determine the noise impact. In urban areas the change from existing ambient noise level tends to be the determinant of the effects of noise. In more rural areas, with very low ambient noise levels, how loud the noise is in isolation tends to be the determinant of the effect of noise on people. In these areas, the noise from the trains is compared to an absolute threshold level and the impact is assessed based on the amount by which the train noise is likely to exceed that level. All of these assessments are of noise levels measured outside rather than inside houses.

The ES describes noise levels both during Phase 1 of the Scheme when Chiltern Railways will operate a passenger service of up to 2 trains per hour in each direction, and during Phase 2 which will only occur if and when the East West Rail proposal is built. The noise levels shown below relate to the worst case ie after Phase 2 of the Scheme.

Predicted noise levels, with and without the Scheme, are reported in Volume 2, Table 6.13 on page 6-35 of the ES. Receptor 22 is representative of noise levels likely to be experienced at Stable Close. Because of the relatively high baseline (existing) noise levels experienced in this area, no impacts from either Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the scheme have been predicted. However, Chiltern Railways are committed to ensuring noise (and vibration) will be mitigated and this is discussed further below.

Vibration

The levels of vibration that will arise from the new train service and track have been carefully assessed based on forecast numbers of all passenger and freight trains in the future, not just those on Chiltern Railways' services. These forecast numbers of services are almost at the maximum capacity of the double track line with the signalling arrangements that are proposed.

Vibration will be way below the levels which could cause any sort of damage to property. Even if, at present, you can feel or hear vibration or groundborne noise from trains, new track and ballast will be provided which will reduce vibration levels, even though it is accepted that there will be a greater frequency of trains passing.

The ES considers the areas that are likely to require mitigation to reduce vibration, and further work will be carried out as part of detailed design studies to take into account local ground conditions.

Where it is predicted that vibration levels will increase, there are engineering methods, which may have to be used to "damp" vibration from the track. These will be used to ensure that, wherever practicable, everywhere along the railway, vibration felt inside residential properties is kept to below a very strict limit, which is defined in British Standard 6472 as a "low probability of adverse comment". In one or two locations, if full vibration mitigation is not practicable, the vibration levels will, at worst, be limited to "adverse comments possible" according to BS 6472, which is still a strict limit. Even at this level, no structural or cosmetic damage to property will occur.

Air Quality

You also mention that you are affected by diesel fumes. Modelling of the dispersion of emissions from rail and road traffic movements associated with Phase 2 of the Scheme (ie with more frequent train movements than in Phase 1) has indicated that pollutant concentrations at residential properties closest to the railway line will not cause significant air quality impacts. The total pollutant concentrations, including those from trains using the Scheme are likely to be within EU statutory guidelines, as implemented in UK law.

The Scheme is generally a positive development for improving air quality, as it provides a sustainable alternative to the car, particularly for commuting journeys into Oxford from surrounding areas.

Loss of Light

The new station facilities at Oxford replace the existing platforms and are not expected to reduce the light to your garden.

Commitment to Mitigation

The ES sets out, in a form which will be legally binding on Chiltern Railways, the noise levels above which mitigation will be applied. The preferred option for noise mitigation is one that contains noise at source, such as maintaining the rails and wheels and considering infrastructure solutions to the track bed which reduce noise. Where these are not possible, measures such as noise barriers will be considered. These interrupt the path of the noise between the rails and the windows of the nearest properties. All of these measures will provide benefits in terms of reducing noise both inside and outside the properties.

Chiltern Railways, in association with Network Rail, is doing everything that can reasonably be done to reduce the environmental impacts of the increased services after the Scheme is built. This includes the installation of effective noise and vibration mitigation, including noise barriers and insulation, where necessary. Those required to deal with noise from Phase 1 will be installed before any additional train services start running. If Phase 2, for the East West

Rail project, is built, additional mitigation measures will be installed, where required.

Continuously welded track will be installed. A range of additional mitigation measures including rail dampers will be considered to mitigate impacts where these have been identified. The extent and type of mitigation at individual locations will be determined as part of the detailed design which will be developed following the approval of the Order. However, the ES identifies the noise and vibration limits for which mitigation will be provided.


Chiltern Railways operates modern trains and undertakes regular inspection and maintenance including regular wheel maintenance at its own facility to correct any wheel flats or other defects that may increase operational noise. Wheel dampers are not normally fitted to trains and would only have a marginal effect under most conditions, and are not proposed for this Scheme.

Potential impact on property value

Since effective noise and vibration mitigation will be implemented, noise impacts from the Scheme will not dramatically change the noise environment in North Oxford. Therefore, it is not expected that house prices would be affected adversely by the Scheme. In the unlikely event that it does, owners will be able to claim for compensation under the Compulsory Purchase Compensation Code. More detail on this can be found in the booklet on compensation produced by The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, which can be found on line at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/compulsorypurchase4>

Yours sincerely



pp.
Ian Gilder
Head of Planning
ERM

For and on behalf of the Chiltern Railway Company Ltd.

02 August 2010

Sushila Dhall
12 Stable Close
Rewley Park
Oxford OX1 2RF

Direct lines
Telephone 020 3206 5340
Facsimile 020 3206 5440
Email
charlene.baker@erm.com

Dear Sushila Dhall,

**Draft Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford improvements) Order
Objection number 235– Sushila Dhall**

I am writing further to the letter we sent to you on 06.07.2010 in response to your letter of objection, which was sent to the Department For Transport. We have not received any response to the letter we sent to you, I trust we have addressed all of your concerns.

If you do have any further questions in relation to the proposed Order or if we have not successfully addressed your concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me on charlene.baker@erm.com. If you feel that we have addressed your concerns with the above Order then you are able to withdraw your objection by writing to the Secretary of State for Transport. Ideally Chiltern will have no objections remaining at the Public Inquiry, we welcome the opportunity to work with you to achieve this position.

Yours faithfully,

Charlene Baker
Consultant
ERM

On behalf of Chiltern Railways

Ms Sushila Dhall
12 Stable Close
Rewley Park
Oxford OX1 2RF

August 8th 2010

**Re: Draft Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford) Order Ojection
number 235**

Dear Ms Baker,

Thank you for your letter. I am sorry not to have replied sooner, and I appreciate your invitation to respond to the letter from Ian Gilder, Head of Planning, ERM, for and on behalf of the Chiltern Railway Company Ltd.

I do not wish to withdraw my objection and will say why by addressing each point individually as raised in the letter of response that I have received. I wish to make my statement by making these responses to each point:

- 1. Regarding an increase in stopping trains outside my property;**
from the current rail line we have times when it is peaceful and trains pass through, and also a few times of day when idling engines cause high levels of vibration and noise in our garden and house. The vibration affects the house and those inside it even when the (double glazed) door is shut, but of course it is far worse when the back door is open, as it is in summer. It is made to be opened, being one which opens onto the back garden, which is adjacent to the current car park. In your letter dated July 5th 2010 your representative tells me that 'timetables can be arranged so that there is no need for additional trains to wait outside the station, therefore there will be no increase in idling trains outside your property'. What is ignored here is that the site where trains currently idle just *outside* the main part of the station, will be the site of land *inside* the station once it has been expanded. So trains stopping to pick up passengers will be behind my garden (which is tiny and creates no buffer zone) and in fact nearer to my property than trains currently idling *outside* the main station. The increased frequency of trains which is proposed will mean more noise and disturbance *unless* serious measures are taken to address and mitigate this. There is no space to accommodate bunds. Tree

planting behind the garden would be welcome if there is thought to be space for this. However I would want to know that this would help.

2. **Consultation.** I explained that I had experienced repeated trouble accessing anyone via the consultation hotline. CRC say in response, 'An extensive public consultation exercise had taken place including exhibitions, newsletters, info-mails and a website. A hotline has been made available so that residents can contact a dedicated consultation team.' The 'extensive public consultation' seemed to me more a presentation of plans than a consultation, and the hotline is the very one I tried to ring several times over several months before anyone got back to me. Referring to 'continued consultation with local residents' CRC say, '...including a meeting held for North Oxford residents of 25th March 2010'. I attended this meeting, which was extremely crowded. It was focussed on issues further north and did not in any way address concerns raised by me as a resident of Rewley Park, adjacent to the actual station. The meeting being packed and vocal, I had no opportunity to speak or otherwise represent my area, although I had attended hoping to have the chance to do so.
3. **Noise.** In response to my concerns about noise CRC seem to be claiming that because noise levels are already high around my property, additional noise will make no difference! This can't be true, as increased frequencies of trains will mean more times when there is noise over each day.
4. **Vibration.** I objected on grounds of our quality of life, not damage to my property. I accept there will be no damage to my property; I would not expect there to be! My concern is that our living room and one bedroom face the railway line, and vibration affects us in these rooms in particular, as well as in the garden, which is situated to the rear of the property. One bedroom and the living room is half of our little house! I am glad to read that mitigating measures will be used – but object that it is acceptable to CRC that 'vibration levels will, at worst, be limited to 'adverse comments possible'. If I make an adverse comment it is because my quality of life will have been adversely affected! These little houses are very expensive. I work long hard hours to pay the mortgage and feel strongly that we do not deserve adverse impacts from developments in this vicinity.
5. I am glad to read that there will be no adverse impact in terms of local air quality. However I would like to understand how this can be, since the new trains are not going to be electric.
6. **Loss of light.** The new station facility does not just replace existing platforms, but builds a new line closer to our property than the

existing one. Therefore there will surely be a need to construct a new platform, on the site of the existing parcels depot? And surely there will be a need for some form of building behind the new platform? In winter the sun is low over the back but we get some welcome rays into the house in the afternoons, and I want to know that we will not lose these.

Thank you for the information about claiming for compensation should noise and disturbance increase here. I sincerely hope this will not be necessary.

Yours sincerely,

Sushila Dhall

18 October 2010

Sushila Dhall
12 Stable Close
Rewley Park
Oxford
OX1 2RF

Direct lines
Telephone +44 20 3206 5661
Facsimile +44 20 3206 5440
Email ian.gilder@erm.com

Your ref: OBJ/235

Dear Sushila Dhall

Proposed Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford Improvements) TWA Order

I write to you as an objector to the Chiltern Railways TWA Order. Specifically, you have raised concern about the effect of noise and/or vibration of the proposed Scheme and its impact on your property.

Chiltern Railways is committed to using the Best Practicable Means to design the railway so as to avoid significant noise and vibration impacts. Enclosed is the *Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford Improvements) TWA Order Draft Noise and Vibration Mitigation Policy (October 2010)*, which sets out Chiltern Railways' commitment to control noise and vibration impacts in detail. This document will be finalised following consideration of improvements that are identified during the Inquiry.

The assessment of operational noise in the ES formed a worst-case view of the likely noise impacts, which was a satisfactory approach for the ES. However, the design of the Scheme has progressed as contemplated in the ES, so that lesser, or equivalent, impacts will result, and the likely mitigation has been refined to take account the current information and the views of stakeholders who have been consulted since the ES was published. That approach is integral to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. This work is ongoing, and we intend to write to you in the near future to confirm the likely noise impacts at your property.

We hope that this policy, which will be legally enforced by planning condition, will satisfy your concerns regarding noise and vibration, and that you will be able to remove your objection to the Scheme.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Gilder

Ian Gilder
Head of Planning

For and on behalf of the Chiltern Railway Company Ltd