

PROPOSED CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD IMPROVEMENTS)

ORDER

CHILTERN RAILWAYS' REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

IN RELATION TO

THE REPRESENTATION AND EVIDENCE OF

CYCLISTS TOURING CLUB

1 Introduction

1.1 This rebuttal proof of evidence has been prepared on behalf of Chiltern Railway Company Limited (Chiltern Railways) to respond to particular aspects of the representation and evidence of Cyclists Touring Club

1.2 The Cyclists Touring Club has raised points in its representation letter which Chiltern Railways has previously addressed through correspondence and 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 the 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 clarify the Chiltern Railways responses to those points raised in the evidence of the Cyclists Touring Club. 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 letters and emails

exchanged between Chiltern Railways and the Cyclists Touring Club dated 17 February 2010 and 18 May 2010, attached as Appendix A to this rebuttal proof; “the

Representor” means the Cyclists Touring Club (CTC); “the

Representor’s evidence” means the letter from Phillip Ashbourn of the Cyclists Touring

Club dated 17 February 2010; “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 Phillip Ashbourn has presented the evidence on behalf of the Cyclists Touring Club.

Recognition of Cyclists Rights to use Bridleways, Ian Gilder

3.2 The Representor expresses concern that the Rights of Way Report failed to recognise that cyclists have a legal right to cycle on public bridleways.

3.3 Although the Public Rights of Way Report [CD/1.11] does not make explicit mention of the right of cyclists to use public bridleways this was given due consideration in the design of the Order Scheme and in the consideration of alternatives for the stopping

up of level crossing and the proposed diversions.

Signage, Ian Gilder

3.4 The Cyclists Touring Club (CTC) objects to the use of 'cycle dismount' signs and proposes alternative signage in accordance with departmental standards.

3.5 Ian Gilder responds to this point in paragraph 11.82 of his proof of evidence [CRCL/P/12/A] confirming that departmental standards in signage will be met.

Provision of Wheeling Ramps on Footbridges with Steps, Stephen Barker

3.6 The Representor seeks confirmation that wheeling ramps can be provided on footbridges with steps.

3.7 Chiltern Railways will not be providing wheeling ramps on stepped footbridges, as these can create water traps and cause maintenance problems. However, all the bridleway bridges will have ramped access, as will the footbridge at Tubbs Lane. The other footbridges are at locations where the level of use is very low and the use of wheelchairs (and thus cycles) is impractical due to impediments along the access route. This is in accordance with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) legislation.

Wheeling ramps are increasingly provided on footbridges where cycles are regularly using the route. The design of the ramp is significant in eliminating the potential to trap water and rubbish , and a ramp fitted as an original feature can be installed to avoid such issues.

Ramps present a reduction in the risks involved when a cycle is picked up, generally to shoulder height and carried up the steps. This raises the centre of gravity of the cycle user raising the risk of falling if a step is missed and presents a potential hazard to other users who may collide with the elevated cycle.

Wheeling ramps also present a means to cross the bridge using less effort and this make it easier for those less able to carry the cycle who may also be using it as an aid to mobility when they have limited physical capacity to carry the cycle.

Suitability of a Subway for Works No 8 (New Railway Chord) and Works No. 9 (Tubbs Lane), Stephen Barker

3.8 The Representor suggests that a subway would be more suitable than the proposed footbridge over the new chord to the London to Birmingham lines proposed in Work No. 8 and Work No. 9 at Tubbs Lane.

The Representor considers that the footbridge at Tubbs Lane will create a substantial intrusion to the privacy of neighbouring properties and that a subway would reduce the distance that would need to be travelled to cross the railway line.

The Representor suggests that if the subway option were to be progressed at Tubbs Lane, flooding could be avoided by leading water alongside the branch of the path heading south so that it can discharge into the adjacent stream or local drainage network.

Work No 8

3.9 A subway would not be appropriate as a means of crossing the proposed connecting line to the London to Birmingham railway line. The level of the footway within the subway would be beneath that of the local water table and the subway would thus require pumped drainage, which represents significant on-going maintenance cost compared to a bridge. Subways present a perceived risk to personal security and

design guidance issued by the Highways Agency advises against their use in 'urban and peri-urban areas' for this reason.

We have checked the ground levels and railway levels at the point where the subway will need to cross the chord line earthworks, and find that at the railway is raised at least 3 metres above the existing ground level, sufficient to fit in an underbridge with the path surface at ground level. Chiltern has indicated that the estimated cost of providing such a crossing would be similar to that of providing the footbridge, if this was installed prior to the construction of the embankment.

Bridge at appx 770m (71.44m) Underbridge 750m (71.8m)

Railway heights at 700m = 72.2m 800m = 71.4

Bridge deck = 77m est

Field levels 68.8m – above indicated flood threat (EA Map)

The proposed footbridge at this point will have to climb not only the 5.5metres required to clear the rail line but at least 3 metres more to reach the level of the railway from the existing ground level. Chilterns design does not allow for the provision of ramps and we estimate that between around 56 steps will be required on each side of the bridge (112 steps in total) to reach the height of the span across the railway (4 flights per side). Evidence is that cycles use this route – from tyre tracks in soft ground to the North

Chiltern has suggested that providing such a crossing under the embankment will require a licence to discharge water which will flow through and be collected by the path, but in their own drawings they show a clear need to provide drainage at the toe of the embankments to the North of the chord line, across the infilled area against the existing railway embankment, and along the toe of the new embankment along its south edge. The provision of an underbridge with a surface at ground level will provide this drainage and additionally act to ensure that no water surge which may give rise to flooding North of the existing railway can become trapped in the area to the North of the new chord line.

Work No 9

3.10 Chiltern Railways examined in some detail the possibility of providing a subway at

Tubbs Lane. However, it would suffer from problems of flooding and perceived security. The latter is particularly important at Tubbs Lane due to the number of children and young family groups using the crossing. In addition, the constricted space on the Launton Road side would result in an overly-steep access ramp that would be narrow and curved (resulting in restricted forward visibility). Maintenance access to the adjacent electricity substation would be difficult to accommodate, additional land that is currently public open space would be required and an inaccessible area of land would be created in the "V" between the paths and the nearest houses on the estate side.

CTC has also reviewed the situation at Tubbs Lane and notes that Chiltern concedes that there is sufficient space to construct an underbridge at a point coincident with the existing culvert with sufficient distance between the Electricity Sub Station and a point at which the path would need to be approximately 3 metres below the level of the railway and there appears to be sufficient distance to drop with a suitable continuous gradient to this point. The spot height at Launton Road is 68.7m above 0m datum and the completed railway is shown as being 69.4 m.(0m/1200m)

Chiltern did highlight a 'pinch point' at the boundary of the property used as a nursery, although this is at a fence line and some distance from the main building.

Tracing the drainage ditch to the Mallards Way (the main route into Langford Village) the road is slightly lower than London Road which has a spot level of 66m shown on OS maps and an approximation is that the level of the attenuation pond is approx 1.2m below this or at 64.8m or less (as levels drop to Mallards Way from London Road), and the watercourse forming the core line for the EA flooding plan is a substantial distance downstream at this point – the only level of this watercourse we have is North of Garvray Drive – which is shown as 65.13m at the point it crosses the existing main line to Banbury, and naturally the watercourse falls between here and Mallards Way 1.0m would not seem to be unusual

The length of ramps to climb from 68.7m to 74.8(?*)m plus the span of 15m almost triples the distance (255m of ramps & span vs 80-90m of the old route) which pedestrians and cyclists will need to travel and presents a thin bridge deck and ramps vulnerable to icing in frosty weather, a fear expressed by a number of local path users. (*Railway height 69.4m – plus 5.5m = 74.9m).

An underbridge will deliver a crossing with very little increase in the distance, and a path level of 66.4m – and possibly higher (ie 66.6-66.8) if a reduced height of soffit or depth of beams can be considered for this span.

The normal flow of water in the existing ditch (wet day) often drains into the ground leaving a muddy trench and the level of water lying in the attenuation pond by Mallards Way is taken to be a reasonable indication of level of the natural water table.

The bed of the ditch at Tubbs Lane is measured at present to be 67.01m. Clearing this ditch downstream will get level just below the path where it needs to pass under the rail line, and drain naturally

Indications from the EA flooding maps and the design of Mallards Way are that a significant flood will raise water levels to approx 66m on the main watercourse North of Garvray Drive and cause water to cover Mallards Way at a slightly lower level downstream. A path under the railway at Tubbs Lane will be slightly higher than this, and the worst case would be likely to generate a very shallow covering of water over the path – by which time the inundation of roads downstream is likely to be a more substantial issue.

Based on designs of cycle route which share underpasses and flood arches with watercourses that CTC has seen in use elsewhere we believe that a carefully designed subway, sharing the span with the drainage ditch is a practical option, with the path rising on either side and the drainage invert level being reduced and cleared at that reduced level to ensure that this will naturally drain to the lower level of the attenuation pond.

We will attempt to provide pictures of examples of such underpasses.

A New Crossing at Launton Road, Ian Gilder

3.11 The Representor is promoting an additional crossing point from the land north of Gavray Drive to Launton Road.

3.12 Ian Gilder responds to this point in paragraph 11.77 of his proof of evidence [CRCL/P/12/A] confirming that Chiltern Railways is not seeking powers for an additional bridge crossing from the land to the north of Gavray Drive to Launton Road as adequate provision is made at the Tubbs Lane crossing.

We note that Garvray Drive was constructed speculatively by the developer with a view to forming a level crossing over the Bicester Bletchley Railway and that with the continued operation of this railway and predisposition of Network Rail against the creation of new Level Crossings

London Road Level Crossing, Stephen Barker

3.13 The Representor considers that the skew crossing at London Road increases the risk of cyclists falling off as tyres could be deflected sideways by vertical edges. In

addition, the Representor states that the crossing width and skew rails could present problems for pedestrians. The Representor points out that the nearby A41 bridge provides a crossing point for non-local traffic which presents the opportunity to redesign the London Road crossing and road alignment to remove the option of running through lights and control traffic speeds entering Bicester. Furthermore, the Representor suggests that Chiltern Railways should work with Oxford County Council to develop direct road links to the A41.

The Representor states that the extension of Station Approach could also be connected to the A41, which would create better conditions for non motorised traffic and pedestrians.

The note “to remove the option of running through lights and control traffic speeds entering Bicester” does not precisely reflect the concern expressed. The current road alignment is such that traffic speeds from the South approach are likely to be higher than 30mph given the alignment and nature of the road up to this point, and the substantial increase in the level of use will generate an increased risk and increased

temptation to beat the barriers. These represent a significant change in the parameters affecting operation of this level crossing.

The changed operating parameters are substantial and it is noted in many cases that such changes have a major impact on the risks associated with level crossings at other locations. We accept that the detail of the level crossing design has still to be fully developed and assessed through the ALCRM process

Part of the risk assessment is in the design of the crossing relative to its use by those on cycles, in wheelchairs etc who are adversely affected by crossing the gaps and rail edges at an oblique angle. The angle of this crossing as it exists is shallower than the preferred limit for a skew crossing.

We note from the alignment of houses at 43-53 London Road (North of the railway) and 1-9 Alcester Terrace (South of the railway) that the original line of the road (and level crossing) was in at a less shallow angle of skew., with a residual rump of London Road to the South

However we do note that with the indicated the increase in footway, and thus overall road width over this level crossing, the actual orientation of the road and rail will change, and we wish to see this result in a reduction of the skew angle and general improvement in the way road traffic is managed, reducing the high speed geometry of the road alignment and returning it to the original road line – thus reducing the potential for speeding traffic attempting to ‘run’ the crossing lights, and reducing the potential traffic speeds entering Bicester Town Centre.

The issue of right turning vehicles entering Station Approach and dispersal of the large volume of motor traffic linked to arrival and departure of trains and the indication that a multi-level car park is being allowed for, likely to exacerbate this issue still suggest that the impact band works associated with this project must be considered on the roads network not included in the Order, We note that in the area of land purchased and buildings demolished, the space to provide a square crossing and greater space for accommodating the vehicle hmovements in and out from Bicester Town station could be provided

We are aware that the project has considered the ideal option of completely eliminating the level crossing and discounted this as a detail which presents challenging issues in the route of the road to achieve the required clearance over the railway and substantial costs for its construction. The issues relating to access to the A41 and blocking created by Bicester Retail Village Car Parks is recognised as an

predicament created by previous planning decisions which did not recognise the potential for the Evergreen 3 project at that time.

There remains a significant amount of detailed design to deliver a safe arrangement for the London Road and the connected paths and other routes at the crossing, notably the path which forms a direct and faster route from Langford Village for access to the station which currently emerges blind and well screened by vegetation at the corner of the level crossing, but is not embraced by the Order Plans and proposals for improved access to the new stations on foot or cycle. Linking this to the proposed crossing point shown in the station plans is an important detail to secure.

We believe there is still substantial detail that requires a commitment and assurances on getting this right although in principle we would agree to engaging in a closer working to resolve matters within the constraint that a level crossing most probably at the same location is likely to be the most practical way to carry this work forward.

Work on level crossing safety and integration with the roads network highlights the importance of dealing with highway matters in a fully integrated way and 3.16 does not reflect the importance of covering the design and operation of the crossing though setting appropriate speed limits on the approaches with appropriate road alignments. We seek a clear commitment to working with the Local and National Roads Authorities on details such as this and cycle routes to stations rather than the note that it is a matter for those authorities, or an intimation that engagement on such matters may take place. It would be good practice to recognise of the need to design this crossing as if it were a new installation regarding all current best practice.

3.14 The rebuilt crossing surface at London Road will be designed to comply with latest standards. There is inadequate space to realign the road in order provide a perpendicular crossing, but Chiltern Railways has made provision for the widening of the footways to improve the situation for pedestrians.

3.15 Speed limits and traffic flow along London Road are a matter for the highways authority and are outside Chiltern Railways' control. London Road is the main vehicle route from the south into the town centre, but some traffic is likely to divert via the A41, as part of the ring road.

3.16 The Order Scheme will deliver a pedestrian and cycling link from the rebuilt Bicester Town station to Bicester Village, and hence the A41 via Pingle Drive. However, general policy in the area is to avoid creating a 'rat-run' for motorists between London Road and Pingle Drive due to congestion on the latter.

Mansmoor Lane/Holts Farm/BBONT Crossing, Ian Gilder

3.17 The Representor is seeking clarity on the alignment of the proposed bridleway alignment to the south of the new Holts Farm bridge and the extent of bridleway to be stopped up. The Representor encourages Chiltern Railways to improve the grassed bridleway on both sides of the railway as it is prone to severe flooding.

3.18 As set out in paragraph 11.79 of Ian Gilder's evidence [CRCL/P/12/A], south of the railway the proposed diversion links back onto the public rights of way network on Mansmoor Road and to the north of the railway it follows the boundary of the Wendlebury Meads and Mansmoor Closes SSSI. The diversion and length of bridleway to be stopped up is shown on the revised illustrative public rights of way plans [CD/1.21.1]. Since the submission of Ian Gilder's proof, it has been proposed that a further part of the bridleway diversion will be a hard surfaced track. The Review of the Hydrological Impacts of Proposals for Hardened Tracks on and around the Wendlebury Meads & Mansmoor Closes SSSI [CD/2.31] concludes that with the provision of standard design mitigation the proposed access tracks will have no impact on the surface water and shallow groundwater hydrology of the SSSI.

Gosford and Water Eaton Number 4, Ian Gilder

3.19 The Representor would prefer to see the location of the existing crossing and the alignment of the right of way retained. The Representor states that the proposed

diversion alongside the A34 is unsatisfactory and would discourage cycling due to noise, debris, parked vehicles, poor surfacing, plus the width and maintenance of the vegetation.

3.20 As stated in paragraph 11.86 of Ian Gilder's evidence [CRCL/P/12/A], when developing the footpath diversions, Chiltern Railways consulted in August 2009 on two alternatives for the diversion of Gosford and Water Eaton Number 4 [FP 229/4]. The list of organisations who were consulted is set out in Annex B of the Public Rights of Way Report [CD/1.11]. The diversion along the A34 and A4165, which is now included as part of the proposed Order, was favoured by the majority of consultees, including the County Council. The advantages of this diversion were seen to be that it gave better and more direct access to Water Eaton Parkway station, especially from Kidlington whilst the proposed diversion of [BR 229/5] maintains a rural and quiet recreational route with safe access over the A34 in this part of the public rights of way network.

3.21 As stated in paragraph 11.80 of Ian Gilder's evidence [CRCL/P/12/A], the public right of way is not a bridleway and there are no rights for use by cyclists.

Water Eaton Bridleway 5, Ian Gilder

3.22 The Representor is expecting that the diverted bridleway will be surfaced with a similar (good) quality surface to existing concrete track.

3.23 Ian Gilder responds to this point in paragraph 11.79 of his proof of evidence [CRCL/P/12/A] confirming that a hard surfaced track will be provided.

General Points on Cycle Parking, Allan Dare

3.24 The Representor is looking for cycle parking to be under cover, secure and convenient to use and in particular supports the use of 'Sheffield' stands. The Objector would like the proposed numbers of cycle parking to be regarded as a minimum and provided when the Scheme opens. The Representor is looking for Chiltern Railways to support a 'call-a-bike' scheme as an essential part of the Scheme.

3.25 All cycle parking (Bicester Town, Islip, Water Eaton Parkway) will be secure, with lockable racks such as Sheffield stands, in prominent areas, and with CCTV surveillance. Chiltern Railways fully recognises the problems that the Objector outlines with front-wheel holding stands, and will not be using these. Chiltern Railways plans to provide sufficient capacity to meet forecast demand through to 2026, but there will also be the ability to switch capacity between car and cycle parking to meet emerging trends.

Cycle Parking Provision at Bicester Town Station, Allan Dare

3.26 The Representor would have liked to have seen evidence of the potential numbers of cyclists within the cycling catchment area of Bicester Town who would use the cycle parking facility. In the absence of this, the proposed 60 spaces are deemed to be acceptable to the Representor provided they are properly monitored and maintained.

3.27 Chiltern Railways will provide a minimum of 60 cycle parking spaces at Bicester Town station. These will be covered and secure, with lockable Sheffield stands, and with CCTV surveillance, and will be properly maintained. In addition 20 secure cycle lockers will be provided. Chiltern Railways will keep the take-up of cycle parking

capacity under review and will add further cycle stands if justified by demand.

3.28 This amplifies the points set out in the correspondence and in Stephen Barker's proof of evidence [CRCL/6/P/A]. Cycle Parking Provision at Islip Station, Allan Dare

3.29 The Representor reports that they could find no mention of proposals for cycle parking at Islip station and seeks clarification that existing provision is adequate. The Representor makes the assertion that Islip station will have an increased importance as a railhead and seeks footfall and likely demand information for future cycle parking. The Representor seeks clarity on how the instatement of a second platform will change the way cyclists come and go and park their bikes.

3.30 It is envisaged that the main railhead for the area will be Water Eaton Parkway station, and that Islip station will continue as a facility for the local community. The present cycle parking capacity (10 spaces) will be retained as visits to the station indicate that the present use of the cycle stands is very low and 10 spaces are considered sufficient for the future. However, the position will be kept under review and further cycle spaces will be added if justified by demand.

3.31 The cycle parking will be under cover, and with CCTV surveillance. The cycle parking will be adjacent to the entrance to the platform, and with level access to trains. When the line is doubled a footbridge will be constructed from this point to the new second platform. There will also be a step-free ramp from Bletchingdon Road to the new platform, which will be available for cyclists wishing to take their bikes onto the train. This is confirmed in Stephen Barker's proof of evidence paragraph 4.209 [CRCL/6/P/A].

Cycle Parking Provision at Water Eaton Station, Allan Dare

3.32 The Representor feels that the proposed 100 cycle spaces may be inadequate given the levels of planned development in the area. The Representor seeks clarity on

how this figure has been arrived at

.

3.33 The 100 space figure is derived from the overall demand forecast for passenger numbers at the station, and the distance from the passengers' origin point. However the position will be kept under review and further cycle spaces will be added if justified by demand.

Cycle Parking Provision at Oxford Station, Allan Dare

3.34 The Representor is concerned about the unsatisfactory situation at Oxford station which is claimed needs better management. The Representor encourages a joint approach with all parties to develop a long term solution which could include new cycle parking, storage and a retail facility giving the example of DB [Chiltern Railways' parent company] in Germany. The Representor questions whether Chiltern Railways has seriously considered taking this approach.

3.35 The Station Facility Operator at Oxford station is First Great Western (FGW), as designated in the FGW Franchise Agreement. This will not change as a result of the Order Scheme. The provision of cycle parking and other facilities is thus a matter for FGW. However, Chiltern Railways is already working with FGW, Network Rail and the local authorities to consider future plans for the station, and it is envisaged that this will continue. This amplifies the points set out in the correspondence and in Stephen Barker's proof of evidence [CRCL/6/P/A].

Cycle Access to Stations, Allan Dare

3.36 The Representor encourages Chiltern Railways to work with Oxfordshire County Council and other organisations to give priority to cycle access to the stations, in particular Water Eaton Parkway and Oxford stations. In relation to Oxford station, it is suggested that improvements are required to access to/from Botley Road, Frideswide Square, Hythe Bridge Street and Jericho. Further, the links between the Park and Ride site and Oxford are considered to be unsatisfactory. The Representor stresses the importance of cycle links to the proposed North Oxford Gateway and the existing Peartree Park and Ride are important alongside cycle crossings of main roads in the area.

3.37 Chiltern Railways does not have powers to make cycling improvements outside the Order Scheme limits and these are properly a matter for the local authorities. However, Chiltern Railways anticipates entering into an agreement with Oxfordshire County Council to encourage the use of non-motorised modes, including cycle, to and from Water Eaton Parkway and Bicester Town stations and to provide sufficient good quality facilities for cyclists at these stations. This agreement will include the provision of cycling infrastructure to the stations; the provision of cycling infrastructure at the stations; and the ongoing review of cycle parking capacity.

3.38 At Water Eaton Parkway station, there will be a dedicated cycleway between the cycle route along the A4165 and the cycle parking area. This will be completely segregated from the main road. The junction leading from the main highway to the station and bus Park and Ride terminus will also be simplified and remodelled, which

will benefit all modes of transport to/from the station.

3.39 As noted above, matters at Oxford station are the responsibility of the Station Facility Operator, First Great Western.

3.40 This amplifies the points set out in the Correspondence and in Stephen Barker's proof of evidence [CRCL/6/P/A].

Carriage of Cycles on Trains, Allan Dare

3.41 The Objector considers that the provision for the carriage of cycles on trains is very important. The Objector urges that the design of trains should take these needs into account and there should be a simple procedure for travelling with a bicycle.

3.42 Chiltern Railways' existing policy for the carriage of cycles on train will continue. This allows cycles to be taken on any train, except on trains arriving at London

Marylebone and Birmingham Snow Hill between 07:45 and 10:00 Monday to Friday,

or leaving these stations between 16:30 and 19:30 Monday to Friday. No charge is made for cycles and no booking is required. Chiltern Railways will also allow the

carriage of cycles on all trains between Bicester, Islip, Water Eaton Parkway and

Oxford at any time, subject to emerging demand and any change in policy that may

be imposed by the Station Facility Operator at Oxford station. Folding bicycles can

be carried at all times. Cycle parking is provided at all stations.

3.43 Chiltern Railways services will normally be operated with Diesel Multiple Unit trains with double doors and wide vestibules, and at least one wheelchair/bicycle area on each train. These arrangements do not apply to tandems, motor scooters or motor bikes. This amplifies the points set out in the correspondence.

4 Conclusion

4.1 This rebuttal responds comprehensively to the evidence presented by the Representor.

4.2 The rebuttal provides reasoning for design solution at various crossings along the route that the Representor has questioned. The evidence of Stephen Barker [CRCL/P/4/A] and Ian Gilder [CRCL/P/12/A] provide further details on these crossings.

4.3 Chiltern Railways is enhancing facilities for cyclists at stations and will maintain its company policy for taking bicycles on trains. Chiltern Railways is actively working with stakeholders such as First Great Western, Network Rail and the local authorities to consider future plans for improvement of facilities at Oxford station.

Appendix A

CRCL/R/REP12 Relevant Correspondence between Chiltern Railways and the Objector

