

OBJ/026/IW

23rd September 2010
Reference OBJ26/1

Mr John Watson
c/o Mrs Helen Wilson
Programme Officer
32 Pennyford Close
Brockhill
Redditch B97 6TW

Dear Sir

RE: APPLICATION FOR THE CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD IMPROVEMENTS) ORDER

I refer to my letter to the then Secretary of State e-mailed on the 8th February 2010 and to Ardent Management's letter to me dated 16th July 2010.

The boundary of my property is shown in Table D2.3 of Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement as being only 9 metres from the proposed chord line. My understanding of Table 8.1 on page 57 of Chiltern's Statement of Case is that there is potential for up to 12 trains per hour to use the line. My property is also close to the proposed site of the Tubbs Lane footbridge and the temporary construction compound in the same area. Consequently, it seems clear to me that my home risks being seriously and permanently affected, particularly by noise, during construction and once the new services become operational. Ardent's Mr Clarke accepts this in paragraph 1.2 of his letter. Citing Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement, on page 2 of his letter, Mr Clarke says that "*mitigation will be provided in the form of noise barriers to protect the ground floor of the result of Phase 1, if noise levels are expected to reach these noise levels following detailed design.*" Further on, he says that it is "extremely likely" (my quotation marks) that the noise barriers will be implemented from Phase 1. As I understand it, eligibility for statutory insulation will depend on the implementation of Phase 2. If this is so, and given the position of my property, I would ask that, if Chiltern's application

is approved and an Order made, provision be made through the means of either a planning condition or the Code of Construction Practice for a noise barrier to be erected at the outset, and additional insulation be considered in advance of Phase 2.

Mr Clarke acknowledges that vibration may be a possible problem at the properties on Whimbrel Close (inter alia) that are closest to the line. These properties are on the borderline where vibration levels may exceed the assessment criterion. The letter states that *"In these areas, specialist resilient track forms will be used, if practicable, so that vibration from the new track at the nearest sensitive receptors will be no higher than the levels specified in BS6472 for 'a low probability of adverse comment'"*. My concern here is what will happen if it is not practicable to use resilient track forms.

I request that you consider these representations in conjunction with my earlier letter, and I would ask that you spare the time to visit this site so that you can appreciate just how close my home is to the line.

Yours faithfully

Beth A Forrow