

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION RAISED BY MR SALISBURY IN RESPECT OF THE EVIDENCE OF STEPHEN BARKER: ENGINEERING

Transport and Works Act 1992

Transport and Works (Applications and Objections Procedure) (England and Wales)

Rules 2006

On Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2010, Mr Salisbury raised a number of questions of clarification in respect of the evidence of Mr Stephen Barker. Mr Barker did not have to hand the answers to three of those questions and Mr Barker therefore undertook to provide answers to the three questions.

The three questions were:

1. What is the gradient that will be achieved on each section of the ramped approaches to Aristotle Lane footbridge as a result of the proposed re-profiling?
2. Who is the "Overseeing Organisation" in respect of the public bridleway that passes over Aristotle Lane footbridge? What is their view on the ramp gradients?
3. On what date was Thames Water first made aware of the Scheme?

The answers to these questions are as follows:

1. It is our intention to provide the gradients indicated on drawing number 5083741-BOX-CBR-08619, supplied to Mr Salisbury as Appendix C to document number CRCL/R/OBJ5 "Chiltern Railways' Rebuttal Proof of Evidence in Relation to the Objection and Evidence of Ian Salisbury". For the sake of clarity, the gradient of each section of ramp is shown on in tables 1 and 2 below. The data in each table run from the bottom of the ramp to the top of the ramp.

**Table 1 (below): Gradients for the western approach ramp to Aristotle Lane footbridge:**

Level at bottom of ramp (m)	Level at top of ramp (m)	Level change (m)	Ramp length (m)	Gradient (%)	Gradient (1 in n)
57.70	58.11	0.41	6.105	6.7	14.9
58.11	58.76	0.65	9.750	6.7	15.0
58.76	59.41	0.65	9.750	6.7	15.0
59.41	60.06	0.65	9.750	6.7	15.0
60.06	60.71	0.65	9.750	6.7	15.0
60.71	61.36	0.65	9.750	6.7	15.0

61.36	62.01	0.65	9.750	6.7	15.0
62.01	62.41	0.40	6.105	6.6	15.3

**Table 2 (below): Gradients for the eastern approach ramp to Aristotle Lane footbridge:**

Level at bottom of ramp (m)	Level at top of ramp (m)	Level change (m)	Ramp length (m)	Gradient (%)	Gradient (1 in n)
57.96	58.55	0.59	10.140	5.8	17.2
58.55	59.20	0.65	11.050	5.9	17.0
59.20	59.85	0.65	11.050	5.9	17.0
59.85	60.50	0.65	11.050	5.9	17.0
60.50	61.15	0.65	11.050	5.9	17.0
61.15	61.80	0.65	11.050	5.9	17.0
61.80	62.40	0.65	10.140	6.4	15.6

It should be noted that the information on the drawing referred to above relating to existing levels, is based on aerial survey data that has an accuracy of +/- 5cm. A more detailed topographical survey will be undertaken as part of the detailed design of the works and this might result in changes to the data presented above. However, I would not expect the completed works to have gradients that materially differ from those set out above.

2. The "Overseeing Organisation" in this instance is the highway authority i.e. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC). I have not yet been able to obtain an opinion from OCC regarding the acceptability of the gradients at this stage. I will pursue this with OCC and provide their response in a separate note once it has been provided to me.
3. Thames Water was first made aware of the scheme on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2010.

*Stephen Barker*

*4<sup>th</sup> November 2010*