

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

RE-REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONCERNING THE EVIDENCE
SUBMITTED BY CHILTERN RAILWAYS

Made by:

Ian Salisbury
24 Lathbury Road
Oxford OX2 7AU

tel: 01865 250777

ian@salisbury.eu

fax: 01865 250999

DX: 145844 Oxford 6

Evidence of Mr Aidan Nelson (CRCL/P/7/A)

- 6 Re: Answer to my questions 3.14 and 3.18, part of your reply appears to have been redacted. Please provide an explanation of Mr Nelson's evidence paragraph 42:
- 6.1 the "Upper" and "Lower" "Numbers" for the entire range A to M and the entire range 1 to 13;
 - 6.2 the "individual risk" that the letters refer to which have only been partially provided. For instance, in the information you have already provided for the "Individual Risk Ranking" value B giving an "Upper number" of 1 in 5,000, please say whether 1 in 5,000 refers to the chance of a fatality arising from a train striking any one pedestrian in any one year; or if that is not the descriptor, please provide it. Please provide the same for "Lower Number";
 - 6.3 (similarly) the "collective" risk that the numbers refer to, none of which you have yet provided, giving the relevant descriptors against which the values are set;
 - 6.4 Alternatively, please place a full copy of the ALCRM User Guide in the Core Documents.
- 7 Re: Answer to my question 3.19, I would respectfully suggest that you have not answered my question because you make no reference to the methodology described in the ALCRM User Guide:
- 7.1 Please answer my question with reference to the ALCRM risk ranking outputs that you refer to.
 - 7.2 Alternatively, please place a full copy of the ALCRM User Guide in the Core Documents.
- 8 Arising from the statement made in your answer to my question 3.19 that the Order Scheme proposes "a viable alternative route across the railway",
- 8.1 please explain what you mean by "viable".
- 9 Re: 3.26, the document CD3/35 is not the document you refer to.
- 9.1 Please provide a copy of the full report rather than the Overview within the Core Documents.