

**MINUTES OF OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL /
CHILTERN RAILWAYS MEETING HELD ON 19 JULY 2010**

Attendees:

Oxfordshire County Council: Dick Helling (DH), Paul Fermer (PF), David Groves (DG), Steve Hayes (SH) David Taylor (DT) Andrew Richards (AR)

ERM: Ian Gilder (IG), Lis Spencer (LS)

PFA: Paul Tregear (PT) Julian Alexander (JA)

SDG: Leo Eyles (LE)

1. Procedures

DG said that he had not looked at the procedures for work to be undertaken in detail but that the work to get this completed was going in the right direction.

DG said that the “Heads of Terms” need to be written out including what the processes should be and what wants to be achieved incorporating elements that are critical in the redesign. The critical functions of section 3.6 of the agreement needed to be pulled out.

IG said that he had hoped that Chiltern railways procedures could be modified to fit in with OCC procedures and captured in the agreement document. The cooperation regarding the procedures will probably continue after the inquiry has finished.

DH said that OCC were not happy about a 2021 termination to some parts of the agreement and the implications for future agreements with whoever ran the rail service and associated facilities after that year.

Action 1: DGH to identify those elements of the draft requiring longer date than 2021, and then arrange a meeting with Network Rail regarding these issues.

Action 2: CR to come up with legal form regarding ongoing agreement.

Action 3: IG to look how the enduring conditions that handed down restricting Oxford station car park use.

Action 4: DH to check that we are happy to sign up for sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the agreement.

IG said that CRCL were unwilling to sign an implementation agreement in respect to any of the individual issues unless OCC withdraw all of their objections.

IG said that the agreement should cover everything that OCC are concerned about then remove those concerns.

It was discussed whether NR should sign off the agreement or be a signatory to it.

A discussion was held about whether the agreement would be a public document or not. DH said that the main agreement would almost certainly have to be but there could be more confidential annexes if needed to include commercially sensitive information. This could highlight the differences between the OCC/CRCL agreement and the agreement between separate landowners. IG said that the agreement with landowners would be “back to back” to the one with OCC.

IG thanked DH for sending the details of standards in the Water Eaton parking management contract and of the leases.

2. Water Eaton Parkway Property and Parking Management

Various pieces of information have already been exchanged, separate meetings are to take place and a legal document is to be drawn up.

Action 6: IG to involve a CR parking specialist (Graham Cross?) and take this forward with DT and Pat Higgins.

3. Bicester Town Parking

PF said that a few of the terms needed tightening up with regards to what has been sent by CRCL in relation to Bicester Town car parking. **Action 5: PF to send suggestions to IG.**

Action 6: DH to send a shopping list for facilities to IG i.e. cycling facilities.

4. Footpath and Bridleway Diversions

IG sent a letter to HP re outstanding footpath and bridleway issues today.

5. Bicester Village

DH asked the progress on CR giving formal assurance that they had given up the car parking agreement between themselves and Bicester Village. **Action 7: IG to look into this issue.**

7. Aggregates Terminal Planning Conditions

IG asked OCC for the acceptable Aggregates terminal Planning Conditions. **Action 9: Kevin Broughton to provide the acceptable conditions.**

8. Archaeology

IG said that ERM were meeting EH and RO to go through geophysics. The western alternative is being looked at. IG said that CR may promote this alternative if it is acceptable and planning permission can be obtained.

9. Bicester Level Crossing

PF said that if the amount of car parking is increased then the barrier may play a role.
Action 10: PF to build the level crossing into agreement.

IG said that the decision regarding this issue detailed decisions regarding how and when trains trigger crossings would follow.

10. Bridge adoption

IG thanked OCC for the letter regarding the wish of OCC to not adopt the new bridges over the Bicester to Oxford line. IG said that this had now gone to Network Rail. Steve Howell has offered further assistance in pursuing this issue with Network Rail.

11. Passenger Demand and Parking Studies

LE said that the catchment area had been recast for London based on a £2.50 all day charge at Water Eaton. The biggest impact was to push 50% of people back to Oxford and Water Eaton stations with some switching back to Bicester North and some going back to using the car. PF said that this may influence heads of terms.

Based on analysis of the mode split by distance approach LE noted that Water Eaton Parkway catchment area close by does not have many people. **Action 11: LE to provide assumptions and analysis behind this modelling.**

LE said that the sensitivity of the parameters on the demand model do not measure congestion.

It was suggested that it would be easier for motorists to travel to Water Eaton Parkway from North Oxford and Headington. **Action 12: LE to send information on sensitivity testing in model.**

It was also suggested that large areas of East Oxford may want to go to Water Eaton.

Action 13: LE to provide demand figures for rail services other than CRCL services.

12. S-Paramics Modelling

JA referred to and outlined details contained within section 2 (methodology) of the "Further Highway Impact Assessment".

JA said that changes have been made to the cordoned off COTM model as mentioned in page 3 of the draft report "Further Highway Impact Assessment".

The implications of having or not having the scheme were looked into with regards to the impact on journeys to and from Oxford Bicester Town and Water Eaton Parkway stations.

It was noted that with the scheme certain trips were currently going to Oxford were now going to Water Eaton Parkway and some trips to Bicester North were now going to Bicester Town.

Egress for all stations had been looked between the times of 8-9am and 5-6pm using the COTM model.

With journeys being transferred to Water Eaton fewer trips were being made to Oxford Station. Journeys were also being shown to have transferred from car to rail and partial car trip and train.

Traffic volumes from Kidlington to Oxford south of Water Eaton Parkway were reduced due to fewer trips to Oxford Station and some Bicester-Oxford traffic now using the train.

JA demonstrated the S-Paramics modelling for Bicester Town and Water Eaton Parkway between the hours of 7:00 and 10:00am.

JA clarified that the figures mentioned in the demand forecast were PCU, “departures” were departing train passengers, equivalent to cars.

RH said that there were difficulties currently showing why so much green belt land belt should be used based on the figures provided for vehicle trips

LS and JA explained that the figures only showed journeys to London and a few other places. Trips to other destinations that passengers may take were not included. The figures also only showed passengers at peak times and therefore did not include passengers turning up for the rest of the day.

Action:LE to send fuller details of car park forecasts.

Passengers that were being dropped off were being modelled but not people leaving the car park with the empty car.

It was asked what the local impact specific model kiss and ride. Only 1 hour between 8-9 of which only 10 trips were forecasted. This issue may be looked at again.

PT said that it had been noted that the timing of the lights appear to be causing car to back up to the Kidlington roundabout at peak times.

It was agreed that the SATURN and S-Paramics modelling should tie in with each other.

Action 14: If tweaks required to network i.e. known rat runs then OCC to let PFA know.

Action 15: Detailed plans showing “rat running” in the Bicester area to be sent to PF for DT from PFA.

PT said that PFA would have to look at cars using the bus lane from the Kidlington roundabout to Water Eaton as the bus lanes effectiveness would be diluted if cars were allowed to use it. JA said that bus journeys could be compared as to how they would be affected. Abnormal delays and severe bus delays would also be thought about.

Action 16: JA to model every 15 minute closure at Bicester Town and incorporate signal changes.

Action 17: SH to email PT with what could be incorporated in the final modelling report.

13. Cabinet meeting

DH said that a meeting was being held on the 28 July with Cabinet members to discuss the progress so far.

Action 18: JA will produce a couple of reports on the traffic modelling in the next couple of weeks.

Action 19: LS will be sending the new junction designs.