

**PROPOSED CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD IMPROVEMENTS)
ORDER**

CHILTERN RAILWAYS' REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

**IN RELATION TO THE OBJECTION AND EVIDENCE OF
THE CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND, OXFORD CITY DISTRICT**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This rebuttal proof of evidence has been prepared on behalf of the Chiltern Railway Company Limited (Chiltern Railways) to respond to particular aspects of the objection and evidence of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), Oxford City District.
- 1.2 The Oxford City District of the CPRE submitted a written representation which raised points that Chiltern Railways wish to address.
- 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 a composite response by Chiltern Railways to those points raised in the written representation of the Oxford City District of the CPRE and referred to above. 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:

<i>"the Objector"</i>	means the Oxford City District of the CPRE;
<i>"the Objector's evidence"</i>	means the written representation of the Oxford City District of the CPRE;
<i>"the Order application"</i>	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 The evidence of the Oxford City District of the CPRE has been written by the District Secretary, Michael Daniell. The Oxford City District of the CPRE states its support for the evidence of the Freeman of Oxford and the Port Meadow Protection Group [OBJ314/1].

Traffic and Car Parking on the Port Meadow, Ian Gilder

- 3.2 The Objector states that there should not be traffic along the concrete track from Walton Well Road across Port Meadow and that there should be no car parking on the meadow by the allotments.
- 3.3 Chiltern Railways has determined that, on the evidence before the Inquiry, it is no longer necessary to seek powers to provide a permanent vehicular access for allotment holders over Port Meadow. Proposed amendments to the Order submitted to the Inquiry [CRCL/INQ/16/1] remove all powers from the Order which would grant permanent powers over Port Meadow.

Ecological Protection, Andy Coates

- 3.4 The Objector states that full recognition should be taken of the sensitive ecology around the meadow end of the Aristotle Road foot bridge.
- 3.5 The current designs for Aristotle Lane have been progressed in order to minimise any potential impacts to the SAC and SSSI. The resulting design within the Order Scheme has been endorsed by Natural England, and has been developed in close consultation with both Natural England and the Environment Agency. If required by these statutory bodies, further assessment during detailed design will ensure that designated habitats of Port Meadow are not compromised. Andy Coates’ Proof of Evidence deals with Ecological Matters [CRCL/P/10/A].

4 Conclusion

- 4.1 This rebuttal responds comprehensively to the evidence presented by the Objector. There will be no rights of access for permanent access rights across Port Meadow and the ecological importance of Port Meadow has been considered in CRCL/P/10/A.