

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

NOTE ON

**IDENTIFICATION OF TRAIN MOVEMENTS DURING NOISE MEASUREMENTS AS
RAISED BY DR C ROBERTSON**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This note provides answers to questions that were raised by Dr C Robertson during cross examination of Michael Fraser regarding the identification of specific trains during the period when unattended noise monitoring was undertaken at Lakeside.

2 Description of Issue and CRCL Response

- 2.1 The Objector has stated in her proof of evidence [**OBJ/234/4**] that during the period of the noise measurement survey which took place at her property between the 12th and the 16th of July 2010, she noted a freight train movement in the 3am to 4am hour on both the 14th July and the 15th July. She has also noted that ERM has not recognised this movement and therefore not removed it from the baseline measurements for those night-time periods.
- 2.2 Unattended measurements rely on secondary evidence (mainly timetabled train movements) in order to identify such events. Train movements are recorded using the TRUST data collection system. However, the data is only held temporarily unless specific requests are made to preserve it. No TRUST data was available for this period due to a misunderstanding by ERM about the period for which data was retained. However, a large period of TRUST data from later in July 2010 and the following months shows that the early morning freight train (which runs infrequently), is timetabled to pass Lakeside at approximately 05.15am, more than one hour later than those movements noted by Dr. Robertson. ERM notes however that the recorded maximum noise level data supports Dr. Robertson's assertion that there were freight trains at the time she recorded. Subsequent consideration of possible freight movements has revealed that occasionally, engineering and waste trains do run at this time although it is unusual, on the present timetable, for a freight train to run so far in advance of its timetabled slot.
- 2.3 ERM recognises there are uncertainties in the collection of unattended noise measurements, and has sought to minimise these uncertainties by carrying out such measurement surveys for extended periods of time (in this case, five days). A

cautious approach is also applied to the use of data collected. For example, when establishing background or baseline noise levels, only the lowest recorded measurement periods are used in the assessment. In this case, as a result of this cautious approach, neither the measurement from the 14th or the 15th that included the train heard by Dr Robertson has been used in the noise impact assessment.

- 2.4 Although we consider that the TRUST data base gives a reasonable level of information regarding train movements, but we will investigate if other systems of registering train movements can be put in place to provide further detail to support any further measurements of noise or vibration that are undertaken in the future.
- 2.5 Dr. Robertson has also stated that the train which has been identified by ERM in the 11pm to midnight hour on the 14th July is erroneous. It was ERM's understanding from the timetable that a train may run at this time and, as a precaution, it has been assumed that it did run. The removal of a train which did not run produces a conservative or lower baseline noise level for use in the impact assessment.

Michael Fraser

16 December 2010