

## The Chiltern Railways (Bicester to Oxford Improvements) Order

### Question of Clarification document number OBJ236/2

#### Proof Of Evidence Of Aidan Nelson CRCL/P//7/A

1. Para 14: what does the national policy referred to define as “exceptional circumstances”?
2. Para 25: ' The ORR policy is that “decisions about level crossings must involve rail companies, highway authorities and other relevant organisations..”'. Which bodies other than Network Rail and CRCL have been involved with the decision to close the Aristotle Lane level crossing?
3. All Level Crossing Risk Model paras 37 to 45:
  - a. What data was gathered with respect to the Aristotle Lane crossing (existing and hypothetical new) and how was it validated?
  - b. What data was entered into the ALCM model?
  - c. What sensitivity analysis was performed to see which factors are most significant; which are the most significant factors?
  - d. What variability in output (A – M, 1 – 13) was obtained when the significant parameters were varied?
  - e. What is meant by individual risk?
  - f. What is meant by collective risk?
  - g. Can the risk model outputs (A – M, 1 – 13) be used to obtain a statistical probability of incidents per time period (e.g. deaths per annum)? If so what are the definitions of incidents, and what are the probabilities?
  - h. What are the uncertainties in the risk model inputs and calculations, and hence outputs, and how are these expressed? As an example, if an input was, say, an estimate of the number of pedestrian crossings made in a given time period, it might be claimed that there is 95% confidence that figure is accurate to +/- 20%. What are these uncertainties for the risk model and how do they affect the output?
4. Para 145: where does Mr J Clark refer to six allotment holders who are sufficiently infirm that they should be granted vehicular access? [If Mr Nelson is referring to my Statement of Case document OBJ236/1 then on a closer reading he will see that I was quoting an agent or employee of CRCL. The figure of six was theirs.]
5. Could CRCL clarify precisely what additional access rights across Port Meadow they are including in their TWA application? e.g. How many allotment holders do CRCL believe are sufficiently infirm that they will need vehicular access across Port Meadow to the allotments? How do CRCL propose that the access rights are made for just those users? What impact will that have on traffic across the meadow? What car parking arrangements will be provided?
6. Could CRCL clarify who will be required to grant those additional rights, i.e. who currently holds the rights of access across the meadow, and how will the additional access rights be made?
7. Could CRCL confirm that the current rights holder has agreed to grant the rights referred to in question 5 above?
8. Could CRCL describe how they have ensured that the granting of the rights referred to in question 5 above will be acceptable to the local community, including existing users of Port Meadow?
9. Para 149: where does Mr Nelson obtain the idea that “Mr J Clark recognises that the more infirm allotment holders will be able to use alternative vehicular access”? [Mr J Clark has been attempting since February to get CRCL to specify what their vague statement in the TWA application about access rights over Port Meadow consists of. Mr J Clark is concerned that, since these access rights have not been described, or publicised to concerned parties, they will not materialise.]

Proof Of Evidence Of Aidan Nelson CRCL/P//7/A and Proof of Evidence of Stephen Barker  
CRCL/P/6A

10. Mr Nelson in para 15 states “This consideration of individual level crossings takes as its starting point the closures proposed by Chiltern Railways and does not address options considered in the development of the Order scheme. These are addressed in Stephen Barker's proof of evidence (CRCL/P/6/A).”

Mr Barker in 11.11 states “Matters relating to the level crossing itself and the proposal by the objectors that Chiltern Railways provide a new level crossing on the reinstated section of track are dealt with in the evidence of Mr Aidan Nelson (CRCL/P/7/A).”

Could CRCL clarify what assessment was made of the objectors' alternative proposal, which included the reinstatement of the crossing across the reinstated track, with management and signalling measures to reduce risk over a period of time (see OBJ236/1)?