

REPRESENTATIONS IN REPOSE TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- These planning conditions were put in place in order to protect the rights of local residents and they must not be changed without proper scrutiny.
- Noise from railway operations is considerable and indoor vibrations associated with freight trains are extreme. In the current assessment no such data or calculations had been provided - it is simply stated without justification that levels of vibration will not cause structural damage to buildings
- Residents experiences of extreme vibration do not concur with the desk based assessments made by consulting engineers
- On silent track the methods by which the benefits of being calculated are not given. Without those calculations it is impossible to judge whether the calculations are credible; indeed without proper measurements of the levels of noise and vibration it is difficult to see that any cost benefit ratio could be calculated with confidence
- Even if SilentTrack is found to be not reasonably practical on grounds of cost the Secretary of State makes it clear that an equally effective substitute must be offered in mitigation while many noise reduction measures have been suggested, so far no alternative measures to mitigate vibration been proposed
- There should be a proper program of monitoring of noise and vibration including monitoring inside at all floor levels within a sample of affected houses
- The benefit to cost ratios must be presented for the purpose scrutiny
- Alternative vibration mitigation measures must be proposed if available. If no alternative vibration mitigation measures are available freight train speeds should be restricted
- The school as well as many properties on Waterside are very close to the railway. Noise and vibration are already a serious issue and, unless the Council is firm with Network Rail, the situation will become intolerable for hundreds of children and thousands of local residents.
- The noise and vibration from the trains especially freight trains at night have been very disturbing and the fact that the frequency is going to be increased and silent track is now going to be reneged on is a really alarming development

- The effect on children who attend St Philip in St James School, the majority of whom live near the railway track, and will be affected during school hours and at home is a real concern
- The noise and vibration monitoring systems should be installed before any new trains run on the new track. The track is very close to many home and community facilities including schools and play areas. The original conditions should be adhered to.
- The original application was supported only on the basis of the conditions being fulfilled. Mitigation measures are small but essential to maintaining normal family life in close proximity to the dramatically increased use of the line forecast over the next 10 years
- The diesel fume pollution if the number of trains is allowed to rise is also of huge concern both for the residents and because this track runs alongside an area of natural beauty
- Monitoring of noise and vibration levels should start now so that we have a clear benchmark to work from. The effects of increased well traffic on lines running through such a heavily populated area needs to be studied properly and mitigated.
- Seeking to make variations to the original planning consents will have a negative impact on Waterside and adjoining neighbourhoods. Seeking such variations at this late stage is underhanded and contemptuous of Network Rail's much-publicised concern for public opinion
- The well-being of children should be a much greater priority for our Council rather than facilitating Network Rail to cut corners.
- This planning application is all about maximizing profit with no consideration to the significant impact on local residents and the school.
- The quality of life and for the local community will be severely impacted on if this application continues
- Is there any risk of train collision near the school where the two railways become only one?
- What will be the noise and vibration impact on birds, protected wildlife, and birds migration Port Meadow?
- The real impact study is necessary and action has to be taken before any increase of circulation on the railway.
- To allow this application would set an appalling precedent

- It makes a total nonsense of the planning application procedure if the builder, developer or in this case a company decide to renege on former agreements in order to further their own interests. Stand up and be counted. Don't be rolled over. There are thousands of residents who will be affected if the original planning conditions are not met.
- The noise of trains reflects off the houses on the opposite side of the canal and bounces back loudly on houses on the railway side of the estate. Network Rail has also cut down all the trees along the railway next to the estate which would have partially screened noise, and have not built the earlier proposed sound barrier. Loss of these trees is visually unpleasant for those living next to the embankment and indeed to all on the estate.
- Based on their past behaviour I have no confidence that Network Rail will honour their word whatever they might have initially agreed to. It is simply not acceptable for Network Rail to secure approval on one basis and then to propose to wind back all the undertakings given on the grounds that this now all looks just too expensive. It would be unconscionable for the public authorities to acquiesce to collapse in planning standards in this way.
- We hear the trains from my house on Burgess Mead and I am often woken by them in the early hours. The prospect of more trains regularly travelling this week has been daunting but we were comforted by the understanding that they would be on silent track and that there would be vibration buffers and ongoing noise monitoring. I object to this application and demand that these conditions be fulfilled.
- The proposal is completely wrong democratically. There is so much for you to be spending your time on it should not be allowed to apply to change a decision already made please have the strength to ensure you are not now pressured into changing the decision
- It will not be possible to take a peaceful walk in Port Meadow or Aristotle playground because people will end up hearing now freight trains every minute
- The best mitigation would be achieved by limiting the speed in the area controlled by the planning application to a maximum of 50 mi./h this is within Network Rail control and would cost them nothing
- There is a great risk of subsidence of our properties close to the line
- We object to Network Rail efforts to compromise the planning process in which many local residents participated and accepted in good faith the mitigation measures that resulted. If accepted, this application by Network Rail will damage any faith we have in planning processes
- With HS2 on the horizon and further strengthening of the rail system being planned, it is important from both local and national perspective that Network Rail current bullying tactics are not allowed to succeed

- I was given an assurance that the impact of this development on our quality-of-life would be lessened by a number of measures including noise mitigation, Restrictions on the number and speed of train that would use the line, and monitoring vibration.
- In March 2015 at a meeting organized by city councillors Network Rail made a clear commit commitment to use SilentTrack for this line. They reassured local people present that they had the funds available
- While accepting that the infrastructure of the country needs to evolve in this case profit is being put before people.
- If the removal of restrictions on the number of trains running occurs this could result in excessive use of the line both during the day and throughout the night and this will affect the modelling of the projected impact of noise and vibration.
- With respect to silence track Network Rail benefit to cost ratio figures lack a clear methodology and appear to have been hastily compiled revealing number of significant contradictions. Route section H has changed from 0.36 to 0.24 without explanation and there are more glaring discrepancies in section I/1.
- Predictive train numbers set out in the noise and vibration mitigation policy were under representing the situation. Network Rail now plans to run more freight and passenger services on this line.
- There is evidence that it will be highly likely that the thresholds for noise and vibration will be exceeded. The modelling of future operational noise and vibration relied heavily on assumptions - these need to be checked by monitoring.
- This application should be rejected as it is clear abuse of process and a waste of taxpayers' money.
- The Secretary of State insisted on the installation of SilentTrack.
- On the number of trains and the noise level were previously set and agreed by Network Rail to limit the impact on the local environment in densely populated urban area.
- The time to propose that the noise reduction and vibration damping measures were unreasonable and unnecessary would have been at the time of the original application. What is unreasonable and unnecessary is for a project of this size and importance to have been started when there were such fundamental issues about its viability.
- We live on Waterside and our house already shakes when freight trains pass and the trains are already very loud. We do not have our windows open at the front of our home because the noise from the trains wakes up our children. It

is very disappointing to see that Network Rail having gained permission to make changes to the rail system with the important restriction on the number of trains and the requirement to use silent track are now trying to get out of their responsibilities.

- I live on Plater Drive that backs onto the train line. It is very noisy during the night and my house shakes horribly as the heavy freight trains go through both of which disturb my sleep terribly. The issue is becoming worse and worse.
- The levels of noise and diesel pollution under the proposed amendments are likely to cause great harm to the primary school children at St Philip and St James school. In addition the increased noise and pollution levels are likely to adversely affect the local ecology of the area - this is a vital resource in terms of the local area and the local community. The likely adverse effect of the likely pollution cannot be overstated particularly in the light of the increased traffic levels on the A34
- Please do not allow previously informed decision-making protecting the public to be overtaken by the commercial interests of Network Rail.
- If Network Rail is successful then the whole planning process has been a huge waste of taxpayers time and money
- An additional condition is required stating that the thresholds for noise and vibration which must not be exceeded should remain in force in perpetuity.
- An additional condition is required stating that NR will, within three months, conduct noise monitoring of operating trains and if the threshold has been exceeded NR will discuss with the Council what further mitigation will be provided and NR will immediately impose a speed restriction on the line until such time as an effective solution is implemented
- Assumptions have been made about the speeds and times of trains with the sole purpose of bringing vibration predictions to just within the threshold which residents know to be false from previous experience of trains using the line
- There is evidence that the predictions underestimate future train services:
 - Oxford Parkway opened more Chiltern Railways passenger trains operated than used that was used in the predictions
 - more Chiltern Railways passenger trains will operate when the line becomes operational than provided for in the predictions;
 - Network Rail enhancements delivery plan dated September 2016 still predicts that much higher numbers of trains will use East West Rail than the mitigation is based on
- The train numbers in Transport and Works Act application should be binding on the applicant otherwise Network Rail might be tempted to under estimate future services to gain planning approval and then rely on its permitted development rights to increase capacity

- It is essential for the well-being of waterside residents and pollution levels affecting the school that sensible measures are implemented to restrict the number and speed of passenger and freight movements particularly at night. The speed of freight traffic overnight already causes extreme vibrations in the top floor of our property. I see no legitimate reason why freight traffic should not be restricted to a sensible, less destructive and disturbing speed particularly at night.
- Network Rail obtained planning permission based on constraints relating to the use of silent track and also on traffic following volumes. Allowing them to renege on this is a precedent that should not be allowed. The council needs to insist that vibration and noise monitoring is installed before any new trains run, and to adhere to the requirements silent track, and to restrict the number of passenger and freight train movements.
- If the Council backs down then where does this leave planning processes? Can we all just ignore any constraints the Council places on development plans we might submit once we have obtained approval?
- It is vital for both fairness and to maintain the credibility of planning in Oxford that the original conditions are held to
- This isn't only about the health and well being of Oxford residents present and future but also about the impact on Port Meadow its tranquility and it's wildlife. And about whether planning conditions mean what they say or can simply be ignored by determined developers.
- The benefit cost ratio for the entire project was considered at the public inquiry and included the cost of installation of the various mitigations offered. Network Rail is using a method where the benefit cost ratio is estimated for silent track only when it is applied as the last of the mitigations instead of sticking to the method laid down in the Transport and Works Act Order where it should have been applied as the first of the mitigation. In a project of this size the cost of SilentTrack is trivial.
- It is absolutely imperative that the future train numbers supplied by NR in the Noise and Vibration Schemes of Assessment are adhered to. The calculations of vibration in particular are critically dependent upon the speed, number and types of train (because the DVD is cumulative and therefore increases with the total number of trains) By seeking to increase the number of trains while not also considering its effects on the vibration and noise schemes of assessment is clear abuse of process
- It is important that the impacts to which residents homes will be subjected in future is monitored. At the moment the noise impacts at residents homes are hypothetical yet it is on those figures alone that the required mitigation has been decided.

- The City Council seems unwilling to support residents in holding Network Rail to account for their commitments and to uphold the interests of hundreds of residents.
- Concerns that if Network Rail were to win an appeal it might impose costs on the Council is not a good reason to cave in to the bullying and devious behaviour of Network Rail. The Council should stand up for residents interests
- Hundreds of residents live within a few dozen metres of the track and increasing train numbers to some unspecified but clearly high level will have a stronger adverse effect on both noise and air pollution in the immediate area. This is particularly concerning at night as even the low number of trains currently running is sufficient to cause substantial vibration and noise.
- This proposal would, in essence, allow motorway levels of traffic immediately beside dozens of houses.
- Given that Network Rail have presumably known projected traffic volumes since before the inception of these works I find it highly dishonest that they are attempting to back out of their commitments at this late stage.
- Councillors must clearly understand that this is a pre-planned ploy by Network Rail and a corrupt and cynical attempt to deceive them the planning authorities and the local residents.
- Network Rail has been obstructive and obfuscating me in the process wasting considerable time and money. There are no good reasons for the request to lift these very reasonable conditions which were put in place after long process of very thorough consultation. The justifications provided by Network Rail are entirely insufficient. Its new benefit cost ratio is entirely unexplained.
- Network Rail has consistently underestimated traffic levels in order to avoid residents objections
- Again NR is trying to avoid the use of silent track as it is desperate to prevent setting a precedent for the rest of the country despite its own preference to mitigation at source and the Secretary of State's insistence on its use
- Without traffic caps an unlimited number of freight trains can run through Oxford regardless of their age condition size pollution emissions maintenance weight or nuisance. The traffic caps should be maintained.
- The conditions that the Council would like to impose do not appear to meet the legal standards required of planning conditions. The Secretary of State has dealt us a very bad deal in saying we could determine the planning permission without adequate powers to insist on anything that does not meet the basic condition of just mitigating the noise by a certain amount.
- Many residents were not convinced by Network Rail's modelling efforts. The models were theoretical, not reflecting the reality. The models should be

tested against reality. Disposing of this absolute maximum annihilates the crucial modelling assumption and again renders the whole exercise void.

- Instead of being a responsible custodian of the railway Network Rail has focused most energy and resources on battling local residents in endless attempts to trim costs.
- Oxford City Council must show the courage to resist this latest attempt to override the planning system and stand up for the interests of Oxford residents.
- There has been huge residential development alongside the railway in the last 20 years. Silent track is approved an inexpensive way of reducing noise at source and therefore much more effective than localized reductions by way of double glazing
- We are not next to the track but in the second floor apartment 50m away where no sound insulation has been offered. The sound from the trains travels through the air and affects our second-floor bedrooms. The importance of the reduction of noise at source is therefore important.
- Please stand firm on our behalf. We appreciate the benefits and improved infrastructure could bring to Oxford. All we ask is that Network Rail adheres to the original commitments to those of us profoundly affected by this development.
- It is nonsensical for Network Rail to refuse to measure actual noise and vibration particularly since the theoretical modelling has proved to be so inconsistent.
- It is incumbent on the Secretary of State and Oxford City Council to stand by the decisions they have already made and for Network Rail to accept them.
- The large increase in the number of train movements (passenger and freight) day and night that will come with East West Rail Phase 2 and HS2 construction are certain to be far more than Network Rail is currently predicting. It is imperative that further noise monitoring is carried out