

by J P Watson BSc FCIHT MICE MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date: 6 October 2011

TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

THE CHILTERN RAILWAYS (BICESTER TO OXFORD IMPROVEMENTS)
ORDER 201[X]

REQUEST FOR A DIRECTION UNDER SECTION 90(2A) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION FOR AN EXCHANGE LAND CERTIFICATE UNDER SECTIONS 19
AND 28 OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981

Dates of Inquiry: 2 November 2010 to 28 January 2011

Ref: TWA/10/APP/01

1 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Having received my report dated 15 July 2011 ("the Report"), the Department for Transport has asked for clarification of two matters:
 - i) Closure of Islip Foot Crossing; and,
 - ii) Paragraph 9.2.5 of the Report.
- 1.2 This Addendum report provides the clarification sought, and considers the effect on my previous conclusions and recommendations.

2 CLOSURE OF ISLIP FOOT CROSSING

- 2.1 Paragraphs 4.6.7 and 9.7.48 of the Report refer to proposals for the closure of Islip Foot Crossing and the diversion of footpath FP318/7. The Department for Transport has asked for clarification of the references in that context in those paragraphs to the road bridge referred to as Work 14.
- The references are drawn from paragraph 27.3 of the promoter's document CRCL/P/7/B, a proof of evidence. However, it is clear that the proposal in the published Orders, the Environmental Statement (page 12.14 of document CD/1.16) and elsewhere in evidence is to divert the footpath to the proposed footbridge that would be Work 15. There was no suggestion at the Inquiry that the Order should be changed so as to alter the footpath diversion to lead to Work 14. The references in the Report to Work 14, at the "Islip Foot" row of the table in paragraph 4.6.7 and in the second line of paragraph 9.7.48, should be changed so that "Work 14" becomes "Work 15".

3 REPORT PARAGRAPH 9.2.5

3.1 The final sentence in this paragraph of the Report is incomplete. The final sentence should read "It was also argued in objection to the Scheme that the current provision is sufficient."

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Having considered the matters set out in this Addendum Report, I find no change to be necessary to the conclusions and recommendations in my report dated 15 July 2011.

J.P. Watson

INSPECTOR