

----- Original message -----

From:

Date: 20/02/2019 19:47 (GMT+00:00)

To: transportandworksact@dft.gov.uk

Subject: Fwd: RE: Network Rail (East West Rail Bicester to Bedford Improvements) Order OBJ/194

Dear Ms Foster,

For reference, please find attached a copy of the latest correspondence from NWR in relation to my objection and my response below.

Yours sincerely,
Anne Jordan

----- Original message -----

From:

Date: 20/02/2019 19:21 (GMT+00:00)

To: EWR Public Information <EWRPublicInformation@networkrail.co.uk>

Subject: RE: Network Rail (East West Rail Bicester to Bedford Improvements) Order OBJ/194

Dear Ms Moeng,

Thank you for your letter today.

I'm sorry but I don't understand how you can confirm that rail traffic noise will not exceed 52db in one paragraph and in another state that a passenger train with mitigation will be 69db and a freight train 86 db max. The rail traffic noise will clearly exceed 52 db.

Then you say that 85db will have a significant effect on sleep disturbance but somehow after taking into account I have no idea what, it will not be significant. That's just nonsense. Even with the nonsense the report would presumably agree it will be adverse, just not significant to the report writer. Common sense says, if you are asleep and 4 trains pass at 85db, 4 pass at 78 db and more pass at 69 db, you are going to be disturbed at least every hour and as an individual, I and I'm sure most people will consider that level of disturbance to be significant compared to now and compared to 52 db, no matter what a report says.

To say that the noise will not exceed 52db is frankly misleading and reinforces my point about the consultation not being adequate.

In addition, your letter of 5 February 2019, stated that the trees on NWR land would be pollarded. Now you say the trees on Network rail land will be removed and it is assumed that a number of mature trees not on NWR land will be removed. That's quite a difference.

The consultation documents, while listed, could **not** be downloaded. I tried over a few days finally giving up and going to the library. In any event now I can download the information, it cannot be said to be easily accessible as it is voluminous, convoluted and difficult for a lay person to interpret. It really needs to be spelt out in a way and manner that people can readily understand not buried in several huge volumes.

I regret that I am now more worried than before that I will be severely affected and that little will be done to mitigate the impact on any people living close to the track. I believe the consultation needs to be reopened to permit intelligent consideration and response to some significant issues.

Yours sincerely

Anne Jordan