

Danny Yee – Eynsham LCWIP

We support the adoption of the Eynsham LCWIP. It is a solid and comprehensive piece of work, which will lay the foundation for some real improvements to walking and cycling in the village and its environs.

Our major concern remains that this, like other Oxfordshire LCWIPs, does not consider the possibility of circulation schemes. The report says, in response to our consultation submission, that "A more comprehensive review of traffic flow in Eynsham will be considered as part of a complimentary piece of work to the LCWIP" and, in another response.

"Traffic routing in the village centre will be considered as part of the Eynsham Village Centre project – a complimentary project to the LCWIP that considers traffic flow and routing in the village centre, alongside public realm and placemaking improvements."

But there is no timeline for this project and logically planning for motor traffic needs to precede or accompany planning of a cycle network. Any cycle network could be undermined by increases in motor traffic - perhaps from new developments - making streets too hostile for people to cycle on. And a removal or reduction of motor traffic could open up new routes for cycling.

Managing motor traffic is absolutely central to enabling walking and especially cycling. It isn't so explicit in LTN 1/20, but the draft Active Travel England _Rural Design Guide_ says "Where cyclists are on-carriageway, traffic volumes may be up to 2000 pcu/day or 200 pcu/hour but should desirably be less." This needs to be central to any planning for cycling, as the vast bulk of cycling will continue to involve sharing the carriageway with motor traffic.