

RESPONDENT	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
<i>Written Responses</i>	
(1) Thames Valley Police (Traffic Management)	No objection – in line with comments made in the previous informal consultation.
(2) Vale of White Horse District Council (Planning)	No comment
(3) East & West Hendred Parish Council	Support – Both East and West Hendred replied in support of this proposal during the informal consultation, and both Parish Councils continue to strongly support the proposal.
(4) Trailriders Fellowship	Object - <i>See Annex 6</i>
(5) British Horse Society	Object (re carriage driving restriction)- <i>See Annex 7</i>
(6) Green Lane Association	Object – It is noted that the Council accepts that it has a responsibility to ensure the safe movement of both vehicles and other traffic. The Council also has a duty under Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 to protect and assert the rights of all users, which of course includes those rights in respect of vehicular users. It may be argued that the prohibition of vehicles on the eastern section of the route, which is only partially accessible to MPVs due to part of it having the status of a Restricted Byway, is reasonable in consideration of the objectives of the project as a whole and the likely level of vehicular use on this section of the Byway. However, the prohibition of vehicles over the western ‘through route’ section of the Byway requires more imaginative consideration rather than the blunt approach adopted which is to simply remove historical vehicular rights as it is the cheapest option available and will only affect a minority group.

As the Council has acknowledged it does have a duty to protect and assert the rights of all users including those in vehicles. It is noted that the Council accepts that it caused an obstruction of the route to vehicles through the provision of an unsuitable bridge at Ginge Brook, whilst this is regrettable it is not insurmountable. I imagine that the Council has already spent many hours and much money in the creation of a network of routes that on the whole benefit only certain classes of user, namely walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Consequently, in the interest of all users including those in vehicles, it is not unreasonable to seek the removal of an unlawful obstruction (a bridge) to the free passage of vehicular traffic. Having achieved that the Council can then apply itself to the problem in hand and resolve this by either replacing the bridge with a suitable multi user bridge or alternatively provide a separate bridge for the use of walkers, cyclists and horse riders, located to one side of the crossing point, and then construct or reinstate a ford to allow the passage of vehicular traffic.

With the creation of a new right of way as part of Route 1, the route leading north from the Byway towards Red Barn, there remains only a short section of Byway that would coincide with the proposed new 'cycle' route. Although I have not visited the site I have been provided with photographs and I would submit that there is an opportunity for the Council to accommodate safe passage for all users along this relatively short section of Byway. As previously discussed, there are a number of options open to the Council, the current approaches to the crossing and the bridge itself are, I understand, inappropriate for horse or cycle use and will have to be reengineered in order to make them suitable, the need for this having already been identified. Consequently, there exists an opportunity for the Council to demonstrate both its commitment and duty to all users and to revise these works in order to accommodate vehicular traffic as well. The remainder of the route to its junction with Ginge Road appears to be wide enough to allow adequate provision for, or segregation of, all users.

Alternatively, and arguably more appropriately, the Council could use its powers under Sections 25 or 26 of the Highways Act 1980 and either enter into an agreement with the relevant landowner(s) to create a right of way running alongside the existing Byway as far as the proposed new right of way leading North towards Red Barn or, in failing to reach such an agreement, to simply create one. The case for such a creation having already been made by the objectives of the SVCN project. This course of action would have the benefit of providing segregated and safe access for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, whilst allowing the continued use of the Byway for vehicular users.

In conclusion, I would submit that the Council has failed to clearly demonstrate that sufficient effort was given to comply with its duty to protect and assert the rights of users and in particular those in vehicles. Instead, it has chosen to use the cheapest option and deploy a blunt instrument in order to prohibit those users it simply finds inconvenient to accommodate.

<p>(7) Oxfordshire Trail Rider Fellowship</p>	<p>Object</p> <p>On behalf of the Oxfordshire Trail Rider Fellowship (OXTRF), I wish to formally submit our objection to the proposed Icknield Way Byways TRO (Ardington, Lockinge, East and West Hendred). Our objection is specifically directed towards the planned restriction of motorbikes on the Byways Open to All Traffic (BOAT) in question.</p> <p>Although OXTRF supports any plans to encourage the general public to enjoy the countryside and the Public Right of Way (PROW) network, and in principle has no problem with the proposed promotion of a safe cycle, walk and horse-riding facility, we cannot condone any plans that take away existing PROW user rights.</p> <p>In our opinion, there is no need to ban motorbikes from the existing BOATs even if, as a promoted facility, these trails become more attractive to non-MPV (Mechanically Propelled Vehicle) users. After all, the trails in question are already legally classified as BOATs, and thus by definition intended to be safely and respectfully shared by all the different kinds of user, non-motorised and motorised.</p> <p>You argue that people may not want to use the new route if there is a possibility they may encounter motorised traffic on it. This is a peculiar statement, as nearly 25% of the route is actually planned along public roads (the total proposed route being just over 8km long, including a 1.8km total of public road section). Surely the possible extra 325m of the Lockinge byway, which the cycle route users would have to share with the occasional motorbike, is not going to be the dealbreaker. Although the West Hendred Byway is longer (around 680m), the chances of any one ever meeting a motorbike here are virtually non-existent; trail riders rarely ever use this dead-end byway.</p> <p>You also state it would not be safe for non-MPV users to share the new route with motorcycles. Your documents refer to the narrowness of the track and Ginge Brook bridge, the damage MPVs can cause to local farming and the speed and noise of our motorbikes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You claim the present byway's width of 3.6m is 'sub-optimal for motorcycles to safely pass cyclists, equestrians and pedestrians... on a stone surfaced byway', and that the new trail should be 4.5m wide minimum 'to allow for two-way traffic including mechanically propelled vehicles such as 4x4s'. Although 4.5m may be the recommended width to safely allow 4x4 traffic, these figures are irrelevant when it comes to motorcycles. Motorcycles do not occupy any bigger space than a large mountain bike or small horse. Additionally, most byways are much narrower than even the 'sub-optimal' 3.6m, and still motorbikes and non-MPV users manage to share them successfully, without incident. • The bridge over Ginge Brook however is a different matter and we appreciate the width of it may be the biggest obstacle regarding shared MPV/non-MPV use. Whilst we understand that allowing 4x4 would have serious implications on the design and cost of the bridge, trail riders would be able to safely share a 2.5m wide bridge with walkers and cyclists without any such issues. When it comes to shared use with horses, however, no trail rider would ever want to be on that
-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

bridge at the same time as a horse, not even if the bridge width were to be within the guidelines for a 'larger bridge structure'. Horses can be unpredictable, and we respect them and their riders too much to put them in a potentially dangerous situation. And although most/all trail riders would automatically wait for any horse to get of the bridge before crossing it themselves, we would have no problems with the installation of official signs indicating non-MPV user priority.

- The WSP safety assessment states that 'at bridges the Sustrans minimum recommended unsegregated width for cyclists and pedestrians is 3.5m'. Add to this the Highways Agency 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' statement that on equestrian routes, 'Where horses are expected to pass, a minimum width of 3.0m should be provided' (Volume 6, Chapter 7, paragraph 7.11), then it would appear that the new Ginge Brook Bridge with a width of 2.5m does not meet the Sustrans and Highways Agency minimum specification required for equestrian use. If this is the case, then the problem of motorcycles and horses meeting each other on the bridge becomes irrelevant, as the bridge is not suitable for equestrian use.
- There was also the argument that banning MPV use will 'improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems'. As the 2 byways in question have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as they are in 'reasonable state of repair' (both claims confirmed by the OCC itself), it is not really clear what relevance this argument has regarding a TRO for motorcycles.
- Yes, motorcycles can indeed go relatively fast and yes, there is always a 'potential' for motorcycles to travel along these byways at inappropriate speeds, but most of us are responsible PROW users and ride at speeds which are safe and appropriate (and in accordance with TRF guidelines). When we meet other PROW users, we are courteous enough to slow down, and even sometimes switch off our engines, especially for horses. There is a big difference between our 'potential' and 'actual' behaviour, and respect for others is at the heart of the TRF.
- We appreciate that we are noisier than a cyclist, horse or walker. But still, as 1/4 of the route is on public roads anyway, where cars and motorbikes are to be expected, the extra 325m and 682m of byways that the 'cycle' route users would occasionally have to share with our noisy bikes, will make little difference to their overall experience.

Unfortunately, many of your other arguments accuse trail riders of general irresponsibility and disregard for the law.

- Your documents claim that the improved surface of the cycle path will not only make us increase our speed, ignoring the fact that most of us are considerate byway users, but it would also 'substantially' increase motorcycle use. We would counteract that. Firstly, the increased non-motorised use of the trail would make us slow down, and secondly, that the sanitisation of these trails is actually a reason why many of us would avoid them, especially as they do not easily link up with other byways. The OCC is making an ungrounded and erroneous assumption.

- Your documents also argue that trail riders cannot be allowed on the Lockinge BOAT part which is NOT part of the Cycle Route (hence the TRO for the whole byway), simply because we cannot be trusted to respect the TRO once it becomes part of the cycle route. Claiming we would wilfully ignore a TRO is rather insulting. Most motorbike trail riders do not break the law and those that do so knowingly will no doubt continue to do so, whether or not part or the whole of the byway gets restricted. Just as a reference, the West Hendred byway of the consultation has been a dead-end byway for a long time and there is no evidence that trail riders deliberately break the law here and continue on the Restricted Byway part of this track. There is absolutely no reason to assume we would act any different with any other dead-end byways, present, or future, and wilfully break the law.
- Related to this last point, you also put forward the argument that if the non-cycle route part of the Lockinge byway were to be kept open, there would be no provision for MPVs to turn around near the Ginge Brook/cycle route meeting point. This may be true for 4x4 (and has always been so due to the steep banks of the brook), but this does not apply to motorbikes. The whole of the Lockinge byway is actually wider than many other byways in the country, definitely more than wide enough to turn a bike around safely within the confines of the byway and without having to causing damage to its surface or verges.

It is extremely disappointing that the OCC and its associates base some of their arguments for a TRO on ungrounded accusations and assumptions. The supplied documents show that the OCC does not trust motorcyclists to do the right thing and accuses us, not of proven, but potential unsocial and unlawful behaviour, ignoring the fact that respect for non-MPV PROW users, as well as adhering to the law, is of the utmost importance to trail riders. It would appear that impartiality, objectivity and respect have become victims in this quest for a MPV-free cycling route.

Byways Open to All Traffic are a precious commodity in Oxfordshire. They are protected by law to allow a small group of the community to enjoy the countryside by means of a mechanically propelled vehicle. Especially for motorcycle riders this is an extremely valuable commodity; we are after all vulnerable road users (as traffic incident statistics show), and BOATs give us the opportunity to exercise our hobby and have fun in the countryside in a relatively safe manner, away from busy roads and fast moving traffic. The proposed alternative routes for MPVs, suggested by this TRO, guide us onto the A417. We cannot state strongly enough that making our often smaller engined bikes join such a busy road is frankly irresponsible.

Trail riding is a valuable recreational activity, and we at OXTRF expect the OCC to protect our legal right of access to the countryside. Rather than trying to find reasons to ban motorbikes, it should be the OCC's priority to find ways for **all** to safely share the byways - even if these byways are improved to become more attractive to non-MPV users. The only valid problem is, in our opinion, the crossing of the Ginge Brook Bridge **if** horses are allowed to cross it when its width is sub-optimal for equestrian use. Horses and bridges are delicate combinations, and no trail rider would deliberately chose to be on that bridge when there is a horse on it too. Installing signs, advising priorities regarding the crossing of Ginge Brook, is a simple solution, but one that would work and get the full support of the trail riding community.

<p>(8) Green Lanes Environmental Action Movement</p>	<p>Support –</p> <p>I am writing to express GLEAM’s support for the prohibition of motor vehicle use of this byway open to all traffic (BOAT) and restricted byway in the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).</p> <p>GLEAM was founded in 1995 to campaign for changes in the law of England and Wales to stop off-road drivers damaging or destroying green lanes, and for the rights of walkers, horse riders, pedal cyclists, carriage drivers and the disabled to use green lanes (highways not sealed with tarmac or concrete) without danger, difficulty and inconvenience.</p> <p>We provide some evidence below to support the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) considerations which you give in your statement of reasons.</p> <p>RTRA section 1(1)(a) “<i>for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising</i>”</p> <p>A video made by a motorcyclist in 2012 of his and two other motorcyclists’ use of the BOAT section of this route (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pBrp-JXzUxI&list=PL83EC16F3B38A4913&index=4&t=0s) shows, at 1 minute 33 seconds, a pedal cyclist having to stop and move on to the verge to avoid a collision with the motorcyclists. The video lasts for 3 minutes 28 seconds and the length of the BOAT section of the route is 1.35 miles, which means that the motorcyclist making the video was travelling at an average speed of 23 miles per hour.</p> <p>This video indicates that motorcycle use of the route is likely to be dangerous for non-motorised users, because of the speed at which motorcycles travel on it and because of the narrowness of the route in some places. Horse riders and less agile walkers and cyclists are especially susceptible to the dangers of sharing such a route with motorcyclists.</p> <p>We note that one of the responses to your informal consultation said that “<i>the bank after the brook [i.e. the bank east of Ginge Brook] is too steep for 4x4s without using a winch</i>”. You commented that it is not acceptable for the use of a winch to be necessary in close proximity to non-motorised users. We agree that this indicates it is not safe for cars to share the route with non-motorised users.</p> <p>RTRA section 1(1)(b) “<i>for preventing damage to the road...</i>”</p> <p>We provide two photos, the first showing the crossing of the Ginge Brook and the second the restricted byway section of the route.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>The first shows motorcycle ruts on the BOAT on either side of the bridge and mud deposited on the bridge by motorcycles. If it is argued that agricultural vehicles have damaged the route, we comment that the restricted byway section appears to have little or no damage from such vehicles.</p> <p>RTRA section 1(1)(c) “<i>for facilitating the passage on the road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)</i>”</p> <p>It is clear, from the video and the first photo referred to above, that some non-motorised users are likely to be deterred from using the route because of the risk of encountering motor vehicles and the damage caused by motor vehicles. Allowing motor vehicles to continue to use the route when most of it becomes part of the Science Vale Cycle Network would be contrary to the primary aim of the Science Vale Cycle Network project “<i>to improve routes for cyclists and pedestrians and to make cycling a more attractive choice</i>”¹. Prohibiting motor vehicle traffic would facilitate the route’s use by cyclists and pedestrians (and horse riders).</p> <p>RTRA section 1(1)(d) “<i>for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road....</i>”</p> <p>The motorcyclist who made the video referred to above notes that the route is “<i>unsuitable for cars</i>”. We comment that the route is also unsuitable for motorcycles because of the danger discussed above.</p> <p>RTRA section (1)(1)(e) “<i>for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot</i>”</p> <p>The route has the character of a tranquil green lane, allowing non-motorised users to take exercise and enjoy the countryside away from the tarmac roads. If motor vehicles are not prohibited this character will continue to be affected by the noise, damage and danger they cause.</p> <p>RTRA section (1)(1)(f) “<i>for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs</i>”</p> <p>Prohibiting motor vehicles would enhance the amenities of the route for non-motorised users. They will be able to appreciate the natural beauty and tranquillity of the area without having to worry about encountering motor vehicles. The route is in North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), whose current management plan cites “<i>irresponsible use of the rights of way network by motorised vehicles</i>” as one of the key issues affecting the leisure and tourism amenities of the area.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

¹ <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-and-transport/roadworks/major-current-roadworks/science-vale-cycling-network>

We point out that, because this route is in an AONB, you could make the TRO for the reasons of “*conserving or enhancing the natural beauty of the area, or of affording better opportunities for the public to enjoy the amenities of the area, or recreation ... in the area*” (section 22(2) RTRA). The latter two reasons are consistent with the benefits of the Science Vale Cycling Network, to “*make Science Vale a more attractive place to live and work*” and “*provide better routes to encourage more people to switch from cars to cycling and walking*”.

We note that, although your statement of reasons cites sections (1)(1)(a) to (f) RTRA as the considerations for making the proposed order, paragraph 5 of your draft order attributes the reasons for the order to sections 3(1) & (2) RTRA. We think this attribution is incorrect, and that paragraph 5 should refer to the considerations in your statement of reasons i.e. sections (1)(1)(a) to (f) RTRA.

You mention section 122 RTRA implicitly in the first paragraph and explicitly in the second paragraph of your statement of reasons. We think it is worth commenting on this section in the context of this route, because it is one that has been used in legal challenges by the Trail Riders Fellowship (TRF) and the Green Lane Association to TROs. In the most recent challenge (by the TRF to Hampshire County Council) Lord Justice Longmore summarised “*the approach which should be adopted by traffic authorities in considering whether to make a TRO*”, saying that:

“1) the decision-maker should have in mind the duty (as set out in section 122(1) of the 1984 Act) to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) so far as practicable;

2) the decision-maker should then have regard to factors which may point in favour of imposing a restriction on that movement; such factors will include the effect of such movement on the amenities of the locality and any other matters appearing to be relevant which will include all the factors mentioned in section 1 of the 1984 Act as being expedient in deciding whether a TRO should be made; and

3) the decision-maker should then balance the various considerations and come to the appropriate decision.”²

We comment that the through BOAT section of the route is not an expeditious, convenient or safe route for cars, because the bank east of Ginge Brook makes it impossible for cars to use without a winch. Your consultation plan shows that there is an alternative route on tarmac minor roads between the ends of the through BOAT section, which is likely to be as expeditious for motorcycles as the BOAT. The section which is part BOAT and

² <https://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/format.cgi?doc=/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2019/1275.html>, paragraph 40

	<p>part restricted byway is not an expeditious route for motor vehicles because they are not allowed to use the restricted byway part.</p> <p>We further comment you have to balance the amenity for motorcyclists of this route against the amenity for non-motorised users (including new users attracted by its inclusion in the Science Vale Cycle Network) of having a route which is expeditious, convenient and safe for non-motorised use because motor vehicles are prohibited.</p> <p>We note that the map of the Science Vale Cycle Network on your website which shows the status of the Phase 1 programme at July 2019 says that a new bridge/ramps are planned for the crossing of Ginge Brook as part of the project. We wondered if the new bridge would be wide enough for horse-drawn vehicles, and if so, horse-drawn vehicles could be excluded from the proposed prohibition of traffic.</p>
(9) Natural England	<p>No comment – Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. This proposal does not impact on designated sites or protected landscapes and therefore Natural England have no comments.</p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes</p>
(10) Vodafone	No objection
(11) As an individual (Alton)	<p>Object – I have been using this byway on my motorcycle for nearly 30 years and in all this time I have never had a problem with other users, not that I ever see many, I would also point out my bikes have always been both quiet and road legal and that while every user causes some sort of wear and tear, a motor cycle on its rubber tyres probably cause less damage than a horse.</p>

<p>(12) As an individual (unknown)</p>	<p>Object – On 5th July, I made a site visit to this right of way, where there is a steep incline down to the Ginge Brook. I had been alerted to the notice of prohibition of non-motorised vehicles via the British Horse Society and as a carriage driver, I was asked to go along with a group of other equestrians to give my opinion as to whether this slope was drivable with a carriage.</p> <p>The answer is yes, it is drivable. However, carriage drivers are a sensible lot and don't want to damage themselves, their horses, or the rights of way. I think we would not drive it in its current state in bad weather (would be too slippery and also further damage the going, which is poor in any case).</p> <p>However, forgetting weather conditions for the moment, if the slope was considered too steep, there is the option of driving it the other way around, so that you would be driving uphill. This is safer for the horses and the carriage and is perfectly doable.</p> <p>While on site we met a cyclist, who was about to cycle down the slope. He was an experienced cyclist and used the route for commuting (to Harwell) and pleasure. We asked him what he thought of the slope and said it was very tough and would not be for the fainthearted cyclist or an inexperienced cyclist. He was very experienced and still found it a challenge.</p> <p>He also said that he understood changes were going to be made to the surface and the steep slope graded out and the whole section re-surfaced to enable ease of cycling on the route.</p> <p>If this were the case then carriage driving too, would be far easier. The fact that someone has deemed in their opinion (even though they may not carriage drive) that the slope is too steep is not a reason to prohibit the use of carriages on this route.</p> <p>Carriage drivers only have access to 5% of the RoW network in England. Please do not take more away from us, making it even harder for us to stay off the road to enjoy our sport. Yes, sport. Carriage driving is a growing sport, in the UK and internationally and we need somewhere to be able to exercise our horses and get them competition fit. We do not all own outdoor arenas, contrary to popular belief!</p> <p>Carriage drivers obey the rules of the road (and are covered by the Highways Act) the same way that motorised vehicle drivers are, it is just that our engine happens to be horsepower of the old-fashioned kind. We are polite and do not drive over people or cause accidents. There seems to be an impression that we could come into conflict with other RoW users and cause danger to them, but this is not the case, any more than two cyclists meeting at the brook</p>
--------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	crossing or cyclists meeting walkers. It is not a valid reason to stop carriage drivers.
(13) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – I would like to register my opposition to any such permanent TRO as a frequent and responsible recreational Trail rider (motorcycle).</p> <p>Obviously I'm a normal member of the public, I enjoy walking in the Countryside, with my family and my dog, and I also have many friends who are horse riders.</p> <p>As such, I ride a small low capacity, lightweight and quiet trail bike, as do all the friends that I ride with. If we do go out together, we keep groups sizes small, typically 2-3 friends.</p> <p>We are always aware, and courteous to other Byways users, often stopping, switching off engines, and talking with walkers, horse riders, and cyclists.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that recreationally 4x4's can cause damage to some surfaces, especially in the Winter. The footprint left by lightweight trail bikes, makes little or no impact, certainly less than a horse, or a tractor.</p> <p>I would prefer no user group to be impacted detrimentally by any TRO, but other Councils have made TRO's only active for vehicles with 3 wheels or more, or over a certain width. Thereby restricting the use by 4x4's but not trail bikes, not my preferred position, but potentially a compromise.</p> <p>My final thought is the ongoing convergence of electric bicycles, and trail bikes. Electric cycles are now faster and are heavier than standard mountain bikes, we surely will soon see the switch of use from petrol to electric motorcycles for many users. So, the differences between the two categories of vehicles will become increasing slight.</p> <p>The Countryside has always been and should remain accessible to all user groups. Historic rights of Way should not be overturned and restricted to benefit certain user groups over others, which I understand to be against Defra's documented Guidelines.</p>
(14) As an individual (Cookham Dean, Berkshire)	<p>Object – I write to object to the proposed TRO's on the byways in Ardington, West and East Hendred for the creation of a cycle route.</p>

	<p>1. The proposed route already uses roads for around 25% of its length where cyclists share their passage with other road users. Cyclists should be capable of controlling their machines in all circumstances, especially when confronted with any form of traffic.</p> <p>2. The proposal is to the detriment of motorcycles who already have VERY limited access to rights of way which is against DEFRA guidelines which clearly state that no user group should benefit at the cost of another.</p> <p>3. I have used these byways on a motorcycle for many years and have never experienced any conflict with other users including horse riders, cyclists and walkers and always slow down, stop and cut the engine when appropriate to do so. Any suggestion that an improved surface would increase speed is unfounded as the same would be true on any surface.</p> <p>4. Any suggestion that motorcycles spoil the tranquillity of the countryside is again unfounded. Farm machinery make far more noise and cause a great deal more damage to rights of way than any motorcycle does!</p> <p>5. I suspect that some of the motivation for the proposal is that OCC have failed to maintain the bridge over the years which may need replacing and it would be cheaper for them not to have to do this to accept motor vehicles – again this is unacceptable and inappropriate behaviour on behalf of the council.</p> <p>6. Any suggestion that there would not be enough space for cyclists to pass a motorcycle is again unfounded as the widest part of the vehicle in both the case of a cycle and a motorcycle is the rider!</p> <p>Oxford CC and or selected individuals with it (and parish councils), have systematically attempted to stop motorcycles accessing byways for many years - this is simply the latest back door method of trying to do it. It is not acceptable that this minority of individuals abuse their position to further their personal agenda.</p>
(15) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – Such a shame that Oxfordshire countryside access is continually becoming not available for ALL but only for majority groups such as walkers, cyclists and pressure groups with their own agendas.</p>
(16) As an individual (Stanford in the Vale)	<p>Object – I wish to register my opposition to the suggested TRO on Ginge brook. I've used and enjoyed this byway for some years both as a walker and as a motorcyclist and know there is very little traffic on it, either on foot, hoof, bicycle or road tyre.</p> <p>I believe all can use this route without detriment to the others and the proposed TRO is unnecessary. I consider it</p>

	<p>inconsiderate and blinkered to exclude users of motorised vehicles who gain as much enjoyment as other users.</p>
<p>(17) As an individual (Baydon)</p>	<p>Object – As a recreational motorbike rider, I object specifically against the planned banning of motorcycles on these Byways Open to All Traffic.</p> <p>Whilst it is praiseworthy that the OCC tries to encourage more people to enjoy the countryside, it is surprising to see that it would do so at the cost of extinguishing the PROW rights of MPV users, especially motorcycle users.</p> <p>Trail riding is a recreational activity, and through the creation of BOATs, the law has made very specific provisions for us to be able to enjoy the countryside in a safe manner. In Oxfordshire these provisions are already severely limited, and it is regrettable that, rather than supporting motorbikes on the PROW network, the OCC is now trying to even further reduce the Oxfordshire BOAT network, with little justification.</p> <p>The OCC states that safety issues are its main reason for banning motorcycles from the byways in question. After reading the documents supplied with the consultation, I understand the OCC bases this assessment on 2 main streams of thought:</p> <p>On the one hand, the OCC plans to build a ‘cycle route’ which would be too narrow to accommodate shared motorcycle and non-MPV use. This seems a feeble argument to me, as many byways in the country are much narrower than the byways in question, and still trail bikes manage to share those quite safely with other PROW users. The OCCs arguments regarding the byways in question may be valid for 4x4s, but when it comes to motorbikes, we need even less space than a small horse, weigh less and are often easier to control, so exactly why are these lanes too narrow to accommodate trail bikes?</p> <p>The proposal of a new bridge over Ginge Brook is interesting, as it appears to allow equestrian use, even if the specifications of this bridge are well below the British Horse Society recommendation which states that bridges longer than 8m should have a minimum width of 4m (BHS, Advice on Bridges, gradients and steps in England and Wales, p.1), and the Highways Agency recommendation that ‘The minimum width of a footbridge for combined pedestrian/equestrian use shall be 3.5m’ (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 2, Section 2, Part 8, Point 12.8). If the council is willing to ignore these guidelines for horses, than surely it can make the same exceptions for small trail bikes, as again we are smaller than a horse, and infinitely more controllable.</p> <p>As an additional thought, I’m not sure any trail user would ever want to be on that bridge when there is a horse on it,</p>

	<p>regardless of whether they are on their bike, bicycle or walking. Horses are after all animals and can easily be spooked. I would happily wait for any horse to cross that bridge first, before continuing myself, and am sure all my fellow riders feel the same.</p> <p>On the other hand, the OCC claims that motorbike riders are irresponsible (would ignore a TRO wilfully), inconsiderate (noise) and dangerous (speed), and that therefore they should not be allowed to share this new cycle route with non-motorised users. I cannot help but think that this whole line of thinking is based on prejudice, assumptions and exaggerations. In general, trail riders are extremely considerate to other PROW users. I, and at everyone I ride with, slow down whenever we meet others trail users, even coming to a standstill when appropriate. We only ride where we are allowed to ride, and make sure our bikes are completely road legal. We respect other BOAT users, and as we know we are fortunate to have such a brilliant commodity, are not in any hurry to jeopardise this wonderful privilege which is BOAT access. It is thus regrettable that your documents paint a picture which shows prejudice and intolerance, distorting the truth to achieve the aim of a MPV-free Route.</p> <p>If anything, I feel it is the OCC who is acting in an careless manner by suggesting that, as an alternative route, I should go on the busy A417. Surely this is not an acceptable alternative for small engine trail bikes! It is no secret that motorbike riders are vulnerable road users (RoSPA, Common motorcycle crash causes, November 2017), and suggesting little trail bikes should join such a busy road is totally irresponsible.</p> <p>The documents also state that making the track suitable for shared MPV/non-MPV use would increase the cost of the project beyond what it is willing to spend. If this is truly the case, why not improve the existing cycle route between Harwell and Wantage? It is only marginally longer than the new route, and would thus not negatively affect cycling commuters, and it is an equally lovely ride, away from main roads and thus perfect for family outings. The added bonus would be that the funds you save by not creating this new cycle route could be spent on improving Oxfordshire's public road network, which is in a truly abysmal state.</p> <p>I do appreciate any efforts to create a safe environment for non-MPV users to enjoy the PROW network, but not if this is achieved by taking existing rights away from trail riders. If anything, trail riders are quite happy to share the few routes we have with others. It is a shame the OCC does not adhere to this same sharing spirit. The OCC also has a responsibility towards us, and suggesting it is acceptable that vulnerable trail bike riders should join a dangerously busy road, is nothing short of a disgrace.</p>
(18) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – express my objection to the proposed closure to motorcycles of the above route, please do register my objection as I ride this route and will be forced to ride other routes as will others, those other routes will then suffer a</p>

	<p>higher frequency of usage until as a result they are then closed too, if we follow to its natural concussion i will then only be able to ride to the bottom of my garden and back!</p>
<p>(19) As an individual (Grove, Wantage)</p>	<p>Object – Since moving to Oxfordshire in 2002, I have been using the Icknield Way as a walker, cyclist and trail rider. Never in those 17 years have I experienced any issues resulting from sharing the byway with other users.</p> <p>The arguments for the proposed Traffic Regulation Order make a lot of assumptions about me as a motorcyclist which I find rather insulting. They are implying that when I use the Icknield Way on my trail bike, I am ‘travelling along at inappropriate speed’ and therefore pose a danger to other users. Apart from the fact that this risk also applies to the paved sections of the cycle route, they presume that I don’t possess any common sense and consideration for other users by slowing down or even stopping - which I always do because I am a walker and cyclist, too.</p> <p>I also see in the arguments that the proposed cycle route is about 8 km in total of which 1.8 km are on tarmacked roads. May I ask why sharing an unmetalled road with other users is a reason to close that very road to a particular user group while the same scenario on a paved road is not an issue?</p> <p>The proposal argues that banning me from using the byway on my trail bike will ‘improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems’. As far as I am aware, the Icknield Way has absolutely no history of problems due to use by motorbikes, and the byway is in a reasonable state of repair. Can you provide any evidence for this claim?</p> <p>Another of the arguments says that motorcycles cannot be allowed on the Lockinge part of the Icknield Way, which is not part of the cycle route, because they cannot be trusted to respect the Traffic Regulation Order. I can assure you that it is not my habit to break any laws; my trail bike is fully road legal, taxed and MOT-ed, and I respect all legislation in this country. Assuming that I would wilfully ignore a TRO is again rather insulting. With the proposed restrictions, you only hit the law-abiding citizens, those riders who ride illegal bikes on paths closed to them, will continue to do so, whether the TRO is imposed or not.</p> <p>It may have escaped the county council’s notice, but there is already an existing cycle route between Wantage and Harwell Campus, which does not use any byways. So why is there a need to spend a considerable amount of funds on creating yet another cycle route when the road network in Oxfordshire is in such a dire state? Oxford County Council should rather spend that money on filling some potholes and improving the miserable conditions of the local roads.</p>

	<p>Speaking of roads, the proposed alternative routes guide me onto the busy A417, exposing me on my small engine trail bike to fast and heavy traffic, which is dangerous and simply irresponsible.</p> <p>The whole reasoning for the proposed traffic regulation order seems to be based on bias and prejudice against motorised vehicles; it is making unfair and pejorative assumptions and is clearly favouring some user groups of the countryside over others, which does not comply with the aim to support recreational activities for ALL residents in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to the proposed restriction on all motor vehicles and horse carriage drivers on the BOAT in Lockinge, Ardington and West Hendred</p>
(20) As an individual (Banbury)	Object – No comments
(21) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – was dismayed to hear that there is a TRO proposed for all motorised vehicles over this section of the BOAT, south of Roundabout Hill and Goldbury Hill.</p> <p>It seems a rather blunt instrument to use when there is no evidence that, at least with respect to powered two-wheelers, all users cannot share this route together amicably.</p> <p>I understand that there is an issue with the bridge over Ginge Brook and if the BOAT is kept open to motorised vehicles will require widening. If the TRO were to exclude powered two-wheelers then I don't believe that any widening would be required, and the bridge could be left alone. I believe that only walkers cross the bridge in both directions at the same time and other users, such as cyclists, horse riders and powered two-wheelers would usually wait if someone was already coming the other way.</p> <p>I feel that powered two-wheelers also have to be represented fairly in these matters and decisions about what vehicles should be included in a TRO cannot be based on prejudice and hearsay. Have you got clear and substantial evidence that powered two-wheelers have been causing problems along this BOAT? If there are some nuisance riders that use this BOAT, will they even respect a TRO anyway? The TRO may actually exacerbate nuisance riders, as considerate and responsible riders will no longer be present who might well be providing some level of monitoring and control.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider your decision regarding this TRO and to take in to account the many careful and responsible users of powered two-wheelers that take great enjoyment from riding this BOAT without causing any offence and who</p>

	<p>co-exist with other users of this BOAT perfectly satisfactorily.</p> <p>Please don't let a small minority of very vocal users restrict this BOAT from its use by the wider population.</p>
(22) As an individual (Maidenhead)	<p>Object – The whole argument why motorcycles should be banned from these byways is based on prejudice, assumptions and exaggerations. Reason, fact and fairness have become the victims of this quest for an idyllic Greenways Cycle Route, and although having ideals and trying to realise them is praiseworthy, this should not be at the cost of extinguishing the rights of an important (and minority) user group.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is to the detriment of motorcycles who already have VERY limited access to rights of way which is against DEFRA guidelines which clearly state that no user group should benefit at the cost of another. 2. I have used these byways as both a cyclist and on a motorcycle for many years and have never experienced any conflict between other users including horse riders and walkers. When I am on my motorcycle, I always show respect for other users and slow down, stop and cut the engine when appropriate to do so. When I have been a cycle user, I have found that motorcyclists have always shown me due respect and regard for safety. 3. I suspect that some of the motivation for the proposal is that OCC have failed to maintain the bridge over the years which may need replacing and it would be cheaper for them not to have to do this to accept motor vehicles – again this is unacceptable and inappropriate behaviour on behalf of the council. 4. Any suggestion that there would not be enough space for cyclists to pass a motorcycle is again unfounded as the widest part of the vehicle in both the case of a cycle and a motorcycle is the rider! 5. The proposed route already uses roads for around 25% of its length where cyclists share their passage with other road users therefore the 322m and 682m of byways that they would occasionally have to share with us, will make little difference to their overall experience. 6. Apparently restricting MPVs will also ‘improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems’. As the 2 byways in question have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as they are in ‘reasonable state of repair’ (both claims confirmed by the OCC itself), it is not really clear what relevance this argument has regarding a TRO for motorcycles.

	<p>Oxford CC and or selected individuals with it (and parish councils), have systematically attempted to stop motorcycles accessing byways for many years - this is simply the latest back door method of trying to do it. It is not acceptable that this minority of individuals abuse their position to further their personal agenda.</p>
(23) As an individual (Marlow)	<p>Object – For a regular user of these byways (motorcycle) I feel most strongly that this proposal is rejected. There are few and few byways that are available for me to use, and those that are left get over used.</p> <p>I believe that we all should have access to the countryside providing all users do so with respect for others.</p> <p>Please register my view that this TRO should not be pursued.</p>
(24) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – I do not believe that the case has been made to restrict motorcycles and I therefore object to making the TRO permanent for motorcycle users.</p> <p>Many of the OCC’s arguments make sense when it comes to 4x4s but are not relevant to motorcycles.</p> <p>The longstanding legal rights of motorcyclists to enjoy riding this BOAT on road legal machines that comply with EU type approval for exhaust noise emissions should not be taken away. The police already have powers to deal with noisy motorcycles under ‘Construction and Use Regulations’.</p> <p>The Traffic Regulation Order would threaten trail-riding as a legitimate and historic past-time, and this has not been considered in the Decision Report. Only a small percentage of unsurfaced rights of way have rights vehicular rights. This means it is especially important for the County Council to honour its duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular traffic; and under Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway. If the County Council fails to perform these duties it will dramatically reduce the opportunities for individuals to part-take in trail riding in the county.</p>
(25) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – Whilst I can understand a restriction being made for 4x4 vehicles due to the narrow access to the lane, I cannot see the relevance to preventing motorcycles from access.</p>

	<p>I am aware that some people may not want to use this cycle route if there is a chance they might meet MPVs on it. As the new route is about 8km long in total, with nearly 1/4 (1.8km) on public roads, then having the extra 322m of the Lockinge Byway/Ginge Brook (682m for the West Hendred Byway) also open to motorbikes really shouldn't be a problem.</p> <p>I am a responsible Public Right of Way (PROW) user and ride at speeds which are safe and appropriate. When I meet other PROW users, I am courteous enough to slow down, and even sometimes switch off our engines, especially for horses and dog walkers. It is all about respecting each other, and it is rather disappointing the OCC does not trust motorcyclists to do the right thing and accuses us, not of proven, but potential unsocial behaviour.</p> <p>As a motorbike trail rider, I do not break the law, and those that do so knowingly, will probably continue to do so, whether or not part or the whole of the byway gets TRO-ed.</p> <p>Regarding the bridge width, OCC claim that if the bridge was to be rebuilt, it would need to be adequate for a car. This is not really appropriate - why not just restrict the byway with a TRO that is applicable to vehicles of 3 wheels or more? West Berkshire undertake this form of TRO every year in Bucklebury and it is welcomed and respected to maintain access to BOAT's.</p>
(26) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p>Object – I've been riding and walking these Byways for many years.</p> <p>Whilst walking I've never experienced an issue with any motorised vehicles, 2 or 4 wheeled.</p> <p>Whilst riding my road legal motorcycle, I've never had an issue with anyone and have received many thanks for my courteous riding, especially when children, horses and dogs are present.</p> <p>I see no reason to restrict motorcycle usage in the area at all. The concept of some sort of cycle route in the area is nonsense, these lanes are not that well used by anyone. Restricting usage just in case someone meets a motorised vehicle of any sort is ridiculous. I believe that proposed route is approximately 8km long with 25% on public roads and only just over 1km of Byways available to motorcycles etc, surely this won't be an issue?</p> <p>If the issue is one of speed, then proper policing is the only way to deal with it, not a blanket restriction that tars everyone with the same brush. I also ride at a sensible & legal pace, as do my riding friends. None of us have a desire to race about. We also stop and turn engines off in the presence of horses & dogs.</p>

	<p>Any restriction to motorcycle usage will not improve conditions for local farming, you only need to compare the tracks left by motorcycles and tractors, in fact horses chew up the ground more than motorcycles. I believe that OCC themselves regard the byways as being in a good state of repair, to which I agree.</p> <p>Please advise me of by return email of any known problems involving motorcycles on the byways in question during the last 10 years. Any improvement in surface quality would not lead to an increase in motorcycle speed, where is the evidence for this?</p> <p>Finally, I have to question the statements about the width of the byways. I ride all over the UK and abroad. The current width of 3.6 metres is more than adequate to accommodate traffic of any kind in either direction at the same time. As previously stated, everyone motorcyclist I know who rides these byways does so in a courteous manner. I can't help thinking that OCC's opinion of motorcyclists is an antiquated one, believing us all to be using the area as a personal race track when in fact everyone I know is 40+ years old, some in their 60's, with steady jobs and mortgages to pay. Perhaps OCC should actually meet some of us motorcyclists in person...?</p>
(27) As an individual (Mitcham, London)	<p>Object – The proposal does not appear to make balanced arguments for prohibiting in line with Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, placing a duty on the Council to secure the expeditious convenient and safe movement of traffic.</p> <p>I would urge the council to find a way to enable lawful and considerate use of this road by motorcycle.</p>
(28) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Object – I am writing to you as a private individual who regularly uses the byway that passes over Ginge Brook as I wish to object to your proposed Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>I gather that it is the councils intention to spend £750,000 on a cycle route and you fear that if cyclists feel there is a chance of meeting a motorcycle (anything motorised that is larger cannot cross the wooden bridge) on a section of the route that is less than half a kilometre long they will be deterred. Yet nearly a quarter of the 8 km route is on public roads.</p> <p>For many years you have had the use as a cycle route of a privately-owned road across farmland owned by Alan Pill which links from East Ginge to just south of Ellaway's Barn yet you have advised Alan that you no longer wish this arrangement to continue.</p>

	<p>On the other side of East Ginge another private road passes alongside Ginge Brook, crossing the said byway and leads up to Red Barn and through to Ardington or West Hendred. This road I understand is owned by the Ardington Estate.</p> <p>Surely with such a simple alternative before you even consider spending such a huge amount of taxpayers money on what appears to be something of a vanity project that is to be used by a very small number of users, you have a duty to ascertain what the cost are of leasing rights for a cycle route along this track may be.</p>
(29) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Support – I am in favour of the proposed changes. The developments on this route in favour of healthy and sustainable travel are to be welcomed. At a time of increased housing development, we need more high quality, non-motorised, active travel options (such as this one) between homes and places of work. Motorised traffic is entirely incompatible with this route due to the risk it poses to other users, the damage it does to the route surface and the environmental impact. Motorised traffic has other, more appropriate, routes to the destinations served by the Icknield Way.</p>
(30) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Support – re-iterate my support for the proposed restrictions. Over use of the route by 4x4 cars and motor cycles causes deep ruts making walking it a less pleasant experience much as has been the case on the Ridgeway.</p>
(31) As an individual (Wantage)	<p>Support – As a regular user of the existing National Cycle Network Route 544 between Wantage and Harwell Campus, I welcome the improvements to the infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians. The growth in traffic on the A417 between Wantage and Rowstock is a known deterrent to cycling. An improved cycling route between Wantage and a major centre of employment is long overdue.</p>
(32) As an individual (unknown)	<p>Support – For almost 50 years I have been lucky enough to walk or ride my horse along the Icknield Way like countless others for hundreds of years. It gives me great pleasure to walk with my grandchildren along the ancient traffic free route where we can listen to birdsong, identify wildflowers and butterflies and enjoy the tranquillity of the environment and safety.</p> <p>The Icknield Way it is especially suitable for walkers of all ages and regularly used by teenagers doing Duke of Edinburgh award hikes.</p>

	<p>There is an excellent established “Sustans” route running parallel to the Icknield Way along the road with light traffic which is regularly used by cyclists from Wantage looking at how well beyond. Such an excellent alternative route there is no need for bicycles, motorbikes or any other vehicles to use the Icknield Way.</p> <p>Safety and protecting the environment are paramount, walkers and horse riders especially children are safer off the road and away for all wheeled vehicles. The Icknield Way should be kept for this group only.</p>
<i>Online Responses</i>	
(33) As part of a group/organisation (Hemel Hempstead)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - As a principal, I object to any right of way being obstructed when a user has rights to use it. I recognise there are reasons why temporary obstructions will be required but, in this case,, as a horse carriage driver, a permanent TRO appears to be required as the BOAT/RB is deemed unsafe for motorised vehicles and carriage drivers. This appears to have arisen due to past actions related to the re-classification of a RUPP and the failure to provide a bridge to the correct specification to allow all users to cross a stream. This is a convenient excuse to request a permanent TRO rather than correct errors of the past. The rights of way network for motorised vehicles and carriage drivers is reduced year on year, and in the case of carriage drivers, forcing them to use roads instead. As a vulnerable user the Highways Authority should be doing more to accommodate these users. Significant sums of money are being spent on cycle routes (not part of the rights of way network nor integrated into it) and so-called multi-user routes that exclude carriage drivers. Not that any of these comments will make any difference to a foregone conclusion that a TRO is required for spurious reasons. It would be helpful if the views of minority user groups are sought on the wider issues of reducing access and positive solutions be found.</p> <p>As an update, on further inspection of the relevant map, are you seriously suggesting that the TRO alternative route, all on roads via East Gringe, is suitable for a horse carriage? Can I suggest this is re-visited and further consideration for the replacement of the bridge is made rather than subject vulnerable users to a considerably less safe route.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Neither - No comments</p>
(34) As part of a group/organisation (Banbury)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>

<p>(35) As part of a group/organisation (Carterton)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I regularly use these PROW lanes as a member of two different user group activities and I have to ask WHY...! What evidence do you have to justify restricting access to just one specific user group?</p> <p>There is already a lovely cycle route in place from Wantage to Harwell which is perfect for recreational cyclists and family cyclist groups.</p> <p>I ride the Lockinge, Ardlington, West Hendred & East Hendred PROW/BOAT as part of my Mountain Bike route all year round and to be honest, other than during a few summer months, I rarely encounter anyone else so again I fail to see the justification in spending more money on another cycle route. I would agree with the prohibition of 4 wheel drive vehicles, especially over the winter period, as these vehicles can and do cause extensive damage as I've observed on other routes I use.</p> <p>PROW are there for all user groups and I know that contradicts part of my previous observations but it's obvious to see the damage that 4 wheel drive vehicles do.</p> <p>In all the time I have been using these routes I have never encountered a 4 wheel drive vehicle but I have encounter walkers, trail riders and horse riders and it's fair to say that I've never had a bad experience with any of them so again I have to ask what evidence you have to restrict the use of this PROW to just one user group.</p> <p>I am also a car user and I would think the money would be better spent on repairing the abysmal condition of your highways, which it has to be said, is a National Scandal.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - As above</p>
<p>(36) As part of a group/organisation (Tamworth)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - The amount of legal access for motor vehicles and horse carriage drivers to BOATS has and continues to decrease nationally.</p> <p>Without these legal routes illegal usage is encouraged amongst those who are not in legitimate groups and organisations. Everybody has a right to enjoy and explore the countryside be that by walking, riding, cycling, driving and in all instances, this help maintain the local economy.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>

(37) As part of a group/organisation (TRF)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(38) As an individual (East Hendred)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I have previously contacted you regarding the proposals to prohibit vehicular traffic on the 2 byways in question. Your replies to the informal consultation leave me totally dismayed, they seem to presume that vehicular traffic cannot co-exist with other users. This presumption is completely incorrect as both of the byways have been used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and vehicular traffic for many years.</p> <p>As a resident I live within walking distance of these byways and I have used them for many years as a walker, horse rider and vehicle user. I have never seen or heard of any problems or accidents on either of these routes.</p> <p>I can fully understand your concerns regarding pinch points and the bridge over the brook, but on the basis that you restricted vehicles of 3 wheels or more I think this would address all of your concerns. i.e. The pinch point objections would become irrelevant as motorcycles can turn around in the same space as a horse.</p> <p>The bridge over the brook could be constructed in the same manner as your plans show, which would not affect the use by motorcycles in conjunction with use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. As a livestock farmer and horse owner I am well aware of the limitations of controlling a horse in a tight space. I would be extremely reluctant as a walker or cyclist to cross a bridge whilst it was being used by a horse rider because this would be putting myself in imminent danger. However, you seem to accept this as a non-concern. On this basis the crossing of the bridge by a motorcycle when a walker or cyclist is approaching would seem to me to be not dangerous at all. The bridge could quite easily be gated, or a bollard put at both ends which would cause cyclist and motorcyclist to restrict their approach to an appropriate speed for navigating the gate/width restriction.</p> <p>Have you taken into account the danger to pedestrians when the cyclists approach and cross the bridge whilst heading towards Ardington? I have personally seen cyclists on mountain bikes in the Peak District coming down hills at a much faster speed than any motorcycle, this is a major concern and needs addressing before the bridge is built. I have spoken to a family friend who is a partner at a Law Firm in London, and after reading your proposals he can see no grounds for vehicle restrictions on these two byways.</p>

	<p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(39) As an individual (Newbury)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Just gone through all documents that you have published and most of the reasons you have mentioned for the proposed restrictions do not apply to 2-wheeled MPVs.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - Just gone through all documents that you have published and most of the reasons you have mentioned for the proposed restrictions do not apply to 2-wheeled MPVs.</p>
(40) As an individual (West Challow)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I am a regular user of this byway as a cyclist, Walker and motorcyclist and the whole reasoning for the TRO is not based on 'need', but purely on the ideal of an "Idyllic Cycle Route through the Countryside", away from any kind of motorised traffic.</p> <p>Here are some of the arguments the OCC has based the TRO on and my reaction. Pick your favourites and hopefully they can assist you in formulating your own reply:</p> <p>There are no cases of conflict between the multiple users of this road recorded in any of the parish council minutes so I do not believe there have been any cases where different users cannot all benefit from equal access rights to the Boat.</p> <p>Responsible users ride with care and consideration for other users and should not be disadvantaged by the proposed TRO.</p> <p>Trail bikes, designed for this type of BOAT are road legal and meet noise requirements set out in an MOT.</p> <p>Restricting MPVs will not 'improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems'. As the two byways in question have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as they are in 'reasonable state of repair' (both claims confirmed by the OCC itself) it is not really clear what relevance this argument has regarding a TRO for motorcycles.</p> <p>You claim that the improved surface of the cycle path would increase motorcycle use. I would counteract that the sanitisation of these trails is a reason why most users would actually avoid them, especially as these byways do not</p>

easily link up with other byways. I believe you are making an ungrounded and completely erroneous assumption.

You claim the width of the new cycle route is a major problem. According to OCC, if the surface is stoned (as it will be here), then the present byway's width of 3.6m is 'sub-optimal for motorcycles to safely pass cyclists, equestrians and pedestrians'. These figures come from the WSP engineering team who has assessed the whole route, and that for me as a cyclist and motorcyclist to use these byways they would need to be '4.5m wide minimum' for us to safely share with other byway users.

Please explain as I don't know where these figures come from but I do question the rationale behind these figures as many BOATs are much narrower than even 3.6m, and we do manage to share them quite successfully. Again it is assumed that motorcyclists are extremely inconsiderate and do not take any notice of other PROW users whilst on the trails.

This expectation of irresponsible behaviour in motorcycle riders links in with the argument that we cannot be allowed on the Lockinge BOAT part which is NOT part of the Cycle Route (hence the TRO for the whole byway), simply because we cannot be trusted to respect the TRO once it becomes part of the cycle route! Claiming we would wilfully ignore a TRO is again rather insulting. Most motorbike trail riders do not break the law, and those that do so knowingly, will probably continue to do so, whether or not part or the whole of the byway gets TRO-ed.

You state that if you were to keep the byway partially open up to Ginge Brook bridge, there is no provision for MPVs to turn around at this point. This may be true for 4x4 (and has always been so due to the steep banks of the brook), but this does not apply to motorbikes. The whole of the Lockinge byway is actually wider than many other byways in the country, definitely more than wide enough to turn your bike around safely within the confines of the byway and without having to causing damage to its surface or verges.

If the bridge were to allow motorbikes to cross it, apparently it would have to be made wide enough for us to cross safely whilst horses are on it, and that extra width alone would increase the cost beyond what the council is willing to spend - cars definitely don't stand a chance. I would argue that there is not necessarily a need for a wider than planned (2.5m) bridge: surely, we can have a system where horses on the bridge get priority, and we just wait until they get of the bridge before we cross it. To be honest, I'm not sure I would ever want to be on that bridge when there is a horse on it, not on a motorbike, bicycle, or even as a walker.

There already is an existing cycle route connecting Wantage to Harwell so is this proposal actually required? It is quite a bit longer and thus not as convenient for commuters to Harwell, but it does not use any byways. Still, it is a lovely ride, away from main roads, and perfect for family outings.

	<p>The proposed alternative routes for MPVs guides us onto the busy A417. Surely this is not an acceptable alternative for trail bikes. Motorcycles are vulnerable road users too (as statistics prove) and making our often smaller engine bikes join such a busy road is irresponsible.</p> <p>Trail riding is a recreational activity too and rather than supporting us and creating safe environments for us to exercise our hobby, the OCC, through this TRO, does exactly the opposite.</p> <p>The cost of this cycle route is considerable, especially when Oxfordshire's road network is in such an abysmal state. Surely the funds can be used for a greater good elsewhere?</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(41) As an individual (Stoke Row)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Whilst I may understand the objection for 4-wheel vehicles, I believe that the points raised in the consultation do not apply to trail-style motorbikes. Trail style motorcycles are low capacity machines and have used the route without conflict with other users for decades. When we meet other users, we will acknowledge them and for example in the case of horses, switch off engines and wait for them to pass. I stress that this is the current situation now, and so the consultation in effect accuses motorcyclists or antisocial behaviour without any evidence of that ever occurring.</p> <p>Likewise, both the routes are in good condition, and have no historical problems due to motorcycle use, and so the point made about damage to fields, and drainage problems, are invalid.</p> <p>In addition, a significant part of the route is a public road, so other users will inevitably come into contact with motors.</p> <p>OCC also claims that the width of the route, at 3.6m, will cause problems. This is not backed up by any evidence, and in fact many thousands of miles of BOATS are less than 3.6m wide and are used without problems by motorcyclists and other users.</p> <p>Motorbikes therefore should not be excluded from the routes.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>

(42) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - The suggested impact of the proposed changes and safety reasoning of the TRO are not applicable to the safe use of motorcycles on these byways. The proposed and existing widths and surface materials are very suitable for motorcycle use.</p> <p>there is no evidence of safety issues with shared use of motorcycles, bicycles, _horses and pedestrians as they co-exist safely on single track lanes and roads throughout the countryside in the county and country. Country access should be for ALL not just majorities and groups with their own agendas. In addition I strongly object to the final decision being made by a councillor who has a publicly stated aim to ban all motorised vehicles from the countryside and is therefore extremely biased. I believe a public inquiry is justified in this matter.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(43) As an individual (Marlborough, Wiltshire)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - You say that one of the reasons to restrict motor vehicle use on this BOAT is that you have to build a new bridge over Ginge Brook to accommodate the needs of the new Science Vale Cycling Network (SVCN). Currently the SVCN (from west to east) goes from Lockinge to West Ginge, East Ginge then turns north to the Icknield Way. If a new bridge is constructed over Ginge Brook to accommodate the new cycle way, the route will be just 1.4km shorter than the current route. At a conservative commuting cycling speed (20km), this new route will save just 4 (four) minutes when compared to the current route. There is not enough users (current of projected) to give value for money. Regardless of whether the funding is coming from the OCC or OxLEP, the Council has a duty to ensure that public money is spent appropriately; this new route, and specifically the new bridge, is a waste of tax-payers money.</p> <p>You state that you wish the new cycle route to be on traffic-free routes. The new route is approximately 8km in length, of which 1.8km of this is on public roads. If the new route were to go along the BOAT over Ginge Brook, the route would save approximately 400m of road work; this is not sufficient justification to limit the use of ALL PRoW users on the BOAT.</p> <p>You state that a reason to restrict the use of motor vehicles on the BOAT is that there will be insufficient turning room at the bridge for vehicles to return along the same route. Whilst this may be true for MPVs, it is NOT the case for motorcycles. Motorcycles are less than 2m in length and require very little more length to be able to turn around. The BOAT in question is plenty wide enough to turn a motorcycle around safely without leaving the confines of the BOAT. Therefore, this reason for restricting motorcycles on the BOAT are invalid.</p>

	<p>You argue that if motorcycles were to be allowed on the new bridge, then it would have to be wide enough to allow a motorcycle and a horse to pass each other safely on it. A horse is a wild animal that has had some training and therefore I would not want to meet a horse on this bridge, regardless of me being on a motorcycle, bicycle or on foot. Therefore, to specifically ban motorcycles on the bridge due to safety implications of meeting a horse are flawed. Moreover, the parapet on the new bridge will be 1.8m high. I would argue that if an 'average' horse (14hh to the withers, 1.42m), for whatever reason, were to 'rear' on the bridge, there is a significant chance that the rider could be tipped over the parapet to the ground; a significant distance to fall. Therefore, a safer option would be to restrict horses on the new cycle route and NOT motorcycles.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction - Object</u> - You state that restricting motorised vehicles on this (and on the Lockinge, Ardington & West Hendred BOAT) will stop the 'potential for motorcycles travelling along these BOATs at an inappropriate speed'. As a responsible PRoW motorcyclist, I disagree with your statement as I always ride with a duty of care to myself and any other potential PRoW user I may meet. Illegal and/or irresponsible riding will happen whether or not you impose a TRO limiting legal use of these BOATs, therefore imposing a TRO is pointless.</p> <p>As a council you should be promoting the access to the countryside for ALL PRoW users and not seeking ways to actively restrict access to some of your public. This proposed TRO is based on prejudice, mis-informed assumptions and inflated exaggerations. Stop wasting public money on projects where the public's money can be spent on more worthy causes.</p>
(44) As an individual (Henley-on-Thames)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction - Object</u> - I object in the very strongest terms to your proposed restrictions to motor vehicles @ West Hendred, East Hendred and Lockinge. I have regularly been using these rights of way by motorcycle since late 1970`s, lanes such as Ginge brook crossing have become part of my quality of life, can you understand that? there has been no problems with motorcycle use of these byways. I have seen your proposals and "reasons" but I think they add up to prejudice, assumptions and exaggerations. e.g. your "not wide enough for motorcycle, needs to be 4.5m" my motorcycle and bicycle are the same width (handlebars).. how can it be too narrow for my motorcycle but ok for my bicycle?</p> <p>Oxfordshire council history on maintaining vehicular rights of way has been appalling. because Oxfordshire repeatedly failed in their legal duty to research and reclassify Rupp's (you had about 37 years to get it done) we now have lost nearly all of the lanes to restricted byway. with just a very small few left, it seems you won't be happy `til it be zero, you have tried to close others. sometimes it feels like hooligans are in charge at Oxfordshire. leave these byways alone. if cyclists want to use them, they will. if you make a route then cyclist will probably have an</p>

	<p>app showing it and see who can post the fastest time, because that is what they do. do us all a favour and leave these byways alone.-as an alternative go and close some bridleways to horses, footpaths to walkers --see how you get on.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p> <p>.</p>
(45) As an individual (Brize Norton)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - As a motorcyclist, I have never experienced any issues with other users of this byway</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(46) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - If vehicles are banned on these byways the proposed new bridge across the Ginge Brook will not have to be of such robust construction thereby saving the project a considerable amount of money-very biased indeed.</p> <p>There are only 33 miles of byway in Oxon why should MPV users have to sacrifice more. Does funding from OXlep depend on the routes in question being traffic free? Why should motorcyclists be penalised when it is 4wd's that have the problems on this byway.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - Once again OCC seeks to restrict MPV users' activities. Motorcycles are not much wider than a cycle so where is the problem, most trail riders are very respectful of other users, what is the expected cycle use of this route, there must surely be room for all.</p>
(47) As an individual (Faringdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I object to the closure of the byway for motorcycles. As a responsible motorcyclist I use it for recreational purposes and closing it restricts my pass time. I always respect other users and do not have problems on this or other lanes. Also, from my experience the damage caused by light motorcycles is no worse than damage caused by equestrians. Regarding the bridge, I would suggest creating a ford for motorised traffic and equestrians next to the newly proposed bridge and thus allowing it to be built to a lesser (and cheaper) specifications. I also do not understand the reasoning that introducing the TRO will somehow limit irresponsible use. Surely for irresponsible people it is fairly easy to ignore a TRO. This is most likely to only restrict the responsible and law-abiding users.</p>

	<p>As decisions makers, your duty is to represent the interests of all road users. As a trail rider I feel that I am being systematically discriminated against. The argument often appears to be that motorcyclist cannot share these lanes with other users. If this is the case, why is it always the trail rides that are banned? Removing the "other" users is surely just as effective at protecting them. Why not start introducing lanes that are for trail riders only? Please remember that I and other likeminded tax payers also needs to be represented.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(48) As an individual (Bicester)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I feel these ancient rights of way should stay open to all that wish to use them.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(49) As an individual (Witney)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(50) As an individual (Weston on the Green)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Both parts of the BOAT I have travelled many times on both Motorbike and by 4x4 over many years. Although overgrown at time there is little or no vehicular damage apparent to this byway.</p> <p>In particular the part from East Lockinge to Ginge Brook is very popular to access the area of the brook. I see no reason either part of this lane should be restricted in anyway.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(51) As an individual (Didcot)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - The Highway Authority's policy towards legitimate use of BOAT by motor vehicles and horse carriage drivers (vehicles) is unreasonable insofar as it is one sided and therefore unfair. Enhancements to encourage use of BOATs by cyclists and disabled users are of course to be welcomed. But that is always at the expense of recreational motor users of BOATs, whilst there is never any reciprocal consideration shown. In fact the general shared use situation is being systematically made worse by the ongoing policy of banning vehicles</p>

	<p>on increasing numbers of BOATs, increasing the potential for conflicts of interests between various users of BOATS that remain fully open to vehicle use. The Highway Authority make no effort to offset the loss of amenity that vehicle users are obliged to suffer, notwithstanding that in all likelihood they will in reality be funding the proposed works.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - Whilst welcoming the proposed improvements to the benefit of some users, there is no commensurate consideration to motor vehicles and horse carriage drivers (vehicles) to offset their loss of amenity.</p>
(52) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - This planned restriction does not make it a traffic free area as you still need to travel on the road between each BOAT. There are a number of accusations in the letters against responsible motor vehicle users implying we speed due to road surface etc. Not true and an assumption.</p> <p>By closing this off to motorcycles that I ride recreationally you are endangering my life as your removing another safe place for me to ride my bike. I am also a cyclist and can assure you this planned changed does absolutely nothing for cyclists.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(53) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I object to restrictions for motorcycles. Cyclists use cycleways on public roads, indeed the proposed cycleway is 25% on metalled roads. The chances of meeting a motorcycle on the additional length covered by the TRO are tiny. The further chance of coming to harm as a result is no greater than meeting another cycle.</p> <p>These byways have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and are -according to OCC - in 'reasonable state of repair'.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(54) As an individual (Didcot)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Use should be allowed for motorcycles because trail riding is a recreational activity which can be enjoyed alongside cycling and horse riding. Trail riders are courteous to other users and so this space can be shared safely. 4x4 vehicles cause the damage and are dangerous to share with. Trail riding, like cycling and pedestrians and horse riding are best kept away from cars. It is not safe to divert small trail motorbikes onto the main A417 road alongside cars and lorries.</p>

	<u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above
(55) As an individual (Newbury)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Most of the details provided is un-necessarily just related to 2-wheel MPVs</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(56) As an individual (Camberley)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Users may not want to use this cycle route if there is a chance, they might meet MPVs on it. As the new route is about 8km long in total, with nearly 1/4 (1.8km) on public roads. By having the extra 322m of the Lockinge Byway/Ginge Brook (682m for the West Hendred Byway) also open to motorbikes really shouldn't be a problem.</p> <p>Motorcycles by their very nature can go relatively fast, and yes, there is always a 'potential for motorcycles travelling along [these byways] at inappropriate speeds', but most Motorcyclists are responsible Public Right of Way (PROW) users and ride at speeds which are safe and appropriate. When we meet other PROW users, they are generally courteous enough to slow down, and switch off our engines, where they encounter horses. It is all about respecting each other, and it is rather disappointing the OCC does not trust motorcyclists to do the right thing and accuses them, not of proven, but potential unsocial behaviour. Motorcycles are noisier than a cyclist or a walker. But still, as 1/4 of the route is on public roads anyway, where cars and motorbikes are expected, the 322m and 682m of byways that they would occasionally have to share with us, will make little difference to their overall experience.</p> <p>Apparently restricting MPVs will also 'improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems'. As the byway in question has absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as it is in 'reasonable state of repair' (as per the OCC) it is not really clear what relevance this argument has regarding a TRO for motorcycles.</p> <p>The OCC claims that the improved surface of the cycle path will not only make motorcyclists increase their speed (ignoring the fact that most motorcyclists are considerate byway users), but it would also 'substantially' increase motorcycle use. I would counteract that the sanitisation of these trails is a reason why most motorcyclists us would actually avoid them, especially as this byway does not easily link up with other byways. This is an enormous assumption.</p>

The width of the new cycle route is a major problem. According to the OCC, if the surface is stoned (as it will be here), then the present byway's width of 3.6m is 'sub-optimal for motorcycles to safely pass cyclists, equestrians and pedestrians'. These figures come from the WSP engineering team who have assessed the whole route, and then for motorcyclists to use these byways they would need to be '4.5m wide minimum' for us to safely share with other byway users. I don't quite know where this statistic comes from? (HSE, CDM - The Construction Design and Management Regulations 2015, possibly), but I do question the rationale behind these figures: many BOATs are much narrower than even 3.6m, and motorcyclists do manage to share them quite successfully. Again it is assumed that motorcyclists are extremely inconsiderate and do not take any notice of other PROW users whilst on the trails.

This expectation of irresponsible behaviour in motorcycle riders links in with the argument that we cannot be allowed on the Lockinge BOAT part which is NOT part of the Cycle Route (hence the TRO for the whole byway), simply because motorcyclists cannot be trusted to respect the TRO once it becomes part of the cycle route! Claiming they would wilfully ignore a TRO is again rather insulting. Most motorbike trail riders do not break the law, and those that do so knowingly, will probably continue to do so, whether or not part or the whole of the byway gets TRO-ed.

The OCC states that if they were to keep the byway partially open up to Ginge Brook bridge, there is no provision for MPVs to turn around at this point. This may be true for 4x4 (and has always been so due to the steep banks of the brook), but this does not apply to motorbikes. The whole of the Lockinge byway is actually wider than many other byways in the country, definitely more than wide enough to turn a bike (or horse) around safely within the confines of the byway and without having to causing damage to its surface or verges.

The current bridge was built when this path was still a RUPP (Road Used as a Public Path), and at the time, it was thought that a bridge built to bridleway specifications was sufficient. In a later reclassification, the track became a BOAT, which now means that if you want to replace the bridge, you have to build it to BOAT specifications. And allowing for cars to cross it increases costs dramatically. So, creating a cycle route where MPVs (and horse drawn carriages) are no longer welcome, solves that problem. The icing on the cake is that, as a cycle route is an 'improve the local community and the commuting to Harwell' project, the OCC has managed to get outside (OxLEP) funding for the project. Indeed, someone else gets to pay for the new bridge!

If the bridge were to allow motorbikes to cross it, apparently it would have to be made wide enough for us to cross safely whilst horses are on it, and that extra width alone would increase the cost beyond what the council is willing to spend - cars definitely don't stand a chance. I would argue that there is not necessarily a need for a wider than planned (2.5m) bridge: surely we can have a system where horses on the bridge get priority, and we just wait until they get off the bridge before we cross it.

	<p>There already is an existing cycle route connecting Wantage to Harwell. It is quite a bit longer and thus not as convenient for commuters to Harwell, but it does not use any byways.</p> <p>The proposed alternative routes for MPVs guides motorcyclists onto the busy A417. Surely this is not an acceptable alternative for trail bikes. Motorcycles are vulnerable road users too (as statistics prove), and making our often smaller engine bikes join such a busy road is irresponsible.</p> <p>Trail riding is a recreational activity too and rather than supporting it, and creating safe environments for us to exercise our hobby, the OCC, through this TRO, does exactly the opposite.</p> <p>The cost of this cycle route is considerable, especially when Oxfordshire's road network is in such an abysmal state. Surely the funds can be better used to improve other roads?</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(57) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(58) As an individual (Tadley)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - The current status as a BOAT is correct and motorcycles do not damage the ground like 4x4, legal motorcycle off-roading is becoming extremely difficult due to BOAT closures i use this byway alot</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(59) As an individual (Aylesbury)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - There is already a cycle route to and from Harwell, so why spend additional funds on duplicating what already exists?</p> <p>It is unfair to upgrade a road's surface and then claim that the new surface is unsuitable for certain groups of road user. If it was suitable in the past, why should it suddenly become unsuitable after upgrading has taken place? OCC claims that, due to limited width and gradient issues on the constructed sections of the route, shared use is not considered safe or appropriate. There are literally thousands of narrow roads, both sealed and unsealed, up and down</p>

	<p>the country where MPV's happily coexist with cyclists, walkers and horse riders. It is all about mutual respect and using common sense. What makes OCC think that MPV users of this stretch of road are going to act any differently? "The creation and promotion of a 'greenway' type designated route will result in many more cyclists, horse-riders and walkers using this route for commuting, leisure and tourism journeys": How many more by each of these user groups does OCC envisage?</p> <p>What research is this claim based upon?</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(60) As an individual (Knowl Hill)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - The British country side should be open to all responsible users irrespective of current trends and fashions. Restrictions are divisive and set citizens against one another. Do not bend to NIMBY pressure ...</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - As above</p>
(61) As an individual (Maidenhead)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - These by ways should be able to be enjoyed by all Motorists horses pedestrians cyclists and motorcyclists we all enjoy the Countryside in our own way</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(62) As an individual (Haslemere)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - The 2 byways in question have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use, so it is not really clear what relevance this argument has regarding a TRO for motorcycles.</p> <p>The Byways are two short sections of the total length of the cycle route so the impact on the public who are not using MPV's would be minimal.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>

<p>(63) As an individual (Didcot)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I am a local resident who enjoys the freedom to travel in the area. I walk my dog, Run, Cycle and Trail ride in the area using those legal routes available to me. Ginge Brook, as it is known, does pose a challenge for some users at some times of the year and this can be a good and bad thing depending on who you are. There are ways to navigate around the steep slopes or avoid the area completely and so my objection is mainly based on keeping as many legal routes open for as many users as possible all year round. Closing access to motor vehicles will only concentrate them elsewhere and the Council should accept that it failed in its duty prior to the 2006 NERC act in preserving rights that existed up to that time and look now to preserve what we have left.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - Despite being a "cul-de-sac" due to previously mentioned ineptitude in preserving existing rights, this route should remain with BOAT status so that should the opportunity arise in the future to reassign vehicular rights on the current RB, there is an established starting point for discussion.</p>
<p>(64) As an individual (Oxford)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - My objection to the TRO is based on the following:</p> <p>1. The majority of off-road MPV drivers and motorcycle riders are considerate and safe when using BOATs. It is in our own interest to try to safeguard the safety of other BOAT users. We should have the same opportunity to engage in our preferred leisure activities as they do, whether they be cyclists, pedestrians or horse-riders. We should reasonably be allowed to continue our own leisure, commuting and recreational activities within the bounds of law and the common courtesy that most people display.</p> <p>In my opinion there is little difference in potential hazard between a motorcycle or MPV and a spooked horse or a cyclist travelling at inappropriate speed, tragically demonstrated by the highly publicised death of a pedestrian caused by a cyclist in Oxford in the recent past.</p> <p>Motorised vehicle use of BOATs is relatively extremely low so I do not think that other users would be put off using the routes in question vs. using busy public roads, where inappropriate/unsafe driving is a much greater problem. There is as much potential for irresponsible and unsafe cycling and horse riding as there is for the same by motorists. (How many of you have witnessed unsafe road use by cyclists on your daily commute?)</p> <p>2. The proposed unsealed surface is precisely the type of surface that is appropriate for the majority of vehicles using BOATs. Pretty much anywhere a horse or bicycle can be ridden an appropriate motorcycle or MPV can be driven.</p>

	<p>3. The limited width and gradient issues are of no more concern for safety regarding motorised vehicles than a cyclist or dog-walker slipping in wet conditions or passing a nervous horse. Horses can be far less predictable than people. Safe turning and exit points for MPVs already exist along these routes. Simple signage would deter MPVs from entering any sections that weren't through-routes.</p> <p>It is insulting to other BOAT users to imply that they couldn't safely negotiate a situation with a vehicle performing a multi-point turn. Most drivers of vehicles using BOATs such as these are experienced and skilled.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(65) As an individual (Henley-on-Thames)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I do not agree that all motor vehicles should be excluded from this BOAT, there are no valid reasons for responsible users to be excluded from using this route on motorcycle. The majority of motorcyclists using byways are extremely considerate, any arguments against them with regards, speed noise, etc. can almost all be applied to horse riders or cyclists who choose to behave anti-socially, especially so cyclists who ride electrically assisted machines - many of which are illegally de-restricted!</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(66) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - Yes, I object to the restriction of Motor bikes on the BOAT and most strongly object to building the bridge! I use the route regularly to commute to Rutherford Laboratory and have done for the past 15 years. I use my Motorcycle sometimes but predominantly my Mountain bike. I have never had any issues on either using this route, I barely see anyone on this route. The idea that you think it's a good idea to build a giant steel monstrosity of a bridge across a beautiful stream which already has a perfectly usable bridge is terrible. As an off-road cycle route, it doesn't need sanitising at great expense.</p> <p>As for closing the BOAT to motorcycles because you cannot turn a car round is nonsense, the BOAT has been blocked to 4x4's at the top by a giant log by land owners and has been for many years. 4x4's don't use it as they cannot get across the bridge anyway. I have never seen a 4x4 by the stream, EVER and I have lived in Wantage and played/commuted through Ginge for the past 30 years. I cannot believe the council has money to spend on ruining a beautiful BOAT/bridleway but no money for the Wantage sport centre. Who commutes from Wantage to Didcot off road anyway? It's beyond commuting route for the majority of cyclists. It would be better to build a cycle lane between Wantage and Hendred. I thought something was up when I saw the Traffic monitoring cameras along the route supposedly to catch fly tippers, Know I see what it's about. Again, I've never seen fly tipping along this route.</p>

	<p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Neither - As above I object to messing with the BOAT bridleway as a cycle route. The BOAT dead ends, so when using my motorcycle I don't use it anyway.</p>
(67) As an individual (Preston Bissett)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(68) As an individual (Wootton)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(69) As an individual (Hereford)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - This is an ancient Right of Way which we as Hereford TRF use several times a year when visiting your county on organised ride outs. This is yet another erosion of our right as Motorcyclists to access the existing network of byways and ancient road ways and should not be supported in any way.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(70) As an individual (Newradnor)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I totally object to the proposed closure and restriction of this important vehicular route, which erodes the rights of its users</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - Again this is an unnecessary closure. These routes support trade and tourism. A group of us spent at least a thousand pounds in local villages whilst trail riding. This continuous erosion of access rights means that it becomes less likely we will use this area</p>
(71) As an individual (Chinnor)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>

(72) As an individual (Oxford)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I regularly use this lane on my motorcycle, I ride carefully and respectfully on a road Legal motorcycle. It's really great to be able to do this. I have met, dog walkers and horse riders along this route many times and we always show each other respect and everybody is very friendly towards one another. It would be awful for all of the law-abiding motorcycle riders to lose their rights to ride along these lanes.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(73) As an individual (Bicester)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I would like to object to this restriction being put in place as in the Oxfordshire area many byways have had a blanket restriction placed upon them and there are very few left available to use in a leisure capacity. I often use the few open legal byways to enjoy the wonderful Oxfordshire countryside it would be a great lost</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(74) As an individual (Barmouth)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I have used this route for the past 30 plus years. As part of a minority user group I feel that you are extinguishing my rights over someone else's as discriminatory.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(75) As an individual (Kingston, Surrey)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – as per reasons below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The whole reasoning for the TRO is not based on 'need', but purely on the ideal of an "Idyllic Cycle Route through the Countryside", away from any kind of motorised traffic. 2) The new route is about 8km long in total, with nearly 1/4 (1.8km) on public roads, having the extra 322m of the Lockinge Byway/Ginge Brook (682m for the West Hendred Byway) also open to motorbikes really shouldn't be a problem. 3) There is no evidence that restricting MPVs will 'improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles

by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems'. As the 2 byways in question have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as they are in 'reasonable state of repair' (both claims confirmed by the OCC),

4) The claim that the improved surface of the cycle path will not only make motorcyclists increase their speed is unproven. Also, there is no evidence that it would also 'substantially' increase motorcycle use.

5) The expectation of irresponsible behaviour in motorcycle riders links in with the argument that we cannot be allowed on the Lockinge BOAT part which is NOT part of the Cycle Route (hence the TRO for the whole byway), simply because we cannot be trusted to respect the TRO once it becomes part of the cycle route! Claiming we would wilfully ignore a TRO is insulting. Most motorbike trail riders do not break the law, and those that do so knowingly, will probably continue to do so, whether or not part or the whole of the byway gets TRO-ed.

6) OCC states that if they were to keep the byway partially open up to Ginge Brook bridge, there is no provision for MPVs to turn around at this point. This may be true for 4x4 (and has always been so due to the steep banks of the brook), but this does not apply to motorbikes. The whole of the Lockinge byway is actually wider than many other byways in the country, definitely more than wide enough to turn your bike around safely within the confines of the byway and without having to causing damage to its surface or verges.

7) There already is an existing cycle route connecting Wantage to Harwell. It is quite a bit longer and thus not as convenient for commuters to Harwell, but it does not use any byways. Still, it is a lovely ride, away from main roads, and perfect for family outings.

8) The proposed alternative routes for MPVs guides us onto the busy A417. Surely this is not an acceptable alternative for trail bikes. Motorcycles are vulnerable road users too (as statistics prove), and making our often smaller engine bikes join such a busy road is irresponsible.

9) Trail riding is a recreational activity too and rather than supporting us, and creating safe environments for us to exercise our hobby, the OCC, through this TRO, does exactly the opposite.

10)The cost of this cycle route is considerable, especially when Oxfordshire's road network is in such an abysmal state. Surely the funds can be used for a greater good elsewhere?

The whole argument why motorcycles should be banned from these byways is based on prejudice, assumptions and exaggerations. Reason, fact and fairness have become the victims of this quest for an idyllic Greenways Cycle Route,

	and although having ideals and trying to realise them is praiseworthy, this should not be at the cost of extinguishing the rights of a small minority of PROW user.
(76) As an individual (Buckingham)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I object on the basis that I use this BOAT on a regular basis and it provides access to a network of BOATs within the South Oxfordshire area and beyond.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(77) As an individual (Didcot)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I object to the proposed restrictions being imposed on the Byways in question. In particular I object to the fact that they will prevent motorcycle use.</p> <p>The net result of closing such byways to such traffic is to concentrate this traffic into an ever-smaller area. Surely this exacerbates instead of alleviates the problem.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(78) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I use these byways regularly as both a cyclist and motorcyclist.</p> <p>Recreational motorcycling is of great benefit to my wellbeing and is a great way to access the countryside, extending my range beyond what my health allows me to achieve by bicycle.</p> <p>The reasons for the TRO are not valid. In particular pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists share tarmac roads quite successful, there is no reason to assume that this is not viable on an unsealed road. MV Restriction - Object - I use these byways regularly as both a cyclist and motorcyclist.</p> <p>Recreational motorcycling is of great benefit to my wellbeing and is a great way to access the countryside, extending my range beyond what my health allows me to achieve by bicycle.</p> <p>The reasons for the TRO are not valid. In particular pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists share tarmac roads quite successful, there is no reason to assume that this is not viable on an unsealed road.</p>

(79) As an individual (Abingdon)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I use that byway regularly on my motorcycle which is totally road legal motorcycles do not cause major damage to that particular lane unlike 4x4 vehicles which do cause damage it is unfair to completely ban all vehicular access especially motorcycles due to a 4x4 drivers that really don't care about the damage they do ... it would good if you could restrict 4x4s and leave it open to motorcycles which do use that route regularly without damaging the area</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - Ban the damage causing 4x4 a but not road legal responsible motorcycles as they do not damage lanes</p>
(80) As an individual (Thames Ditton)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - There is no justifiable reason for restricting motor vehicles from access to this BOAT. BOATs are ancient rights of way and should be accessible by all users. Have you assessed the number of motor vehicles that pass along this route in a 12-month period?</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(81) As an individual (Oxford)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(82) As an individual (Henley-on-Thames)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - There is no history of problems as a result of motorcycle use and the route is in a reasonable state of repair. Many Boats are much narrower than 4.5 M and are shared by multiple user types, including horses and cyclists as well as motorcycles. I would support restricting 4x4 vehicles.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(83) As an individual (Worminghall)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I frequently use the lanes and strongly object any restrictions for motorcycles - many of the OCC's arguments may make sense when it comes to 4x4s but are not relevant to motorcycles.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>

<p>(84) As an individual (Grove)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - One of OCC arguments is that people may not want to use this cycle route if there is a chance they might meet MPVs on it. As the new route is about 8km long in total, with nearly 1/4 (1.8km) on public roads, then having the extra 322m of the Lockinge Byway/Ginge Brook (682m for the West Hendred Byway) also open to motorbikes really doesn't have that much of an impact to the public.</p> <p>OCC also states restrictions will 'improve conditions for local farming where the use of motor vehicles by members of the public can damage existing field areas and exacerbate drainage and water ponding problems'. As the 2 byways in question have absolutely no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as they are in 'reasonable state of repair' (both claims confirmed by the OCC itself), it is not really clear what relevance this argument has regarding a TRO for motorcycles.</p> <p>It has also been stated that if the byway is partially open up to Ginge Brook bridge, there is no provision for MPVs to turn around at this point. This may be true for 4x4 (and has always been so due to the steep banks of the brook), but this does not apply to motorbikes. The whole of the Lockinge byway is actually wider than many other byways in the country, definitely more than wide enough to turn a bike around safely within the confines of the byway and without having to causing damage to its surface or verges.</p> <p>The proposed alternative routes for MPVs guides us onto the busy A417. Which is not an acceptable alternative for trail bikes. Motorcycles are vulnerable road users too (as statistics prove) and making our often smaller engine bikes join such a busy road is irresponsible.</p> <p>There already is an existing cycle route connecting Wantage to Harwell. It is quite a bit longer and thus not as convenient for commuters to Harwell, but it does not use any byways. Still, it is a lovely ride, away from main roads, and perfect for family outings.</p> <p>The cost of this cycle route is considerable, especially when Oxfordshire's road network is in such an abysmal state. Surely the funds can be used for a greater good elsewhere.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
<p>(85) As an individual (Bookham, Surrey)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I am objecting against any restrictions for motorcycles - many of OCC's arguments may make sense when it comes to 4x4s, but are not relevant to motorcycles.</p>

	<p>The byway in question has no history of any problems due to motorcycle use and as they are in 'reasonable state of repair it is not really clear why there is a proposal to TRO for against motorcycles.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - I am objecting against any restrictions for motorcycles - many of OCC's arguments may make sense when it comes to 4x4s but are not relevant to motorcycles.</p> <p>The whole argument why motorcycles should be banned from these byways is based on prejudice, assumptions and exaggerations.</p>
(86) As an individual (Reading)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - I do not support the restriction of Motor Vehicles on the BOAT. I am a responsible Motorcyclist. Motorcycles do not create the same damage as other motor vehicles. My Son and I ride for recreation on BOATs in the countryside. We are very respectful to other countryside user and slow down or stop or even turn off our engines in the case of meeting a horse rider. Restricting this BOAT to motorcycles will severely impact my recreational pleasure and the time I can have in the countryside with my son.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object – As above</p>
(87) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(88) As an individual (Newbury)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>
(89) As an individual (Coventry)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Object - No comments</p>

<p>(90) As part of a group/organisation (Watlington)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
<p>(91) As part of a group/organisation (Harwell Campus)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - The improvements to the Icknield Way will provide a new cycle commuting route to Wantage and Grove from the Harwell Campus as well as a community amenity. Both Wantage, Grove and the Campus are growing, and the route is required to provide a direct cycle route as an alternative to car use and cycles using the A417.</p> <p>Motor vehicles and horse drawn carriages will damage the type of surface proposed for the route. This will result in increased maintenance costs and / or cyclist not using the route, which will defeat the reason for upgrading the route and fail to meet the County Council's policy of increasing transport choices and reducing the reliance on motorised transport.</p> <p>Ginge brook and its approaches have been damaged by 4x4 use and this has made the surface hazardous for cyclists, walkers and horse riders.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - As above 4x4 and moto-cross use causes the surface to break up and will not be a surface that will attract cyclists to switch and try cycle commuting to the Harwell Campus.</p> <p>This is an important cycle route connecting Wantage & Grove to the Harwell Campus and beyond, an all-season surface is needed with the confidence that cyclists, walkers and horse riders can use it safely without being intimidated by motorised traffic.</p>
<p>(92) As part of a group/organisation (Abingdon)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - This will enable the route to be improved and promoted as a safe facility for walking, cycling and horse riders for commuting and leisure.</p> <p>Most importantly, it will significantly improve the cycle commuting route between Wantage/Grove and Harwell Campus. This objective would not be compatible with the rutted tracks quickly caused by 4x4s and motorcycles on some sections of the current route and elsewhere.</p> <p>For example, the damage currently done by motorcycles to the track on the slope immediately to the East of Ginge</p>

	<p>Brook - the rut left here makes cycling down the slope hazardous and makes riding up it almost impossible even for a skilled mountain biker.</p> <p>We note that an improved bridge is necessary to make this cycle-able by most people.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - This will enable the route to be improved and promoted as a safe facility for walking, cycling and horse riders for commuting and leisure. It will significantly improve the commuting route between Wantage/Grove and Harwell Campus. This objective would not be compatible with the rutted tracks quickly caused by 4x4s and motorcycles on some sections of the current route and elsewhere.</p> <p>Applicable to both parts: the surface treatment will be very important for cyclists. If it is too loose or bumpy, people will not ride 'sports' bikes on it. If it throws up dirty water when wet, people will not ride when it rains. In either case, this reduces its achievement of objectives - we should be aiming for an all-season commuter route for a 7-mile route, so one that can be ridden at 15-20mph on the flat straights at least.</p>
(93) As part of a group/organisation (Milton Park)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - This restriction will help with the completion of the Science Vale Cycle Network, especially for people cycling to Milton Park from the West where we know from our own internal consultations that routes are poor or perceived as dangerous. We fully support this plan to restrict motor traffic on this section of the route so that a decent cycleway can be completed.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p>
(94) As part of a group/organisation (Harwell Campus Bicycle Users Group (Secretary))	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - A very considerable amount of work has already been done to establish this route as the preferred choice for development as a fit-for-purpose (all-weather, all-year) cycle-commuting route, connecting Wantage/Grove to the Business Parks. This is an essential element of the OCC's transport strategy, particularly the Science Vale Cycle Network Project.</p> <p>The proposed surface improvements will quickly be damaged and degraded by allowing unsuitable traffic to use the route. Such damage would divert existing cycle-users back onto unsuitable main roads, and/or put-off cycle-users altogether. Promoting a 'damaged' route to new cycle-users will be difficult and will fail to achieve the intended modal-shift.</p> <p>It would represent a very poor return on precious public investment if such damage was allowed to occur. The</p>

	<p>proposed restrictions are therefore an important part of the upgrade project.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p> <p>* Additional comment: For consistency, please consider applying similar access restrictions along the eastward continuation of Icknield Way towards Harwell Campus, which forms part of the same cycle-route.</p>
(95) As an individual (Charlbury)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - This will significantly improve route quality and safety for cycling and thereby enable safe, sustainable, healthy transport to be used between Wantage/Grove and major employment sites.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p>
(96) As an individual (Harwell)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - I use this route on foot and on a pedal cycle, although the rutted and uneven surface detracts from my enjoyment of the route. Improving the surface and the crossing of Ginge Brook in a manner that is in keeping with the surroundings will be a benefit. Preventing use by motor vehicles and carriage drivers in order to prevent damage to the improved but unsealed surface is sensible and reasonable.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - I use this route on foot and on a pedal cycle. Improving the surface in a manner that is in keeping with the surroundings will be a benefit. Preventing use by motor vehicles and carriage drivers in order to prevent damage to the improved but unsealed surface is sensible and reasonable.</p>
(97) As an individual (Uffington)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - I strongly support this proposal for a low level, as opposed to The Ridgeway, route of high quality, though still rural in character, surface for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and people on mobility scooters etc. Although not a cyclist I am very supportive of a good route for cyclists through the west of Science Vale, combining the safety of a bridleway with an improved surface to encourage commuting by cycling, as well as encouraging others, including children and families to cycle in the countryside by providing a safe, high quality surface route. I would imagine that the change from BOAT to bridleway – with an improved surface – will encourage some mobility scooter people to use it. There are several access points by vehicles for such users. I understand that major work will be done at the crossing of Ginge Brook; the current situation there is a serious impediment for walkers and cyclists, and an impossible one for horse riders and mobility scooter users.</p>

	<u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above
(98) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - I don't think it is a great loss to the horse carriage community as I don't think it is useable by them anyway at the moment. I think that motorbikes do use it and make it impassable for everybody else (at the steep slope by Ginge Brook)</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - My support for this is selfish - I don't want vehicles chewing up the ground making it hard for everybody else to use. I feel less strongly about this section than the section which includes Ginge Brook</p>
(99) As an individual (Harwell)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - The potential damage to the proposed surface of the track has been shown to be susceptible to damage by motor vehicles but not by walkers, cyclists or horse riders. I support this proposal.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p>
(100) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(101) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - As a cyclist from Wantage to the Harwell Campus who long ago gave up using the A417 due to safety concerns, I've used the roads from Lockinge to Ginge and the farm track to Newbury Road, East Hendred but have found them increasingly unsafe due to the narrow width and often have to stop when anything larger than a small car passes.</p> <p>I strongly welcome the provision of a safer alternative cycle route. I have often walked the proposed route but have found the surface challenging for cycling.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p>

(102) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(103) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - Preventing motorised vehicles from using the route would protect the road surface reducing maintenance burden and improving the quality of the track.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p>
(104) As an individual (Harwell)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - Cycling from Wantage to Harwell will be greatly improved by these proposals.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support – As above</p>
(105) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(106) As an individual (Ardington)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - As someone about to start a regular commute from Ardington to Harwell Campus, I believe that it is a very sensible idea to make the Icknield way suitable for cycle commuting. These cycle routes are important to encourage safe cycle commuting (and the resulting reduction in road traffic and CO2 emissions). Improving the access to the Ginge bridge and banning motorised vehicles from it should allow regular cyclists to be able to push their bicycles up and down the slope easily and safely, and so make this section suitable for regular commuting.</p> <p>Indeed with the construction of so many new houses in the Wantage/Grove area, a direct cycle route to Harwell Campus and Harwell that avoids the A417 (which is not really safe to cycle on and cyclists cause queues and frustration to drivers).</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Neither - This is an important section of byway that if upgraded as proposed and maintained should</p>

	<p>make the cycle from Wantage to Harwell much more attractive to potential cycle commuters as it misses out a significant detour and a pair of hills. If motorised vehicles can use it without destroying it then that would not be a problem. However, if they are likely to cause ruts and make it unusable for ordinary road bicycles, then they should be prohibited.</p>
(107) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - Improving the off-main-road cycle route from Wantage to Harwell would allow me to cycle to work without holding up the traffic on the A417 (and to cycle more safely!).</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(108) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - I strongly support these proposed restrictions as a cyclist who would like to use the Icknield Way route across the Ginge Brook bridge. The improvement of this surface will aid cyclists significantly, as currently, the clay-based soil on the steep banks either side of this bridge will build up on any part of the cycle coming into contact with it, whenever the soil is wet. I have a number of times needed to partially dismantle my bicycle to remove caked clay/mud on wheels that have become obstructed. Re-grading these steep banks and reinforcing the bridge would be most welcome also. Motorised vehicles such as motorbikes and 4x4s cause significant rutting and other surface disruption leading to rather dangerous routes for cyclists. Restricting their use would reduce wear and tear and make the routes safer for other users.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(109) As an individual (Ardington)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - It would be wonderful to make this section of the Icknield Way commutable for cyclists. I have commuted between Grove and Harwell Campus and now Ardington and Harwell Campus and have often thought it is such a pity, and missed opportunity, that there is a public byway providing a much more direct route than is possible today, except that it is impractical to use by everyday cyclists. One of the main reasons for this is that the Ginge Brook crossing is virtually impassable and is dubbed "The Bridge of Doom" by the local mountain biking community. Damage to the surface from motorised vehicles has a big role to play in making it impassable and would prevent a better surface from being maintained on any future cycle path, therefore limiting their access would be important for opening this up as a cycle route. By providing a much more direct cycle route than is possible today, I believe it would also provide a viable alternative for some of the cyclists that use the Reading Road, which, in rush hour, is both dangerous and causes delays.</p>

	<p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - This section of the byway is, in my experience as a cycle commuter to Harwell Campus, rideable on a hybrid or mountain bike, but the surface is so poor to make it a very uncomfortable and slow experience and, therefore, not a practical alternative. When I have tried it, I have rattled and bumped along it so much I have been concerned about damage being done to my computer in my pannier! It is not viable at all when wet and muddy. It is heavily rutted, presumably by motorised vehicles, making it very difficult to ride. Preventing motorise vehicles would presumably be necessary for the maintenance of a rideable surface on this section of byway.</p>
(110) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(111) As an individual (Grove)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - It's fun to bounce down a muddy track in a 4x4 or on a trail bike. But with the surfacing you propose for the Icknield way-based cycle route, experience shows that allowing recreational motor vehicle use will rapidly render the surface unsuitable for cyclists. Given the money you are spending on making a dedicated cycle route it would not make sense to allow it to be spoilt in this way. If you were to spend lots more money and surface the route in a way that made it withstand motor vehicle use and still be smooth enough to cycle on, that still wouldn't keep everyone happy. Driving down such a smooth, dry road is no fun for recreational users.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - As above. Forgive me if I have remembered the details of the proposed cycle route incorrectly.</p>
(112) As an individual (Wantage)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>
(113) As an individual (Grove)	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - No comments</p>

<p>(114) As an individual (Wantage)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - As a local resident and keen walker I see this BOAT as an important route for walkers, cyclists, horse riders as well as disabled users. There are serious safety risks and certain damage to the surface of the BOAT from usage by motorised cycles or vehicles -other than disabled - as seen on stretches of the much wider Ridgeway in the past.</p> <p>It is a route that can see development as a part of a safe cycle route between Harwell West Hendred and Wantage - with appropriate restrictions.</p> <p>It is also one of only three cross routes between West Hendred & Ardington - the other two being footpaths each having stiles which prevent use by both children on bikes (with their parents) or teenagers on cycles wishing to travel between the adjacent villages. This BOAT has important potential for them.</p> <p>A major problem for all users currently is the safety of the slope down to the Ginge Brook on the WH side at the bridge over the brook. This needs serious planning and investment if the BOAT is to fulfil its potential for walkers, cyclists, horse-riders and the disabled. Regular use by motorised cycles or vehicles at this point would in my opinion seriously limit (at minimum) and probably largely prevent most or all public use as described above.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - As a local resident and keen walker I see this BOAT as an important route for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and well as disabled users. There are serious safety risks and certain damage to the surface of the BOAT from usage by motorised cycles or vehicles -other than disabled - as seen on stretches of the much wider Ridgeway in the past. This BOAT is not an appropriate route for motorised cycles or vehicles in my opinion.</p> <p>It is a also a route that can see development as a part of a safe cycle route between Harwell, West Hendred and Wantage - with appropriate restrictions related to shared usage.</p>
<p>(115) As an individual (Wantage)</p>	<p><u>MV & Horse Carriage Drivers Restriction</u> - Support - These improvements to the Icknield Way will provide a new cycle commuting route to Wantage and Grove from the Harwell Campus and beyond as well as an improved community amenity . Wantage and its surrounding villages are growing and the provision of a more direct cycle route to Harwell and Didcot as an alternative to car use and cycles using the A417 is very much required. Having been involved in an accident on the A417 while cycling which resulted in injuries to me, I very much approve of the plan to increase cycle routes in this area. Motor vehicles and horse drawn carriages will damage the type of surface proposed for the route. If this results in cyclists not using the route, that would defeat the object of this improvement work and require higher maintenance costs, which the county can ill-afford. This area has been damaged by vehicle use in the past and this</p>

	<p>has made the surface hazardous for cyclists, walkers and horse riders.</p> <p><u>MV Restriction</u> - Support - Motor vehicles break up the surface and this will deter cyclists from using the route. This is an important cycle route connecting Wantage & Grove to the Harwell Campus and beyond, an all season surface is needed with the confidence that cyclists, walkers and horse riders can use it safely with out being intimidated by motorised traffic.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------