

## Lockinge and West Hendred Traffic Regulation Orders - Informal Consultation Analysis of responses and proposed action

The informal consultation ran for three weeks until 31 May. Thirty-six responses were made through the consultation website and by email. These are categorised as

- 3 no comment/no view
- 6 support – including two parish councils and Thames Valley Policy
- 27 object -including
  - 2 from 4x4s, including Green Lanes Association and Tread Lightly
  - 20 from motorcyclists, including the Trail Riders Fellowship
  - 5 from unstated interests

This document considers each comment (aggregated when similar) and gives commentary on the proposed action arising from that consideration. Comments marked with an asterisk in one TRO table are also applicable to the other TRO

### Key to analysis on the comment

**Agree** – address in formal TRO by making changes

**Disagree** – not agreed with, argument rejected or incorrect

**Noted** – considered and no change required

<b>TRO 1: Lockinge BOAT 285/8, Ardington BOAT 108/12 and West Hendred BOAT 403/9 – specific comments</b>		
<b>Comment/part-comment</b>	<b>Proposed action</b> • Agree • Disagree • Noted	<b>Commentary where necessary</b>
This byway is a fabulous drive, ride or walk, and although the bank after the brook is too steep for 4x4s without using a winch, it makes a great stop for lunch.	Noted	It is not considered acceptable to construct a route where a winch is necessary for a vehicle to negotiate it in close proximity to NMU
There is nothing wrong with a dead end byway, and in fact I live on a dead end road. I'm sure you wouldn't propose a TRO on the road I live on in Oxfordshire, which happens to be a dead end. This byway is no different.	Disagree	There is no provision for parking or turning within the boundaries of the Byway anywhere within the stream/slopes' boundary. This byway does not serve any houses or businesses apart from farmland

<p>I would also suggest the bridge is possibly illegal as it's not built to vehicular standards. Seeing as the bridge over the canal at East Challow (Cornhill Lane) needs to take 38 tons, I'm quite happy to force the issue here (I know this as I've spoken to the canal trust). When I first started driving the lane, there was no bridge, so I would like to see the paperwork that allowed the bridge to be built.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The bridge is a bridleway bridge built to a specification and in the only place that it could be constructed without impacting on the stream corridor. It was built when the route was a CRB/RUPP. It is acknowledged that a TRO could perhaps have been put in place when the route changed to BOAT</p>
<p>Personally I would like to see the bank graded to make it safe for all to use. A TRO is an excuse for avoiding your DUTY of maintenance.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>It is not possible to regrade the bank to meet the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 "CDM" requirements for all-user byway as it would affect arable field too much, including public footpath crossing. No aspect of this route can be regarded as 'out of repair'</p>
<p>(Reason 1) Rubbish. Many tarmac roads have limited space to pass. Plus there is plenty of room to turn at the other end. Is there any reason why you haven't closed the road through West Hagbourne as there is no room to pass there! It's no different than on this byway, except traffic is minimal. Please can you let me know how many vehicles use this byway per week, as I'm sure you must have done a survey prior to the proposal. You have done one, right?</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The bridge, slope and track are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations. It is not possible to accommodate shared use in this pinch point and meet standards. It is not about previous or current levels of use</p>
<p>(Reason 2): All use on any road causes damage and need repairing, from motorway down to footpaths. What damage has been done to this byway, and how much have you spent on repairing the byway in the last 20 years? What users have damaged the slope, and what have you done to repair this. Why aren't you banning horses? A horse could slip and easily injure a walker, who might have already fallen because you haven't done anything to make the bank commodious to users.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>It is not about previous or current levels of use/damage – and the route is in a reasonable state of repair. The bridge and slope are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations. It is not possible to accommodate shared use in this pinch point and get CDM signoff.</p>
<p>Reason 3: As a highway authority, you have a DUTY to assert and protect the rights of all users. It appears you are neglecting that DUTY, preferring to support these users that have more access to the countryside than MPV users do. Are you suggesting that some users are more welcome in the countryside than others?</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The route is in a reasonable state of repair. The work on the bridge, slope and track is intended to make access easier and safer for non-motorised users as a promoted route within an AONB</p>
<p>MPV user have a Code of Conduct and pull over for other users, turn off engines for horse riders. The pinch point is the bridge, which 4x4s can't use due to my previous comment.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>MPV users are not required to pull over for other users and turn off engines on roads. The bridge and slopes are the key pinch points as well as the drop between fields to the west of the crossing</p>

<p>Reason 4: So, the way I read this is you believe recreational vehicular users aren't part of the public that can enjoy the amenities of the area, for recreation. Can you please re-read the definition of a BOAT please? While I commend your <b>'Improved infrastructure is planned to support the creation of route one of the Science Vale Cycle Network which is a shared walking, cycling and horse-riding community 'Greenway'</b> as a walker and mountain biker, I feel somewhat side lined as a recreational vehicular user. You neglected your duties to reclassify many RuPPs and now you want to further restrict MPV users that have minimal access to a descent byway network in Oxfordshire.</p>	Disagree	<p>The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The bridge, slope and track are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations. It is not possible to accommodate shared use in this pinch point and get CDM signoff.</p> <p>The comment re RUPP reclassification is irrelevant to this TRO proposal, but correct process was followed</p>
<p>I am disappointed that the Council seems to have gone straight for the easy option of closure rather than the statutory duty of maintaining the right of way. Living close to the waste recycling centre at Dix Pit, Stanton Harcourt, I am only too familiar with fly tipping that occurs along the Cogges/Tarr Road when people have been turned away from the recycling centre. Preventing motor vehicles and carriage drivers from accessing a lane is not going to stop fly tipping, it will just move it elsewhere. I would suggest that routes that allow access from both ends could reduce the likelihood of fly tipping as those doing it would need to watch both ends of the route to not get caught which would be more difficult. I have not seen evidence of fly tipping on the Lockinge byway.</p>	Noted	<p>The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. OCC welcomes discussion with all user and interest groups which is why the informal consultation stage was used. No alternative options have been presented</p> <p>Flytipping is just one issue that the TRO and vehicle restriction structures will help to prevent. Harecoursing and farm burglary are crimes that may use tracks as access and through routes. The main point of the TRO is to protect user safety on a new promoted facility</p>
<p>I have used this byway on several occasions in recent years, knowing the nature of the byway at Ginge Brook, always with the intention of stopping at the bridge for a lunch or tea/coffee stop. I have walked across the bridge and up the bank on the far side, currently that bank is very near impassable to walkers and I would suggest very dangerous for horses and impossible for carriages and motor vehicles to go up.</p> <p>On first going to Ginge Brook I was very surprised to find an entirely inappropriate bridge for the status of the right of way and have to wonder how it was allowed to be put in.</p> <p>The byway should be maintained in such a way that it remains a byway open to all traffic. Any solution to the grading will be a narrow track, it would be inappropriate in the location to make it anything but, but that does not make it dangerous. I travel along a single track road that includes a steep slope daily to work, this road has large articulated lorries, cyclists, children walking to school and cars all travelling</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Disagree</p>	<p>This is the key reason for the TRO</p> <p>The bridge is a bridleway bridge built to a specification and in the only place that it could be constructed without impacting on the stream corridor. AT the time of installation the route was recorded as a CRB. It is acknowledged that a TRO could perhaps have been put in place when this bridge was installed or when the route was reclassified as a BOAT.</p> <p>The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The bridge, slope and track are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations. It is not possible to regrade the bank to meet CDM</p>

<p>along it. In 26 years of using that single track road, I know of no accidents. Safety is an unacceptable excuse to avoid the duty to maintain the byway that the Council has. I have travelled many byways in England and Wales and have seen a variety of engineering solutions that Councils have taken to overcome similar problems to that of Ginge Brook.</p> <p>I would be very happy to arrange a meeting with representatives of the Green Lane Association (GLASS) for these to be discussed.</p> <p>Many byways, as a result of earlier reclassifications, have become dead ends. Many do not warrant travelling along but this is not the case with this byway, Ginge Brook makes an excellent stopping point, it is indeed a destination in its own right.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>requirements as it would affect arable field and public footpath crossing. The route is currently in reasonable repair</p> <p>OCC welcomes discussion with all user and interest groups which is why the informal consultation stage was used. No alternative options have been presented</p> <p>There is no provision for parking or turning within the boundaries of the Byway anywhere within the stream boundary and OCC usually cannot support the deliberate creation of dead end routes that require turning around or reversing manoeuvres and that meet CDM regulations for new construction</p>
<p>*Access controls must enable legitimate users to continue using the route, including those on foot, those with buggies, etc. and people with all types of bike.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Barriers are likely to be lockable bollards or gates that control vehicle access with gaps for users to reduce the restrictions on public</p>
<p>*I have been using this byway for walking and motorcycling for 30 + years and I have never witnessed any Hare coursing or illegal fly tipping on this track, and I do not understand how restricting vehicles will improve any of these incidents if they are actually occurring as the people who commit these offences will not heed a sign saying NO VEHICULAR USE.</p> <p>*With regard to the close proximity of the fencing, this is could occur anywhere if the landowner wants to fence up to his boundary, so I cannot see how this is relevant to your case.</p> <p>*All motorcyclists I have met are always courteous and stop and turn their engines off when I have been walking with my dog.</p> <p>The slope down to Ginge brook was never as steep as it is today, If I recall approx 5 years ago more soil was tipped down the bank on the West Hendred side of the brook. This soil is mostly clay based and it therefore becomes very slippery when wet . Previously the slope was shallower and it had more vegetation to hold the structure of the slope together, this of course will not regrow now on sub soil which is totally clay. I have a few friends who are horse riders and they will not use this route because of the slope down to the brook.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Disagree</p>	<p>By its nature hare coursing, flytipping and access for other criminal activities often takes place at night. The TRO will accompany access control structures to prevent illegal access</p> <p>Landowners cannot fence across the highway and OCC can only maintain/repair within the available width.</p> <p>MPV users are not required to pull over for other users and turn off engines on roads.</p> <p>There's no evidence or reports of additional soil being tipped down the bank. It is assumed that if this had occurred it would have made the slope shallower.</p> <p>The steep slope one of the key reasons for the TRO</p>

<p>There is another bridge which walkers can cross within 200 metres of the wooden bridge , so in wet weather, walkers could use this if it was sign posted as many people do not realise it is there. Restricting vehicles will not make the route any easier for horse riders or walkers so I therefore do not see the reason for your case, if the route was down graded to a restriction to vehicles of 3 wheels or more this would stop any further damage to this byway .</p>		<p>Whilst the alternative footpath/bridge is available to walkers it is not suitable for other user types. The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The bridge slope and track are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations</p>
<p>*This TRO does not have a sound basis. Will need data on the risk assessment on the arising danger mentioned.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>A report will be supplied to Cabinet Member following the formal TRO consultation process</p>
<p>*I am a cyclist, walker and motorcyclist and have been using the byway described for over forty years. I have never experienced any of the reasons for the planned restrictions and believe it is yet another attempt to prevent access to the countryside for ALL users. Closing these byways will have no impact on people who fly tip or those who hare course and I think your proposals are misguided and a waste of rate payers money. If this informal consultation goes forward to the next stage I will request a freedom of information action to formally review the evidence on which the decision is based.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The bridge, slope and track are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations. It is not possible to accommodate shared use in this pinch point and get CDM signoff.</p> <p>The comment re all user restrictions is irrelevant as this TRO is about restricting MPVs as well as carriage drivers for part</p> <p>TRO will be accompanied by access control structures to prevent illegal access</p> <p>A report will be supplied to Cabinet Member following the formal TRO consultation process</p>
<p>*Yet again the council are using the illegal actions of a minority to justify an unjust TRo on a public right of way. A TRo will not stop fly tipping. No one has ever flytipped from a motorcycle!! Use the correct tools such as a pspo and proper inforcement and prosecutions to deter flytipping.</p> <p>This byway can safely and sustainably accommodate motorised users on motorcycles. Consider a restrictive TRO that exempts these users rather than persecuting them for legal responsible riding.</p> <p>Our members use this byway on a regular basis and have never reported any problems with other byway users here. Motorcycles are small enough to safely let pass other users and we do not understand why they should be banned from using this track.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>TRO will be accompanied by access control structures to prevent illegal access</p> <p>The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The bridge, slope and track are going to have to be constructed to meet CDM regulations. It is not possible to accommodate shared use in this pinch point and get CDM signoff.</p>
<p>*The TRO will enhance the safety cyclists and walkers using the Science Vale Cycle Network route which is currently under consideration and includes the byways that are the subject of the TRO.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

<p>*Thank you for your letter of 13 May 2019 about the above matter. I agree with the proposed vehicle restrictions.</p>		
<p>*Clearly any restriction in these rural locations should be self-enforcing and not reliant on any police enforcement . Having sought local advice we have no objection. I am in favour of this, the control strategies that would be put in place would restrict any vehicle access to any potential hare courses, fly tippers, or criminality. I understand the local farmers &amp; landowners have been consulted and are happy with the plans. The farmers will have access through the control strategies for their own purposes, and we would be able to get access also, should we need to do so.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>It is unlikely that blue-light services will gain anything from access to these two routes</p>
<p>*Express support for the proposed TRO 1 and TRO2. We feel the TROs are essential to enable access control structures to be installed to ensure users' safety along the track as well as protecting the environment, this giving greater opportunities for the public to enjoy the amenities of the area for recreation.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	
<p>I go down this byway for many years on my bike I have never had any trouble with anybody or anything. I cannot walk far and my bike is the only thing that gets me to places that I enjoy.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Unclear if this comment is about bicycle or motorcycle/quad</p>
<p>*As a motorcycle rider I have never experienced any problems when riding this legal byway on my legal motorcycle.</p> <p>*I use the lanes discussed recreationally and would object to restrictions on vehicles other than motorcycles</p> <p>*As a responsible motorcycle rider I have never experienced any problems or issues with other users of the Byway nor have I had any difficulties regarding the dimensions of the Byway.</p> <p>*I have never experienced any trouble with motorised vehicles on this Byway. Not sure why they should be prohibited from using this Byway, especially motorbikes, the track is wide enough to pass each other safely.</p> <p>You mention in your reasons for the TRO that "it is not considered possible to accommodate the likelihood of all Byway users negotiating the crossing and slope at the same time". I use this Byway approximately once per month on a motorcycle and have only once in 4 years ever met anyone else at the "pinch point".</p> <p>I use this route on my motorcycle</p> <p>I use these roads regularly on my motorcycle without problems.</p> <p>I am a motorcyclist who regularly rides the byways in Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire. Sadly there are too few remaining legally open for our use and the closure of another byway would only place additional strain on the remaining legal</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>This is not about previous use. The TRO is a preventative measure to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for bridge/slope works and stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme and to meet CDM requirements. The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option</p>

routes. I frequently ride this byway and have never encountered any issues whilst on route either from other users of the byway or local in the area. I always stop and make it safe for other user to pass, frequently chatting with them as they pass. It would be a great pity to lose access to another part of rural Oxfordshire.

lockinge/ginge brook: been using it for decades by motorcycle, no problems.  
note: being able to use ginge brook and other byways is my quality of life and I will defend my harmless use of them.

\*As a motorcyclist, I have never experienced any issues with other users of this byway

\*As a motorcyclist, I use this byway on a regular basis and have never experienced any issues with this route. Closing byways to motor vehicles is not a sustainable solution to the points raised.

I have used the Lockinge Byway (TRO 1) for a number of years, both on foot when walking my dogs, whilst riding my mountain bike and when riding my motorcycle. I do not believe there are any undue safety issues when using the byway with a motorcycle.

Yes, the bank is steep but in reality this presents no real problems. In fact, I would say that it is actually safer to ascend the bank on a motorcycle than it is on my bicycle or indeed on foot.

As far as ascending/descending the bank when other users are present, this surely just takes common sense from all parties as does the use of any public right of way, whether metalled or not.

In the past 15 years of using this byway on foot, on a bicycle and on a motorcycle, I have yet to encounter other users at the same point so I really fail to see that this is actually of significant concern.

Furthermore, I do not believe that there is significant and lasting damage to the byway from responsible motorcycle use. Certainly the byway is in the same if not better condition now than when I first used it roughly 15 years ago.

With regard to point 4 ("For affording better opportunities for the public to enjoy the amenities of the area, for recreation"), I am a member of the public and I use the byway for recreational use of my motorcycle and therefore removing MVP access would in fact reduce my opportunity to enjoy the amenities of the area for recreation.

<p>*As a motorcyclist I have never encountered any problems with any other users on this byway,in fact you rarely meet any other users. With only 33 miles of byway in Oxfordshire this is a precious resource.</p> <p>*As a responsible motorcyclist, I occasionally use these lanes and did not experience any problems with the lane itself or other users.</p> <p>*I, as a motorbike rider, have never experienced any problems with other byway users on this byway.</p> <p>I've been riding this lane for many years and have never encountered any problems with other users.</p>		
<p>The byway is useful, I use it often and have never seen any vehicles in trouble.</p> <p>*The number of byways in the county is already severely limited , this feels another nail in the coffin for recreational use.</p>	Noted	
<p>Four-wheeled motor vehicles have not been able to proceed eastbound along this Byway for some time due to their access being blocked by a large tree trunk that has been installed by an interested party.</p> <p>I do agree that the byway is not as well suited to 4x4 use although I might add it has been deliberately and illegally obstructed by a large log at the western end for some time thus preventing 4x4 use. However, I believe it is perfectly well suited to 2 wheeled use without causing an issue safety or otherwise for other users.</p>	Noted	We are aware of occasions where farmers install temporary defensive measures to protect land from harecoursing, flytipping and other criminal activity. When requested these structures have been removed. The TRO and associated vehicle restriction structures will prevent the need for these and enable lawful access
<p>The slope out of Genge brook is perfectly safe and navigable by most users.</p>	Disagree	Unclear if the comment is based on experience of use – but the slope is not safely and easily usable by MPVs and carriage drivers due to its gradient and width
<p>You also argue that "as a fenced route for much of its length there is very limited space for all users to use the route at the same time and for motor vehicles to turn round and retrace their route.". In fact, there is plenty of space along the route for vehicles and other users -the only narrow stretch is actually at the bridge over the brook. Additionally, a number of years ago, I once took my car at the time (a Subaru Forester - i.e. not what you would traditionally deem a "4x4") along the byway whilst walking my dogs and was easily able to turn around to retrace my route. I therefore strongly object to any proposal that would withdraw the rights for 2 wheeled MPV access.</p>	Disagree	In addition to the bridge it is the two slopes to the stream, plus the narrow drop from the upper to lower fields west of the brook which are also very narrow.
<p>Support But please note that:</p>		



<p>1. the Society normally objects to the exclusion of horse drawn carriages. However, in this instance, due to the severity of the slope into Ginge Brook and that a bridge seems to have already been built which is not suitable for carriage drivers, it is dubious whether any carriages can physically use this route. We feel it is up to carriage drivers to judge for themselves whether they can tackle any particular path. We don't feel that paths should be closed to a particular user group because someone thinks it is unsuitable for them, apart from when there is danger to life.</p>	Noted	The decision to restrict MPVs and carriage drivers is not made lightly but it is considered the only option given the situation and limited range of solutions
<p>2. The consultation states 'that it is not possible to engineer a reasonable solution that safely provides for all byway users in this location in such a restricted 'pinch point''. What does 'reasonable' mean? It must be possible to construct a bridge there to take motorised vehicles &amp; horse drawn carriages. Presumably it means that it is not reasonable to spend money on a bridge to the standard to take vehicles? This reason might be better worded. A bridge has been constructed already but not to the standard to take horse drawn carriages.</p>	Noted	The formal TRO consultation will clarify the wording regarding the bridge, slope and track engineering and environmental limitations. The existing bridge is a brideway bridge built to a specification when the route was a CRB and in the only place that it could be constructed without impacting on the stream corridor. It is acknowledged that a TRO should perhaps have been put in place when this bridge was installed or when the route was classified as a BOAT.
<p>3. Reason 1 states: 'For avoiding danger to people or other traffic using the byway and preventing danger arising. It is not considered possible to accommodate the likelihood of all byway users negotiating the crossing and slope at the same time. There are no escape routes and poor visibility. Additionally, as a fenced route for much of its length there is very limited space for all users to use the route at the same time and for motor vehicles to turn round and retrace their route'. The Society does not support this reason for the TRO. There is no evidence, as far as we are aware, that many users use the byway, the crossing and the slope at the same time. The Society does not accept that inadequate path width is a valid reason for imposing a TRO. There are many public rights of way where the path width does not allow different users to pass: they have to either find a passing place or re-trace their steps. Much / all of the length of the byway is wide enough for users to pass, if not for motor vehicles and horse drawn vehicles to turn around. Perhaps this needs re-wording?</p>	Disagree	In addition to the bridge it is the two slopes to the stream, plus the narrow drop from the upper to lower fields west of the brook which are also too narrow. The decision to restrict MPVs and carriage drivers is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The bridge, slope and track are being constructed to meet CDM regulations. The formal TRO consultation wording and reasoning will be made clearer

<b>West Hendred BOAT 403/9 and East Hendred restricted byway 199/17 – specific comments</b>		
<b>Comment/part-comment</b>	<b>Proposed action</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Disagree</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>	<b>Commentary where necessary</b>
<p>This byway is often illegally blocked, and you as a highway authority fail in your DUTY to remove the illegal obstruction put in, no doubt, by the land owner.</p> <p>As the authority, you had to make a pragmatic decision post NERC on whether vehicular rights still existed on certain Restricted Byways. On this byway, the majority length is BOAT. I would suggest that if someone drove the short RB section, it would be unlikely that they would be prosecuted in court for doing so, more so because the continuation is byway also. Personally I would say you failed in your reclassification duty pre-NERC and now you are trying to wipe the mistakes under the carpet.</p> <p>Can you tell me if the white road on the dogleg north past Park Hill is on the List of Streets? If so, this creates a further connection.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>We are aware of occasions where farmers install temporary defensive measures to protect land from harecoursing, flytipping and other criminal activity. When requested these structures have been removed. The TRO and associated vehicle restriction structures will prevent the need for these and enable lawful access</p> <p>This comment re NERC is irrelevant to the improvement project and the TRO as no application to 'claim' byway rights was made for this route. The RB section is around 600m long so cannot be considered 'short'</p> <p>Not relevant to the RB section of the Icknield Way but the continuation is not on the LoS. The Icknield Way was diverted to its current route in 1983 leaving a stub of the BOAT as a dead-end for no clear reason</p>
<p>Reason 1: Rubbish. Many tarmac roads have limited space to pass. Please can you let me know how many vehicles use this byway per week, as I'm sure you must have done a survey prior to the proposal. The tarmac roads next to this byway are no wider, so your reason is flawed.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>This is not about previous use. The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme.</p>
<p>Reason 2: As a highway authority, you have a DUTY to assert and protect the rights of all users. It appears you are neglecting that DUTY, preferring to support this users that have more access to the countryside than MPV users do. Are you suggesting that some users are more welcome in the countryside than others?</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme. The duty to assert and protect includes the ability to undertake lawful restriction processes</p>

<p>MPV user have a Code of Conduct and pull over for other users, turn off engines for horse riders. The pinch point is the bridge, which 4x4s can't use due to my previous comment.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>MPV users are not required to pull over for other users and turn off engines on roads.</p>
<p>Reason 3: As above. It's no narrower than other byway and nearby tarmac roads. Please provide information on the number of vehicles the use this each week compared to the tarmac roads at either end.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for construction of new stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme. The comparison with other roads in the area is irrelevant</p>
<p>Reason 4: So, the way I read this is you believe recreational vehicular users aren't part of the public that can enjoy the amenities of the area, for recreation. Can you please re-read the definition of a BOAT please? While I commend your <b>'Improved infrastructure is planned to support the creation of route one of the Science Vale Cycle Network which is a shared walking, cycling and horse-riding community 'Greenway'</b> as a walker and mountain biker, I feel somewhat side lined as a recreational vehicular user. You neglected your duties to reclassify many RuPPs and now you want to further restrict MPV users that have minimal access to a descent byway network in Oxfordshire.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The decision to restrict MPVs is not made lightly but it is considered the only option. The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for construction of new stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme</p>
<p>Your reasons for a TRO are weak and I believe you are being pressured by a land owner to do this, as there is no other reason for doing so.</p> <p>I hope you consider dropping these proposals, and consider talking to GLASS (Green Lane Association) to discuss options. There are too many anomalies in Oxfordshire and these need resolving.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>The requirement for the TROs is predominantly because of the improvement scheme design/construction and use needs</p> <p>OCC welcomes discussion with all user and interest groups which is why the informal consultation stage was used. No alternative options have been presented</p>
<p>This is a route that I have never been able to use as it has always been illegally blocked everytime that I have been to the western end.</p> <p>It is very clear from looking at a map that there is a route from Hagbourne Hill to East Lockinge that should be a byway in its entirety, much of it is, rather than</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Disagree</p>	<p>We are aware of occasions where farmers install temporary defensive measures to protect land from harecoursing, flytipping and other criminal activity. When requested these structures have been removed. The TRO and associated vehicle restriction structures will prevent the need for these and enable lawful access</p> <p>No application to 'claim' byway rights was made for this route. Flytipping is just one issue that the TRO and vehicle restriction structures will help to</p>

<p>attempting to close the route it should be opened up to allow a through route that could reduce the likely hood of fly tipping as suggested above.</p>		<p>prevent. Harecoursing and farm burglary are other crimes that may use tracks as access and through routes</p>
<p>As the byway was never originally a dead end where it turns into a restricted byway, why not consider upgrading the restricted byway to a byway to create a through route. Something that should have been don pre 2005 when the NERC act extinguished the rights on the restricted byway and created a dead end!!!</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>No application to 'claim' byway rights was made for this route</p>
<p>Horses do more damage than anything that goes down there and walkers leaving rubbish down there as well dog walkers not picking up after their dogs.</p> <p>This is a useful route that I use often, it would be against public spirit to restrict it.</p> <p>As above, I have never come across any problems with other users on this track</p> <p>I have ridden Byways on a motorcycle around the U.K. that are much more restrictive in width than these without incident or inhibiting the passage of other fellow vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Our members use this byway occasionally and have never encountered any problems with other byway users. We thus do not understand why this byway should have a blanket ban TRO for motorised vehicles, especially motorcycles.</p> <p>I use the road regularly on my motorcycle without problems</p> <p>I often use this byway as a motorcyclist and have never found any issues whilst on it with other users.</p> <p>You do not get any problems as rarely see other users.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>This is not about previous use. The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for construction of new stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme</p> <p>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</p>
<p>never had any problems in decades of using west hendred byway (by motorcycle). The problem is Oxfordshire council ( my opinion lawless hooligans) repeatedly failed in their legal duty to research and reclassify rupps. because of that part of (w hendred) byway is now restricted byway, and now they want to close the other half (because of their failings).ps: they done exactly the same for ridgeway and made it illegal for us to use Oxfordshire ridgeway (but we can use berks and wilts ridgeway) what an appalling byway track record Oxfordshire council have.</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>No application to 'claim' byway rights was made for this route. Due process was undertaken for the Special Review in the 1970s and subsequent legal events</p>
<p>Personally, I do not see the point of going to the expense of applying for a TRO on this byway since the fact that it leads to a restricted byway means that it's MVP use is naturally limited. The fact that those who choose to use it have to retrace</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for construction of</p>

<p>their steps is their choice if they wish to do so - why shouldn't they? 4x4s do not need to turn around to retrace their steps, they can simply reverse and there is plenty of space on this route to turn a motorcycle around.</p> <p>With regard to illegal fly tipping and hare coursing, I also do not see how removing the lawful use of this byway will prevent existing illegal activities on the surrounding land – if they are prepared to fly tip or hare course, then making use of the lane to motor vehicles also illegal is not going to stop them. I therefore object to council funds being used to impose an unnecessary TRO.</p>		<p>new stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme</p> <p>Flytipping is just one issue that the TRO and vehicle restriction structures will help to prevent. Hare coursing and farm burglary are other crimes that may use tracks as access and through routes</p>
<p>Support</p> <p>But please note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Society does not accept that inadequate path width is a valid reason for imposing a TRO. There are many public rights of way where the path width does not allow different users to pass: users have to either find a passing place or re-trace their steps. Much /all of the length of the byway is wide enough for users to pass.</li> </ol>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The TRO is a preventative measure on a dead-end MPV route to manage risk to an acceptable level along a route proposed for construction of new stone surfacing as part of a cycle/horse/walker improvement scheme</p>

15<sup>th</sup> June 2019

Paul Harris  
Principal Officer Countryside Access Strategy & Development  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Planning & Place/Environment & Heritage