

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Nicholas John Moon [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 01 March 2023 23:25  
**To:** NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Becky Crockett <administrator@cpreoxon.org.uk>; Gordon Garraway [REDACTED] >;  
McEwan-James, Arthur - Oxfordshire County Council <arthur.mcewan-james@oxfordshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 THE OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (DIDCOT TO CULHAM THAMES BRIDGE) SCHEME  
2022 THE OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (DIDCOT GARDEN TOWN HIGHWAYS INFRASTRUCTURE – A4130  
IMPROVEMENT (MILTON GATE TO COLLETT ROUNDABOUT), A4197 DIDCOT TO CULHAM LIN...



The countryside charity  
Oxfordshire

Campaigning to protect our rural c

Dear Sir / Madam,

CPRE Oxfordshire wishes to object to the following provisions of the above-named side roads order:-

**Appleford, Bridleway No.3**

We wish to object to the proposed extinguishment of Appleford BR3 as, while the proposed new road would largely obliterate its current course, this extinguishment would deprive riders, cyclists and walkers of a segregated route between Didcot and

Appleford and force, in particular horseriders, to use roads which are totally unsuitable for their needs. While we understand that it may be intended to develop the land between the new road and the Didcot - Oxford railway in the near future, a diversion of Appleford BR3 to follow the railway fence would provide an alternative route which would have a minimal effect on use of the land but would also provide a safe alternative route for walkers and cyclists in the event of the land being developed.

**Clifton Hampden, Footpath No.6**

We wish to object to the proposed extinguishment of Clifton Hampden FP6 between its crossing of the proposed bypass and Clifton Hampden FP3 as walkers wishing to turn south onto FP3 or join FP5 would have to cross the proposed bypass anyway, whether at FP6 or FP3, whereas those turning north onto FP3 would be unlikely to cross and recross the bypass, so that the detour for walkers turning south along the roadside footway seems totally unnecessary. If there is some compelling reason why walkers should not cross the bypass on the line of FP6, a more acceptable alternative would be to divert FP6 along the north side of the bypass fence to meet FP3 so that the detour would follow a field headland rather than a roadside footway and so be more pleasant as part of a recreational walk.

Kind regards

NICK MOON

Rights of Way Consultant (South Oxfordshire)

---

This email has originated from external sources and has been scanned by DfT's email scanning service.

---

---

The information in this email may be confidential or otherwise protected by law. If you received it in error, please let us know by return e-mail and then delete it immediately, without printing or passing it on to anybody else. Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications and for other lawful purposes.