

In presenting my submitted objections, HIF1Objections.pdf, I provided supplementary information and highlighted the major points.

I have lived in Didcot for about 50 years, and in Culham for about a year, before that (My wife worked at the then Culham Teacher Training College, which became the European School) I commuted by Honda 50 motorcycle to Didcot Station, and thence to London, where I worked, as a professional Engineer. There was not a suitable service, from Culham Station, and in some ways the service now is worse, many trains stopping at either Appleford or Culham.

I was interested in the development of Didcot (I spoke on road development at the Ladygrove Enquiry) from the beginning.

I have been interested in infrastructure, since I was at school, and canals, which follow the land contours, before that.

To cross over the railway, where it is on an embankment, and where the bridge would also have to cross over two roads as well, seems ridiculous.

Near Milton Gate, there is a roadway under the railway.

East of the Station, Cow Lane bridge, is under the railway.

Where Manor Bridge crosses the railway, the railway is in a cutting. This is only 1km east of the proposed 'Science Bridge' site.

Siting a new bridge here should be significantly cheaper, though it would necessitate the A4130 improvements continuing a further 1km. A new bridge design could quickly be produced, based on the fairly recently built bridge over the railway in a cutting near Beale Wildlife Park. (Nat Grid Ref SU616780)

Putting the Northbound traffic onto a separate carriageway would ease traffic problems at the existing roundabout ("death roundabout", Cllr David Rouane) and mostly be via existing roadways.

The design of the new road cuts Didcot in two. Travel from the centre of Didcot, south of the railway, to Didcot Town Football Club, Willowbrook Leisure Centre, or Oak Tree Health Centre, would travel on the existing A4130, past Screwfix, and into Ladygrove from the North, as Cow Lane bridge is one-way only.

With the new road layout, this traffic, (including bicycles) would have to turn right, at a "T" junction, across a fast road, with more traffic. Traffic from Milton Park will also be faced with this turn right at a "T" junction.

If this route is to be retained, it should not be built, until the Cow Lane bridge has been rebuilt with two-way traffic.

I attach a Diagram, NPR.pdf, illustrating the route from central Didcot to the Northern Perimeter Road and these facilities in Ladygrove marked where it would be significantly cut, if HIF1 joins at this T" junction.

When the proposed road leaves the Northern Perimeter Road, why does it go over an expensive, noise emitting viaduct, when it could be routed further West, and mostly follow existing roadways.

This proposed road will divert additional traffic to Golden Balls and Nuneham Courtenay. So until these are improved and bypassed, the new Thames Bridge should have an HGV restriction placed on it.

Several people have said that the cycling provision is inadequate. I proposed a high-level Foot and Cycle Bridge, bypassing the Manor Bridge and "death roundabout" for cyclists heading towards Milton Park, and easing the route for those heading onto the Northern Perimeter Road. CycleBridge.pdf

There is a considerable need for improved infrastructure in and around Didcot, but if it is spent wisely, it can go further, better.

Andrew P. Jones

