

Policy & Programmes

HEAD OF SERVICE: Tim Oruye



Oxfordshire County Council

By email:

southandvale@oxfordshire.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: [REDACTED]

planning.policy@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel: 01235 422422

Textphone: 18001 01235 422422

Abbey House, Abbey Close, Abingdon,
OXON, OX14 3JE

7 January 2026

Dear Oxfordshire County Council,

Thank you for inviting responses on the Wallingford Area Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). We would like to take this opportunity to express our strong support for infrastructure planning for active travel to promote modal shift in our district. We welcome these proposals to make walking and cycling easier and more enjoyable in the Wallingford Area.

The close proximity of Wallingford to its surrounding villages, including: Crowmarsh Gifford, Benson, Cholsey, Ewelme, Brightwell-cum-Sotwell, Preston Crowmarsh, Warborough, Shillingford and all those in-between has strong potential for improved uptake in walking and cycling, particularly once the right infrastructure is provided. Wallingford has a strong relationship with Cholsey with its Great Western Mainline railway station. The Wallingford Area also has a strong relationship with places and settlements to the west; notably Harwell Campus and Milton Park (major local employment sites), and Didcot. We strongly support the opportunity to support the uptake of longer distance active travel commuting and leisure travel for these destinations.

Thank you for involving our council officers in the development of these proposals through steering group sessions. We would like to confirm our support for the delivery of, and offer our support and assistance with, drawing up further LCWIPs across the District, notably Henley-on-Thames and Watlington. We also welcome ongoing review and revision of existing LCWIPs, which are currently present in: Didcot and Thame.

We recognise the value of walking and cycling infrastructure, not only to help active travel for work and other purposes, but also because it supports leisure journeys as well. It is well documented that levels of activity correlate positively with health and well-being.

The LCWIP proposals support our [South Oxfordshire Council Plan](#) through promoting carbon reduction through modal shift and thus “action on climate change”, the proposed schemes help to identify “infrastructure that meet[s] local needs”, and encourages “inclusive communities” that foster cohesion and inclusion. Enabling active travel through new and improved infrastructure supports our [Nature and Climate Action Plan](#) target, which is to be a carbon neutral district by 2045.

The LCWIP proposals also align with our existing and emerging Local Plan policies which seek to promote the use of active travel, including Policy TRANS2: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility ([South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035](#)) and Policy IN2 – Sustainable transport and accessibility (emerging [South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Joint Local Plan 2041](#)).

Public consultation draft plan Comments

We would like to suggest re-wording ‘its aerial settlements’ to ‘surrounding settlements’ for clarity.

When describing the LCWIP development process, the report states that six ‘stages’ are advised by the DfT. The report then goes on to state that the report will be organised into four ‘stages’. To prevent confusion and to better describe what is being communicated, we suggest changing the report’s ‘stages’ to ‘chapters’ or similar.

When referring to ‘local members’ of the steering group, it could be inferred that only elected members of the council were present, so we would suggest re-wording to: “*local residents, Councillors, stakeholders and interested parties*”.

When referring to the ‘Place Planning and Coordination team for South Oxfordshire’ it is unclear that this team resides within the Oxfordshire County Council, as opposed to South Oxfordshire District Council, please rephrase in each instance.

Please ensure consistent use of language for stakeholder involvement, such as the use of ‘Councillors’ or ‘members’.

The [Joint Local Plan](#) (JLP) for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse is currently at examination, and therefore holds some weight in decision making. As such, the JLP should be included in Table 1 that lists the relevant policy, strategy, and guidance for the LCWIP. The adopted and emerging plans would fit better under the local category, as opposed to regional. Please consider adding the South and Vale Joint Design Guide, as well as Oxfordshire County Council’s Street Design Guide in the policy/guidance review.

Figure 4 depicts a simplified trip generation plan of the area, but it is unclear why other areas would not be attracted to Benson Marina, or why Brightwell-cum-Sotwell residents would not be attracted to Cholsey Railway Station.

Text on page 12 refers to a map below, however, there does not appear to be one. While Figure 4 is described on page 7 as ‘including planned developments’, these are not clearly illustrated on the figure.

It is unclear why more walking and cycling trips would result in greater “*resilience to future emergencies*”, please review this paragraph on page 13. Please provide additional detail in the report for the AQMA that has been revoked, i.e. provide the unabbreviated name ‘Wallingford Air Quality Management Area’ and provide an image for, or describe, the geographical scope.

The information depicted on page 17 infers that the entirety of the local road network forms the desire lines for cycling. It may be more appropriate to state which roads are classified into: Primary Roads, Secondary Roads, Local Roads, and RAF Benson Roads and then state that the entirety of the network is available to cycle users. Though some of the ‘primary’ cycle routes shown may not be attractive to many cyclists, such as the A4074 and A4130 due to the lack of cycle lanes, as well as high motorised vehicle volumes and speeds. Please consider adding the Public Right of Way network to Figure 5 or providing an additional map. It is unclear why “Primary” roads would be defined as being “where high demand is less likely”. Please review and rephrase.

Roads that are identified in the Walking Hierarchy (Figure 8) include those that do not have any pedestrian infrastructure. Similar to the cycle map (Figure 5), it is not clear in the report that these maps are showing the existing road network and identifying where, in this case, pedestrians may want to walk in the future. For example, a ‘secondary walking route’ is shown along the western stretch of the A4130 Wallingford bypass (Calvin Thomas Way) which has no footways, just grass verges on either side of the carriageway. Altering Figure 5 to illustrate the existing road network and removing Figure 8 may help overall understanding of the LCWIP process.

Please amend the Figure references on Page 34 and review reference text colour inconsistency. It is unclear what attribute change warrants a ‘safety’ improvement, as some schemes show an improvement when cycle infrastructure is moved from the carriageway to the pavement (Proposal 7A: Station Road / Wantage Road), while other schemes seek to do the same but don’t achieve safety improvements (Proposal 3D: Church Road, Proposal 7B: A4130 High Road).

In the Walking Improvements section (3.4), please consider altering the explanation of the Coherence criterion to: “*For a walking route to be coherent, it needs to be accessible for all pavement users. A measure of the condition of dropped kerbs and tactile paving is taken for each route.*”

Please review the document references to aid reader navigation of the report. For example, early references to Table 4 are some pages from the table itself, please consider adding to these references the Section and a page number. Page 38 suggests that Table 4 is in Section 3.4, but it is in Section 3.6. Similarly, Page 44 refers to a Section 4.3 that is not present in the report. Please also review Section references on Page 47 and a Table reference on Page 50.

Page 45 sets out the criteria used to assess the schemes proposed. Under 'effectiveness' it is identified that the number of killed and seriously injured casualties will be used to assess road safety implications for the scheme, please rephrase to 'Potential improvements to road safety'.

We consider that the prioritisation criteria used to assess each scheme is well rounded, with the range of criteria considering all key aspects of potential schemes.

It is unclear how the routes were prioritised in step 2 of the prioritisation exercise set out on Page 47. Perhaps the schemes were 'organised based on their criteria scores'.

The Movement And Place (MAP) Plan for this area has been identified in the supporting work for the Science Vale MAP Plan as "Wallingford and River Thames Corridor", please amend text on Page 69 to reflect this.

The monitoring and review section of the report (Section 4.2) indicates that journeys by walking, cycling, small vehicles and large vehicles will be monitored, please provide more detail regarding the method of data collection.

A link has been secured from the north of development Site E into Brookmead Drive, and reserved matters have now been approved for the pedestrian/cycle bridge. This is required to be constructed prior to the occupation of 230th dwelling. Furthermore, it is also worth noting that the revised Wallingford Neighbourhood Plan allocated part of the site to deliver a new medical centre, and we are currently considering an application for this (P25/S1803/FUL). The medical centre would be intended to replace the existing Wallingford Medical Centre, so if approved and implemented, the site would become much more of a destination from the wider area. It is unclear if the 'Site E' development in Wallingford has been factored into the LCWIP routes, please review.

Appendix A Comments

The Census data reviewed on pages 23-26 and Figures 5-9 include data from 2021. Please be aware that 2021 Census data for method of travel to work data should not be used due to COVID lockdown procedures occurring during the year of data collection, please see further information [here](#). National Travel Survey (although quite granular) or 2011 Census (although quite dated) data appear to be the most relevant data available at this time.

Labels and annotations could be added to Figure 20 to help illustrate where the Chilterns National Landscape and North Wessex Downs National Landscape extend. An annotation identifying that the railway line from Cholsey to Wallingford is indeed a Heritage Railway Line as opposed to a regular passenger train line would also aid reader interpretation of the map and local area.

Please update the Table references set out on Page 82.

Thank you again for inviting comments on this LCWIP. We are committed to working with you to roll out LCWIPs across our district and trust the above is helpful.

Yours sincerely



Senior Transport Planner
South Oxfordshire District Council