

To who it may concern.

Apologies for being late with my comments on the consultation on the development of PR9 Yarnton.

I had not realised the cut off date of 22/09 but hopefully being submitted on the 25/09 may still be viable.

Looking at the consultations - the may concerns I have are.

1. The proposed access to the site off Rutten Lane - this is not needed as their is access off the A44. It has the potential to create a "rat run" through the village or the Garth at peak time or traffic disruption on the A44. As such this should be removed.
2. There is increased chance of high traffic on Rutten lane due to the development past the school - The developer should pay for speed decrease solutions under a Section 106 agreement on Rutten lane - such as cameras and speed bumps.
3. There is an increased change of water surface run off - increasing the flood risk to existing properties in yarnton. The developer should pay for an independent flood risk assessment chosen by the parish council. Their recommendations in terms of improved piping and pumping again should be paid for under a a Section 106 agreement.
4. The improvements to non-vehicle transport infrastructure to support such as development is unsatisfactory. Improvements to NCR 5 / bike route 5 - the bike route than runs next to the canal is welcomed - However the cycle/footbath alongside the A44 all the way from Yarnton up to Pear Tree roundabout which is the most direct route to North Oxford and the Universities is unsatisfactory (narrow in places and poor surface). This is the route which is becoming increasingly busy and is not good enough to take the increased number of potential users. Underr a section 106 agreement - there should be a wider foot/cycle path and possibly on both sides allowing a satisfactory non vehicle commute to Oxford.

ideal - solar powered led lights in the lanes at night for the bike lane would improve safety.
5. Any increase in public transport should be directed along the A44 and not through the village/Rutten Lane.
6. Both medical and Schooling will be pressured - I note improvements in the plan to these which is welcome - again an audit to ensure that the capacity increases are satisfactory should be provided.
7. A noise pollution assessment of London Oxford Airport to be required as the new development is under current agree flight paths and likely to be affected. Changes to London Airports operating hours to be made if needed.

Of course ideally this would not go ahead as its killing off the green land around Oxford to the detriment of all... but if it is to go ahead they key aspects are ensuring that it actually improves the welfare of those already residing in the area

Kind regards

Jonathan Young