



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

14 August 2025

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
3	Page 2	Public Speakers
5	Pages 3 - 15	Written Updates

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Matt Swinford / Martyn Surfleet, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221534

Planning Committee 14 August 2025 – Public Speakers

Agenda Item	Application Number	Application Address	Ward Member	Speaker – Objector	Speaker – Support
5	24/00539/F	Land To The East Of Stratfield Brake And West Of Oxford Parkway Railway Station, Oxford Road, Kidlington	Councillor Linda Ward Councillor Ian Middleton	1 st Cllr Melanie Moorhouse, on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council 2 nd Adrian Sutton, on behalf of Friends of Stratfield Brake 3 rd Ian Salisbury, Lathbury Road Residents Association 4 th Geoffrey Randell, resident and on behalf of the Summertown and St Margarets Neighbourhood Forum	Tim Williams, Chief Executive of Oxford United Football Club Roland Francis Clements, on behalf of the applicant

**CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

14 August 2025

WRITTEN UPDATES

**Agenda Item 5 – Land To The East Of Stratfield Brake And West Of Oxford Parkway
Railway Station Oxford Road Kidlington**

Additional representations from third parties

5 new representations received, 4 in objection and 1 in support

A particular letter of objection and accompanying response note (to the applicant's '*Arboricultural Technical Note*' dated 18 July 2025), received on 11 August 2025, raising the following points in summary:

- New evidence (including the 1833 OS map) suggests the woodland bordering the Triangle site may qualify as Ancient Woodland.
- The Applicant's Arboricultural Technical Note is alleged to contain material flaws, including:
 - Omission of key historical maps.
 - Misinterpretation of woodland features and history.
- The Council is urged to:
 - Reconsult on the new evidence.
 - Engage Natural England to reassess the woodland's status.
 - Correct procedural errors, including misleading statements in the planning officer's report.

Response received (12 August 2025) in relation to the response above, disputing evidence submitted for the following summarised reasons below and asking that the evidence submitted be completely dismissed and afforded no weight:

1. Misunderstanding of Criteria: Ancient woodland status depends on continuous woodland cover since 1600 AD, not individual tree age.
2. Unreliable Estimates: The growth rate calculations are speculative and fall short of the required age threshold.
3. Unsupported Assumptions: Claims about coppice stool continuity lack physical or historical evidence.
4. Contradictory Historic Records: Historic maps show the area was open pasture for centuries, undermining claims of continuous woodland

Letter received 13 August 2025 raising the following points in summary:

Supports the principle of the stadium development but raises significant concerns about the transport strategy and its potential adverse impacts:

- Oxford Road Closures: Proposed matchday closures could cause delays of up to 15 minutes on key routes and 13 minutes for buses. Emergency evacuation plans are not yet detailed.

- Pedestrian Safety: High pedestrian volumes crossing Oxford Road are a concern. Alternatives such as bridges/underpasses or relocating cycle parking and drop-off points are suggested.
- Walking & Cycling Routes: The proposed “greenway” is not deliverable. The Frieze Way route is viable but needs design clarification and safety improvements.
- Bus & Rail Provision: No formal commitments to enhanced services. Chiltern Railways cannot guarantee matchday rail services. Planning obligations are requested to secure funding and delivery.
- Parking & CPZs: Controlled Parking Zones should be extended to nearby future developments.
- Governance & Funding: The Match Day Travel Plan lacks governance detail. All mitigation measures should be secured via planning obligations.

Response received (13 August 2025) disputing the claims made against road closures by other third parties, in summary raising the following points:

- Diversion Window Misunderstood: The 45-minute window is a flexible operational envelope—not a rigid 35+5+5 minute breakdown. Deployment and removal are phased and managed dynamically.
- Speculative Infrastructure Assumptions: The objection incorrectly assumes continuous fencing/barriers along the full 675m closure. The application proposes targeted infrastructure at pinch points, consistent with modern event traffic management.
- Pedestrian/Bus Segregation: Safe separation can be achieved without full-length barriers using marshals, shuttle control, and temporary pens.
- Emergency Access Misrepresented: Evacuation plans allow for rapid access via removable sections and steward control. Full dismantling mid-event is not required.
- Appropriate Detail for Planning Stage: OCC confirms that deployment specifics will be secured via planning condition and TTRO approval—standard practice for stadium operations.

Response received (13 August 2025) disputing the comments made regarding the third party response to ‘Tree Age Calculations and Ancient Woodland Claims’.

Officer note – No new ecological information has been submitted by the applicants requiring a statutory re-consultation. Officers are satisfied with the approach taken to the assessment of Stratfield Brake (i.e. that it is not Ancient Woodland). Ancient woodland is defined as land that has been continuously wooded since at least 1600 AD, and in assessing such status, reliance is placed on Natural England (NE) as the responsible authority rather than information from other parties such as OUFC. While it is acknowledged that the Ancient Woodland Inventory does not rule out the identification of additional ancient woodland areas, in this case, NE has given the matter significant consideration, including issuing three formal communications. Their latest position reflects appropriate scrutiny, and although differing views have been expressed by various stakeholders, NE’s authority is the basis for judgement. Given the thorough review already undertaken, it would be unreasonable to delay the application’s determination. This is a substantial area of woodland, but one that has been properly assessed.

Additional representations from consultees

CHILTERN RAILWAYS AND NETWORK RAIL (received 8 August 2025) - Updated finalised joint response, with requested Section 106 Heads of Terms:

Rail capacity:

- Chiltern Railways can confirm that following an announcement of new trains on Tuesday 5 August, we do expect to have enough carriages to serve the stadium development.
- Whilst our new (MK5A) trains will not serve Oxford Parkway, they will free up our existing trains (Class 165 and Class 168) so that we can run longer and more services from December 2026. This means that we do now have additional capacity secured to support future Oxford United football fixtures.
- We are continuing to monitor future development across our Oxford – London and Oxford – Milton Keynes routes including from the Puy du Fou Theme Park, Bicester Village growth and Universal Studios development.
- It is likely that more rail capacity will be needed by the early 2030's to support this cumulative growth. We are building a business case for new battery/electric trains which subject to approval from the Department for Transport would be introduced in the mid 2030's.

Oxford Parkway – S.106 requirements:

- Network Rail as the owner of the land would be a co-signatory to the Section 106 agreement with Chiltern Railways to ensure it is future proofed as the UK railways transition to public ownership.
- Network Rail and Chiltern will need to work with Oxford United to deliver the enhancements according to existing railway standards and permissions. Further design work by a specialist contractor will need to be paid for by Oxford United to ascertain exact costs and scope of these interventions once the scheme progresses to a detailed design stage.
- Chiltern/Network Rail will appoint an interface Project Manager to deliver the enhancements with Oxford United providing the funding.

Payment of contributions towards Chiltern Railway improvements, to include;

- 2 new access gates to the Oxford bound platform and associated ticket readers
- 4 additional customer waiting shelters (2 on each platform)
- Creation of a dedicated toilet facility to meet the needs of 4000 fans on match days
- Improvement to wayfinding and signage between the station and new stadium
- Contribution towards provision of operational management centre at Oxford Parkway
- Contribution towards providing match day barriers and related storage facility

NATURAL ENGLAND (received 11 August 2025) Natural England has reviewed new evidence submitted on 24 July 2025 and concluded that while Stratfield Brake cannot be definitively ruled out as ancient woodland, the available evidence is contradictory and insufficient to support such a designation.

The site is confirmed as long-established woodland with high biodiversity value and qualifies as priority deciduous woodland habitat, which ranks just below ancient woodland in conservation importance. Historic mapping shows woodland presence from around 1830, but earlier maps are either inconsistent or unreliable for confirming woodland continuity before 1600.

Ecological surveys and species data are incomplete or lacking in location specificity, and discrepancies exist between reports. The presence of old coppice stools and ancient woodland indicator species is noted but not clearly mapped.

Natural England recommends further seasonal ground flora surveys and mapping of old growth features but, given the planning context, concludes that Stratfield Brake does not meet the criteria for ancient woodland. Nonetheless, it urges strong protection measures to prevent habitat loss or degradation.

Officer comment: Following Natural England's review of new evidence submitted and their conclusions submitted on 11 August 2025, Officers are content that the status of Stratfield Brake has been appropriately assessed.

In accordance with paragraph 193a of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states:

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

Officers are satisfied that the application has incorporated appropriate safeguards. These include measures to avoid habitat deterioration, protect root protection zones, and to minimise impacts on biodiversity, through appropriate conditions and legal obligations (i.e. woodland management plan).

Officers therefore consider that the application accords with national policy requirements for the protection of priority deciduous woodland habitats.

OCC HIGHWAYS: Comments have been provided to address the points raised by Mayer Brown's Transport Technical Note Report (TTN) dated 15th July on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) acting as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has engaged with the applicant along with multiple stakeholders throughout the planning process and has thoroughly assessed the proposed new stadium development. As such the recommendation of no objection subject to planning conditions and planning obligations is maintained. **The full response can be found at appendix 1.**

WOODLAND TRUST: The Woodland Trust, managing Stratfield Brake on behalf of Oxfordshire County Council, raises concerns about drainage impacts from the proposed stadium development:

- Culvert Clearance: Supports Cherwell DC's drainage advisor recommendation that planning consent be conditional on clearing the 750mm culvert under Frieze Way.
- Ecological Risk: Increased surface water discharge may turn Stratfield Brake into a floodplain, threatening mature woodland and biodiversity.
- Access Issues: Seasonal flooding already affects the permissive path network and canal towpath access. Additional runoff could worsen this.
- Requested Conditions:
 1. Applicant to clear the drainage ditch across Stratfield Brake and connect to the canal siphon.
 2. Works to be completed alongside culvert clearance before stadium operation.
 3. All works to be funded by the applicant and agreed with the Woodland Trust and OCC.
 4. Ongoing maintenance of culvert and ditch to be applicant-funded and agreed with relevant parties.

The Trust emphasises that these measures are essential to prevent ecological harm and ensure public access is not compromised.

Additional representations from Agent/Applicant

Clarification received regarding the date that the right to use the Kassam ends.

- The licence at the time of the ASA was until June 2026
- The extension is **only agreed to June 2027** (not 2028)
- There is an **option to extend to June 2028** – but the stadium company made this **conditional on planning permission having been granted**. E.g if planning permission is not granted the club have to vacate by 2027.

This has been reflected in the Officer update below.

Additional representations from Councillors

COUNCILLOR MIDDLETON - concerns about the assessment of financial viability information provided to support the VSC argument for this application. There is no detail that can be scrutinised by either members of the planning committee or the general public, save for an outline position that was published but was not re-consulted on. There's also a non-disclosed document that is being used to inform a vital aspect of the VSC consideration that is not available for scrutiny or consultation. On that basis the recommendation of weight in the VSC matrix is being made that also cannot be properly scrutinised by the planning committee.

Given the above I would suggest that this aspect of the VSC should be given absolutely no weight rather than 'little' weight and completely excluded from the VSC consideration.

Officer comment: This aspect of the VSC is given little weight on the basis that officers have not had sight of any detailed accounts or business plans to show the substance behind these assumptions. The weight to be applied to the VSC and any other material planning consideration is ultimately a matter of judgement for the decision maker – in this case the Planning Committee with the advice of its officers.

Officer Update:

Clarification/amendments to the committee report:

Para 9.76 of the committee report is amended to -

- 9.76 At the present time, OUFC play at the Kassam Stadium. Evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that post ~~30 June 2026~~ **June 2027**, OUFC will have no legal right to use or occupy the Kassam Stadium and post 14 October 2026 there will be no legal obligation for the main use of the land to be for football (by any club). **There is an option to extend to June 2028 – but the stadium company made this conditional on planning permission having been granted. E.g if planning permission is not granted the club have to vacate by 2027.**

Para 9.118 1st bullet point of the committee report amended to –

- Site 27 (Kassam Stadium) – the availability of the Kassam Stadium is detailed in the ‘Need to relocate from the Kassam Stadium’ section above. In essence, post ~~30 June 2026~~ **June 2027**, OUFC will have no legal right to use or occupy the Kassam Stadium and post 14 October 2026 there will be no obligation for the main use of the land to be for football (by any club). **There is an option to extend to June 2028 – but the stadium company made this conditional on planning permission having been granted. E.g if planning permission is not granted the club have to vacate by 2027.**

Whilst it is currently available, it does not provide the necessary security of tenure required by EFL (as detailed in the ‘EFL Requirements’ section below).

Conclusions in respect of Heritage updated as per the relevant paragraphs below:

- 9.185 **In accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, the effect of the proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset (in this case, archaeological remains) must be balanced against the scale of the harm or any loss to the significance of the heritage asset.** The County Archaeologist has noted that the submitted ADBA concludes that if further Mesolithic remains are recorded on the site they could be of regional significance. If granted permission, the development of a stadium is likely to have extensive impacts on any surviving below ground remains which are **non-designated heritage assets**. Whilst this would be a harmful impact, a staged programme of archaeological investigation should be implemented to be sought via a planning condition and this would therefore result in less than substantial harm. For this reason the OCC Archaeologist raises no objections. The additional investigation would enable the investigation, recording, analysis and archiving of heritage assets before they are lost and to advance the understanding of the heritage assets in their wider context through publication and dissemination of the evidence.

Conclusion

- 9.186 **In terms of the direct impact on non-designated heritage assets, the County Archaeologist is satisfied that** the suggested conditions would address and **appropriately record** safeguard any potential below ground remains **and therefore on balance, the impact is considered acceptable. In terms of the impact on designated heritage assets,** a large development of this kind will undoubtedly have a visual impact within the landscape and there will inevitably be wider landscape implications in views both close to the site and from the wider countryside. This does not however necessarily equate to heritage harm or more specifically mean there is harm to the significance of the heritage assets as a result of development within their setting.
- ~~9.186 The NPPF requires (paragraph 215) that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset (in this case below ground archaeology), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. This balance will be undertaken in the overall planning balance later in this report.~~
- 10.21 As per paragraph 216 of the NPPF, it is also necessary, due to the identification of the potential for **a direct effect on non-designated archaeological assets** ~~less than substantial harm to heritage assets (i.e. below ground archaeology),~~

to **reach a balanced judgment, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.** ~~weigh this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.~~ In this case and for the reasons set out throughout this conclusion which represent significant public benefits, it is considered that those benefits outweigh the harm to **non-designated** heritage assets. This also acknowledges the required planning conditions sought by the OCC Archaeology team which has led to their response of no objection.

Correction of para 9.235

- 9.235 The submitted metric demonstrates a net loss for biodiversity on site and there are queries in the metric regarding the baseline and post development habitat classifications which will need to be updated later via a metric required to discharge the statutory condition. The development is statutorily obligated to achieve a 10% net gain but in this case the proposal seeks to deliver a 20% net gain. The achievement of this higher standard is proposed as a combination of on-site habitat creation and the purchase of off-site credits to enhance biodiversity. This would be secured via a legal agreement and/or planning conditions accompanying any planning permission. ~~The achievement of BNG will be.~~ The provision of an updated Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be required and a monitoring fee for habitat reports to be submitted for a minimum of 30 years given the complexity of the habitats to be created.
-

Application no: 24/00539/F

Location: Land To The East Of Stratfield Brake And West Of Oxford Parkway
Railway Station Oxford Road Kidlington

Transport Development Management

Detailed Comments:

These comments have been provided to address the points raised by Mayer Brown's Transport Technical Note Report (TTN) dated 15th July on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) acting as the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has engaged with the applicant along with multiple stakeholders throughout the planning process and has thoroughly assessed the proposed new stadium development. As such the recommendation of no objection subject to planning conditions and planning obligations is maintained.

The comments provided below have considered the points raised in the Mayer Brown TTN. For assistance they are presented in the same order as Table 3.1 in the TTN.

Item 1. (Paragraphs 3.4, 3.6 & 3.7) Proposed stadium parking proposals are likely to result in a significant shortfall of car parking for supporters during match days – This has been considered and addressed within the formal OCC response dated 30th May 2025 (pages 16 & 25). Parking surveys have been undertaken for all P&R's (Transport Assessment Addendum December 24, page 93), plus the council's own exercise, adding in the expected increased occupation when the Traffic Filters trial starts. This demonstrates there is sufficient existing capacity and does not include the new P&R at Oxford Airport which will increase parking capacity in the area by an additional 1000 spaces in 2030/2031. Mayer Brown again state that that P&R's are for city centre use but as stated in the OCC response dated 30th May (page 16), there is no policy wording that stipulates P&R's are for city centre use only. There should not be an economic impact on the city as there is spare capacity at the P&R's which can be used by supporters without removing space for other users.

As for Mayer Browns argument that the P&R's are essentially remote car parks for the stadium and are against policy, due to the sustainability of the site there is a lower vehicular trip rate than the existing stadium (Scenario 3 + Parkway). This already means there is a reduction in vehicular trips across the network on match days but it also should be made clear that despite the proximity of the stadium to the P&R's, they are acting exactly as intended, allowing users to transition from car to other modes of transport (walking, cycling and bus). Officers consider the assessment that has been undertaken to be robust and acceptable.

A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) funded by the applicant will be introduced within a 2km radius of the stadium (with a further 1km zone if required) to prohibit any 'ad-

hoc' parking on residential streets. This approach has been modelled, analysed and is deemed acceptable. The applicant will fund the matchday CPZ's through S106 contributions, Oxfordshire County Council will then design and implement the scheme. S106 contributions are also sought for additional enforcement, however, this is also funded by the cost of permits and through parking tickets. The county council currently operate matchday CPZ's around the existing stadium so do not have any concerns regarding its effectiveness.

Item 2. (Paragraphs 3.9, 3.10 & 3.11) The vehicle mode share has been based on a GIS assessment, which could be underestimating the mode share and parking demand for supporters - The methodology has been agreed by Oxfordshire County Council and National Highways via the pre-application and planning application process. The GIS analysis is based on the postcode ticket data provided by the club and the use of TravelTime to determine travel times or isochrones to estimate how supporters might travel to the stadium. The proposed stadium benefits from a wide range of travel choices. Discussions with public transport operators have been undertaken throughout the development of the strategy and support by them has been made evident.

Mayer Brown are essentially advocating the use of a 'Predict & Provide' approach, stating that due to a fan survey (not a matchday survey which is an important point of difference) showing that 85% of fans travel by car to the existing stadium that the assessment for the proposed stadium needs to provide for similar patterns of traffic generation.

This approach is not considered appropriate as national and local guidance (TRICS Decide and Provide Guidance, OCC's adopted Implementing Decide & Provide, OCC Local Transport & Connectivity Plan) encourages moving away from this methodology towards a 'Decide & Provide' approach. This essentially means traffic modelling different scenarios using a variety of methods including Travel Plans to improve active travel infrastructure and public transport initiatives instead of highway capacity improvements.

As detailed in the formal OCC response dated 30th May 2025, the proposed site and its location is vastly different from the existing stadium in terms of connectivity. This allows for a reduction in vehicular trips and provides more opportunities for people to travel sustainably to the site via the proposed mitigation package (highway works, financial contributions and planning conditions) that is being provided.

The submitted TTN also mentions the mode share target within the Travel Plan being too low; however, it is important to note that this document is only a draft and its subsequent targets will be updated within the final Travel Plan (to be secured by planning condition). For the avoidance of doubt the mode split that has been used to inform the traffic assessment is from the Transport Assessment (TA) and not the target within the draft Travel Plan document.

Item 3. (the assessment in the TA is based on an existing demand at the P&R sites that is lower than might be expected for an established P&R network – As discussed previously there is sufficient capacity at the P&R's (TA Addendum Dec 24,

page 93) which will be increased further in 2030/2031 when the new P&R at Oxford Airport is operational. OCC have undertaken our own exercise on future demand and can confirm there is still sufficient capacity.

Item 4. (Paragraph 3.5) The car parking requirements for the stadium ancillary uses have not been met by the proposed provision – The parking provision for the ancillary uses is in line with the adopted Oxfordshire County Council Parking Standards for New Developments guidance and is considered adequate outside of matchdays. On matchdays on-site parking will be reserved for stadium use only (primarily as disabled bays). With Peartree and Oxford Parkway P&R's which both have sufficient available capacity within walking/cycling distance this approach is considered acceptable.

Item 5. (Paragraphs 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 3.15, 3.16 & 3.17) The closure of Oxford Road before a match for 30 mins is unlikely to capture the majority of supporters arriving on foot and it is considered that the pre-match assessment should be extended to include earlier periods – Mayer Brown have stated that they do not think 5 minutes is sufficient for setting up/taking down the Hostile Vehicle Mitigation. The county council's Network Management team (and TVP) have been consulted on the proposed match day arrangements and considered what is proposed to be acceptable based on their considerable experience with traffic and event management. The road closure is required for the people expected to arrive/leave in the 35 minute period before and after matches, if some fans decide to arrive early/leave later this is likely to reduce the road closure time, not extend it. The new footway/cycleways planned for Frieze Way and Oxford Road are sufficiently wide enough to facilitate a large number of pedestrians. This approach will be monitored and reviewed by all parties when the new stadium is in operation. Further details will be provided via the Crowd & Traffic Management Strategy condition.

Mayer Brown have also questioned the use of the Tottenham stadium as an example in the submitted TA stating that it has *“significantly better public transport infrastructure with multiple rail stations and much larger volumes of bus services.”*. This is noted, however there is no acknowledgement from Mayer Brown of the sustainability benefits of the proposed site that has easy access to multiple P&R's and a train station within a close proximity as well as planned high quality active and public transport routes with frequent bus services. The Mayer Brown TTN does acknowledge the Tottenham stadium is larger than the proposed stadium (four times the size) meaning that local road closures around the Tottenham stadium must be managed differently, i.e. Tottenham have permission to close the roads for longer periods (60 minutes) due the higher footfall of supporters on match days. However, when speaking to Tottenham they confirmed that despite having permission to close High Road for 60 minutes, on average it only requires a 30-minute closure.

The pedestrian modelling for the new stadium shows the requirement for a 35-minute closure with 5 minutes each side for set up/takedown. The methodology for the pedestrian modelling is considered acceptable and OCC has seen no evidence to believe the data provided is not accurate. On this basis, OCC does not believe that extending the modelled period to 60 minutes is required. However, the match

day management of road closures and general traffic management will be monitored and reviewed by all parties when the new stadium is in operation.

Item 6. (Paragraphs 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21 & 3.22) The TA indicates that 74 additional buses for the P&Rs and 8 additional trains will be required to support the stadium proposals but it is unclear whether this significant undertaking is achievable – Oxford Bus Company and Stagecoach have been involved in the Transport Working Group and the workshops which have taken place throughout the application and pre-application process. They have confirmed they are supportive of the scheme and the transport strategy – there will be a private agreement between Oxford United and a bus operator for the match day services and shuttle buses (as there is currently) – these will be monitored and reviewed as part of the Matchday Steering Group in the Section 106 agreement. Financial contributions are sought to further improve existing services and to help bring forward the Cowley Branch Line and Oxford Airport P&R.

Chiltern Railways have now confirmed that sufficient rolling stock is available to cater for the expected demand on the Oxford-London Marylebone line, including the proposed stadium. Oxfordshire County Council have been in discussion with Chiltern Railways throughout the process and have been expecting this announcement for some time, if the announcement had not come before planning committee and planning permission was granted it would have needed to be subject to the increase in rolling stock by DfT.

Item 7. (Paragraphs 3.2, 3.3, 3.23, 3.24, 3.25, 3.26 3.27, 3.28 & 3.29) Junction modelling would be required to understand the local impacts at junctions that are subject to the greatest changes in traffic flows, as a result of the new stadium proposals. - Oxfordshire County Council consider that the junction modelling aspect of the TA has sufficiently been covered within the formal response dated 30th May 2025. The Mayer Brown TTN suggests there will be 43 events per year including women's games which will require a road closure. Women's games are played on Sundays when background traffic is considered to be significantly lower, and the visiting crowds are unlikely to require the road to be closed. There are on average 28 men's home games a season including cup games, on average only 6 of these are weekday evenings when the micro-simulation model shows the biggest impact. Mayer Brown also state that the road closure should be modelled for 60 minutes – this is not supported by evidence or advice and as such the 45 minute period is considered acceptable.

Mayer Brown have stated that local junction modelling should be used alongside micro-simulation modelling (VISSIM). However, this has not been the standard approach in this area, for example the Cherwell Partial Review (PR) sites did not use junction models and only used a micro-simulation model. This is because micro-simulation models are much better at showing the interaction between the junctions and in this area with a number of challenging junctions within close proximity to one another it was considered that a VISSIM model would better show the impact and provide a more robust assessment.

Throughout the development of the transport assessment and strategy OCC, NH, CDC, and their respective consultants have been included within discussions and

key decisions for the proposed stadium. The modelling methodology was requested by OCC with their consultants. Pell Frischmann, OCC's independent consultant, has undertaken a thorough review of the base model and forecast modelling scenarios and where applicable has requested model updates or additional scenarios, which Ridge has undertaken. The outputs have been presented in additional documentation and subsequently approved by OCC and NH.

The VISSIM model provides greater accuracy with regards to the effect of road closures and the interaction of junctions in close proximity. Junction modelling can be a useful tool assessing single junctions but in this area, where there are multiple junctions and signalised crossings all connecting it was deemed more beneficial to be able to assess the impact using micro-simulation modelling that captures the interface and performance of multiple junctions together.

Mayer Brown have stated that queues will be 1.2km long but have not given any context how this is derived. The queue that has been identified is only shown in 1 scenario (Saturday 12:30 kick-off with Parkway), however, examination of the corresponding journey time data shows there is only a 4 minute and 22 second delay across the route which is approximately 8km, an average delay per kilometre of 53 seconds. In that hour period across the whole modelled network there is an average delay per vehicle of 41.1 seconds. Queue lengths are not always considered the best indicator of traffic impact, especially in an area where a number of junctions interact with each other and where there are a large number of signals.

The 1.2km queue which is on Banbury Road northbound, is the longest queue shown within the model but there are also shorter queues shown on the A40 westbound between Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts and on Frieze Way southbound. The queues are only present before matches and last approximately 60 minutes. However, the journey time delays not being significant (generally, although there are localised delays) indicate that these are not static queues (i.e. are rolling queues), this means there is unlikely to be significant blocking of junctions or driveways.

Mayer Brown state that a number of "favourable assumptions" are included in the model to show there will be a higher reduction in background traffic. However, OCC disagree with this statement and feel the assessment is robust. For example, the model does not include the Oxford Airport P&R or the Cowley Branch Line which will further reduce background traffic and the need for supporters to drive to Peartree or Parkway. Several of the junctions are also not modelled using MOVA which they do use in reality meaning they are more efficient at clearing traffic than the model shows. It is therefore considered that the approach used to model the transport impact of the new stadium, including all junctions, is robust and acceptable and that the results show that this proposal is in line with paragraph 116 of the NPPF (and paras 115, 117 and 118).

Other Matters Identified

Core Scenarios (Paragraphs 4.2, 4.3 7 4.4). – Mayer Brown have stated that the traffic impact of the development should be modelled with a 0% reduction in background traffic rather than the 10-15% which has been used in the model.

However, the applicant has presented substantial evidence to demonstrate that there will likely be a higher percentage of background traffic reduction than 10-15%.

Studies done on Variable Messaging Signs (VMS), which will form a large part of the transport strategy, show on average they reduce traffic by approximately 30% by alerting people of road closures/events so they can choose a different route or not travel during that time. OCC's Network Management team have also confirmed that they reduce traffic significantly when managing events and roadworks etc. The monitoring report for the London Olympics shows a reduction in background traffic of 35% and the applicant has provided information on traffic around Reading stadium on match days which shows it is similar to non-matchdays, meaning there is likely to be a significant reduction in background traffic to accommodate match day traffic. This is supported by surveys on the highway network near the existing Oxford United stadium which show traffic levels similar on match days to non-match days. It should also be noted that once the Oxford Airport P&R, East West Rail and the Cowley Branch Line come forward (all between 2030-2032) background traffic and supporter traffic is likely to see a further reduction. As such it is considered that the 10-15% is robust and is in line with a vision-led approach. As such it is considered that this is acceptable.

Modelling Sources (Paragraphs 4.5 & 4.6)– No response required. This was the information we received from Tottenham and when looking through the Tottenham Stadium planning application documents online it does not appear that any micro-simulation modelling has been undertaken or that their road closures have been modelled, however, it does appear that 2 junctions were modelled separately. Regardless of this, whether Tottenham Stadium was modelled or not does not impact the modelling or the assessment for the proposed site.

Toucan Crossing – Loop Farm Roundabout (Paragraphs 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 & 4.10) – This crossing is included within the model. It was also included in the A44 Corridor Scheme model but the crossing was removed from the scheme at that time for value engineering reasons.

Other Matters raised by Kidlington Parish Council

Highway works and other measures requiring land dedication – all highway works are within the public highway land and will not require any dedication from third party landowners. The exception to this is part of the land required for the steps between Oxford Road and Oxford Parkway which is owned by Chiltern Railways which will be dedicated as public highway land by legal agreement.

Officer's Name: Will Madgwick

Officer's Title: Technical Lead

Date: 11 August 2025
