From: Laura Bell
To: DC Support
Subject: FW: 22836 RE: 5018932 - Oxford United FC - New Stadium Development - Planning Ref: 24/00539/F
Date: 19 June 2024 10:14:31
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png
image007.png
image008.png
image009.png
image010.png
image011.png
image012.png

For logging in DEF as a consultation response from National Highways please, received 12/6/24

From: Patrick Blake <Patrick.Blake@nationalhighways.co.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 5:04 PM
To: Dave Cope <davecope@ridge.co.uk>
Cc: Sarah Matthews <sarahmatthews@ridge.co.uk>; Paul Robertson <paulrobertson@ridge.co.uk>; Tom Ravenhall <tomravenhall@ridge.co.uk>; Giles Brockbank <GBrockbank@ridge.co.uk>; Planning SE <planningse@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Beata Ginn <Beata.Ginn@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Doyle, Simon/LON <Simon.Doyle@jacobs.com>; Colclough, Joseph <Joseph.Colclough@jacobs.com>; Laura Bell <Laura.Bell@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Beata Ginn <Beata.Ginn@nationalhighways.co.uk>
Subject: RE: 22836 RE: 5018932 - Oxford United FC - New Stadium Development - Planning Ref: 24/00539/F

Dear Dave

Please see below our further review of available information:

Table 1: JSJV's Review of *'Oxford United Football Club – New Stadium Development, Transport Assessment'* (February 2024), *'Oxford United Football Club – New Stadium Development, Match Day Interim Travel Plan'* (February 2024), *'Oxford United Football Club – New Stadium Development, Non-Match Day Interim Travel Plan'* (February 2024) & *'Oxford United Football Club – New Stadium Development, Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan'* (February 2024)

Section			Text (*in italics*) or Matter in View	Comments & Questions
OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB – NEW STADIUM DEVELOPMENT, Transport Assessment, February 2024				
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	Development Proposals		*The Stadium has capacity to host events for up to 1,000 attendees and initial projections anticipate that there will be approximately 85 events with an average of 150 people, and 68 large events with an average number of 700 people, including Christmas parties.*	A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
	Development Proposals	Table 2	*Site Land Use*	Conferencing facilities for up to 1,000 attendees not explicitly listed.
	Assessment	Description of scenarios		The description of the scenarios appears to be sufficiently comprehensive.
				The Executive Summary and paragraph 5.14 define a *'Major Event Weekday event'* as *'up to 700 attendees'* while paragraph 7.1.4 defines a *'Major Event Weekday event'* as *'up to 1000 attendees'*. Tables 8.3 to 8.6 assume 700 attendees. Table 8.1 lists *'Capacity for 1,000 attendees'*. A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
		Table 3	*Weekday Person and Vehicle Trips to Stadium and Oxford Parkway – D&P Scenario 2 and 3*	Why is there no vehicle trip generation for an event day?
		Tables 3 and 4	Person and vehicle trip amounts	The expected number of vehicle trips in a number of cases appear either very high or very low relative to the total number of person trips. JSJV was not able to replicate the person trip generation calculations and therefore was not able to undertake basic checks of the vehicle generation associated with them.
	Transport Modelling		*Transport modelling will be undertaken and will be submitted via an Addendum Report. OCC has advised via pre application discussions that the North Oxford VISSIM Model is required to be used to assess the impact of the stadium during operation, rather than junction modelling that had initially been carried out.*	NH has responded on the proposed modelling methodology separately. NH is still to fully understand how forecast background demands were generated for the North Oxford VISSIM Model.
			Access to the model was approved on 7th February 2024 by the six parties who have funded the 2031 model. Once access is granted, model development and scenario testing will be agreed with OCC with results submitted via addendum to this document.	
3 PROPOSALS	3.7 Proposed Development at the Triangle	Paragraph 3.7.5	*Outside of football matches, it is proposed that the stadium will be utilised for a wide range of activities including conferences, meetings, trade shows, corporate events, and dinners. Over the course of a year, it is anticipated that around 580 events will be hosted. These will be of differing scales, with the majority being smaller events with an average attendance of 10 or 30 people. The Stadium has capacity to host events for up to 1,000 attendees and initial projections anticipate that there will be approximately 85 events with an average of 150 people, and 68 large events with an average number of 700 people, including Christmas parties.*	A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
5 TRAFFIC SURVEYS	5.14 Assessment Periods	Paragraph 5.14.1	• *2026 Major Event Weekday event – up to 700 attendees*	The Executive Summary defines a *'Major Event Weekday event'* as *'up to 700 attendees'* while paragraph 7.1.4 defines a *'Major Event Weekday event'* as *'up to 1000 attendees'*. Tables 8.3 to 8.6 assume 700 attendees. Table 8.1 lists *'Capacity for 1,000 attendees'*. A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
6 TRANSPORT STRATEGY	6.3 Pre and Post Match Traffic Management	Paragraph 6.3.1	*It is expected that traffic management will be required for safety reasons. Traffic will be diverted via Frieze Way (a dual carriageway) for at least 30 minutes to enable the supporters to safely arrive and leave the stadium via Oxford Road to reach the transport interchange at Oxford Parkway.*	When would the 30mins occur relative kick-off or pre-game/pre-event build-up?
7 ASSESSMENT – OVERVIEW	7.1 Decide & Provide and 7.2 Vehicle Trip Generation (D&P Scenario 2 and 3)	Paragraphs 7.1.1 to 7.1.3	Description of scenarios	The description of the scenarios appears to be sufficiently comprehensive.
		Paragraph 7.1.4	• *Major Event Weekday event – up to 1000 attendees*	The Executive Summary and paragraph 5.14 define a *'Major Event Weekday event'* as *'up to 700 attendees'*. Tables 8.3 to 8.6 assume 700 attendees. Table 8.1 lists *'Capacity for 1,000 attendees'*. A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
		Table 7.1	*Total Weekday Person Trips – D&P Scenario 2 and 3*	When do the *'Weekday Stadium Staff'* arrive at and depart from the site?
		Table 7.3	*Total Weekday Vehicle Trips to Stadium and Oxford Parkway – D&P Scenario 2 and 3*	When do the *'Weekday Stadium Staff'* arrive at and depart from the site?
				Are there *'Match Day Weekday Ancillary'* trips missing from the AM (08:00–09:00) and PM (17:00–18:00) hours?
		Tables 7.1 and 7.3	Weekday Stadium Staff car mode share and car occupancy	100% of *'Weekday Stadium Staff'* arrive by car with one person per car.
		Tables 7.2 to 7.4	Total trip generation	The weekday peak hour vehicle trip generations for ancillary uses and stadium staff are significant in themselves.
		Tables 7.2 and 7.4	Saturday Stadium Staff mode share	Both tables indicate that 100% of *'Weekday Stadium Staff'* arrive by car with one person per car. However, 122 *'Weekday Stadium Staff'* depart in the PM (14:00–15:00) hour with no vehicle departures.
			Saturday Ancillary Uses person and vehicle trip generation	More vehicles depart the site than persons in the case of *'Saturday Ancillary Uses'* in the AM (11:00–12:00) and PM (14:00–15:00) hours.
			Saturday Ancillary Uses missing trips	Are there *'Saturday Ancillary Uses'* trips missing from the AM (11:00-12:00) hour in Tables 7.2 and 7.4?
			Saturday Ancillary Uses vehicle trip generation	There are 104 and 109 *'Saturday Ancillary Uses'* person trip arrivals and departures in the PM (17:00–18:00) hour in Table 7.2 but no vehicle arrivals and departures in Table 7.4.
		Table 7.4	*Total Saturday Vehicle Trips to Stadium and Oxford Parkway – D&P Scenario 2 and 3*	The *'Saturday Match Day D&P Scenario 2'* totals appear to include the *'Saturday Match Day Supporters D&P Scenario 3'* trip generation.
8 ASSESSMENT – NON SUPPORTER TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION AND MODE SHARE	8.1 Ancillary Uses	Table 8.1	*Proposed Land Use (non-match day)*	A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
	8.2 Trip Rates	Table 8.3	*Weekday People Trips – TRICS Trip Rate per Use*	With two exceptions the trip rates appear plausible. The exceptions are:

				1. Is it reasonable to assume that a restaurant and a sports bar would have identical trip generation characters? 2. A decision needs to be taken concerning the event size to be assessed – 700 or 1,000 attendees. Unless otherwise justified (i.e. 1,000 attendee events will be rare or will have trip generations that are spread over more than the AM and PM peak hours) the 'worst case' of 1,000 should be assumed.
		Table 8.4	*Weekday Match Day People TRICS Trip Rate per Use*	The 21:00–22:00 appears to be a mistake. Tables 3, 7.1 and 7.3 have 21:30–22:30.
				Expected the time periods to have reflected Tables 4, 7.2 and 7.4 (i.e. 0800–0900, 1100–1200, 1400–1500 and 1700–1800).
				With one exception the trip rates appear plausible. The exception is: Is it reasonable to assume that a restaurant and a sports bar would have identical trip generation characters?
		Table 8.5	*Standard Saturday People TRICS Trip Rate per Use*	The times in the table do not appear to be correct. Tables 4, 7.2 and 7.4 have 11:00–12:00 and 14:00–15:00.
				Expected the time periods to have reflected Tables 4, 7.2 and 7.4 (i.e. 0800–0900, 1100–1200, 1400–1500 and 1700–1800).
				With one exception the trip rates appear plausible. The exception is: • Is it reasonable to assume that a restaurant and a sports bar would have identical trip generation characters?
		Table 8.6	*Match Day People TRICS Trip Rate per Use*	To avoid confusion should 'Saturday' be added to the table title?
				The times in the table do not appear to be correct. Tables 4, 7.2 and 7.4 have 11:00–12:00 and 14:00–15:00.
				With one exception the trip rates appear plausible. The exception is: Is it reasonable to assume that a restaurant and a sports bar would have identical trip generation characters?
	8.3 Multi-Modal Trip Generation	Paragraph 8.3.1	*A local mode share has been determined using the 2011 Census travel to work data …*	The use of 2011 Census data rather than 2021 Census data makes sense given the obvious impact of COVID on 2021 Census data (i.e. 32% 'Work mainly at or from home').
		Paragraph 8.3.3	*It was also identified that the walking mode share also seemed quite high, this was adjusted to 9% based upon Oxford 001 2021 data TS06: Method used to Travel to Work.*	Independent review of the 2011 WU03EW dataset suggests that the *'Bus, Minibus or Coach'* and *'On foot'* mode shares (under *'MODE SHARE %'*) may have been inadvertently switched, suggesting in turn that the mode share for *'Bus, Minibus or Coach'* (under *'ADJUSTED MODE SHARE %'*) is too low. The *'Bicycle'* and *'On foot'* appear high given the specific nature of the proposed development (i.e. not regular local employment in nature).
		Table 8.7	*Local Adjusted Mode Share*	
				With the exception of conference attendees, which deserve bespoke mode split assumptions, the vehicle-based proportions (affecting the SRN) appear reasonable.
		Table 8.8	*Standard Weekday Ancillary Users – People Trips*	What does the asterisk in *'Hotel (Major event)*'* mean?
		Tables 8.8 to 8.11	People Trip Generation	JSJV was not able to replicate the trip generation shown in these tables using the trip rates of Tables 8.3 to 8.6. The applicant's transport consultant should be asked to supply the working spreadsheets.
	8.4 Trip Generation – People Trips	Paragraph 8.4.2	*The stadium staff have been forecast based upon a first principles approach from the workforce predictions outlined in the Socio-Economic Assessment. Table 7.12 summarises the numbers of stadium staff for each scenario.*	Typo: *'Table 7.12'* should be *'Table 8.12'*.
		Paragraph 8.4.4	*It is assumed that general and operational staff arrive 08:00-09:00 and leave 17:00–18:00, as a worst case. Match Day staff will arrive prior to the supporters arriving and after they leave. This is set out in Table 7.13 to Table 7.16.*	Typos: *'Table 7.13 to Table 7.16'* should be *'Table 8.13 to Table 8.16'*.
	8.5 Trip Generation – Vehicle Trips (D&P Scenario 2)	Tables 8.17 to 8.20	Vehicle trip generation	No attempt made to check/replicate Tables 8.17 and following given inability to replicate Tables 8.3 to 8.6.
	8.6 Major Event Trip Generation and 8.8 Major Event Travel	Major events		Identical text.
	8.7 Trip Distribution	Paragraph 8.7.1	*Trip Distribution for work trips has been obtained from the 2011 Census data. Data for all residents aged 16 and over in employment was obtained for place of work as Middle Layer Super Output Area (MSOA) level (E0200590938: Cherwell 018) where the site is travelling from all 2011 MSOAs in Cherwell and surrounding counties. The percentage travelling from each area has been distributed to the potential highway network depending on the access to the Stadium, Oxford Parkway Station and Park and Ride are as shown in Appendix I.*	This suggests Major Event trip generation respects work trip distributions. JSJV is not convinced this is a reasonable assumption.
9 ASSESSMENT - SUPPORTER TRAVEL TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION AND MODE SHARE	Trip Distribution	Paragraph 9.1.5	*The data indicated five major areas which supporters travel from:* *a) Bicester Corridor* *b) The Thame area* *c) Abingdon and Didcot* *d) Witney and* *e) Southeast Oxford*	What are the trip proportions associated with the five major areas which supporters travel from and how many trips would be expected to use the different portions of the SRN to approach and depart the stadium?
	9.2 Mode Share	Paragraph 9.2.4	*It was assumed that supporters living further than a 2-hour drive from the Stadium would be unlikely to travel on the day of the match. TravelTime API (a GIS plug in allowing isochrones to be generated using live travel time data) has been used to determine a 2-hour drive time from the site. Figure 9.2 shows the area which has been used to calculate the mode share presented in the following section.*	What is the justification for this assumption given weekday and weekend match times?
	9.3 Home Supporter Travel	Table 9.2	*Home Supporter Mode Share and Vehicle Requirement (D&P Scenario 2 and 3)*	A *'MODE SHARE %'* of 5% for *'Public Bus'* appears low.
				A *'MODE SHARE %'* of 4% for *'Total Supporter Coach'* also appears low. In so far as it informs coach parking requirements its reasonableness/robustness needs to be demonstrated.
	9.4 Away Supporter Travel	Table 9.4	*Away Supporter Mode Share and Vehicle Requirement (D&P Scenario 3)*	The *'MODE SHARE %'* for *'Total Park and Ride'* of 31% and *'Total Rail'* of 47% appear to be reasonable.
	9.5 Home and Away Park and Ride Use	Tables 9.5 to 9.8	Forecast P&R Use	OCC's view on the assumptions in these tables ought to be sought.
	9.8 Bus and Private Coach Patronage	Forecast bus and private coach patronage		See comments concerning *'MODE SHARE %'* for *'Public Bus'* above.
	9.9 Arrival and Departure Profiles of Supporters	Paragraph 9.9.1 and Table 9.11	*The profile of supporter arrivals at and departures from the stadium within the hour of a match, has been based on research carried out at other football stadiums in the UK. This is presented in Table 9.11.*	Four of the six examples have stadiums significantly bigger than 16,000. Is there not historic information available for OUFC to add to the 'picture' presented in Table 9.11?
		Table 9.12	*Arrival and Departure Research*	Both the target and worst-case arrival and departure profiles in Table 9.12 appear high. Is it worth distinguishing between home and away fans (as shown for Aston Villa in Table 9.11)?
10 MULTI-MODAL ASSIGNMENT	10.1 Overview	Paragraph 10.1.3	*Transport modelling will be undertaken and will be submitted via an Addendum Report. OCC has advised via pre application discussions that the North Oxford VISSIM Model is required to be used to assess the impact of the stadium during operation, rather than junction modelling that had initially been carried out.*	NH has responded on the proposed modelling methodology separately.
		Paragraph 10.1.4	*Access to the model was approved on 7th February 2024 by the six parties who have funded the 2031 model. Once access is granted, model development and scenario testing will be agreed with OCC with results submitted via addendum to this document.*	
	10.2 Link Impact Assessment, Traffic Distribution Methodology	Table 10.1	*Traffic Distribution*	The road sections for which potential stadium impacts were estimated reflect a tight analysis area. NH will want to see development flow estimates for M40 J9 and M40 J8 in addition to the A34 Peartree IC.
	10.2 Link Impact Assessment, Link Impact Assessment	Paragraph 10.2.12	*These traffic flows have been combined to calculate the traffic flow for with development as shown in Table 10.3 and without development traffic in Table 10.4, the differences are shown in Table 10.5 and reassignment with Oxford Road Under Traffic Management presented in Figure 10.1.*	Traffic flows without and with development are shown in Tables 10.3 and 10.4 rather than as stated in paragraph 10.2.12.
		Table 10.3 to 10.5	Traffic flow forecasts	Please provide a map or a figure indicating where the site locations are. Should *'9 Elsfield Road'* not be *'9 A40 North Way'*? Further, where is *'15 A44 Woodstock Road (N)'*? The Saturday 2026 Baseline Flows are relatively high.
				Development impacts for a standard weekday (with conference-related traffic generation) should also be estimated.

				A number of the flow changes are substantial (expected). More significant, a number of flow changes are unexpectedly low – i.e. at sites 9 (if site 9 is *'A40 North Way (E)'* rather than *'Elsfield Way'*), 10, 13 & 14.
	10.4 Summary	Paragraph 10.4.5	*Transport modelling will be undertaken and will be submitted via an Addendum Report. OCC has advised via pre application discussions that the North Oxford VISSIM Model is required to be used to assess the impact of the stadium during operation, rather than junction modelling that had initially been carried out.*	NH has responded on the proposed modelling methodology separately. See also comment on paragraph 10.1.3 above.
11 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	11.1 Background	Paragraph 11.1.1	*Ridge and Partners LLP has been appointed by OUFC to provide transport advice in support of their proposal to develop a new stadium development at 'Land to the east of Stratfield Brake and west of Oxford Parkway Station, known as 'The Triangle' ('the Site'). The capacity of the stadium on match days is 16,000 people and will also include flexible commercial and community facilities for conferences, exhibitions, education and other events. In addition, ancillary community facilities are proposed to support the stadium including a club shop, public restaurant, café/bar, health and wellbeing facility/clinic, gym, and a 180-bed hotel.*	Despite paragraph 11.3.4, as many as 1,000 attendees at the conferences, exhibitions, education and other events deserves mention, even in brackets, given the impact of attendee arrivals and departures on normal AM and PM weekday traffic peaks.
	11.10 Assessment – Multi-Modal Assignment, Link Impact Assessment	Paragraph 11.10.4	*A percentage impact assessment has been undertaken to inform the selection of time periods for junction testing, including:* *• Major Event Weekday event – up to 1000 attendees* *o 08:00–09:00 (network peak hour)* *o 17:00–18:00 (network peak hour)*	The weekday AM peak hour (08:00–09:00) does not appear in Tables 10.2 to 10.5.
	11.10 Assessment – Multi-Modal Assignment, Transport Modelling	Paragraph 11.10.5	*Transport modelling will be undertaken and will be submitted via an Addendum Report. Pre-application discussions with OCC has advised that the North Oxford VISSIM Model is required to be used to assess the impact of the stadium during operation, rather than junction modelling that had initially been carried out.*	NH has responded on the proposed modelling methodology separately. See also comment concerning paragraph 10.1.3 above.
		Paragraph 11.10.6	*Access to the model was approved on 7th February 2024 by the six parties who have funded the 2031 model. Once access is granted, the model developments and scenario testing will be agreed with OCC with results submitted via addendum to this document.*	
General			Trip generation estimates.	Given the complexity of the trip generation assumptions and calculations, JSJV proposes a sense check approach to the vehicle generation of large conference (up to 1,000 attendees) and full stadium events (16,000 people) on the site until working spreadsheets are received. Fully understanding the North Oxford VISSIM Model forecast reference case assumptions is more important than understanding the trip generation calculations. The current mode split in favour of car trips currently appears to represent a worst case situation.
			Match-related Traffic Management	There is not much that can be said concerning Traffic Management proposals at this stage apart from noting that the closure of the section of Oxford Road adjacent the proposed stadium and Oxford Parkway Station would appear to be a practical necessity (something the OCC Member for Kidlington South appears to oppose). However, the real impact of the proposed closure and match-related traffic generation will only be known once model outputs become available.
OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB – NEW STADIUM DEVELOPMENT, MATCH DAY INTERIM TRAVEL PLAN, February 2024				
4. TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS – MATCH DAY SUPPORTERS	4.3. Baseline Match Day Staff Travel Patterns	Table 6	*Match Day Staff Mode Share*	Independent review of the 2011 WU03EW journey to work dataset suggests that the *'Bus, Minibus or Coach'* and *'On foot'* mode shares (under *'MODE SHARE %'*) in Table 8.7 of the TA may have been inadvertently switched in the applicant's consultant's analysis, suggesting in turn that the *'ADJUSTED MODE SHARE %'* in the same table (i.e. Table 8.7 of the TA) and the *'MODE SHARE %'* in this table (i.e. Table 6 of the Match Day Interim Travel Plan) for *'Bus, Minibus or Coach'* is too low. The *'Bicycle'* and *'On foot'* appear high given the specific nature of the proposed development (i.e. not regular local employment in nature).
APPENDIX B – 2022 SUPPORTERS SURVEY RESULTS	OUFC Stadium Supporter Survey - 20Jul22	*What is the primary mode of transport you currently use to travel to the Kassam Stadium on matchdays? (Select all applicable options)*		Modal combinations might have been a better way to present this data.
		How do you think you would you travel to Stratfield Brake on matchdays in the proposal was to proceed?		Total of 38% by Car and Park and Ride is significantly lower than the 52% in Table 9.2 of the TA (i.e. the TA assumptions appear to be a vehicle generation worst case.
OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB – NEW STADIUM DEVELOPMENT, NON-MATCH DAY INTERIM TRAVEL PLAN, February 2024				
2. BACKGROUND	2.1. Background Information	Table 1	*Proposed land use schedule*	Conferencing/hospitality facilities for up to 1,000 attendees not explicitly listed. Despite paragraphs 2.1.5, 4.1.1, 4.3.1, 4.3.3 and 6.1.4, conferencing/hospitality events for as many as 1,000 attendees ought to be listed.
		Table 2	*Travel Plan Requirements According to OCC thresholds*	
OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB – NEW STADIUM DEVELOPMENT, FRAMEWORK CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN, February 2024				
General			Contents	With just two exceptions, the normal contents of a CTMP are present. The two exceptions are: • Drawings showing and text describing the area(s) that will be set aside for the parking and turning of vehicles of site operatives and visitors on site, the loading and unloading of plant and materials, and for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development. • The contact details of the company and personnel responsible for the construction works. Such details will be required in the final version of a CTMP.
			Proximity to SRN and Water Eaton Bridge	Proximity to the SRN and Water Eaton Bridge requires the development of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to fully manage the potential adverse impacts of construction on the SRN.

Kind Regards

Patrick

Patrick Blake, Area 3 Spatial Planner
National Highways | Bridge House | 1 Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | Surrey | GU1 4LZ
Tel: +44 (0) 300 4701043 | **Mobile**: + 44 (0) 7825 024024
Web: http://www.highways.gov.uk
GTN: 0300 470 1043

From: Patrick Blake
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2024 4:49 PM
To: 'Dave Cope' <davecope@ridge.co.uk>
Cc: Sarah Matthews <sarahmatthews@ridge.co.uk>; Paul Robertson <paulrobertson@ridge.co.uk>; Tom Ravenhall <tomravenhall@ridge.co.uk>; Giles Brockbank <GBrockbank@ridge.co.uk>; Planning SE <planningse@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Beata Ginn <Beata.Ginn@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Doyle, Simon/LON <Simon.Doyle@jacobs.com>; Colclough, Joseph <Joseph.Colclough@jacobs.com>
Subject: 22836 RE: 5018932 - Oxford United FC - New Stadium Development - Planning Ref: 24/00539/F

Dear Dave

We have reviewed the updated modelling methodology. Please see below:

Area	Section	Paragraph, Table or Figure	Relevant Text	Item	NH Response
Proposed Scenarios	2	2.1.5	*A link impact assessment will be undertaken to provide evidence of the worst impacted time period. The length of closure will need to be agreed with* [the] *safety board and with OCC and NH, so that the model reflects the agreed diversion duration.*	1	This is acceptable if there is an understanding that different stakeholders (especially, the LHAs associated with the road networks affected by the proposed development) might have different interests dictating different time periods.
		2.1.6	*A complete list of all recommended scenarios is provided in Table 2.1. This shows that if all scenarios are required, including scenarios with and without traffic management along Oxford Road for all scenarios, a total of 64 scenarios could be created, including the requirement to create, validate and agree 8 base models and reference case scenarios.*	2	Review of Table 2.1 and paragraphs 5.1, 5.2, 5.3.1, 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 suggests the development of 14 rather than 12 VISSIM models and a different distribution of LinSig models across the seven bulleted categories. Our count is:
		2.1.7	*It is recommended that the following number of models and model types are developed, equating to a total of 12 VISSIM scenarios (of the cordoned VISSIM model) and 36 LinSig model scenarios (per junction):* *• 3 VISSIM and 2 LinSig Base Models* *• 3 VISSIM and 2 LinSig Reference Case models* *• 6 VISSIM and 6 LinSig 2031 16,000 Attendee scenario models* *• 6 LinSig 2031 12,500 Attendee scenario models* *• 6 LinSig 2031 10,500 Attendee scenario models* *• 12 LinSig 2031 6,500 Attendee scenario models*	3	• 3 VISSIM and 3 LinSig Base Models • 3 VISSIM and 3 LinSig Reference Case models • 6 VISSIM and 6 LinSig 2031 16,000 Attendee scenario models • 6 LinSig 2031 12,500 Attendee scenario models • 6 LinSig 2031 10,500 Attendee scenario models • 12 LinSig 2031 6,500 Attendee scenario models • 2 VISSIM Weekday Conference scenario models Irrespective of the actual model count, the applicant is advised to make sure that sufficient models are budgeted for to cover all proposed scenarios.

			• *2 LinSig Weekday Conference scenario models*		
		Table 2.1	*NA*	4	An additional column representing the '2018 BASE YEAR' models should be added to Table 2.1 for clarity.
				5	What junctions or extent of highway network will the LinSig models cover?
VISSIM modelling	4	4.1.3 & Figure 4.1	*The highway network will be amended, this will include the cordoning of the existing network to the extents shown in Figure 4.1.*	6	The model cordoning (and extension) proposal appears reasonable. However, the amounts of traffic not loading onto the VISSIM network should be monitored and tracked if queue lengths exceed available highway queue storage.
		4.1.6	*Further updates to the network will be made for the forecast scenarios, to include any further highway mitigation measures that have been completed or are expected to be completed up to 2031, access points associated with the PR sites in the modelled area, and network associated with OUFC, such as the car park access and egress and further highway proposals along Oxford Road.*	7	The sustainable transport measures proposed for the north of Oxford should be mentioned as part of the 2031 Reference Case to avoid confusion.
2031 Reference Case scenarios	5	Table 5.3	*Average Tuesday 2031 Reference Case - AM Peak 07:00 to 10:00 (Standard Day)* *DEVELOPED BY SLR, NO CHANGE PROPOSED*	8	NH assumes that these scenarios will include the sustainable transport measures and associated traffic demand changes proposed for the north of Oxford. Is this assumption correct?
			Average Tuesday 2031 Reference Case - PM Peak 15:00 to 18:00 (Standard Day) *DEVELOPED BY SLR, NO CHANGE PROPOSED*	9	
Saturday models		5.3.5	*A review of the TRICS database has been undertaken and identified that there are four 7 day surveys undertaken in 2019 that could be used to calculate a weekday to weekend factor, which would then be applied to the trip generation for all PR sites and other committed development included within the current AM and PM peak periods.*	10	This appears to be a reasonable approach.

I hope this helps and we welcome further engagement as the proposal develops. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Patrick Blake, Area 3 Spatial Planner
National Highways | Bridge House | 1 Walnut Tree Close | Guildford | Surrey | GU1 4LZ
Tel: +44 (0) 300 4701043 | **Mobile**: + 44 (0) 7825 024024
Web: http://www.highways.gov.uk
GTN: 0300 470 1043

From: Dave Cope <davecope@ridge.co.uk>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 11:47 AM
To: Planning EE <planningEE@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Planning SE <planningSE@nationalhighways.co.uk>
Cc: Patrick Blake <patrick.blake@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Sarah Matthews <sarahmatthews@ridge.co.uk>; Paul Robertson <paulrobertson@ridge.co.uk>; Tom Ravenhall <tomravenhall@ridge.co.uk>; Giles Brockbank <GBrockbank@ridge.co.uk>
Subject: RE: 5018932 - Oxford United FC - New Stadium Development - Planning Ref: 24/00539/F

To whom this may concern,

In light of comments made by OCC please find attached a slightly updated modelling methodology.

Note the key changes include additional scenarios to be assessed within VISSIM, as well as using the existing 2018 dynamic assignment base model for the AM and PM weekday peak period as used by the PR sites for the assessment of the ancillary uses proposed at the new stadium; but using fixed routing for the other scenarios associated with matches when traffic management along Oxford Road is proposed.

Please respond with any comments as soon as possible.

Regards,

Dave Cope
Associate
Ridge and Partners LLP
07823 600229
davecope@ridge.co.uk

From: Dave Cope
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2024 4:14 PM
To: 'planningEE@nationalhighways.co.uk' <planningEE@nationalhighways.co.uk>; 'planningSE@nationalhighways.co.uk' <planningSE@nationalhighways.co.uk>
Cc: 'patrick.blake@nationalhighways.co.uk' <patrick.blake@nationalhighways.co.uk>; Sarah Matthews <sarahmatthews@ridge.co.uk>; Paul Robertson <paulrobertson@ridge.co.uk>; Tom Ravenhall <tomravenhall@ridge.co.uk>; Giles Brockbank <GBrockbank@ridge.co.uk>
Subject: 5018932 - Oxford United FC - New Stadium Development - Planning Ref: 24/00539/F

Regarding the Planning Application of Oxford United Football Stadium – Planning Application Reference: 24/00539/F.

Please find attached our transport modelling scoping report to support the application above. This has been developed from comments from Oxfordshire County Council officers, we are still awaiting access to the North Oxford VISSIM model so there may be elements that may need to be updated.

Please respond with any comments as soon as possible.

Kind Regards,

Dave Cope
Associate
Ridge and Partners LLP
07823 600229
davecope@ridge.co.uk