

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 24/00539/F

Proposal: Erection of a stadium (Use Class F2) with flexible commercial and community facilities and uses including for conferences, exhibitions, education, and other events, club shop, public restaurant, bar, health and wellbeing facility/clinic, and gym (Use Class E/Sui Generis), hotel (Use Class C1), external concourse/fan-zone, car and cycle parking, access and highway works, utilities, public realm, landscaping and all associated and ancillary works and structures

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

Response Date: 8th May 2024

This report sets out the officer views of Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) on the above proposal. These are set out by individual service area/technical discipline and include details of any planning conditions or Informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement. Where considered appropriate, an overarching strategic commentary is also included. If the local County Council member has provided comments on the application these are provided as a separate attachment.

Assessment Criteria

Proposal overview and mix /population generation

OCC's response is based on a development as set out in the table below. The development is taken from the application form.

Commercial – use class	m²
F2	16,306
C1	6,616
Other	2,313
E (a)	315

Application no: 24/00539/F

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

General Information and Advice

Recommendations for approval contrary to OCC objection:

If within this response an OCC officer has raised an objection but the Local Planning Authority are still minded to recommend approval, OCC would be grateful for notification (via planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk) as to why material consideration outweighs OCC's objections, and to be given an opportunity to make further representations.

Outline applications and contributions

The anticipated number and type of dwellings and/or the floor space may be set by the developer at the time of application which is used to assess necessary mitigation. If not stated in the application, a policy compliant mix will be used. The number and type of dwellings used when assessing S106 planning obligations is set out on the first page of this response.

In the case of outline applications, once the unit mix/floor space is confirmed by reserved matters approval/discharge of condition a matrix (if appropriate) will be applied to establish any increase in contributions payable. A further increase in contributions may result if there is a reserved matters approval changing the unit mix/floor space.

Where a S106/Planning Obligation is required:

- **Index Linked** – in order to maintain the real value of S106 contributions, contributions will be index linked. Base values and the index to be applied are set out in the Schedules to this response.
- **Administration and Monitoring Fee - TBC**
This is an estimate of the amount required to cover the monitoring and administration associated with the S106 agreement. The final amount will be based on the OCC's scale of fees and will be adjusted to take account of the number of obligations and the complexity of the S106 agreement.
- **OCC Legal Fees** The applicant will be required to pay OCC's legal fees in relation to legal agreements. Please note the fees apply whether a S106 agreement is completed or not.

Security of payment for deferred contributions - Applicants should be aware that an approved bond will be required to secure a payment where a S106 contribution is to be paid post implementation and

- the contribution amounts to 25% or more (including anticipated indexation) of the cost of the project it is towards and that project cost £7.5m or more
- the developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure costing £7.5m or more
- where aggregate contributions towards bus services exceeds £1m (including anticipated indexation).

A bond will also be required where a developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure.

The County Infrastructure Funding Team can provide the full policy and advice, on request.

Application no: 24/00539/F

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

Strategic Comments

The use of micro-simulation modelling to allow a better understanding of how the local highway network would operate with the proposed stadium and associated facilities was requested by OCC and is supported. The Transport Development Management comments below are in response to the transport modelling scoping note submitted by the applicant. The scoping note proposes how the additional modelling (that will be used to inform an updated Transport Assessment) will be undertaken.

Officer's Name: David Flavin

Officer's Title: Principal Planner

Date: 08/05/2024

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:

Oxfordshire County Council acting as the Local Highway Authority have the following comments to make regarding the 'North Oxford VISSIM Model Scoping' note. These comments should be considered alongside National Highways' comments who are responsible for the Strategic Road Network (including A34) and may have additional requirements for modelling.

Need for VISSIM modelling

Further narrative around the specific impacts to be assessed would be helpful to provide context to the modelling approach. These impacts include:

- **A34 impacts** - with the assessment considering the different times when the A34 would be most impacted including:
 - **Saturday match days** – maximum attendance (16,000 attendees)
 - **Weekday AM peak** – with conference facilities and hotel operating at maximum capacity.
- **Diversion impacts** – before and after the match with temporary road closure including impacts on:
 - journey times of public buses
 - shuttle buses serving OUFC
 - general traffic
 - local residential roads and junctions (including identifying any exit blocking instances for key junctions)

Residual impacts between opening of the closure after arrivals and the second closure for departures should be considered. Detailed understanding of closure duration is key.

Model Version

VISSIM v10 was used to validate the original base model and should be used for this assessment given that later versions of the model can change the results.

Model extents

The extent of the model is required to increase beyond the network indicated in Figure 4.1 to include the following key locations:

- West along the A40 to include Cassington lights.
- North along the A44 to Langford Lane, with Langford Lane included as a connector between A44 and A4260 to allow for traffic reassignment to A44.
- East on the A40 northern bypass to include Marston Interchange.
- South on Woodstock and Banbury Roads down to the junction with Marston Ferry Road.

If queues extend beyond the network, vehicles not loading into the network will need to be reviewed.

Whilst vehicles can be assigned within this 'cordoned' area, it is recommended that the original network extents are retained so that the routes of buses can remain (and thus journey times be adequately simulated). This approach should also make coding easier given that there will be no need to remove parts of the network nor change bus routes.

Bus operations including the proposed two stops by the stadium should be modelled in detail including suitably applied dwell times to reflect loading and unloading of fully occupied vehicles.

Journey Time Routes

The proposed journey time routes (Figure 6.1) should be modified to reflect the final agreed network extents.

It should also be noted that the TAG criteria of 15% only and not one minute should be applied; the latter is only applicable for routes over 3km in length.

Base Model assumptions and background

- Table 3.1 does not reference that the Existing 2018 Base Model is a weekday model. The applicant will need to set out the process for development of a weekend model.
- The updated 2023 base model must include network changes since 2018 (ref. para 4.1.4) and be representative of the current highway and public transport network.
- Recent traffic counts for Langford Lane and the A44 south of Langford Lane should be included (Figure 4.2).
- Para 6.1.2 proposes that: '*Journey time data will be extracted from TravelTime API for the same day as the MCTC surveys were undertaken.*' TravelTime API's website suggests that their data does not use 'live' historic traffic data but uses its own proprietary model for predicting and calculating drive times. The applicant should clarify how journey time data will be extracted specifically for the day of the MCTC surveys from TravelTime API.
- The growth assumptions need to be reviewed to ensure they are appropriate for a weekend and weekday. Analysis of historic data regarding traffic growth specifically on

Saturdays should be reviewed and considered alongside the location of future development to justify growth factors used.

Assignment Method

Whilst it is agreed that static assignment is required to model temporary road closures within a wider time period, there are different ways that static assignment can be applied as follows:

- Full Origin-Destination (OD) static assignment with a single route assigned for each OD pair; or
- Static assignment applied at individual junctions on a turning movement basis.

The former has the advantage in that all vehicles are fully aware of their ultimate destination and therefore select suitable lanes when navigating the network, whilst the latter is easier to code but does not allow vehicles full knowledge of their route. Confirmation is required regarding which method will be adopted for the new statically assigned models.

Regardless of the method selected above, another assignment method called dynamic routing is the most effective to model the closure of roads for a temporary period during the simulation. This works using VAP code to assign alternative static routes depending on a dynamic condition (such as change in time or queuing on a detector). Two alternative static routes are coded for all those affected, the route with the road open and the diversion with the road closed. Therefore, if turning movement static assignment is adopted then multiple junction routes will need to be combined to ensure that the dynamic routing can be adopted effectively. Confirmation is required that dynamic routing is to be adopted to model the temporary road closure.

Modelled period

The modelled period should consider/ demonstrate any residual impacts from the early afternoon road closure. The modelling period should increase to capture residual impacts of the road closure and rerouting that will have to occur. Whilst it is acknowledged that the greatest impact will be directly before and after games, there may be some delayed impact at local junctions.

The core model scenarios set out in Table 2.1 should be covered in combined models where time periods are adjacent, for example the Tuesday evening matchday arrival and departure scenarios can be achieved within a single model between 18:30-22:30 and similarly the Saturday matchday scenarios can be achieved within a single model between 14:00-18:00.

Scenarios

- 'Oxford Parkway Parking Availability' assumptions (Table 2.1) will need explanation and agreement.
- Tuesday scenarios should represent a typical day during school term time.

- There should be discussion of likely impacts for weekday departures given more limited availability of public transport at 2130 to 2230, and how this will be managed.
- The scenario when the stadium is at capacity (16,000 attendees) represents the worst case scenario and should be considered for Oxford Road open and closed. The 12 scenarios for 12,500, 10,500 and 6,500 attendees in 2031 are of less significance from an assessment perspective, unless the proposals around traffic management differ significantly to the 2031 16,000 attendee scenario.
- A sensitivity test is required showing the impact of the site on the highway network once Oxford's traffic filters are operational. Modelling outputs for the traffic filters can be provided.
- The applicant will need to demonstrate how the proposed Transport Management Strategy will impact the modelled scenario and how in reality it will be managed as this may not be picked up fully in the modelling outputs. For example, there are 2 bus bays proposed for supporter pick up/drop off on Frieze Way; how will this be managed if buses are delayed and 3 or 4 buses converge for pick up/ drop off?

Scenario Management

All new VISSIM scenarios should be coded using scenario management with clearly labelled modification files so that changes are clear and transparent. The modification files should be separated for logical combined changes, e.g. network changes, demand changes etc.

Model Outputs

There are no TAG criteria for forecast comparisons and the reference at para 6.1.5 to TAG validation criteria for 2031 Reference Case and OUFC outputs is therefore unclear.

Along with the results outlined in paragraph 6.1.5, bus journey times also need to be provided.

Results should be presented by hour within each peak period model and include the following comparisons:

- Node evaluation junction performance – including turning movement volumes, queues and delays;
- Network performance – key metrics including total and average delay and speed, number of stops etc; and
- Travel times for each section for both general traffic and buses.

Officer's Name: Will Madgwick

Officer's Title: Technical Lead

Date: 07/05/2024