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| Friday | 29/07/2022 | Time | 0908 | Sligh |  | A | NOLVER | COTE RBT J/W | /W A40 EXI |  | EY OXFOR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 449681 | N: 210179 Junct | D Detail: | 1 | Control | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine withou | ut high winds |  |  | Road surface | Dry |  |  | Daylight |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference 1 | Car |  |  |  |  |  | Moving from | m SE to | W | Turning left |  |  |  |
|  | Casualt | Reference: |  | 1 | Age: | 24 | Male |  | Driver/rider |  | Severity: | Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 1 |
|  | Casualt | Reference: |  | 2 | Age: | 28 | Female |  | Passenger |  | Severity: | Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 1 |
|  | Vehicle Reference 2 | Goods 7.5 tonnes mgw and over |  |  |  |  |  | Moving from | n SE to | N | Going ahead right bend |  |  |  |


| Friday | 26/08/2022 | Time | 0857 | 7 Slight |  | A34 NBOUND |  | EXIT SLIP ROA | ROAD APP | OX | W OF RBT J/W A | PEARTREE IN | ERCHANGE | GOSFOR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 449248 | N: 210754 Junc | on Detail: | 0 | Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine without | ut high winds |  |  | Road surface | Dry |  |  | Daylight |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference 1 | Car |  |  |  |  |  | Moving from | $n$ S to | NE | Going ahead other |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference 2 | Car |  |  |  |  |  | Moving from | $m$ S to | NE | Going ahead but h |  |  |  |
|  |  | Reference |  | 1 | Age: | 36 | 6 Female |  | Driver/ride |  | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference 3 | Car |  |  |  |  |  | Moving from | $m$ S to | NE | Going ahead but he |  |  |  |

Wednesday $14 / 09 / 2022$ Time 1518 at A34 NBOUND J/W ENTRY SLIP ROAD FROM PEARTREE RBT GOSFORD

E: 449528 N: 211253 Junction Detail: 5 Control 4
Fine without high winds Road surface Dry

| Vehicle Reference 1Car    <br> Casualty Reference: 1 Age: 41 | Female |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Reference 2 | Agricultural vehicle |  |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 2 | Age: | 39 | Male |

Daylight

| Moving from S to NE | Going ahead other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Driver/rider | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: 1 |
| Moving from S to NE | Going ahead other |  |
| Driver/rider | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: 2 |
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Wednesday $05 / 10 / 2022$ Time 1526 Slight at A44 PEARTREE ROUNDABOUT BY A44 TO/FROM OXFORD OXFORD
E: 449422 N: 210872 Junction Detail: 1 Control 4
Fine without high winds Road surface Dry


Wednesday $16 / 11 / 2022$ Time 0838 Slight at A34 SBOUND J/W A34 SBOUND ENTRY SLIP RPOAD FROM PEARTREEE INTERCHANGE BY MP 87/6 GOSF( E: 449158 N: 210525 Junction Detail: $5 \quad$ Control 4 Fine without high winds Road surface Dry
Vehicle Reference $1 \quad$ Goods 3.5 tonnes mgw and under
Vehicle Reference $2 \quad$ Car
Casualty Reference:

Saturday $10 / 12 / 2022$ Time 1615 at A44 NBOUND J/W A44/A34 PEARTREE RBT OXFORD
E: 449401 N: 210821 Junction Detail: 1 Control 4
Fine without high winds Road surface Frost/Ice

| Vehicle Reference 1 | Car |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vehicle Reference 2 | Car |  |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: | 32 | Female |


| Darkness: street lights present and lit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Moving from S to N | Going ahead other |  |  |  |
| Moving from S to N | Going ahead but held up |  |  |  |
| Driver/rider |  |  |  | Severity: Slight Injured by vehicle: 2 |

Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 01 / 2018$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 1 2 / 2 0 2 2}$ (60) months
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 E: 449859 N: 212399 Junction Detail: 1 Control 4Fine without high winds Road surface Frost/Ice
Darkness: street lights present and lit
Moving from S to N
Going ahead left bend
Driver/rider
Severity: Slight Injured by vehicle: 1

Accidents involving:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Motor vehicles <br> only (excluding <br> 2-wheels) | 0 | 2 | 47 | 49 |
| 2-wheeled motor <br> vehicles | 1 | 5 | 7 | 13 |
| Pedal cycles | 1 | 3 | 14 | 18 |
| Horses \& other | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 2 | 10 | 66 | 78 |

Casualties:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle driver | 0 | 2 | 46 | 48 |
| Passenger | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 |
| Motorcycle rider | 1 | 5 | 4 | 10 |
| Cyclist | 1 | 3 | 15 | 19 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 11 | 79 | 92 |



|  W COUNTY COUNCIL | (3) Crown copyright. All rights reserved Oxfordshire County Council Licence No. 01000233432023 | SMıIr | 1:10000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : $:=$ | 13/09/2023 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX E ACTIVE TRAVEL CHECKLIST

| ID | Criterion | Description | 0 (FAIL) | 1 (PASS) | Rating | Appraiser Comments | Relevant policy / guidance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATEPAF_101 | TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Quantitative analysis | Transport Assessments should forecast the multimodal movements generated by a development, quantifying the additional trip generation and the distribution and assignment | No Transport Assessment submitted; or the submitted Transport Assessment has failed to provide a suitable analysis upon which to consider movement to and from the site by active modes | Transport Assessment provides a quantitative analysis of the multi-modal trip generation of the development, considering the routing of those trips to inform further considerations about the impacts and quality of existing routes within and outside of the development | 1 | Please refer to chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment. This chapter breaks down and provides an assessment of the trip generation, mode share and the distribution of the development proposals. It also breaks down different scenarios of whether a match day is | OCC's Implementing 'Decide and Provide' (July 2022) <br> DfT's Decide \& Provide Policy (December 2022) National Planning Policy |
| ATEPAF_102 | TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Qualitative analysis | Transport Assessments must provide a qualitative analysis of the current infrastructure of the surrounding area, taking into account how additional movements across all modes of transport will impact upon the capacity of public transport, walking wheeling \& cycling networks. | The submitted Transport Assessment has failed to provide a sufficient evaluation the quality of the walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure of the surrounding area which will be impacted by the development | The Transport Assessment provides a qualitative analysis of the accessibility of the site and highlights deficiencies in surrounding infrastructure in line with policy and guidance provided in LTN $1 / 20$ | 1 | Chapter 4 in the Transport Assessment sets out all of the routes in close proximity to the existing site as well as planned works close to the site. <br> The combination of our pedestrian modelling and this Active Travel Audit provides a clear | Standing Advice Note: <br> Active Travel and <br> Sustainable Development <br> (Active Travel England, <br> 2022) <br> 20-minute Neighbourhood <br> Guide (TCPA, 2021) |
| ATEPAF_103 | Local Amenities | A mix of local amenities is provided within an 800 m walking distance of all properties (either within the site or outside but accessed via an accessible walking network). Examples of local amenities include: <br> - A food shop which sells fresh fruit and vegetables - A park or green space <br> - An indoor meeting place (pub, café, community centre, place of worship) <br> - A primary school <br> - A post office or bank <br> - A GP surgery | There are few or no useful amenities (i.e. such as those listed in the description) within an 800 m ( 10 minute) walking distance of the whole site via an accessible walking route. | There are a sufficient number and range of essential local facilities (as listed in the description) within an 800 m ( 10 minute) walking distance all areas of the site via an accessible walking route. | 1 | The development does not include any permanent housing, therefore GP Surgery and Primary are relevant to the site. <br> There is a food shop selling fresh fruit and veg approximately 450 metres from the site. Kidlington Green Gardens is approximately 600 metres from the site. <br> There is The Broadway Post Office 460 metres from the site and Sainsburys money 450 metres from the site. | Standing Advice Note: <br> Active Travel and Sustainable Development (Active Travel England, 2022) <br> 20-minute Neighbourhood Guide (TCPA, 2021) Walkable Neighbourhoods - Building in the right places to reduce car dependency (Sustrans, 2022) |
| ATEPAF_104 | Walking routes to a primary school | A high-quality walking connection should be provided (or already exist) from the site to a primary school. Refer to Manual for Streets and CIHT Designing for Walking for details but, as a minimum, routes must be: -2 m wide (with limited pinch points of 1.5 m due to street furniture) and localised widening to accommodate peak usage. step-free has a smooth, even surface -has street lighting -includes appropriate crossings in compliance with LTN 1/20 Table 10-2 <br> $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ for sites which do not include residential land uses | A section of the route does not meet the minimum criteria | $100 \%$ of the route meets the minimum criteria along its entire length | N/A - exclude | Excluded as there are no primary schools or housing on the site. | N/A |
| ATEPAF_105 | Walking routes to a food shop | A high-quality walking connection should be provided from the site to a food shop selling fresh fruit \& veg or services which benefit the community e.g. medical services. Refer to Manual for Streets and CIHT Designing for Walking for details but, as a minimum, routes must be: <br> -2 m wide (with limited pinch points of 1.5 m due to street furniture) - step-free <br> - has a smooth, even surface - has street lighting - includes appropriate crossings in compliance with LTN 1/20 Table 10-2 | A section of the route does not meet the minimum criteria | $100 \%$ of the route meets the minimum criteria along its | 1 | The proposed active travel scheme seek to LTN $1 / 20$. Kidlington Roundabout to the north of the site is currently under construction (designed by OCC) to deliver improved active travel facilities. All arms include crossings, except one, therefore good access will be available for active travel. The routes to the local amenities are LTN $1 / 20$ compliant and will provide a high quality walking link to a food shop for the staff and gym users on non-match days. | LTN 1/20 (2020) Manual for Streets 1 (2007) Manual for Streets 2 (2010) |
| ATEPAF_106 | Suitability for walking and wheeling (external to the site) | All walking routes surrounding the site must be accessible to all users (access controls, widths, steps, ramps, materials) | Some or all external pedestrian routes are not accessible or do not have adjacent accessible alternatives (i.e. ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths etc) | All external pedestrian routes are accessible or have adjacent accessible alternatives such as ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths in accordance with Inclusive Mobility section 4.2-4.4 | 1 | All site entrances are accessible to the public as well as the routes around the site. There are steps where there is a significant level difference and alternative ramps to access the stadium site. High quality accessible entrances are available to reach the stadium. | Inclusive Mobility (2021) LTN $1 / 20$ (2020) |


| ATEPAF_107 |  | All new or improved off-site junctions should be designed in line with the movement hierarchy: pedestrians, followed by cyclists, public transport users and private motor vehicles <br> The Junction Assessment Tool from LTN $1 / 20$ should be used for the design of all junctions except priority junctions between minor roads with flows below 500vpd | Any of <br> - Some side roads are not treated <br> - Priority junctions have radii that is inappropriate. <br> - Signalised junctions do not have pedestrian aspects <br> on some arms <br> - There are red movements (0 scores) in the JAT | All side roads are treated Priority junctions have appropriate radii as recommended in MfS 2 paragraphs 9.4.10-9.4.16 Signalised junctions have pedestrian aspects on all arms <br> There are no red movements (0 scores) in the JAT | 1 | Kidlington Roundabout to the north of the site is currently under construction (designed by OCC) to deliver improved active travel facilities. All arms include crossings, except one, therefore good access will be available for active travel. <br> Other junctions include pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities. | DMRB (2020); Manual for Streets (2007); Manual for Streets 2 (2010); LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATEPAF_108 | Cycle routes to key destinations | The development should provide off-site LTN $1 / 20$ compliant routes to relevant destinations such as schools, local centres, employment centres, railway stations and the existing cycling network | The development does not propose to deliver or benefit from existing LTN $1 / 20$ compliant off-site cycle routes to key destinations proportionate to its size and impacts | The development either proposes to deliver or benefits from existing LTN $1 / 20$ compliant off-site cycle routes to key destinations proportionate to its size and impacts | 1 | The cycle routes are compliant with LTN $1 / 20$. Segregated routes are proposed where possible and a shared use route in specific locations to provide flexibility on match and non-match days. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_109 | Cycle Safety on links (off-site) | All new or improved infrastructure off-site should conform to the 5 Core Design Principles in addition to the criteria outlined in Figure 4.1 and geometry requirements as required by LTN $1 / 20$ | One or more of the new or improved streets off-site are "not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns" (i.e. orange and pink criteria from Figure 4.1) OR <br> The geometry of proposed cycle lanes does not meet minimum requirements (Table 5-2) <br> OR <br> Where people cycling are mixing with motor vehicles, traffic lane widths are 3.2-3.9m wide |  | 1 | Kidlington Roundabout to the north of the site is currently under construction (designed by OCC) to deliver improved active travel facilities. All arms include crossings, except one, therefore good access will be available for active travel. <br> Other facilities that have been designed for OUFC are compliant to LTN $1 / 20$ and follow the 5 Core Design Principles. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_110 | Crossings (external to the site) | Where appropriate, the provision of crossings to an appropriate type and specification (signalised / zebra / uncontrolled / continuous footway) must be provided along forecasted desire lines, including away from vehicular junctions <br> Crossings should be evenly spaced and at regular intervals and provided on most streets in accordance with the movement patterns of the development Crossings must be accessible to all and comply with standards set out in LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility | Insufficient or infrequent crossings have been provided and / or fail to match desire lines outside of the development and towards key external routes and facilities <br> Crossings fail to meet standards set out in design guidance contained in MfS and Inclusive Mobility | The appropriate crossing type (see LTN $1 / 20$ Table $10-$ 2) is provided on predicted desire lines. All crossings are designed to meet highway standards | 1 | There are regular crossings proposed along Oxford Road in close proximity to the site. They are TOUCAN crossings with appropriate tactile paving. <br> A further TOUCAN crossing is proposed over Frieze Way to Stratfield Brake Sports Ground. This provides an east-west connection between Stratfield Brake Sports Ground, the Stadium (including open space) and the Open sapce proposed at the development site (P7a) connecting to Oxford Road/Oxford Parkway and Public Rights of Way. | Trafic Signs Manual- Chpater 6 (2022); : LTN $1 / 20$ (2020); Manual for Streets (2007) |
| ATEPAF_111 | Shared use routes <br> (external to the site) | Shared use routes (i.e. a path or surface which is available for use by both pedestrians and cyclists) must be avoided along all new or improved off-site streets, unless they fit within the limited acceptable situations listed in LTN 1/20 | Any of <br> - Shared use paths are provided in areas of medium/high pedestrian or cyclist flows - Shared use paths are below 3 m wide (<300 cyclists per hour), or below 4.5m elsewhere, as per Table 6-3 of LTN1/20 <br> - Pedestrians and cycle users are separated, but only by a painted line | Shared use routes are only provided in the situations listed at para 6.5.6 and section 1.6 (2) of LTN $1 / 20$ and meet the recommended minimum width set out in Table 6-3 of LTN $1 / 20$ ( 3 m when $<300$ cyclists per hour, 4.5 m elsewhere. Flows take account of future generated by nearby growth proposals and allocations). | 1 | A shared use route is proposed on the eastern boundary of the site (i.e. on the western side of Oxford Road). Shared use is necessary to accommodate match day crowds. A segregated cycleway is proposed along the eastern side of Oxford Road slightly further from the match day crowds to improve safety for users. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_112 | Physical barriers for cycle users (on and offsite) | All new or improved cycle routes (within the site or outside it) must be fully accessible | The presence of steps or barriers on-site or within a reasonable distance off-site that would reduce the ease of access for a Cycle Design Vehicle (as per LTN $1 / 20$ ) or the presence of situations that would require users to dismount. | No steps or barriers within the site which would reduce ease of access for Cycle Design Vehicle (as per LTN $1 / 20$ ). No requirement for users to dismount at any point. | 1 | There are steps where there is a significant level difference and alternative ramps to access the stadium site. The site is fully accessible. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_113 | Lighting (on and off site) | Streets, footways and cycle routes are adequately lit at night to provide safety and security for all users | Not all routes within the boundary of the site or externally where appropriate to the users of the site are lit | All routes within the boundary of the site and off-site where required by users of the site are lit in accordance with 1 TN $1 / 20$ paragraphs 8.7 and 15.3 (Urban lighting) \& paragraph 8.7 (traffic free routes) | 1 | Street lighting will be provided along all pedestrian and cycle routes around the proximity of the site. Detailed design of the lighting is to be completed once planning permission is granted. | LTN 1/20 (2020); BS 5489- <br> 1:2020 - Design of Road Lighting |


| ATEPAF_114 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Walking routes to } \\ & \text { nearest transport } \\ & \text { nodes } \end{aligned}$ | A high-quality walking connection should be provided from the site to a transport node (a regular public transport service which enables people to carry out daily duties such as employment and education). Refer to Manual for Streets and CIHT Designing for Walking for details but, as a minimum, they must be: -2 m wide (with limited pinch points of 1.5 m due to street furniture) - step-free <br> - has a smooth, even surface - has street lighting - includes appropriate crossings in compliance with LTN 1/20 Table 10-2 | A section of the route does not meet the minimum criteria | $100 \%$ of the route meets the minimum criteria along its entire length | 1 | There are direct routes that are greater than 2 metres width to both new and existing bus stops as well as a route to Oxford Parkway that is approximately 220 metres from the site. These routes meet the requirements stated in this criteria. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATEPAF_115 | Access and provision of public transport | Effective and convenient public transport should be available either through proximity to existing routes or through the provision of new or extended routes | There are locations within the site for which pedestrian access is in excess of a 400 m walking distance of a public transport station or stop, and / or none of the public transport routes to serve the site are secured or proposed to be fully operational upon first occupation of the development (including demand-responsive public transport as development is phased.) | All locations within the site are within a 400 m walking distance of a public transport station or stop and on larger sites then at least one public transport route is secured or proposed to be fully operational on the first day of occupation or in accordance with the phasing of the development (including demand responsive or shuttle bus services). | 1 | See answer above. All parts of the site are within 400 metres of high quality bus and rail provision. | Oxfordshire Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (2022) Central Oxfordshire Travel Plan (2022) |
| ATEPAF_116 | Active Travel <br> infrastructure enabling <br> use of public transport | Bus stop and rail station (where applicable) facilities that enable ease of access by active travel modes, including secure and overlooked cycle parking and facilities, seating provision, lighting, adequate shelter to accommodate likely demand, service information (including RTI) \& raised kerbs at bus stops. | either streets are wide and straight, encouraging high speeds, or they are signed above the 20 mph and 30 mph thresholds | Bus stop and rail station (where applicable) facilities already exist (or are provided) that enable ease of access to public transport by active travel modes, facilities, seating, lighting, adequate shelter to accommodate likely demand, raised kerb access for wheelchair users, service information (including RTI), dropped kerbs for accessing bus stops and an identified bus cage / layby (where applicable). | 1 | 150 cycle parking spaces will be provided on site and a further max. 495 additional cycle parking spaces at Oxford Parkway within a new cycle hub. There is real time information at the bus stops at Oxford Parkway and shelter and seating. The shelter is a significant waiting room with lighting. On Oxford Road, the northbound bus stop has a raised kerb, but the southbound one does not have a raised kerb. There is a faded bus cage northbound and the bus stop southbound is within a bus lane. | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Oxfordshire Active Travel } \\ \text { Strategy (2022) } \\ \text { vanual for Streets } 1 \text { (2007) } \\ \text { Manal for Streets } 2 \text { (2010) } \end{array}$ |
| ATEPAF_117 | TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Proposed Infrastructure | Transport Assessments must provide detail (and justification) of proposed improvements to infrastructure and any other supporting strategies which seek to enable an increase in walking and cycling rates. | The submitted Transport Assessments have not proposed improvements to infrastructure and/or not explained how the proposed development will enable an increase in walking and cycling rates. | The Transport Assessment clearly proposes improvements to infrastructure and details how they will enable an increase in walking and cycling rates. | 1 | The proposals align with Oxford and Kidlington LCWIP and other committed active travel improvements around the proposed stadium to encourage an increase in walking and cycling rates. The overall transport strategy for the site | Oxford LCWIP (July 2022) Kidlington LCWIP (December 2021) |
| ATEPAF_118 | Site permeability | Within the site, routes for walking and cycling should be shorter and more direct than the equivalent by car This could be achieved, for example, through filtered permeability and the provision of car-free routes. | Journeys within the site by walking, wheeling and cycling are equal to or longer than by car | Journeys within the site by walking, wheeling and cycling are demonstrably shorter than those used by motor vehicles (excluding emergency accesses) | 1 | Chapter 4 in the Transport Assessment sets out the routes in close proximity to the existing site as well as planned works close to the site The combination of pedestrian modelling and this Active Travel Audit provides a clear qualititative analysis of the accessibility of the site and highlights the deficiencies in surrounding infrastructure. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_119 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Walking and cycling } \\ & \text { access } \end{aligned}$ | All opportunities for safe, step-free, fully-accessible walking and cycling site access points have been maximised AND are greater in number than the number of access points for motor vehicles (except where additional accesses would provide no benefit to people walking and cycling). A motor vehicle access point with safe provision for both walking and cycling counts as a walking and cycling access point | There are fewer or the same number of accessible walking and cycling access points as access points for motor vehicles and/or not all opportunities have been taken to provide high quality and convenient access points for walking and cycling. | There are more accessible walking and cycling access points than motor vehicle access points and/or all reasonable opportunities have been taken to provide a greater number of high quality and convenient access points for walking and cycling. | 1 | There is one main entrance for vehicles to access the site, one egress and an emergency access. There are six accesses for walking, wheeling and cycling. It is not possible to travel around the site using a motor vehicle because the one entrance leads to a car park and then the exit leads back to the same carriageway. The permeability on the site for walking, wheeling and cycling is of a high quality. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_120 | Future-proofing and safeguarding | The proposals should not prejudice existing and future development and connectivity to and from adjoining sites. Where such potential may exist, development should progress within a comprehensive masterplan framework or enable a co-ordinated approach to be adopted towards the development of adjoining sites in the future | Development makes no attempt to enable, provide or safeguard walking and cycling connections to adjoining sites up to the site boundary where adjoining sites are either anticipated, planned, proposed or allocated in the local plan | Development enables and proposes the adoption of walking and cycling routes up to the site boundary to provide direct connections to existing or future development where sites are either anticipated, planned, proposed or allocated through the local plan. | 1 | The proposals connect into committed active travel plans to be delivered by surrounding developments (PR sites). The east-west connection, including crossings of Freize Way and Oxford Road, provide new safe connections for planned development to reach the stadium, new open space and connection to Stratfield Brake Sports Ground. The | Oxfordshire Active Travel <br> Strategy (2022) <br> Central oxfordshire Travel <br> Plan (2022) <br> Connecting Oxford (Draft <br> 20199 <br> LTN1/20 (2020) |


| ATEPAF_121 | Through traffic | The site accesses must be arranged to prevent private vehicle drivers from using the site as a shortcut while undertaking longer journeys. This is best achieved through filtered permeability, or by ensuring all general traffic accesses are taken from the same main road | It is convenient for car drivers to cut through the site while undertaking longer journeys | It is either impossible or of considerable inconvenience for car drivers to cut through the site while undertaking longer journeys |  | There is an access, car park, taxi rank and separate egress. This means that it is not possible to take a convenient cut through the development using a motor vehicle. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATEPAF_122 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Safety at junctions } \\ \text { (internal to the site, } \\ \text { including site accesses) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | All new or improved on-site junctions (including the site access) should be designed in line with the movement hierarchy: pedestrians, followed by cyclists, public transport users and private motor vehicles <br> The Junction Assessment Tool from LTN $1 / 20$ should be used for the design of all junctions except priority junctions between minor roads with flows below 500vpd | Any of <br> - Some side roads are not treated <br> - Priority junctions have radii that is inappropriate. - Signalised junctions do not have pedestrian aspects on some arms <br> - There are red movements (0 scores) in the JAT | All side roads are treated Priority junctions have appropriate radii as recommended in MfS 2 paragraphs 9.4.10-9.4.16 Signalised junctions have pedestrian aspects on all arms <br> There are no red movements ( 0 scores) in the JAT | 1 | There are very few conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles because of the design of the site. There is a new TOUCAN crossing across Freeze Way in close proximity to the access. Traffic is expected to be low throughout the site, therefore only requiring informal crossing points. Additionally, during a match days, there will be no vehicles using the site without pre-booking their space and low numbers during non-match days. | LTN 1/20 (2020); Manual for Streets (2007) |
| ATEPAF_123 | Design speed of new streets | Within the red line boundary <br> - Any new or improved residential/local streets should be designed (no centre line, horizontal deflection, narrow width) and signed for vehicles to travel at a speed of max 20 mph . <br> No new or improved streets should be designed and signed for speeds above 30 mph | Either streets are wide and straight, encouraging high speeds, or they are signed above the 20 mph and 30 mph thresholds | The geometry of the streets ensures drivers will not exceed 20 mph on residential / local streets and will not exceed 30 mph anywhere within the site | 1 | We believe that this question is tailored towards new streets, this site only has access to a car park and a taxi rank for vehicles. Speeds will be 20 mph . | LTN 1/20 (2020); Manual for Streets (2007) |
| ATEPAF_124 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crossings (internal to } \\ & \text { the site) } \end{aligned}$ | Within the red line boundary of the proposed development, the appropriate crossing type (signalised / zebra / uncontrolled / continuous footway) must be provided along forecasted desire lines, including away from vehicular junctions Crossings should be evenly spaced and at regular interval sand provided on most streets Crossings must be accessible to all and comply with standards set out in LTN $1 / 20$ and Inclusive Mobility | Insufficient or infrequent crossings have been provided and / or fail to match desire lines within the development and towards key external routes and facilities <br> Crossings fail to meet standards set out in design guidance contained in MfS and Inclusive Mobility | The appropriate crossing type (see LTN $1 / 20$ Table 10 2) is provided on predicted desire lines. All crossings are designed to meet highway standards | 1 | The majority of the site is pedestrianised, however where there is vehicle access there will be an appropriate number of informal crossings spaced at regular intervals. | LTN 1/20 (2020); Manual for Streets (2007); Traffic Signs Manual - Chapter 6 (2022) |
| ATEPAF_125 | Suitability for walking and wheeling (internal to the site) | All walking routes within the red line boundary must be accessible to all users (access controls, widths, steps, ramps, materials) | Some or all internal pedestrian routes are not accessible or do not have adjacent accessible alternatives (i.e. ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths etc) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All internal pedestrian routes are accessible or have } \\ & \text { adjacent accessible alternatives such as ramps } \\ & \text { alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths in } \\ & \text { accordance with Inclusive Mobility section 4.2-4.4 } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | Whilst there are some steps from Oxford Road to the site due to the level difference, there is a ramp in close proximity to the steps. All parts of the site internally are fully accessible. | Inclusive Mobility (2021) LTN $1 / 20$ (2020) |
| ATEPAF_126 | Cycle safety on links (Internal to the site) | Cycle infrastructure should be provided on site in compliance with the 5 Core Design Principles and the criteria outlined in Table 4.1 and accompanying geometry requirements as confirmed in LTN1/20 | One or more of the new or improved streets are "not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns" (i.e. as shown orange and pink in LTN Figure 4.1) <br> OR <br> The geometry of proposed cycle lanes does not meet minimum requirements (Table 5 -2) <br> or <br> Where people cycling are mixing with motor vehicles, traffic lane widths are 3.2-3.9m wide | All internal streets are safe for all users to cycle along, satisfying the criteria of LTN $1 / 20$ (ref: Fig. 4.1), geometry requirements (Table 5.2) and are in alignment with the 5 'Core' Design Principles as stated in LTN $1 / 20$ and therefore must be demonstrably: Coherent, Direct, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive for cyclists of all abilities, ages and mobility needs. | 1 | The site provides appropriate shared use facilities for cyclists. On a site like this, segregated cycle routes would not be appropriate. On event days the segregated cycle route would not be able to be used, the shared space gives the site more flexibility. The routes are Direct, Coherent, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive for cyclists. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_127 | Shared use routes <br> (internal to the site) | Shared use routes (i.e. a path or surface which is available for use by both pedestrians and cyclists) must be avoided along all new or improved streets within the site, unless they fit in the limited acceptable situations listed in LTN $1 / 20$ | Any of <br> -Shared use paths are provided in areas of <br> medium/high pedestrian or cyclist flows <br> - Shared use paths are below 3 m wide ( $<300$ cyclists <br> per hour), or below 4.5 m elsewhere, as per Table $6-3$ <br> of LTN1/20 <br> - Pedestrians and cycle users are separated, but only by <br> a painted line | Shared use routes are only provided in the situations listed at para 6.5.6 and section 1.6 (2) of LTN $1 / 20$ and meet the recommended minimum width set out in Table 6-3 of LTN $1 / 20$ ( 3 m when $<300$ cyclists per hour, 4.5 m elsewhere. Flows take account of future generated by nearby growth proposals and allocations). | 1 | The stadium site is designed to accommodate match day crowds. Shared space provides the high volumes of pedestrians would be using the site on event and match days. On nonevent days there would be <300 cyclists using the site. This adheres to paragraph 6.5.6 in LTN 1/20. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |


| ATEPAF_128 | Car parking layout | The proposed street design should remove <br> opportunities for indiscriminate and obstructive <br> parking that would cause safety hazards and prevent <br> access bbatative modes of travel ly e either designing in <br> protected or marked parking bays and accompanying <br> street furnitiure, planting o otheref features and <br> restrictions that trevent footway parking, the <br> mounting of kerbss damage to green infrastructure and <br> blockage of crossing points and sightlines. | There is no parking management strategy or contribution. The proposed layout may lead to parked vehicles blocking footways, crossing points and cycle routes either on or off-site | The site layout, parking management strategy or contribution demonstrably and physically discourage the blockage of footways, crossing points and cycle routes on and off-site | 1 | There are specific parking bays allocated on the site. However, supporters will be advised that there is no car parking on site (aside from operational and accessible spaces). Appropriate design (at detailed design stage), signage and match day marshals will prevent blocking footways and crossing points.There will be a match management as well as an antiterror plan in place. The car park is also to be monitored by ANPR cameras. All spaces are pre | Oxfordshire Parking Standards for New Developments (2022) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATEPAF_129 | Cycle Parking |  | Development fails to meet the criteria set out either in LTN1/20 or meet the Local Plan minimum standards, if those are more onerous | Cycle parking exceeds the suggested minimum from LTN 1/20 Table 11.1, or the requirements of local policies, if those are more onerous | 1 | See table 2.1 in the Transport Assessment for Oxfordshire cycle parking standards. The provision for Oxfordshire is more onerous than LTN 1/20. 150 cycle spaces are proposed on site as well as max. 495 spaces at Oxford Parkway. | Oxfordshire Parking Standards for New Developments (2022); LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_130 | Trip end facilities for cycling (Destinations) | High-quality facilities including showers, lockers, changing facilities and drying areas should be provided to facilitate use of active travel modes | Development fails to propose at least one of the facilities referenced in pass criteria | Development proposes all of the following: 1 shower per 10 (long-term) cycle parking spaces, 2 lockers for 3 (long-term) cycle parking space, changing facilities and a drying area | 1 | There are 52 square metres of space is provided for end of trip facilities. The shower, changing and lockers will be designed post planning. | LTN 1/20 (2020) |
| ATEPAF_ 131 | TRAVEL PLAN | Travel Plan / Framework Travel Plans must clearly outline the mode share targets, proposed measures, monitoring strategy and the remedial measures in the event that these are not met | No Travel Plan submitted or TP submitted fails to sufficiently identify measures, targets and monitoring | Travel Plan includes mode share targets, monitoring and remedial measures / actions in the event that modal share targets are not met | 1 | Travel Plans for non-match days and for match days have been prepared. The Travel Plans provide mode share targets, proposed/remedial measures and monitoring strategy. | OCC Transport for New Developments: Transport Assessment and Travel Plans (2014) |
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