

# Kidlington Parish Council

Exeter Hall, Oxford Road, Kidlington OX5 1AB

Tel: 01865 372143 [www.kidlington-pc.gov.uk](http://www.kidlington-pc.gov.uk)



**Kidlington Parish Council (KPC) response to OUFC's planning application for Stadium development.**  
See <https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Planning/Display/24/00539/F>.

## **Supplementary response on traffic management**

Kidlington Parish Council has serious concerns regarding the impact of the stadium on the transport network and we have strong reservations regarding the Oxfordshire County Council Highways Department's assessment. We are concerned that this has not taken into account several key issues that are likely to have significant effect on our residents.

We believe OCC have been too ready to accept best case scenarios, even to the extent that in some areas they have ignored the advice of their own external transport consultant Pell Frischmann.

Cherwell District Council needs to be able to assess "*reasonable future scenarios*" (NPPF para 116) and "*likely impacts*" of the development (NPPF para 118) and it is KPC's view that, with the current information available, this is simply not possible.

In KPC's view the development is also contrary to Local Plan Policy SLE4 which states "*Development which is not suitable for the roads that serve the development and which have a severe traffic impact will not be supported.*"

As a result we have commissioned transport consultancy Mayer Brown to provide an assessment of OCC's response to the planning application. This builds on previous work they carried out for CPRE and takes into account additional submissions made since then, including the Transport Assessment Addendum submitted by OUFC in March 2025.

We have submitted this for consideration by the planning team but would specifically draw attention to the following concerns referenced within it:

### **1. Impacts of road closures are consistently under-stated**

- Para 3.3: suggests that the impacts of the proposals could occur with greater frequency than anticipated (43 times per year), resulting in severe impacts on the local transport network.
- Para 3.13 states that the time period allowed for the installation of HVM and air-lock system appears to be very short. The report notes that the details on this are unclear.

- 3.14 states that while modelling may have demonstrated that supporters could clear within 35 minutes of a final whistle, it is not clear whether they will do so in reality. The measures being taken by the applicant to encourage dwell time before and after a match suggest that there are likely to be substantial delays in clearing the site (Para 3.15).
- Para 3.16 notes that the comparison with Tottenham Hotspur is weak due to that club's significantly better public transport infrastructure. Indeed the author of the report commissioned by KPC was responsible for reviewing the transport planning elements of the planning application for Haringey Council at the time of the submission.
- Para 3.17 states : *"It would appear more appropriate for the applicant to model a 60 minute road closure to consider the effects on the local highway network."* [the modelled period is 45 minutes]
- Paras 3.18 – 3.22 raise significant concern over the uncertainty of the increased rail provision, meaning that nearly 10% of the capacity of the stadium could be looking for another way to travel.
- Para 3.23 suggests that the modelling should be re-run for 60 minutes. Para 3.28 states : *"Notwithstanding this and taking the results on face value, it is for Members to consider whether a development that may introduce 1.2km long queues up to 43 times per year is introducing severe impacts."* KPC's view is that these impacts **would be severe.**
- Para 3.29 describe the modelling as *"....taking a series of favourable assumptions which have been taken on the premise of vision-led sustainable transport planning"* and explaining that if this 'vision' is not delivered impacts could be significantly different.
- Taking all these points into account, KPC has significant concerns that there are several elements of the OCC transport response that are over-optimistic and lacking in real-world context.

## 2. OCC Highways appear to have ignored their own consultants

While OCC's external consultants Pell Frischmann have recommended that the core scenario should be run with **no reduction in background traffic** (thus reflecting a far more realistic context), OCC officers have instead accepted a projected 10-15% reduction in traffic, assuming that the proposed mitigation will work in practice.

As Mayer Brown state in Para 4.4: *"It is considered that this 0% reduction scenario requested by Pell Frischmann would represent a "reasonable future scenario" (as required by the NPPF para 116) and failure to test this may have **overlooked essential transport infrastructure potentially required to mitigate the scheme and make it acceptable.**"* [our emphasis].

In our opinion, and that of Mayer Brown, the potential cumulative impact of the sum of these concerns should not be overlooked by Cherwell District Council.

## 3. Reliance on the use of Peartree and Oxford Parkway P&Rs is not sustainable transport option because they are being used as car parks not as sustainable travel options.

We contend that this is contrary to OCC's stated policy on the purpose of the local P&Rs concerned, which is to reduce car travel into Oxford city centre

In para 3.7 Mayer Brown have noted that the OUFC proposals rely on P&Rs being used principally as car parks and not as a means of intercepting car journeys. In fact encouraging

their use as such will actually increase car use by encouraging fans to drive to the area. This is not sustainable travel.

Cherwell's Local Plan also identifies sustainable travel as a key feature in Policy SLE4:

**Improved Transport and Connections:** *“All development where reasonable to do so, should facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Encouragement will be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. **Development which is not suitable for the roads that serve the development and which have a severe traffic impact will not be supported.** [our emphasis]”*

#### **4. No evidence that the Toucan Crossing adjacent to Loop Farm Roundabout has been modelled**

The Mayer Brown report explains (Para 4.7) that it is not possible to confirm if a new Toucan Crossing across the A44 adjacent to the Loop Farm Roundabout and Frieze Way has been modelled. There is also some doubt about junction modelling at other main roundabouts.

Mayer Brown recommend that the applicant should be requested to confirm the proposed crossing has been modelled and that appropriate pedestrian flows have been included at all key junctions.

This is especially important given Pell Frischmann's comments in Appendix B of the Officers consultation response which states repeatedly that **“no outputs on junction performance are provided”**. KPC would like to know why OCC Highways appear to have ignored these concerns raised by their own consultants.

Loop Farm is a key junction feeding Frieze Way and crosses the A44. It is likely to be a major pinch point during times when the Oxford Road is closed, affecting access to Kidlington and surrounding residential areas (including some of the PR sites). KPC specifically requests confirmation that modelling on the impact of this crossing and others has been done.

We hope the planning team will include due consideration of all these points and others contained in the Mayer Brown report which is being submitted separately. We would specifically like a response on points 3 & 4 before the planning committee considers this application.

Sent by Sarah Kearney on behalf of the Council  
Clerk to Kidlington Parish Council  
On 21<sup>st</sup> July 2025