



**KIDLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB
NEW STADIUM DEVELOPMENT**

TRANSPORT TECHNICAL NOTE

JULY 2025



the journey is the reward

**KIDLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB
NEW STADIUM DEVELOPMENT**

TRANSPORT TECHNICAL NOTE

JULY 2025

Report Reference:	KPC_OUFC/TN01
Project Code:	KPC_OUFC
Prepared by:	AP
Checked by:	KC
Issue Date:	15th July 2025
Status:	Final

**Kidlington Parish Council
Oxford United Football Club
New Stadium Development
Transport Technical Note**

List of Contents

Sections

1	Appraisal Team	1
2	Introduction	2
3	Update on Feb 2025 Review	4
4	Other Matters Identified.....	9
5	Summary and Conclusions	11

Tables

Table 3.1: February 2025 Concerns	5
---	---

1 Appraisal Team

- 1.1 This report has been authored by Alec Philpott. He holds a Bachelor of Engineering Degree and is a Fellow of both the Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation and the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport.
- 1.2 Alec is a Director at Mayer Brown Limited and has been engaged in the practice of civil engineering for over 28 years, specialising in transport planning. He has extensive experience in working with both public and private sector clients, regularly advising on highways, transport and road safety matters and projects involving sports stadiums up to 63,000 capacity including advising Haringey Council on the Tottenham Hotspur Football Club stadium.
- 1.3 Alec has developed an all-round skills base in all aspects of transport planning from transport assessments to detailed design.
- 1.4 The report reviewer, Kevin Chaney, has over 25 years' experience in development planning working as a transport consultant for private and public sector clients covering a wide range of land uses including residential, retail, mixed use, commercial, leisure and education development schemes. Experienced in technical reviews, transport matters, mitigation strategies through sustainable transport promotion, site access solutions and junction improvement design and modelling. Kevin also has experience in development control and has also been involved in the planning stage of large transport infrastructure projects.
- 1.5 The appraisal team are familiar with the Oxford United Football Club development proposals, having previously been commissioned by CPRE (Oxfordshire) in February 2025 to peer-review the planning submission in relation to transport and highway matters.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 In February 2025, Mayer Brown prepared a Technical Note (TN) on behalf of CPRE (Oxfordshire), reviewing submissions made in respect of a proposed new football stadium to the north of the city.
- 2.2 The purpose of the February report was to carry out a review of the Transport Assessment prepared by Ridge and dated February 2024 to support the planning application (ref 24/00539/F) for a new stadium development for Oxford United Football Club (OUFC).
- 2.3 The scope of this review also included a Match Day Travel Plan and Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA), both dated December 2024, which were prepared by Ridge.
- 2.4 The February 2025 TN concluded the following about the planning submission:
- *“The proposed stadium parking proposals are likely to result in a significant shortfall of car parking for supporters during match days based on the assumptions made;*
 - *The vehicle mode share has been based on a GIS assessment, which could be underestimating the mode share and parking demand for supporters given the actual mode share taken from a supporters’ poll indicates an 85% car mode share;*
 - *The strategy for supporter parking hinges on the availability of spare capacity at the P&R sites across the city. However, the assessment in the TA is based on an existing demand at the P&R sites that is lower than might be expected for an established P&R network. This assumption is supported by surveys at the Oxford Parkway and Peartree P&R sites undertaken for the TAA, which show higher existing parking levels (i.e. less available parking for supporters). It is recommended that surveys are carried out at the other P&R sites (Seacourt, Redbridge, Thornhill and Eynsham) and the capacity assessment is revisited;*
 - *The car parking requirements for the stadium ancillary uses have not been met by the proposed provision, which suggests off-site parking will be required for the ancillary uses to operate;*
 - *The closure of Oxford Road before a match for 30 mins is unlikely to capture the majority of supporters arriving on foot and it is considered that the pre-match assessment should be extended to include earlier periods. This should include the highway impact assessment;*

- *The TA indicates that 74 additional buses for the P&Rs and 8 additional trains will be required to support the stadium proposals but it is unclear whether this significant undertaking is achievable or is supported by the operators and how it will be funded/guaranteed; and*
- *Junction modelling would be required to understand the local impacts at junctions that are subject to the greatest changes in traffic flows, as a result of the new stadium proposals.*

Having reviewed the Transport Assessment and Transport Assessment Addendum, it has been concluded that the transport impacts associated with the new stadium proposals have not been fully considered.”

- 2.5 Since the publication of Mayer Brown's February 2025 TN, there have been a series of additions and statutory consultation responses on the Local Planning Authority's planning portal, as the proposals navigate the consultation process.
- 2.6 Kidlington Parish Council have provided the following documents to Mayer Brown for further review:
- Addendum Transport Assessment – Option and Sensitivity Tests (March 2025), prepared by Ridge; and
 - Oxfordshire County Council Transport Consultation Response (30th May 2025), including Appendices A-D.
- 2.7 A brief provided by Kidlington Parish Council identified the following questions, on which they would like advice:
- Does the March 2025 Addendum Transport Assessment address the issues raised in the February 2025 Mayer Brown TN?
 - Has junction modelling now been carried out for Roundabouts at Peartree, Wolvercote & Loop Farm.
 - Has the impact of the extra Toucan crossing (necessary because of the planned new pedestrian/cycle path along the length of Frieze Way) at Loop Farm Roundabout been considered?
- 2.8 This TN considers the points in turn.

3 Update on Feb 2025 Review

3.1 Table 3.1 below provides a summary of whether the Addendum Transport Assessment, or Officer comments address matters raised in the Mayer Brown February 2025 TN and these points are explored further in this section.

Item	Concern	Addendum Transport Assessment (20 th March 2025)	Officer Consultation Response (30 th May 2025)	Further comment
1	<i>Proposed stadium parking proposals are likely to result in a significant shortfall of car parking for supporters during match days....</i>	Not addressed	Officers disagree believing there is sufficient capacity.	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.
2	<i>The vehicle mode share has been based on a GIS assessment, which could be underestimating the mode share and parking demand for supporters.....</i>	Not addressed	By default of accepting the assessment work, Officers appear to accept the applicant's approach.	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.
3	<i>...the assessment in the TA is based on an existing demand at the P&R sites that is lower than might be expected for an established P&R network.....</i>	Not addressed	Not specifically addressed, although the Officer considers there to be sufficient existing capacity and future provisions may be made. Officers are content that the PnR sites do not have to be reserved for PnR journeys into the city but can be used to alleviate traffic impacts in general.	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.
4	<i>The car parking requirements for the stadium ancillary uses have not been met by the proposed provision,</i>	Not addressed	Not specifically mentioned	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.
5	<i>The closure of Oxford Road before a match for 30 mins is unlikely to capture the majority of supporters arriving on foot and it is considered that the pre-match assessment should be extended to include earlier periods</i>	Not adequately addressed	Identifies some closures of an hour at other stadiums, but dismisses these.	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.
6	<i>The TA indicates that 74 additional buses for the P&Rs and 8 additional trains will be required to support the</i>	Not adequately addressed	By default of accepting the assessment work, Officers appear to	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.

	<i>stadium proposals but it is unclear whether this significant undertaking is achievable</i>		accept the applicant's approach	
7	<i>Junction modelling would be required to understand the local impacts at junctions that are subject to the greatest changes in traffic flows, as a result of the new stadium proposals.</i>	Additional modelling has raised significant concerns regarding queueing	By default of accepting the assessment work, Officers appear to accept the applicant's approach	There is no new evidence within the reviewed documents that changes Mayer Brown's position.

Table 3.1: February 2025 Concerns

- 3.2 It is noteworthy that throughout their response, Officers identify impacts as occurring on average 28 times per year. On this basis, they consider *“the impact is not considered severe in the context of NPPF para 116”*.
- 3.3 As set out by the applicant, occurrences may actually be 43 times per year (28 first team matches, 13 women's league matches and 2 event hires). It would not be unreasonable to assume that the impacts of the proposals could occur with greater frequency than anticipated, resulting in severe effects.

Stadium Parking (Items 1, 3 & 4)

- 3.4 The documents provided for review do not specifically address the concerns raised in relation to insufficient parking for matchdays and any corresponding impacts this may have on what may reasonably be considered to be the primary function of the Park and Ride facilities (being to serve the city centre).
- 3.5 Moreover, the Addendum Transport Assessment provides no further information on the sufficiency of parking provision for the ancillary uses proposed on the site.
- 3.6 Officers appear to accept the implications of matchday use of the Park and Ride facilities by supporters, identifying the Park and Ride facilities as a tool to reduce highway impacts. It is hoped that, elsewhere in the submission documents, the potential effect of this on the city centre economy has been considered.

3.7 While the County Council are content that the park and ride facilities can be used for matchday parking, this is a conclusion reached on the premise that the facilities are provided to mitigate congestion, rather than be a facility to serve the City Centre economy. Considering the proposals a little more objectively, the travel strategy for the stadium essentially promotes a series of remote car parks (i.e. the park and ride sites at Oxford Parkway and Peartree) encouraging travel to the development in unsustainable ways.

3.8 Sufficient evidence has not been provided within the supplied documents to remove the parking concern raised in the Mayer Brown February 2025 report.

Supporter Modal Split (Item 2)

3.9 The Addendum Transport Assessment provides no further clarification on the modal split for supporters travelling to the stadium.

3.10 It therefore remains a concern that the transport impacts of the scheme have been significantly under-estimated.

3.11 Sufficient evidence has not been provided within the supplied documents to remove this concern raised in the Mayer Brown February 2025 report.

Road Closure Duration (Item 5)

3.12 The Addendum Transport Assessment references the VISSIM modelling covering a road closure of 45 minutes. This is to allow for a short setup/take down period to install Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM) and “air-lock” for buses/authorised vehicles.

3.13 While some details of the HVM and air-lock system were indicated, it does appear to be a very short period to install these types of measures. No sufficient detail is provided to give a clear indication of the time required for road closure.

3.14 While pedestrian modelling may have demonstrated that supporters are able to clear within 35 minutes of a final whistle, it is not clear whether they are actually likely to do this in reality. It is not uncommon for matchdays to include pre and post-match entertainment which may prolong the time taken for the volumes of supports to clear.

3.15 Indeed, within the ES Addendum Volume 3 Appendix 10.1 Taa Part 1 11/12/2024, the applicant sets out a series of measures to encourage supporters to dwell at the stadium before and after the match, including the following:

- Access to CCTV for traffic management
- Early attraction measure, such as:
 - Pre-Match build up programme including, player match previews, the manager pre match press conference and fixture preview.
 - Retail offers for food and drinks purchase before matches.
 - Retail happy hour offers which offers discounts during the hours before games.
 - Show other matches before games in stadium or associated facilities (club pub).
 - Provide pre-match entertainment for selected games.
- Retention measures, such as:
 - League round-up
 - Interviews
 - Hospitality packages structures to encourage staying after the game, including complementary refreshments, player appearances, post match presentation.
 - General admission packages that include free drinks post-match happy hour.
 - Catering kiosks and bars to stay open for a minimum of 1 hours post matches.
 - Post match entertainment kids/family zone.
 - Real-time travel information

3.16 Moreover, it is noted that the Officer identifies closures of an hour at the Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to enable supporters to clear. While it is acknowledged THFC is larger than the development proposals, it also benefits from significantly better public transport infrastructure with multiple rail stations and much larger volumes of bus services.

3.17 It would appear more appropriate for the applicant to model a 60 minute road closure to consider the effects on the local highway network.

Public Transport Provisions (Item 6)

3.18 Both the applicant's team and Officers identify that the increased rail provision required to deliver the sustainable vision for the development may not actually come forward.

3.19 Para 2.3.14 of the Addendum Transport Assessment identifies that a minimum of 10 additional carriages would be required mid-week to cater for demand. This paragraph also identifies that these additional carriages may not come forward.

3.20 A typical rail carriage can carry up to 140 persons in standard class. On matchdays, this is likely to be significantly more.

3.21 The lack of certainty over deliverability of the necessary additional 10 carriages results in circa 1,400 supporters (10 carriages x 140 capacity) looking for another means of travel – close to 10% of the stadium capacity.

3.22 This uncertainty remains a significant concern.

Junction Modelling (Item 7)

- 3.23 Microsimulation modelling has been updated for a 45 minute closure. As above, it is considered that this should be rerun for 60 minutes. This modelling includes the junctions at Peartree, Wolvercote & Loop Farm.
- 3.24 The graphs presented at Figures 5.5 and 5.6 of the Addendum Transport Assessment identify queues that extend to 1.2km in length, which is approximately 240 cars (assuming a reasonable 5m per car).
- 3.25 Due to the low resolution of the PDF available, it is not possible to identify whether these are on the Peartree Roundabout, or Cuttleslowe Roundabout.
- 3.26 In any event, these queues will inevitably block adjacent junctions, affecting local residents and it should be noted that these are average maximum queues, therefore they will be exceeded on occasion.
- 3.27 While the modelling was undertaken with a microsimulation tool, it would be usual to see some “traditional” modelling results presented alongside (e.g. ARCADY assessments) to assist in validating the microsimulation. These are not apparent.
- 3.28 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.
- 3.29 The above should be considered in the light of the modelling taking a series of favourable assumptions which have been taken on the premise of vision-led sustainable transport planning. If the vision is not delivered, impacts could be significantly different.

4 Other Matters Identified

- 4.1 The Addendum Transport Assessment and Officer Consultation response raise the additional following points:

Core Scenario

- 4.2 In their advisory capacity to the Council, Pell Frishmann raised that the core scenario should be run with no reduction in background traffic. Acting as the Local Highway Authority, Oxfordshire County Council officers decided to accept a 10-15% reduction in traffic assuming that the proposed mitigation will work in practice.
- 4.3 Given some of the uncertainties that have been identified not only by the applicants themselves (e.g. questionable deliverability of additional train services) as well as the concerns raised by Mayer Brown, it is considered that Pell Frishmann's approach would have provided a helpful insight into the effects of the scheme should elements of the proposed transport strategy fail.
- 4.4 It is considered that this 0% reduction scenario requested by Pell Frishmann 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.

Modelling Sources

- 4.5 The Officers consultation response states that:
- "Tottenham and Arsenal did not undertake traffic modelling for their stadiums as it was agreed that there would be a neutral effect on traffic and the highway network....."*
- 4.6 The Tottenham stadium application actually included extensive modelling of the adjacent highway network, including traditional LINSIG models of a number of local signal junctions. The author of this Technical Note for Kidlington was responsible for reviewing the transport planning elements of the planning application for Haringey Council at the time of the submission. In the event that any modelling is re-run for the Oxford United FC proposals, it is recommended that this is reviewed to see if it can provide any useful insights.

Toucan Crossing – Loop Farm Roundabout

- 4.7 Based on the documents provided, it is not possible to confirm if a new Toucan crossing has been modelled on Frieze Way adjacent to the Loop Farm Roundabout.
- 4.8 Para 4.2 of Appendix B to the Officer consultation response identifies a query relating to pedestrian demands at a crossing on Frieze Road (sic) but it is not clear if this relates to the existing one at the northern end, or a new one proposed to the south.
- 4.9 Paragraph 5.2 of Appendix C to the Officer consultation response mentions proposed crossings on Oxford Road only, which may indicate that nothing has been proposed, or modelled, on Frieze Way.
- 4.10 In any event the applicant should be requested to confirm the proposed crossing has been modelled and that appropriate pedestrian flows have been included (given the Pell Frischmann comments in Appendix B of the Officers consultation response).

5 Summary and Conclusions

- 5.1 The Technical Note (TN) has been prepared on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council to carry out a review of the Addendum Transport Assessment prepared by Ridge and dated 20th March 2025 to support the planning application (ref 24/00539/F) and the May 2025 OCC consultation response in respect of a new stadium development for Oxford United Football Club (OUFC).
- 5.2 The documents fail to address significant concerns raised in the February 2025 Technical Note prepared by Mayer Brown, and it is considered that the proposals have not adequately considered the potential effects of the scheme on the adjacent transport infrastructure.

