

3. Southend United in 2008, was to be built close to, not in green belt land and so is entirely irrelevant.

Two of these cases are more than 20 years old. Oxfordshire Councils have since recognised climate change as an existential 'emergency'.

There were no alternate sites in these three case study locations. There are 42 being considered in Oxfordshire, 8 of these are not in the green belt.

The proposed Kidlington site is not in Oxford City.

These case studies are not at all relevant to this application and do not provide a precedent for building on green belt land.

It is clear that OUFC management's failure to consider the future of their club, and to negotiate contracts with the Kassam owners for the longevity of the site (60 years) is outstandingly poor business.

Green belt cannot be overruled as a result of such bad business decisions or weak business management. These are commercial decisions, and are not the concern of the people of

elsewhere?

Biodiversity Net Gain

The application claims that this site isn't highly biodiverse. This is entirely false. The site is rich in biodiversity including, but not confined to, great crested newt, badgers, and bats. These are all protected species.

Since it is now universally accepted that the monitoring equipment installed at the site to detect these bats was removed very shortly after it was installed, there have effectively been no bat surveys conducted.

This is legal requirement in such an area. In terms of these species, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.

What are the new and improved habitats? "The vision has been to incorporate flexible multi-functional spaces, monocultured (and aesthetically pleasant trees and shrubs) that can be enjoyed whether it be a match day or not".

This fails to understand anything about Biodiversity. Biodiversity net gain is not about giving over green and wild lands to public wanderings.

How exactly can the building of a concrete and asphalt mass on this site, add a 10% net biodiversity gain?

This premise is built on the entirely false assumption that the site is currently biodiversity neutral and contains no biodiversity. This is evidently and absolutely not the case.

Traffic and transport

The planning statement anticipates there will be 580 annual events at the stadium and proposes a stadium with 18,000 seats and lounge access for 1,000 guests. Parking at this site will only be available for around 80 cars.

The Kidlington roads where we live, work and study, are already congested. Where is the Air Quality Management Plan that supports the addition of up to 18,000 additional cars on football match days?

There is no evidence that supporters (that don't currently use public transport to attend Kassam), will suddenly change their travel habits and travel by more expensive trains, simply because of this proposed move to Kidlington. Supporters can travel to Oxford Railway Station for Kassam now and, according to OUFC's own evidence, they broadly do not do this.

There is therefore no current evidence that supporters use the train or will use the train to attend a new site.

Where is the UK case study evidence to demonstrate that football supporters will suddenly move their journey habits to rail?