

Of the 24 teams in League One, where Oxford United play, most would find it challenging to travel by train. There is no evidence that this form of transport - 'that forms the sustainability claim of the application', would result in majority supporters taking rail transport to this new ground.

There is no plan for the additional congestion, traffic spill, double parking and increased automotive exhaust emissions that will ensue from this ill-considered application. This will cause considerable harm and safety issues to local children and older residents.

The plan to install a crossing over Frieze Way (which it appears is already now being constructed by Oxfordshire County Council Highways as part of roundabout adjustments, and before this application even being considered by Cherwell District Council Planners!), effectively agrees that parking will spill over into Kidlington residential streets.

Supporters that travel by train or bus (as the application proposes), would be on the other side of the roundabout and would have no other reason to cross Frieze Way to and from Kidlington.

The Fan Travel section of the Sustainability Statement bases all of its 'what if' beliefs on two surveys of football supporters. It shows over 83.1% of supporters currently travel by private transport (cars and vans).

The 'what if' ambition suggests a 33% reduction in CO2e emissions 'if' car use dropped to 32%. What and where is the evidence for this?

Away supporters will all have at least one change to make (most will need to make two or more), in order to take trains to the site. If supporters claim they would not drive to site, why is this not evident currently in the 83.1% figure, where only 16.9% use sustainable forms of travel?

And why on match days are all roads leading to and from the Kassam loaded with parked cars?

Construction

The talk of a Route Map for Avoidable Waste in Construction could be better delivered by not constructing this new site.

O UFC and its new owner should be coming to a sustainable business arrangement with Mr Kassam to build a fourth stand at the Kassam and upgrade facilities there.

This will avoid the need to demolish a perfectly good and adaptable stadium and avoid all of the embodied carbon being lost from this 23-year-old site.

An approach to share ownership of the Kassam site may be an option. Where is the evidence that such discussions been conducted 'to exhaustion' between the old and new owners and O UFC themselves?

Carbon Reduction Pledges

The summary claims a 51% CO2e reduction by moving to Stratfield Brake. The stadium is not being built at Stratfield Brake, so how is this relevant? Even if it were relevant, this is clearly not taking into account the embodied CO2e within the existing Kassam Stadium.

The 'what if' reductions discussed in this Sustainability Statement, are exactly that, what ifs and pipe dreams.

What if the stadium were to be built to Olympic standards or to BREEAM Outstanding and confirmed as this?

In reality, we see an application with vaguely aspirational goals to be diluted if they use too much capital funding and start to look like they might become 'economically unviable'.

A voluntary BREEAM 'Very Good' equates to 55% of what an outstanding build would look like. this is what BREEAM 'very good' means. This application demonstrates that neither O UFC or its new owners have any will to build a sustainable or world class stadium.