

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, 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 89% 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?

Green Belt

There is a very high bar that needs to be reached to justify building on green belt land. These 'very special circumstances' to justify the proposed development in the Green Belt

Specifically:

1. Newcastle Falcons in 2002, did not already occupy a 23-year-old football stadium (with a 60-year life) that already had foundations and potential to expand it to 16,000 seats. Nor are OUFC members of a prestigious league such as the Premier league.
2. Brighton and Hove Albion: In 2001, this case was called in. It took until 2005 for the secretary of state to judge in their favour, only for this to be quashed in 2006 and not finally approved until 2007. In this case, OUFC would be without a stadium until 2031. Consequently, OUFC should be building relationships with Mr Kassam.
3. Southend United in 2008, was not to be built on green belt land. This is therefore irrelevant.

These cases are 20 years old. All 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 which not in the green belt. The Kidlington site is not in Oxford. These case studies are put forward to justify a case for building on green belt land. None of these three are at all relevant to this application and do not provide a precedent for building on green belt land.

OUFCs failure to consider the future of their club, and to negotiate and agree contracts with the Kassam owners for the longevity of the site (60 years) are unforgivably poor business decisions. Green belt cannot be rolled over as a result of such poor business decisions or weak business management. These are business decisions and are not the concern of the residents of Kidlington who would-be left to pick up the pieces of this.

How do OUFC propose to act if the same poor management leads to disagreement with their new owner. Will they be seeking to demolish this and build another stadium?

Biodiversity Net Gain

The claims that this site isn't highly biodiverse are intrinsically false. The site is rich in biodiversity including but not confined to great crested newt, badgers, and bats.

These are all protected species. Since we understand that 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