

Planning Application 24/00539/F

Deadline for responses 3 April 2024

Target Decision date 21 June 2024

To Whom it May Concern

Planning Response Number 2

Having read the planning application for the stadium at the triangle in Kidlington we have the following concerns:

Energy Efficiency

“The stadium will be constructed to achieve the highest economically viable energy efficiency and be designed to maximise the delivery of decentralised renewable or low-carbon energy generation. A feasibility study of the Low and zero carbon technologies has been undertaken as part of the drive towards achieving carbon neutrality. The stadium will aim to reduce energy use and carbon emissions through the use of energy efficient equipment and Low and zero carbon technologies”.

This entire statement is made meaningless by the phrase: achieve the highest **economically viable** energy efficiency.

This pledge is further watered down in the Sustainability Statement 1. Introduction. This states that the BREEAM target for this build is just ‘very good’ (therefore highest possible would be 64.96%).

BREEAM targets are aspirations. When the ambition is as low as this, (in BREEAM terms, anything greater than 55% is ‘very good’), there is no confidence in these boasts. Nothing shy of outstanding (> 85%) makes this both unsustainable and derisory. Given its proximity to a railway station, this site already scores BREEAM points with no effort.

Trumpeting about their BREEAM “very good” ambition, whilst omitting to mention the embedded carbon in the building they propose to demolish for this unnecessary new build, is far away from the boasts of OUFC in their earlier marketing that spoke of creating a “best in class sustainable stadium facility”.

<https://oufcstadium.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Creating-a-new-home-for-Oxford-United-3.pdf>

As councils leading by example, there is an absolute need to avoid new build where we can. Refurbish. Convert. Retrofit. Demolition as very last resort.

Oxford City Council require for 20% of total energy requirements, both unregulated and regulated to be met from on-site LZC or low carbon technologies. There is therefore limited ambition here.

“Together these renewable and low carbon technologies will maximise energy efficiency”.

Renewable energy generation has nothing to do with energy efficiency.

The statement of ‘ambitions’ says:

“What if all electricity used to be from renewable sources”.

This could not be delivered from a 3,000m² array on site, even if the whole of that array covered the entire area (limiting any suggested green roof potential). This is because solar power does not generate on match nights or effectively during the winter. Simply buying green energy is off-setting and far away from the promises being made here.

Page 113 (24) of the Sustainability Statement suggest that PV generation (table 9) will generate 17.92kWh/m²/year. On 3,000m², that is just 53,760kWh per year.

Effectively equivalent to the consumption of perhaps 13 average UK semi-detached houses. A very small solar array given the size of the claimed available roof space.

What is the actual renewable energy generating install that will be installed on this site and how much electricity will it generate compared to the planned site electrical consumption in kWh?

Yours faithfully

A. Asbury

Resident and local Company Director