

# Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document:

Summary of comments from 2009 consultation.

Note: The following comments all contain the word Panshanger and remain in the public domain on the council website.

National Planning policy has changed since these comments were made, but the general points many people make will still apply in 2013.

List in no particular order:

## [Mr Keith Bennett \(ID: 289633\)](#)

.

Sustainability Appraisal Question Do you agree with the Sustainability appraisal commentary? If not, please state why.

PG33 sustainability disadvantages makes no mention of the potential loss of an important amenity in the area. A development that prevented the continued operation of Panshanger Aerodrome would result in the loss of a significant leisure and training facility for the local community and for the borough.

Panshanger is used by local residents for leisure aviation, flight training and sports aviation and is a significant asset for the borough and is important for the quality of life of the people who use it.

Panshanger provides an important training facility for young people enabling them to start a career in aviation as well for those learning to fly for recreational purposes.

If this facility was lost residents would have to travel to alternative aerodromes to pursue their flying, putting extra strain on road infrastructure and they would not be able to access it via environmentally friendly modes of transport such as cycling and walking as they can at present.

If the 10,000 new homes suggested in the East of England plan are built in the area the population and hence the demand for leisure flying and flight training in the borough would increase and the local flying community would need to be able to accommodate them.

It would be a sad loss if an ill-informed planning decision prevented our children and future generations from having the same opportunity to fly locally that we enjoy today.

- [View consultation point](#)

SPG33-SPG34 : Sustainability Advantages and Disadvantages of the Options

- Comment ID: csio2486
- Response Date: 08/05/09 19:34

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Andrew Murray \(ID: 291015\)](#)

•

Sustainability Appraisal QuestionDo you agree with the Sustainability appraisal commentary? If not, please state why.

I believe that the appraisal has understated the impact of both developments in terms of its impact on local traffic on the A414 In particular it has understated the impact on the local environment of development North East of Welwyn Garden in Panshanger.

The area will be remote from the town centres and is poorly served by public transport, resulting in increased car travel with associated environmental impact. The area also lacks suitable infrastructure in terms of shops and schools to support a potential further 2500 people. Traffic onto the B1000 will be increased particularly through Digswell which is already difficult at peak periods. Traffic on the B1000 to Hertford may also greatly increase. The impact on Rye Meads STW is also likely to be significant.

- [View consultation point](#)

SPG33-SPG34 : Sustainability Advantages and Disadvantages of the Options

- Comment ID: csio1653
- Response Date: 01/05/09 13:30

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr John Norton \(ID: 290577\)](#)

•

Sustainability Appraisal QuestionDo you agree with the Sustainability appraisal commentary? If not, please state why.

No.

PG33 would not help to maintain viability of Welwyn Garden City - it would cause over development of the Panshanger area which already lacks adequate local services. The proposal is stated to be too small to support a new neighbourhood centre, but the existing shops, and facilities are already inadequate for the area,

The area cannot really be described as "already developed land" - the majority is open grassland which has undoubted ecological significance and is far from a "brownfield" site in the true meaning of the term. It would generate a large amount of traffic that would use the roads through the existing residential areas - particularly when travelling towards or from the A414.

- [View consultation point](#)

SPG33-SPG34 : Sustainability Advantages and Disadvantages of the Options

- Comment ID: csio2224
- Response Date: 27/04/09 16:07

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Martin Shopland \(ID: 305394\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Having recently been an active participant in the consultative process conducted by Mariposa Investments, I am writing to inquire about Welwyn Hatfield's core strategy and the possible implications for the Panshanger proposal.

There would appear to be several possibilities for synergies between the two at this early stage. I have discussed some of these with the Planning Design Consultant for Mariposa, Mr. Iain Rhind, on an informal basis.

In the light of the recently announced intention to restore WGC's Heritage Status and the interest expressed by Mr. Rhind in the suggestion for a 'Panshanger Heritage Centre' as part of the re-development, there may be some value in discussing this possibility further. I was recently in another Garden City, Woodhall Spa, where the legacy of the Dambusters generates national and international interest which translates into substantial benefits for the local community and it's businesses.

The 'private/public' model for re-development of this Borough sets new challenges and offers new opportunities which seems particularly appropriate in the current economic circumstances.

I write as someone who has an intimate experience of the Panshanger site, it's importance historically and with a perception of the potential generating both educational and commercial benefits for this town and borough.

From correspondence which I have had on the issue of the proposed redevelopment, it is becoming clear that there is a growing number of residents who are concerned that the heritage aspect of the site should be preserved and promoted for the benefit of all WGC residents and businesses. I raised this point with Ian Rhind, Planning Design Economics consultant to the Mariposa project, when we met on April 24th.

If the site of the old airfield is no longer eligible for redevelopment, then it seems logical that a concerted effort should be made to enhance the existing installations at the airfield in order to create a centre of interest, education and economic activity. I would like to draw your attention to the example of Woodhall Spa which has benefited from similar development of it's historical capital while retaining it's Garden City character. There are some 'lessons to learn' from Woodhall Spa, particularly with respect to the integration of private resources with public interest, to the mutual benefit of all. The international awareness of the Woodhall Spa experience has far-reaching economic benefits to the town, thanks to the generosity and sense of public duty shown by another lady property owner.

A re-development along these lines would have the potential to draw this outlying area of WGC more into the centre, creating the possibility of a Heritage Trail running from the centre of town and encompassing the silos at the former Nabisco site, for example, as well as other significant points of interest. The recent re-application for the lapsed Heritage status of the Garden City leads me to believe that the Welwyn and Hatfield Borough Council is well aware of the potential civic and economic benefits which could result from the proposal which I am making to you.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio6457
- Response Date: 15/05/09 15:02

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Miss Emily Martin \(ID: 299015\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Objection to development at Panshanger airfield. I strongly object to your idea of chopping down part of the woods. Me and my Dad love to go for long walks every evening in the woods. We will be dissapointed if your idea is carried through. Why do you want to build more houses when there are 24 apartments above Lidl? and only 3 of them have been brought. So the people in need of homes can have the 21 apartments left. Please don't take a place away from me that has become part of my every day life.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4286
- Response Date: 13/05/09 10:09

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Gavin Koh \(ID: 303743\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

I wish to object to the proposals by the owners of the Panshanger Airfield, Birchall Farm and Commonwoods to develop housing on the Green Belt.

We have a duty to protect Green Belt land for future generations. It does not make sense to be using greenfield sites to build more houses when there is so much office space unused in Welwyn. These fields provide vital soak away, and when Panshanger extended over the last 20 years, friends living in Hertford reported increase in flooding there.

The environmental impact of cementing over such a large chunk of land will alter the water drainage, run off and increase the likelihood of further flooding as encountered elsewhere.

The current infrastructure on roads, schools, hospital, GP, Water, refuse, local transport and leisure facilities. In particularly, I note that there are plans to close the QE2 hospital. How can you be contemplating building more houses when you are actually cutting down on the services needed?

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio5482
- Response Date: 12/05/09 14:46

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Adrian Whitby \(ID: 330646\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

## Panshanger Aerodrome Redevelopment

I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed re-development of Panshanger Aerodrome. Having attended the exhibition and viewing the plans "I WAS HORRIFIED" at the extent of the development. Included in the option is green belt land, living just around the corner on a Conservation estate, I have to have council permission as to what style of Windows and Doors I have fitted. Yet a company can come in and propose digging up half of Hertfordshire and the government can wave its magic wand and permission is granted.

What about the destruction of wild habit, in this day and age of conserving land because of global warming. I took my 3 year old daughter for a walk over the paths adjacent to the end of the runway about 4 weeks ago and there flying in the field hunting was a Barn Owl, now I'm 40 years old and that is the first time I've seen one in the wild just think of the delight it gave to a 3 year old. I notice on the proposed re-development Lincoln Close will be on one of the main access points to the estate. What about the increase in traffic, most households will have one car if not two that's between 1000 and 1500 cars how will the area cope. Not only that there is a green space adjacent to Lincoln Close which the children use, that's a very high % increase of chances in a car running down a child.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio6716
- Response Date: 12/05/09 14:35

## Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Miss Fiona Parker \(ID: 303702\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

I am writing to object to the proposed development of Panshanger Airfield.

The proposed development will have a devastating effect on the community and infrastructure of the area.

Existing local facilities like the doctors surgeries and schools would be completely overstretched, as would the local bus services.

We have already lost the 406/407 bus service which now means that certain member of the community without a car are unable to get to the local shops and more importantly the doctors surgery. How will these services cope with yet more development ?

At present Panshanger has access to open space/wildlife which offers high quality living for local people ,all this would be lost along with the airfield which is a historic and now also a social facility for the community. I understand the proposal could include high density plans so how would that fit into the current low density landscape. Land suitability must surely be an issue as swallowholes have always been a problem in this area.

I hope you will take notice of the comments of local people when reviewing this strategy.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio5465
- Response Date: 12/05/09 13:57

-

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Panshanger Airfield Site

We consider that this to be included as a proposed site would be totally unsuitable for the following reasons:

- 1 Being on the edge of the existing development we are well aware of issues regarding the placement of any further housing. We previously lived on the other side of this immense estate (in Sylvandale) where we enjoyed easier and closer access by foot to shops, postal services, public transport and much easier access to utilities such as ntlworld telecommunications. Having moved to a larger, more 'executive' home I have to admit that we have had major issues with distance from main substations or exchanges causing issues with the speed of broadband and connectivity of telephone lines. My husband, as part of his job, in IT support, has had to work all hours by 'remote access'. This has caused some major issues when telephone lines have not been good enough and have 'fallen over' when he has been in the middle of trying to resolve technical issues. I have recently relocated to run my business from home, which the government in many of it's own departments and services, appears to be encouraging people to do, and have already experienced difficulties with the quality of the communications locally. The infrastructure here would not support another 1,000 houses.
2. A site consisting of 1,000 or more houses would create another 'separate' community as the current community does not have sufficient schooling, doctors or other shops and services to meet any additional demands.
3. We would be concerned about the impact on the local environment. We are aware of some of the arguments that were raised against a proposal some few years ago for a gravel pit near to this site. Such arguments as the affect on the local Water table, the impact of the natural and protected wildlife locally, the effect on the Mimram Valley itself and its ecology and landscape would surely be as applicable to at least some degree to the proposal to develop this site for housing as they were for gravel extraction. We currently watch bats flying outside our windows of an evening. I doubt that these would continue to exist if the proposals went ahead. We were aware that the potential pollution to an already constrained sewerage and contamination treatment was an issue then. Another 1,000 houses would again give more pressure and concern.
4. We understand that part of the housing would be aimed at elderly or infirm. The restricted access of such individuals of society to shops and public transport etcetera at the moment should be a good indication that further housing of this type would be unsuitable and could not be serviced sufficiently.
5. The road infrastructure of the area is not strong enough to support such a site. We are particularly aware of the traffic congestion which builds up around the Mundells roundabout area of Welwyn Garden City and the roads into and away from Welwyn Garden City in the direction of Hertford and Stevenage (i.e. to the North and East of the Town). With the further development of the Mundells roundabout site and a proposal of further housing on this side of the town, these can only get worse. There have been a number of major accidents on the surrounding roads, and the speed at which some vehicles drive through the estate as it is at the moment can only give more concern to healthy and safety matters. The proposal we saw the other weekend, with only two main points of access, we believe could particularly not be sustained and could only add to the existing pressure. The road from the public golf course is difficult to exit onto the lower Hertford Road (or access from that road) due to traffic volumes and speeds. It seems to be used even more and more as a 'by-route' by people trying

to avoid other routes of congestion. The lower Hertford Road itself has seen a number of fatalities.

6. The poor road infrastructure and distance, with reduced local hospital and emergency services provision locally, gives concern with respect to health and safety issues.

7. The loss of the British Aerospace Site, with its historical significance to the country as a whole, has already affected the economy and history of the local area. The further loss of this airfield, of minor significance, but of important significance nonetheless, would exacerbate this loss. Rather than remove it, more consideration should be given to building on its significance and using it as a base to tell the story of the region as a whole, including the larger airfield already lost. The further loss of a place where people spend time and money rebuilding aircraft and practising their pilot skills would be a further loss not only to the local economy but to the skills base locally which is being taken away. It would also be a loss to the UK as a whole if there were no sites left where such activities could be undertaken. The informal air displays which can be viewed and heard and the site of a restored old biplane would be a great loss for an area steeped in history relating to aircraft.

8. There would be an economical impact on existing business and the community locally. From the privately run flying school, with its café actually based at the airfield, to other local enterprises. For example, there are a number of driving schools and instructors practicing their trade in the quiet, safe roads locally, which may have to relocate due to the increased volume of traffic the proposals would bring.

In addition we should like it to be noted that we attended the recent exhibition at The Fairway Suite by representatives of the pps group. We were unimpressed by a number of things in relation to the exhibition - namely that;

1. It was not clear who the gentleman holding the exhibition were unless specific questions were directed to them (in response to which we did get answers) but for some others there appears to have been a lot of misunderstandings and misrepresentation. Although 'suited and booted', the representatives did not wear badges and this did not help either their identification or clarification of their purpose.

2. The pps group were just representing the owners of the airfield and there were no actual members of the owners, Mariposa Investments Ltd, nor of the Council. Although I did appreciate that, apparently, through the pps group, Mariposa Investments Ltd do seek representation from the directly affected public with respect to proposed developments

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)

- Comment ID: csio6086
- Response Date: 12/05/09 11:44

## **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Richard Blanch \(ID: 304721\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

I would like the Panshanger Airfield to remain an area of Special Restraint and I would hope it will remain in use as an airfield. However, as the EERA plan insists Welwyn Hatfield must take 10,000 new homes and the Airfield owners have indicated in the literature sent to Panshanger residents that they wish to sell their land, my second option would be for the land to be used for a housing development. Current Central Government policy is that gravel for

building must be sourced locally. In 2002, Lafarge wanted to include the airfield in the Minerals Plan so they could extract gravel from it. At the expiry of the current Minerals Plan, Lafarge will no doubt want to include the airfield in the next Minerals Plan, if only to produce the gravel required for the housing developments elsewhere in the district approved under the requirement to provide the 10,000 extra homes. If the airfield site has already been approved for housing and built on, Lafarge will not be able to extract any gravel. My reasons for opposing gravel extraction are (1) it will lower the water-table so could cause subsidence to existing housing on the perimeter of the airfield (2) significant dust, noise from the workings (3) other points noted under housing. My reasons for preferring the airfield against housing are (1) loss of amenity (2) loss of wildlife habitat (3) remoteness from services & insufficient size to enable viable provision for these within the development.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio6042
- Response Date: 12/05/09 10:25

### **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document** [Mr & Mrs Martin & Rebecca Pope \(ID: 303015\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

[We] wish to oppose the proposed development of Panshanger Airfield. The reasons for this are:

1. Panshanger Airfield is a feature of the WGC region: it is actually one of the reasons that we moved to Panshanger in 2007. Our family regularly enjoy the walks around the airfields and the small airplanes are wonderful for our young children to look at. The leaflet supplied to our home about the development states that a benefit of the proposed development is that it will eliminate the aircraft noise. These single-engined planes make hardly any noise and are soon out of ear-shot. The argument of aircraft noise reduction is not a valid argument in our opinion.
2. Strain on existing utilities. We draw your attention to what has happened in Great Ashby in Stevenage. Several new homes were built there and residents cannot get a decent, or in a lot of cases any, broadband connection owing to the fact that the existing copper setup was insufficient. Cable was not installed as standard that was not an alternative.
3. Whilst we welcome the proposal not to open up the existing cul-de-sac roads into the proposed development, we do not see the point in the pedestrian access from the cul-de-sacs. Pedestrian access at either end of the development where the proposed vehicle access is seems more than sufficient.
4. We strongly disagree with the proposal for high-density housing, including flats that may be 4 stories high. This end of the estate is where the larger properties are and we disagree with the proposal to spoil the views with high, densely populated, buildings.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio5162
- Response Date: 12/05/09 09:53



**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Ms Lorraine Whitby \(ID: 303018\)](#)

-

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

I visited the consultation for the proposed housing development scheme in Panshanger recently and I was absolutely horrified at what I saw. The size of the development was way larger than we imagined taking up a lot of wonderful greenbelt land.

No provisions have been made for the infrastructure (roads, schools, utilities, HOSPITALS including A&E, a decent place to shop for groceries (Morrisons is not large enough and to be quite honest the town isn't that great either), etc) not to mention the beautiful landscape which will be destroyed and with that the wildlife

Correct me if I am wrong but we are supposed to be taking action to slow down/reverse the effects of global warming so why are we considering ripping up the landscape for 600 to 1000 new homes on a part of Welwyn Garden City that is beautiful. Is WGC not a conservation area?

With so many places around the town and outskirts toward Hatfield which are Brownfield sites why not use them.

I have 2 children and regularly go for walks along around the proposed area. Recently my children witnessed something that even I have never seen, barn owl hunting. It was glorious to see and something that I would encourage anyone to watch.

With 600+ homes, are you intending to stop the closure of the QEII, the A1 can only just about cope with the volume of traffic using it already.

I strongly believe that the plans we were shown are very ill thought out and represent a total disregard for this area. It was the landscape around that attracted us to Welwyn Garden City in the first place. We are further out from London so again it makes no sense again to destroy this entire habitat and remove the valuable green belt further.

I appeal to your better sense of reasoning and do not allow this proposal to go ahead.

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)

- Comment ID: csio5155
- Response Date: 12/05/09 09:41

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mrs Rachel Oldridge \(ID: 293049\)](#)

-

PG33-PG34 Please indicate which of the following broad locations you would consider to be the most suitable option for growth around Welwyn Garden City. Please rank the option you would support the most with a 1 and the option you would support least with a 2.

- North east of Welwyn Garden City  
2
- South east of Welwyn Garden City  
1

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Panshanger area is already a long way out of town, too far to walk for most people and poorly served by public transport. The airfield is also a feature in its own right, part of the history and fabric of the area and a green space which should not be built over. Any further building would encroach on the Mimram valley area and/or the woodland adjoining Moneyhole Park, which are all well-used for recreation.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio2766
- Response Date: 11/05/09 15:25

### **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Peter Coles \(ID: 303614\)](#)

·

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

The "Garden City" concept that is supposed to be so important to Welwyn Hatfield Council (WHC) is under threat by the proposed development of Panshanger Airfield.

In an age where protecting the environment is paramount, clearly this development (and that of other green areas) is politically driven and all talk of saving the planet is merely lip service.

Personally, I like the airfield. It gives me the feeling of being in remote spaces, of being out in the country. The aircraft noise is small at best - it's hardly Heathrow Airport. Instead, we are to have up to 1000 new homes - that's up to 3,000 people. This puts additional strain on the town's resources. We have water shortages more summers than not: this development will further exacerbate that problem.

Then there's things like schools (primary and secondary), Queen Elizabeth II hospital, increase in traffic levels... the list goes on.

Suppose the airfield is developed, then what? Will Moneyhole Park be next, either whole or in part? The green spaces on Mundells? The open space in Little Rivers? WHC will insist not, but as we all know, money talks. Every spare plot of green land is being swallowed up and built on. Houses are being shoe-horned into every spare corner big enough. There is a plot of land big enough outside my house - can I expect that to be built on?

What is more, the plans were only available to view in person at the exhibitions, and are not available on the internet. Is this a sign of under-handedness by Mariposa Investments Ltd., the airfields owners? It will claim that public consultations were held, but the reality is that these were poorly advertised and easy to miss.

Green spaces are like school playing fields - disappearing fast under government pressure to build new homes, and I strongly oppose the proposed development.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio5438
- Response Date: 11/05/09 12:25

### **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr TK Choo \(ID: 292268\)](#)

·

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

This is a petition by the undersigned to prevent the development of Panshanger Airfield of 900 + houses and the change of use of Birchall Farm from a productive farm into a sprawling housing estate. The reasons for the objections are based on the following:

1. Infrastructure – inadequate local infrastructure to support a surge of new residents in this corner of Welwyn Garden City like:
  1. Schools, hospital, NHS GP clinics, dentists and community amenities.
  2. Roads – increase in traffic through Panshanger and residential streets especially Bericot and Sylvan Way.
  3. Hospital – the downgrade of QEII will mean more demand on the dwindling NHS resources.
  4. Quality of life for current and new residents in Panshanger will all suffer.
  5. Water supply – this massive increase in dwellings will put severe strain on water resources in WGC.
  6. Sewers – the current sewers are already having problems with frequent blockage in parts of Panshanger.
2. Environmental – Paving over vast tracks of green spaces and farmland will affect the soak away and underground aquifers. The rainwater run off onto the Mimram brook may cause flooding downstream.
3. Lack of local amenities – current Panshanger residents suffer from a lack of amenities and social facilities. There is nothing for the youths in Panshanger and the social problems are unresolved. More residents will exacerbate this.

This petition has been signed by a total of 185 respondents.

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)

- Comment ID: csio6539
- Response Date: 11/05/09 09:55

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Ms Sara Norwood \(ID: 304862\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Please leave Panshanger Airfield as it is. I lived in Hilly Fields for 22 years directly beneath the flight path of the landing planes and now live in Lincoln Close which is next to the airfield too.

When the estate I am living on now was first built, the residents in the 'bigger/posher' houses soon complained about the planes flying so close to their homes. They knew an airfield was close by with active flying at the time and if they didnt like it, then they should not have bought a home there. Since then, and as the years have gone by, those residents along with many of us, enjoy the planes flying around.

The airfield with its cafe and peaceful surroundings along with the planes bring joy to the neighbourhood and now I have a child of my own, like when I grew up there, also enjoy taking leisurely walks to go and watch the planes taking off and landing.

Further housing, no matter what type of housing it is, is a definite NO. This area is already heavily built on and having extra residents there will only put an extra strain on the schools,

lack of NHS as it is and other services that are already suffering as things stand at the moment.

I think I have waffled on enough but I am sure you understand what I am trying to say??!!  
NO to homes - KEEP the airfield.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio6213
- Response Date: 07/05/09 16:58

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Jason Claridge \(ID: 303607\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below.

Panshanger airfield objection [Comments surrounding the following topics].

Infrastructure

Community

Employment

Environment

**Attachments:**

- [CSIO 5417.doc](#) (Size: 25.5K)
- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio5417
- Response Date: 07/05/09 11:28

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Ms Linda Dobson \(ID: 302247\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below. I am strongly against Panshanger airfield being developed for a number of reasons. These include: the distance of the area from local shops and services, the impact on the environment, loss of open space, impact on constrained local infrastructure (sewage capacity, roads, public transport), damage to residents quality of life, loss of the airfield as an area of historic significance and amenity (including a cafe) and the lack of employment opportunities for the influx of new residents.

**Attachments:**

- [LindaDobson csio4551.doc](#) (Size: 28.0K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4551
- Response Date: 06/05/09 16:07

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Robert Southgate \(ID: 299406\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below.

Object to proposals on the Panshanger airfield.

Main comments expand upon the following matters:

Noise.

Infrastructure.

Loss of green land.

The airfield itself.

Reduced training facilities for pilots.

**Attachments:**

- [CSIO 4150.doc](#) (Size: 27.5K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4150
- Response Date: 06/05/09 11:04

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Kevin Keogh \(ID: 299405\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below.

Strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of Panshanger airfield.

Issues arising from the Mariposa local meeting to review and discuss the proposed redevelopment.

Main objections (in summary):

The site is an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Lack of facilities and infrastructure issues.

The detrimental effect on the local community.

Employment opportunity issues.

Proposed high density area concerns.

**Attachments:**

- [CSIO 4144.doc](#) (Size: 27.5K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4144
- Response Date: 06/05/09 10:36

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Roger Manning \(ID: 299404\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

i am a keen military history enthusiast ,i live in plymouth but my sister has lived in the area for years i go when i visit to see the freindly people at panshanger airdrome ,it has a long history of a training airfield for tiger moth aircraft for ww2 airmen and as a decoy for hatfield ,surely in this day we can keep an old ww2 heritage airfield alive ,we have enough houses in the area and i know that mrs webber from jersey was happy to keep the interest going although her husband was not and started the rot of the housing estate , i think we do not honour the pilots and ww2 enough and let greed and excuses for noise etc cloud our motives for housing . stop the eating up of green land and use some used sites around your area not green ones for housing . redevelopment is the wrong word for this idea it was a green field before and had as much historical importance as any ancient monument ,would you like windsor castle removed for new wimpy etc homes of course not.

Many of our dead pilots from ww2 were trained at panshanger ,leave it alone ,many hundreds of people think as i do .

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4136
- Response Date: 06/05/09 08:56

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Ms Patricia Haines \(ID: 303012\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below.

I would like to object very strongly to the inclusion of the Panshanger Airfield,as detailed in the Core Strategy, as one of the possible sites for housing development in the district. [Full comments attached].

**Attachments:**

- [CSIO 5100.doc](#) (Size: 26.5K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio5100
- Response Date: 05/05/09 16:19

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Carol West \(ID: 299391\)](#)**

±

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

I cannot believe that you are even considering building on our historic airfield when there are large numbers of vacant properties already in Panshanger! I am referring to Ley House on the corner of Moors Walk /Long Ley for one.

I am lost for words that such a number of flats can be empty for so long, clearly no building improves by being unoccupied. Surely the currently empty properties should be let or sold before creating even more "concrete jungle" on an attractive and thriving local flying school. Please register the fact that I am totally opposed to such development. It is part of our local history with the connection to the 2nd world war.

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4115
- Response Date: 05/05/09 15:50

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Mr & Mrs Kevin & Caroline Welch \(ID: 299402\)](#)**

±

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below.

Proposed development of Panshanger Airfield by Mariposa Investments.

Matters of concern include overall government policy for regional development. The need for vast numbers of new homes and green belt issues.

Infrastructure issues in Welwyn Garden City.

The loss of green, amenity land.

**Attachments:**

- [CSIO 4142.doc](#) (Size: 26.5K)

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio4142
- Response Date: 04/05/09 10:19

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Grant Teasdale \(ID: 299412\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

PG33

I am a member of the flying club at Panshanger. Me and my family enjoy many hours visiting this amenity. It would be a travisly to obliterate this historic site and yet again allow developers to destroy another green area where animals and plant thrive. We do not need another raft of cheap houses deposited onto this site for financial gain , to allow developers to become a little weathier. Its the only corridor between Luton and Stanstead. Remove it and the flight paths of the a forementioned airports will be directed here.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio4130
- Response Date: 01/05/09 17:48

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr & Mrs Alan Willison \(ID: 291504\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Objecting to broad location PG33-ie North east of Welwyn Garden City. This falls within Consultation threads PG33-PG34 Options. The original representation is also attached.

We would like to submit our comments about the core strategy identifying Panshanger Airfield as a site with potential for housing development (Possibly up to 1,000 new homes).

-Aircraft flights-not a problem-no one on the existing estate moved into their house without knowledge that the airfield was there already, and indeed we moved in there to enjoy the experience of seeing the aircraft.

Local schools unlikely to have the capacity available for 1,000 new homes. They will not have the site capacity to expand enough without jeopardising existing facilities.

-Local Doctors-can the local surgery at Moors Walk handle the arrival of a potential 2-3,000 new patients?

-Proposed access routes through existing estate will create a negative impact on the environment ie increased risk to safety and unhealthy CO2 emmisions. Potentially 3 or 4,000 extra car journeys (at least) through the existing estate everyday to reach local services alone. This could be ameliorated to a degree by creating other access routes, particulary at the eastern end.



- Visual impact on the landscape could be dramatic particularly proposed 3 to 4 story high density buildings.
- Wildlife in the area could be destroyed ie Skylarks-a wonderful sight and sound.
- Could existing sewage systems and treatment works cope with the extra needed for 1,000 homes?

**Attachments:**

- [alanwillisonrescan csio4051public..](#) (Size: 88.28K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4051
- Response Date: 01/05/09 17:17

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[DEACTIVATED Mrs Jane Frampton \(ID: 298396\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

The consultee did not rank the PG33, however, the comments below were made:

I strongly object to the building of houses on Panshanger Airfield. The Airfield is a healthy asset to the Panshanger community and surrounding area.

The Airfield provides the following :

An effective band of green belt that has a series of paths that gives access to countryside that is enjoyed by many walkers and protects the ancient Mimram valley landscape and an area with much biodiversity.

Employment in the aviation industry, with skilled employment for aircraft engineers and flying instructors. Employment in the developing airfield cafe.

An expanding social amenity at the cafe for local residents, walkers, cyclists and visitors from the surrounding area. A link with the aviation and wartime heritage of Welwyn Hatfield that has some value in being preserved.

I do not find the small amount of noise from light aircraft that do not fly at night to be a nuisance, especially when compared to the noise, pollution and congestion that will be generated by new housing estate that will probably produce two thousand extra cars that operate 24 hours a day.

Additional houses would place an unacceptable strain on the local services, schools, roads and infrastructure.

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio3993
- Response Date: 01/05/09 17:14

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr John Blanch \(ID: 299386\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Housing

Panshanger aerodrome has been identified as an area for housing ( originally allocated as such in the late 1980's). The removal of the airfield would be desirable as the aircraft are noisy - more so the helicopter school practices.

-Are a nuisance flying low over property , and dangerously close to our current housing. These are , after all, amateur pilots at the mercy of wind and weather. However, there must be plenty of low density housing and open spaces in order to maintain the characteristics of the area and maintain a quality of life that avoids social problems associated with high density housing.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4114
- Response Date: 01/05/09 15:37

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[DEACTIVATED Mr Stephen Frampton \(ID: 298007\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

I strongly object to the building of houses on Panshanger Airfield.

The Airfield is an asset to the Panshanger community and surrounding area.

The Airfield provides the following;-

An effective band of green belt that has a series of paths that gives access to countryside that is enjoyed by many walkers and protects an area with much bio diversity.

Employment in the aviation industry, with skilled employment for aircraft engineers and flying instructors.

Employment in the developing airfield cafe.

An expanding social amenity at the cafe for walkers, cyclists and visitors.

A link with the aviation and wartime heritage of Welwyn Hatfield that has some value is being preserved.

I do not find the small amount of noise from light aircraft that do not fly at night to be a nuisance, especially when compared to the noise, pollution and congestion that will be generated by a new housing estate that will probably produce two thousand extra cars that operate 24 hours a day.

Building on empty brown field sites that already exist within walking distance of the town centre and station are the green and sustainable solution to any perceived need for more housing

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio3927
- Response Date: 01/05/09 14:08

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mariposa Investments Limited \( Mariposa Investments Limited \) \(ID: 331197\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full comments are viewable by clicking on the attachments below. Mariposa Investments supports the conclusion within the Core Strategy (PG33) that the area to the north-east of Panshangher Village is suitable for housing development. Both our client and the HCA wish to see this site taken forward as a preferred option for housing in the next preferred options stage of the Core Strategy as part of a planned expansion of the Welwyn Garden City settlement area. In summary, our conclusion that Panshanger Airfield and the adjoining HCA land are suitable for development to meet the housing needs of the District is based on the following key points:

1. The site is in part previously developed land.
  2. The site is on the edge of the existing urban area of Welwyn Garden City.
  3. A substantial part of the opportunity area has a long-standing policy status as an Area of Special Restraint.
  4. Access from the existing highway network is straightforward.
  5. The extension of Panshanger Village offers the scope for new services and community facilities which would become more viable with a new larger population.
  6. Scope for integration with the existing urban area of Welwyn - bus routes, cycle network.
  7. Site offers a major opportunity to provide formal and informal recreational open space.
- ... 8 - 12.

For full response please see attachments.

**Attachments:**

- [Mariposa nathaniellichfield scan csio6726..](#) (Size: 6,134.19K)
- [Mariposa nathaniellichfield scan2 csio6726..](#) (Size: 274.31K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio6726
- Response Date: 01/05/09 12:03

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr David Farmer \(ID: 298973\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Site A) PG33 Panshanger Aerodrome. This site is not Green Belt, therefore to build on other Green Belt sites before this one would be difficult to justify, especially at public enquiry. The area has been an area of restraint, earmarked for development, for some time now. Its present use is a noisy (and potentially dangerous) nuisance to local residents. The consultants concerned, when asked, stated that the woods to be grown on the northern edge of their

planned development would be of locally sourced woodland stock. This would need to be agreed and monitored. The County Sites and Monuments Records also mention features of the Second World War dummy airfield; these are recorded to be of archaeological importance and would need to be preserved in some way. These are the only two sites on which I would like to comment at this stage. Obviously, in the event of a public inquiry, further details might be submitted.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4335
- Response Date: 01/05/09 12:03

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Paul Matthews \(ID: 303606\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below.

Panshanger airfield objection [Comments surrounding the following topics].

Mariposa local meeting

Infrastructure

Community

Employment

Environment

**Attachments:**

- [CSIO 5405.doc](#) (Size: 27.5K)
- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio5405
- Response Date: 01/05/09 11:04

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr & Mrs Eric & Rita Wells \(ID: 291448\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

We have the following comments on the above proposals [Panshanger Airfield].

### 1. General Amenities

It really does NOT appear the the current structure can support such a large future development. The schools in the area are over subscribed already so it is difficult to understand how they will cope with another 1000 house. The same applies to the Doctors, Dentist and with the closure of some of the units at the QE2, the Hospital facilities. We understood that there is a usage problem with the swerage so how is that going to cope?

### 2. Shops and Transport.

There are insufficient shops. Morrisons is invariable full of people and more houses will only increase the problem. The distance to town is more than walking distance and could create problems in particular late evening time with the drink and drive problems.

### 3. High Density Housing.

The suggested 'high density' housing is very close to the exist to existing homes. It would be far better to site these closer to the Hems Lane area so as to reduce the amount of traffic using the Bericot Way approach. This road is used as a 'race track' now so more traffic will create a worst situation.

### 4. Our Heritage.

I am surprised that with a heritage such as the Panshanger Airfield that consideration is even being given to development on this land.

### 5. Community Enhancement.

No consideration appears to have been given to community enhancement to the existing housing area on Panshanger.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio5168
- Response Date: 30/04/09 10:05

## **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr & Mrs TK Choo \(ID: 301473\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Our prime objections are :

1 Green Belt - these are Green Belt and agricultural land that belongs to our future generation. We have a duty to protect these for them.

2 Infrastructure - the increase in housing on these sites creating massive housing estates will put severe strains on the current infrastructure on roads, schools, hospital, GP, Water, refuse, local transport and leisure facilities.

As such the peak traffic on WGC roads are pretty bad and will mean a big reduction in the quality of life for everyone. When we are loosing the QE2 hospital, it seems daft to create more dwelling here rather in Stevenage.

3 Environmental - These fields provide vital soak away. When Panshanger extended over the last 20 years, friends living in Hertford reported increase in flooding there. The environmental impact of cementing over such a large chunk of land will alter the water drainage, run off and increase the likelihood of further flooding as encountered elsewhere.

Brownfield and Infilling - The council should look at encouraging more building on brownfield and infill sites to meet the Government imposed targets. With many designated commercial and industrial zones now underused, this is a more sensible policy. The Broadwater development could and should be allowed higher residential density. Lift the restrictions imposed to allow more creative use of such space to preserve our Green belt.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4454
- Response Date: 29/04/09 17:15

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Ms Elvina Culver \(ID: 302280\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

I understand that your council is likely to be asked to grant planning permission for Panshanger airfield.

I am writing to express my dismay at this possibility.

I came to know Panshanger airfield when my son recently learnt to fly there. It was during my visits that I came to see the amount of use it gets - not just from those who fly but from their many guests and the ramblers who use the facilities. In addition I have been to community activities at the cafe on the site.

So much of the Home Counties has seen the villages joined up by housing development so that they all look the same. It was so pleasant to see a part of the country which seemed to make a virtue of offering something different. The fact that Panshanger had a history which the county seemed to acknowledge was most refreshing.

Please do all you can to maintain this unique area and don't let it become like everywhere else!

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4574
- Response Date: 29/04/09 16:44

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Jack Culver \(ID: 302253\)](#)

:

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

I am writing to oppose the proposed development of Panshanger Airfield.

Like so many others, we moved to the Hertford area some years ago because it felt like part of the country even though you were only an hour from the centre of London. We were

attracted to the county town for its scale and pace of life. Hertford appeared an oasis among the urban areas of Hatfield, Welwyn and Watford. More development in the area, especially to the east side of Welwyn would ruin that.

The effects of more housing built on the substantial site will, of course, put added pressure on the local infrastructure such as hospitals, schools and emergency services as well as increasing the carbon emissions from 600 homes and the cars that will invariably go with it. The proximity to London will obviously mean extra use of the A414 with pollution and noise that will encourage.

It is well recognised that replacing green and open spaces on an elevated site such as this with concrete and tarmac will increase the flooding risk. In addition, as an elevated site, it would be visually intrusive in the landscape.

The aerodrome is not only an historic site but has formed strong ties with local community and together with the Out of the Box cafe holds many community events such as fireworks display, Christmas Santa visits and an Easter egg hunts and is home to a wide range of wildlife. Out of the Box cafe has in itself become a mecca for local walkers, cyclist and families using it as a meeting place and eatery.

The developers offering to take away the noise pollution from the airfield is small compensation for the things that will be lost. The airfield has a strict noise abatement policy in place in which all the club planes avoid flying over local houses. At present there exists an air corridor over Panshanger with related height restrictions. If Panshanger goes there will be nothing stopping Luton or Stanstead from changing the areas they use for stacking airliners: what will be worse - a few light planes during the day or the noise and pollution of airliners all day and night?

There would appear to be other factors, such as the fact that an SSSI exists along the Mimram that could be sensitive to development, a County Wildlife site to the west and an Area of Archaeological Significance to the south could be affected.

In conclusion I wish to stress how beautiful and quiet and peaceful this area is. To allow development on this scale will produce another Hatfield and destroy the unique nature of this area.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options

- Comment ID: csio4552
- Response Date: 29/04/09 16:10

## **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Jerry Larke \(ID: 297982\)](#)

⋮

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Wrong place/wrong decision. Look at all the unoccupied houses, many according to BBC news programme! Building on this lovely airfield site or even the thought of it is disgraceful. I notice that you have brought up the subject of noise, completely unobtrusive to most Panshanger residents. Mr Hiam Mikado has brought a delightful airfield back to life, lots of amenities, employment and a very necessary aircraft training school you will destroy one mans livelihood and ambitions for the future, the majority of residents want to see the aircraft continue flying and the surroundings remain green and of course the wildlife that exists

alongside of us. I shall do all I can to prevent this insane proposal. Think of the next generation. Panshanger will soon merge into Sele Farm!  
p.s Airfield has wartime history and Lotus build G. Prix cars here!

- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio3915
- Response Date: 29/04/09 11:34

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr & Mrs Tony & Lynne Gavaghan \(ID: 302240\)](#)

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Having seen the proposed plans for the re development of Panshanger Airfield we wish to register our objections to this development for the following reasons:-

The proposed construction of 900-1,000 houses on this site would extend a housing estate which has already reached its full capacity and sustainability. This would place enormous pressure on existing services such as doctors , schools and the sewage system which already has recognised capability constraints ( Rye Meads) It would also mean that as the QE2 would be closed a potential extra 4,000 people would have to travel to the Lister hospital along the A1 , a hospital which is already going to have to deal with an extended number of existing residents. The air ambulance would also not have anywhere close by to land.

The density of housing would go against the ethos of the Garden City The existing residents' quality of life would be severely affected as a large number of them walk along the footpaths alongside the airfield and benefit from the space and air that this gives them The airfield provides a good green space next to the estate which provides an excellent habitat for wildlife and birds.

This wildlife would have their hedges and habitats destroyed and the impact of the building would affect all the wildlife in the surrounding area, including in the area designated as of special interest for its' grassland habitats along the B1000.

The planned entrance route to the planned new estate would be from Bericot way with a second one along Old Hearn Lane. There would be a huge increase in traffic along Bericot way and Panshanger Drive as this would be people's preferred route to Morrison's supermarket. This road is normally quiet with children playing alongside and crossing it. The planned footpath entrances from all the cul-de sacs would increase pedestrian traffic along what are normally very quiet roads and could lead to ant-social behaviour from bands of youngsters who already cause some trouble on surrounding footpaths with motor scooters etc. In fact the fencing at the bottom of one cul de sac in Westcott was put up especially to prevent this sort of behaviour ( as the council will be able to verify).

The addition of 1,000 extra houses would greatly increase the traffic along Birchall lane B195 and the A414 and along the B1000 and the A414 If the council plans to choose one of its other options along the A414 as well, the traffic in the rush hour could well become impossible.

The planned four storey buildings would only be 50 metres away from existing houses which would significantly affect the landscape and be visually prominent from all areas and could



impact on the ancient landscape of the Mimram. Run-off from the site could also increase risk of flooding and pollution to the River Mimram and therefore have an impact on the SSI site and the County Wildlife site.

The council may already intend to build houses to the West of the airfield on land it already owns which Mariposa Investments are claiming would be a green area.

The reduction in aircraft noise is of little benefit to the community as they are good neighbours and most residents and their guests enjoy watching the planes. Noise is kept to a minimum and planes do not fly at anti-social times.

We realise that more houses have to be built in this area and accept that the council will have to use the land it already owns on the Panshanger estate, but we feel that the airfield is not suitable for housing and urge the council to reject this proposal.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4542
- Response Date: 28/04/09 15:51

### **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Nigel Bradley \(ID: 289607\)](#)**

.

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

I would like to take this opportunity to strongly object to the proposed development mainly on environmental grounds.

We have lived in Panshanger for the past 22 years 20 of which here in Chelveston. Last year a family of grass snakes decided to nest in my rear garden and they have just returned.

I believe that any such development would threaten such natural wild life and will be asking advice from a family friend, Nigel Marven, whom you will no doubt remember as a wildlife expert from his television appearances.

I understand that the council has not made any proposal to develop the Aerodrome but have included the area as possible space in future development plans as part of the NE Growth for WGC. The land owners have raised a proposal for future housing development of their land based upon Government guidelines for future growth and have run a series of public exhibitions one of which I attended last week.

I wish to raise an objection to any such development of Panshanger Aerodrome on Environmental grounds as it would have an adverse affect on natural wildlife in the area. Also I believe, in my role as a Civil Engineer, that the current Infrastructure would not be adequate to sustain a development as proposed and any upgrading cost would far outweigh the benefit gained.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4105
- Response Date: 28/04/09 14:23

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Colin Grimwood \(ID: 295882\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

We oppose the option for residential development of the Panshanger Airfield site. We believe that the list of disadvantages given in the Core Strategy is materially incomplete. We believe that advantages identifies in the Core Strategy are, in fact, disadvantages. Please see attached letter for further details.

**Attachments:**

- [colingrimwood scan csio3923..](#) (Size: 492.0K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio3923
- Response Date: 28/04/09 13:57

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr and Mrs Robin and Lynda Smith \(ID: 299823\)](#)

.

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

NOTE - These comments have been summarised. The full submitted comments are viewable by clicking on the attachment below. We oppose development of Panshanger Airfield for a number of reasons. Firstly, 1000 new houses would add extra burden to already constrained infrastructure (doctors, dentists, utilities, schools roads and rail). Secondly it would mean the loss of a green area. Too many green areas have already been lost. The airfield is important for biodiversity (such as barn owls, birds of prey and bats) and gives pleasure to many local residents. Thirdly, the airfield also has a small flying school which is an important recreational resource and is also important for pilots who wish to make a career in aviation. On the social side there is a cafe which is a place for local residents to go and enjoy. The airfield is something that should be celebrated and enjoyed on all these levels and not just a site under pressure from central government to develop additional housing, which in our opinion is unsustainable.

The original concept for WGC was that there should be pleasant houses and gardens, with good amenities and an abundance of open space.. It is a shame that these inspiring original ideas are now being treated rough shod, and it would appear that Welwyn may as well drop the 'Garden' from its name and be called 'Welwyn City'.

**Attachments:**

- [Lyndaandrobinsmith email csio 4251.doc](#) (Size: 26.5K)
- [View consultation point PG33-PG34 : Options](#)
- Comment ID: csio4251
- Response Date: 27/04/09 16:33

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Sharp \(ID: 288561\)](#)

⋮

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

This part of the Mimram valley is a special amenity, protected by the County Council over the years against gravel extraction and the residential development of the so-called plotlands. Housing at the airfield would create a new skyline and effectively spoil the rural nature of the valley. There are only two licensed airfields in the whole of Hertfordshire. The future of Elstree airfield is precarious. This development of Panshanger would potentially leave Hertfordshire with no facilities for flyng training and private flying. It is in these schools that most commercial pilots start their training.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio734
- Response Date: 27/04/09 16:03

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr John Norton \(ID: 290577\)](#)

⋮

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

PG33 would not help to maintain viability of Welwyn Garden City - it would cause over development of the Panshanger area which already lacks adequate local services. The proposal is stated to be too small to support a new neighbourhood centre, but the existing shops, and facilities are already inadequate for the area,

The area cannot really be described as "already developed land" - the majority is open grassland which has undoubted ecological significance and is far from a "brownfield" site in the true meaning of the term. It would generate a large amount of traffic that would use the roads through the existing residential areas - particularly when travelling towards or from the A414.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio2221
- Response Date: 27/04/09 16:02

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Ms Elaine Donaldson \(ID: 289320\)](#)

⋮

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Growth around WGC - NE Panshanger.

This area is too far from WGC town centre to be feasible as a site for so many additional houses. I already live in Panshanger and commute from Hatfield (railway station) as the drive and parking are more convenient! Many more fellow commuters do likewise. With 1,000 extra homes the traffic congestion would be "gridlock" - there already is constant traffic on

the A414/B195 and it seems incredible that this site is even being considered. Local bus services are poor; car use is essential (imagine the number of extra cars with 1,000 houses...) Please, please...Herts green spaces are being swallowed up, it is essential all brownfield/non rural sites are used up first.

NB the old Shredded Wheat site in WGC (perfectly located for local amenities)

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio4098
- Response Date: 27/04/09 13:54

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mrs Brigitte Bevan \(ID: 12299\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

I am commenting not on any part of the document as I haven't seen it but I am most concerned that the wonderful amenity of Panshanger Aerodrome is in danger of being closed for yet more housing. There are so few amenities left. Stanborough pool is closed and still not replaced by anything. Panshanger is a historic aerodrome used by both light aircraft and helicopters. It is surrounded by lovely woods and has a cafe serving meals and snacks to anyone. You can sit in pleasant surroundings watching small aircraft taking off and landing making far less noise than the motorway I have to listen to all day and everyday. Can't we have some nice places left for enjoyment?

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio3943
- Response Date: 24/04/09 16:18

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Captain Colin Hastings \(ID: 287885\)](#)

±

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

Section 6, PG33-34 - Providing for Growth

The statement is unclear as to the proposals for Panshanger Aerodrome. The East Of England Plan was quite clear in its protection statement on local, active aerodromes such as Panshanger. This was confirmed by the DfT and in writing by David Gaulke MP.

Are the Council proposing a shift away from the previously approved protection of the Aerodrome?

Closure of the Aerodrome would have a significant effect on the local businesses resident there and on the very active pilot training school as well as the owner / operators of some 50+ light aircraft. Residents of East Hertfordshire will find no local services for flight training,

with the only nearest opportunity being Elstree Aerodrome at Watford or North Weald Aerodrome is Essex - both too far for locals to reasonably travel. In addition, there is limited capacity at either of those aerodromes to house the displaced light aircraft should Panshanger Aerodrome be given up for development. The result would be a significant loss to aviation in the district. Those aircraft currently located at Panshanger would likely have to be sold or the owners move to other airfields that are an unreasonable travelling distance.

It is true that a big aerodrome is an ideal place to build and that a number of locals in the area would be glad to see the closure of the aerodrome, but the loss to Hertfordshire aviation services would be large, with few opportunities to displace to other locations.

The Aerodrome community does all it can to support local community relations by published Noise Abatement procedures and organising a number of community events such as the annual Young Aviator Days where local and disadvantaged young people are given an insight to aviation as a career and an opportunity to fly in a light aircraft - all for free. In 2008, pilots at Panshanger Aerodrome introduced 193 young people from all backgrounds to aviation related learning, with similar planned in 2009.

Developments around the Aerodrome would introduce a safety risk - the Civil Aviation Authority has 'minimums' that must be adhered to for an Aerodrome plus increase the number of noise complaints from residents, to the detriment of the Aerodrome businesses.

- [View consultation point](#)  
PG33-PG34 : Options
- Comment ID: csio223
- Response Date: 20/04/09 21:42

### **Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr Adrian Whitby \(ID: 330646\)](#)

-

Q3b Do you think that we have examined, or started to examine, all the key infrastructure requirements that will be needed to support the delivery of growth in the borough?  
No

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Panshanger Aerodrome Redevelopment

With this development are the council planning on expanded Road and Rail links, I assume we are subject to this proposal due to our commuter status into London. How will the A1 cope it can't handle the rush hour traffic now. Also what about parking at railway stations, have you ever tried to catch a train from WGC, Hatfield, Stevenage or St Albans after rush hour, absolutely no parking? You have to be at the station for 6am to have any hope, not good when you plan a day out for the children during holiday time.

Why must Welwyn and Hatfield be the focus of this ridiculous effort by the government for taking 10 to 15,000 houses, surely that equates to a new town? - Why doesn't someone find a area of land that a Whole New Town could be developed, infrastructure such as Roads and rail could pre-planned along with Utilities (gas / Water / electricity) and Amenities for the residents. - Wasn't that how places such as WGC and Letchworth were planned and built upon not shoe horning houses into already over crowded developments lacking any sort of infrastructure to cope with the traffic and people.

I do hope you reconsider the proposal and block any planned re-development, as when I moved to this area 6 years ago from Luton, having the countryside and open spaces 2 minutes from my doorstep was the biggest factor in moving to WGC.

- [View consultation point](#)  
Q3b : Question

- Comment ID: csio6718
- Response Date: 12/05/09 15:25

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Miss Fiona Parker \(ID: 303702\)](#)

⋮

Miscellaneous CommentsDo you have any other comments?

The proposed development will have a devastating effect on the community and infrastructure of the area.

Existing local facilities like the doctors surgeries and schools would be completely overstretched, as would the local bus services.

We have already lost the 406/407 bus service which now means that certain member of the community without a car are unable to get to the local shops and more importantly the doctors surgery. How will these services cope with yet more development ?

At present Panshanger has access to open space/wildlife which offers high quality living for local people ,all this would be lost along with the airfield which is a historic and now also a social facility for the community. I understand the proposal could include high density plans so how would that fit into the current low density landscape. Land suitability must surely be an issue as swallowholes have always been a problem in this area.

I hope you will take notice of the comments of local people when reviewing this strategy

- [View consultation point](#)  
Q3b : Question

- Comment ID: csio5468
- Response Date: 12/05/09 14:15

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr John Blanch \(ID: 299386\)](#)

⋮

Q3b2If no, please identify any additional matters you would like us to consider and supply any relevant evidence in support of your comments.

Infrastructure

No buses on sunday are a problem for some people. Housing development ( a mixture of low density and some high ) on Panshanger aerodrome would be desirable as the aircraft and helicopters are very noisy, a nuisance and dangerously close to our housing.

- [View consultation point](#)  
Q3b : Question

- Comment ID: csio4129

- Response Date: 01/05/09 17:18

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mrs Rachel Oldridge \(ID: 293049\)](#)

⋮

SC6-SC8 Should the development of any areas identified for urban expansion...  
Embody the key design principles of the original 'Garden City', in terms of layout, landscaping and architectural styles, regardless of it's location. OR

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

Also consider how far out of the town any new development will be; eg parts of Panshanger are already nearly an hour's walk from the town centre; if you want communities to be sustainable and connected, by means other than the car, don't build any further out.

- [View consultation point](#)  
SC6-SC8 : Options
- Comment ID: csio2710
- Response Date: 11/05/09 14:27

**Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document**[Mr TK Choo \(ID: 292268\)](#)

⋮

Strategy Statement Question Do you agree with this strategy statement? If not, please state what you consider to be a realistic alternative.

Yes. Translating this into reality requires vision, planning, funding and execution. Various districts like Panshanger endure many housing development without increases in community services for everyone, especially the youths and the elderly. This lofty aim is worthless unless an audit is carried out and an action plan is enacted. How and who is responsible for this strategy?

- [View consultation point](#)  
SS12 : Strategy Statement
- Comment ID: csio2487
- Response Date: 08/05/09 23:57

## Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Mr TK Choo \(ID: 292268\)](#)

⋮

Strategy Statement Question Do you agree with this strategy statement? If not, please state what you consider to be a realistic alternative.

The Panshanger Airfield massive housing development of 800-1000 dwellings will remove a vital soak away. The effects of surface runoff onto the Mimram will be disastrous and polluting. The potential for flooding further downstream, especially in Hertford, is high and potentially damaging to the fragile ecosystem.

Environment impact of flooding downstream must be assessed.

- [View consultation point](#)

SS9 : Strategy Statement - Water Quality and Land Contamination

- Comment ID: csio2284
- Response Date: 07/05/09 23:49

## Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Mr Sharp \(ID: 288561\)](#)

⋮

Issue Question Do you think that we have identified the relevant key issues? If not, please state any other issues you think we should consider and why.

This part of the Mimram valley is a special amenity, protected by the County Council over the years against gravel extraction and the residential development of the so-called plotlands. Housing at the airfield would create a new skyline and effectively spoil the rural nature of the valley.

There are only two licensed airfields in the whole of Hertfordshire. The future of Elstree airfield is precarious. This development of Panshanger would potentially leave Hertfordshire with no facilities for flying training and private flying. It is in these schools that most commercial pilots start their training.

- [View consultation point](#)

I1 : The Issues

- Comment ID: csio377
- Response Date: 23/04/09 06:48

## Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document [Mr John Norton \(ID: 290577\)](#)

⋮

Miscellaneous Comments Do you have any other comments?

I do not feel that most of the people in the area are aware of this consultation or the importance of certain areas being designated for future development. We only found out as a result of a leaflet drop by the developer that is promoting the Panshanger airfield site. At their exhibition they gave the impression that the site had already been allocated for housing and made no mention of the alternatives; rather than concentrating on trying to get us to



express opinions on the various details of their proposed development. They also gave the impression that there was plenty of time to comment to the Council, when in fact time was quite tight. I feel that the opportunity to comment on all the proposals has been limited to choosing between various options rather than to be able to indicate other preferences which may not support any of the suggested options. It feels as if one is being given the opportunity choose between the lesser of two evils rather than the option of neither.

Some questions such as E1-7 require you to rank various issues when many people feel that they are all important and it is impossible to use a generic ranking in some cases certain issues will be more important than others, in others the ranking will be different. I wonder how much this consultation will be dominated by vested interests of developers and owners wanting to promote their own sites for financial reasons and how much notice will really be taken of the views of individual residents of the area.