

## **Application 6/2018/1635 Airfield Proposal**

### **Objection**

#### **Councillor Duncan Bell**

Having called in this application earlier, I would now like to summarise my grounds for objecting:

- There would be the potential for considerable noise pollution over a wide area, covering Ellenbrook, Salisbury Village, and Hatfield Garden Village. Light aircraft noise, particularly if microlights and helicopters are permitted, can be relatively intrusive. Although the application mentions the use of electric aircraft in future, there does not seem to be any guarantee that limits will be placed on the use of piston-engined aircraft, or when such limits might be feasible.
- There is currently no airfield at Panshanger to replace. Therefore I believe that this application should be considered in isolation from any discussion concerning Panshanger.
- The location of the proposed airfield appears to overlap with the area earmarked for an Ellenbrook country park, which is the subject of an existing S106 condition attached to a mineral extraction proposal for this area. It is not clear how the two could co-exist.

- As well as appearing to overlap with the proposed country park, the airfield proposal also appears to overlap with the proposed mineral extraction area itself. Again, it is not clear how these will co-exist.
- There is an implication within the Feasibility Study attached to the application documents that Section 106 monies could be used to fund all or part of the construction of the airfield. Whilst perhaps not strictly a planning matter, I believe that this would be inappropriate. Section 106 monies are really a public resource. They will be finite, and subject to many competing demands. Realistically, provision of private flying facilities cannot be seen as a valid priority use for such funds.