

- The application is inconsistent with the stated policy of Welwyn Hatfield Council that the (now approved) application for permission to extract sand and gravel “could only be acceptable if the remaining part of the park could be secured for the longer term as a high quality informal recreation and nature conservation resource with links to the wider network of green spaces thereby becoming a key part of the wider strategic green infrastructure belt described above.” The proposed use of the park for a private airfield would render this condition impossible to comply with.
- The airfield could destroy archaeological remains, many recent (20th Century), but others possibly less so.
- Herts CC’s own review of the planning history of the site in 2004 noted that: “The S106 gives details of the Ellenbrook Park Trust that is to be set up with representatives from Welwyn Hatfield, St Albans District Council, Watling Chase Community Forest, Hatfield Town Council, Colney Heath Parish Council and Arlington. This Trust will be activated when a trigger point is reached and this is linked to the road system improvements, with the last modification joining Ellenbrook due to be completed in April 2004. The trigger points are linked to four Bonds as detailed in the S106 agreement.” The promised Trust was never set up in accordance with those commitments. In effect, permission for use of the land as an airfield would mean that the former S106 would not achieve the benefit that it was intended for.
- The site is used by dogwalkers, runners, walkers, cyclists, horse riders, students, and no doubt many more would use it if access were further enabled by provision of more parking. This would be lost as an amenity, if the outlined site were given over as a private airfield.
- This development, if approved, together with the already approved quarry, would effectively mean the total loss of Ellenbrook as a public amenity, except to the members of the flying club, many of which do not live in the area.
- The development could mean loss of permissive paths and paths that enable exploration and movement on foot, bike and horse around the land between St Albans and Hatfield
- The site is home to a great deal and variety of wildlife. I personally have seen or heard many species of birds, including woodpeckers, cuckoos, herons, and owls, kites and other birds of prey, foxes, muntjac, rabbits and hares, and I’ve seen evidence of badgers. It is hard to imagine that this wildlife would continue to thrive between the quarry and the kind of landscaping required for operation as an airfield. The site is also home to many species of wild plants. Much of this flora and fauna can be seen here:
 - <https://www.flickr.com/photos/98651538@N08/albums/72157638795462286>; and
 - <https://www.flickr.com/photos/43324529@N04/albums/72157628150554277>.
- The site would generate noise, disturbance, and pollution; a significant factor in our decision to buy the house was the absence of noise and disturbance in particular. The boundary of the airfield will be just a few feet from the front of our house, and this will inevitably create noise hours of operation. There is also the risk of light pollution from airfield and runway lighting; at present, the aspect from the front of our house at night is almost complete darkness.
- It would be interesting to speculate just how many of the supporters of this application live in the area, let alone within the Borough (it is clear that some will not live within the Borough), while those objecting are those that live nearby and will experience most disturbance and the

greatest loss of amenity.

- The application states that it seeks permission to build a community park around the perimeter of the airfield. It is impossible to tell from the application where this would be, given the perimeter of the proposed airfield encapsulates the majority of the site not to be occupied by the quarry, including the ancient woodland to the north of the site at Round Wood.
- The application is so high level as to make it impossible to understand what the consequences of approval would be. For example:
 - it shows a red boundary encapsulating a great deal more than the proposed airstrip, including paths, drainage ponds, etc, and at the same time fails to indicate what, if any, public access there will be to existing users of the site (for example, walking, running, riding, etc).
 - There is very little information about the numbers of flights arriving, leaving and flying over the site, nor at what times those would be expected. There is however the suggestion that this may be used for commercial traffic “The position of the relocated airfield is such that the business centres of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield as well as the University of Hertfordshire can be reached in minutes,”, which could imply that there will be pressure for the number of flights to increase over time.
- There is also very little evidence to support assertions within the application (for example, statements in respect of biodiversity and flood risk, contamination), so much so, that one has to wonder whether the applicant or his representatives have either visited the site or researched the statements on which they rely.
- The application makes much of the fact that there was formerly a runway on the site, and implies that this is in a way simply reinstating that, while overlooking the fact that hundreds more homes now also exist on the site and would be disturbed by airfield operations, flight paths etc.
- The application is inaccurate in many ways:
 - It states that south of the proposed runway there is ‘No’ housing, and yet this is clearly not the case according to the applicant’s own plans (to the south of the proposed airfield is the housing development that includes Poplar Avenue and Bramble Road).
 - The application also states that the land is flat and that no landscaping would be required, when anyone that uses the site regularly knows that while it may look flat, the grass conceals many irregularities, while other features (eg around the grazing land) will require landscaping.
 - The application also states that the proposed site is currently up for gravel extraction: as far as I can tell, this applies only to a small corner of the site close to the proposed access point from the Ellenbrook bus link. If it genuinely did fully replace the quarry, it might be more welcome, but as far as I can see, that claim is incorrect, and the proposed site includes pretty much everything that isn’t in the area to be quarried.
 - The application states that the airfield will be on the University of Herts campus, and once again, that it is incorrect as the site is not owned or operated by the University (although the University campus would be adjacent to the proposed site).
- The application makes fanciful predictions about the impact that electric planes would have to reduce noise, while in reality, it is likely that fossil-fuelled planes will continue to be the norm for many years to come.