

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 29 July 2021 13:20

To: Contact-WHC <Contact-WHC@welhat.gov.uk>

Subject: Broadwater Road development proposals

47 Elmwood
Welwyn Garden City
Herts AL8 6LD

29 July 2021

Director of Planning
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Council Offices
The Campus
Herts

Dear Sir

[Objection to development proposals on Broadwater Road](#)

[Wheat Quarter Ltd 6/2021/0181/MAJ](#)

[MTVH 6/2021/0671/MAJ](#)

[Bio Park 6/2020/3420/MAJ](#)

We are writing to lodge our objections to the above applications for the proposed redevelopment of this site for the following reasons:

These proposals are quite out of keeping with what Welwyn Garden City stands for. They reflect the developer's wish to maximise the area for housing at the expense of design, character and context. It ignores what ordinary people want; there is minimal attention given to the public realm and landscaping; and the impact of this development will severely impact movement across the town.

The entire design of the sites is alien to the town and has no kinship with it.

These developments are far too dense; many of the buildings are too tall for the town and much of these developments will be in shadow all the time. Much of them would also overshadow the town centre from which it could be seen.

The pre-eminence of the silos as a major landmark in the town will be lost amongst other tall but nondescript blocks. The focus on the industrial heritage of the location as was envisaged in the Broadwater Road West Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has all but been ignored.

These proposals are contrary to most of the Council's broad design principles as set out in the last and still current District Plan as regards Policy D1 (Quality of Design), Policy D2 (Character and Context), Policy D4 (Quality of the public realm)

All this in a town that has been cited as the country's foremost garden city. It is as if the developer is not aware where it is placing the development. It could be dumped anywhere to make a profit.

The proposals seem to be creating gardens in the sky – ie, on the top of the tall buildings. These would require substantial maintenance and upkeep and there is little confidence in this being done properly in the future, even if residents used them. There are safety issues that do not seem to have been properly considered either.

It is odd that little thought has been given to the amount of space allocated to parking needed for visitors to anyone living on the site or for deliveries to be possible to residents. Equally, there is not enough provision of space allocated for ambulances calling into the site for the sick or for picking up patients and delivering them back. It all shows that the needs of ordinary people who would have to live on the site have not been foremost in the developer's mind.

The proposed development represents an increase over the current approved plans of some 55% and will add some 15% to the overall town population but crammed into a very concentrated area.

The proposed increase in the number of flats is targeted in an area by developers without, it seems, any assessment of the overall impact on the locality. The Council does not seem to be aware of the impact of these developments and other developments already agreed and other developments already built.

At a time of pandemic when we have all learned of the value of gardens, the open air and the need to "get out", it is all more than evident that tall housing blocks are not the answer to the well-being of residents. It is even more surprising that these proposals are set for an area of the town that is the most deprived and amongst the most deprived in Hertfordshire. So, adding this development into an area that is being significantly developed with new flats already and into deprived area is a recipe for disaster. It simply promises to be a slum of the future and will epitomise the very conditions that Ebenezer Howard was seeking to avoid when the town was founded a century ago.

So we object to all three proposals.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the author.