

Main Questions to the WHBC Planning

(Q10 & Q11 are one question)

The Direct Connection to the Southern Outfall Sewer at Rye Meads is a Super Sewer and is required ahead of development at Panshanger ; it dwarfs the WGC Southern Outfall Sewer, the Mimram Trunk Sewer and the North Western Outfall Sewer, because this is a Large Undertaking and one I do not believe can be covered by a Section 106 as the sewer is 11 miles long and has cross boundary issues.

1. If they have carried out a "Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule in respect of this Super Sewer pursuant to the CIL Regulations 2010?
2. Where appropriate if they have carried out a Section 106 pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as the Super Sewer is Necessary Supporting Infrastructure?
3. Can the council please explain the CIL in regards to the Super Sewer and the Section 106 and any Unilateral Undertakings and which developers and infrastructure partners are involved in the sharing the cost for this super sewer?
4. Can the Local Planning Authority please tell me which developers (if any) have they entered in to any agreements concerning Panshanger Aerodrome, to the making of payments in the form of planning contributions towards this super sewer?
5. That this council acknowledges that this Super Sewer is Legitimate Supporting Infrastructure and this council will ensure funding is in place for this Super Sewer and its direct connection at the rye meads waste water treatment works before any development is undertaken?
6. Bearing in mind what the 2009 WCS stated "It is important therefore that the Core Strategy (now Local Plan) makes proper provision for such uncertainty & does not place undue reliance on critical elements of Infrastructure whose funding is unknown"; does the council here accurately know where the funding is coming from for this Super Sewer?
7. I Advised both Thames Water and the Local Planning Authority (WHBC) not to update the TW Position Statement or the new Draft IDP until after the Government Inspector had made his decision on the local plan; however my advice was not heeded; The Updating of these two documents went in to process by TWU and is Grossly Incompetent as TW lays the foundation for any proposed IDP by the LPA have not fully acknowledged the foundation of

the August 4th 2017 Infrastructure meeting with myself but have eluded to the text regarding the foundational reasons for updating the new TW Position Statement & LPA proposed Draft IDP which was based on the exposure of a 1990's Report which was (allegedly) carried over in to the 2009 WCS and the information which was transferred from the 1990's document in to the 2009 WCS, also carried over in to the LPA's Draft IDP's for the last 5 years but the Information that was discussed was never written in the 2009 WCS and therefore neither the TW Position Statement or the Draft IDP can be updated based on Evidence which does not exist; the evidence that they do acknowledge is network upgrades in some places, but this was in addition to and not in place of, but which now would appear as the main point when in fact it was a sub point. The information that was allegedly carried over in to the 2009 WCS was this; "Thames Water have identified that to deliver growth around Welwyn Garden City & Hatfield it is likely that the following Infrastructure & Infrastructure Upgrades will be required; A New Direct Connection to the Southern Outfall Sewer at Rye Meads". The justification to not to build the Super Sewer based on this false information being carried over is now not justified as the carry over information did not exist from the 1990's document and this Fact now justifies the need (as previously pointed out by myself) for this Super Sewer to be built ahead of development at Panshanger. Can WHBC Planning Dept. please explain their reasons for going ahead In Favour with the October 2017 TW Position Statement when there was no evidence to support it in regards to the false information from a 1990's report and that report does not exist as TWU claimed did exist and TWU claimed that report carried over in to the 2009 WCS important strategic data that affected all the Welhat IDP's for the last 5 years and that welhat data was invalid but when in fact the report was false but the report findings were correct at time of writing by the 2009 WCS authors?

8. Can WHBC Planning Dept. please explain their reasons for wanting to go ahead with the proposed new Draft IDP when the TWU Position Statement is fundamentally flawed (post August 2017) when there was no evidence to support it in regards to the false information from a 1990's report, and the report never existed?
9. Can WHBC Planning please tell me, Why was the information from the August 4th 2017 Infrastructure meeting Omitted from the Minutes of the meeting (which was sent to me) in regards to the updating of both the new TW Position Statement & the Draft IDP, based on alleged False Information being carried over from a 1990's document in to all the Welhat IDP's when it has been proven the information allegedly carried over did not exist and the report it was alleged to have been carried over from, did not exist?

10. In March 2015 TW contacted WHBC Planning;

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development:

- 1) WGC4 East of Welwyn Garden City (Panshanger Aerodrome);**
- 2) WGC5 Land To South East of Welwyn Garden City (Birchall Garden Suburb);**
- 3) WGr1 Woolmer Green;
- 4) Former Shredded Wheat Factory Complex Welwyn;
- 5) Hat 2 West Hatfield;
- 6) Hat 1/13 North West Hatfield
- 7) WGC1 South of Welwyn Garden City (Creswick);
- 8) BPLH30 Land to the rear of Builders Arms Public House
- 9) BPLH44 1-12 Green Close AL97ST
- 10) BrP14 East of Golf Club Road
- 11) BrP7 South of Hawkshead Road
- 12) Cuf1 The Meadway
- 13) Cuf6 East of Northaw Road East
- 14) HE23 Factory adjacent Wellfield Road depot
- 15) HW12 Land North of Toms Field
- 16) Land at Bericot Way
- 17) LHe1 North of Hawkshead Road
- 18) QEII Howlands Welwyn Garden City
- 19) Ratcliff Tail Lift Site
- 20) Town Centre North
- 21) WeG1 Welham Manor House
- 22) WeG10 Dixons Hill Road
- 23) WeG2 Welham Manor Grounds
- 24) WeG3 South of Welham Manor
- 25) WeG4b Marshmoor
- 26) WeG6 Skimpans Farm

11. Can WHBC Planning please tell me, knowing already that these 26 areas already Specifically, had a wastewater network capacity constraints in these areas that was likely to be unable to support the demand anticipated from these developments, what justification does WHBC Planning have in not building this Super Sewer, bearing in mind two of the largest areas are back to back at Panshanger & BGS?

Thank You Inspector.