From: [redacted]
To: Joanna Vincent
Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates' Revised Public Access Strategy – Ellenbrook Fields
Date: 14 March 2026 16:55:14

Dear Ms Vincent,
I am writing to object to the revised Public Access Strategy submitted by Brett Aggregates for the proposed quarrying on Ellenbrook Fields.
My objection relates specifically to public access across the park, as required by the Inspector. I live locally and rely on Ellenbrook Fields as a safe, direct, and accessible walking route for daily travel (Hatfield Police Station) — including my commute to work. The proposed strategy would remove the only practical cross-park route I can use on foot, forcing me into a car for journeys I currently make sustainably.
Loss of a viable walking route
The existing concrete taxiway is the only surface that allows me to walk year-round without detours, mud, or safety concerns. It is wide, visible, and accessible, which makes it suitable for commuting in all weather. Under the new plans, only around 40% of this route would remain, and the replacement paths would be narrow, grass-based, and often unusable in winter, as the document itself illustrates.
For someone who depends on walking to get to work, this is not a minor inconvenience — it removes my only reliable non-car option.
Proposed routes are not "convenient, attractive or unfettered"
The Inspector was clear that cross-park access must remain convenient and unfettered. The new proposals fail to achieve this:
Many paths would run next to bunds, fencing, quarry workings, or heavy vehicle routes, which is neither attractive nor safe.
The narrow grass path between the lagoons would be impassable for months of the year, forcing long diversions.
Several routes would require navigating crossings and quarry traffic, which is not compatible with free movement, especially for pedestrians.
These are not realistic commuting routes for residents.
The strategy forces residents into cars
If these plans go ahead, I will no longer be able to walk to work. The diversions, unsafe conditions, and seasonal impassability mean I would have no choice but to drive. This contradicts local and national commitments to sustainable travel, and it places an unnecessary burden on residents who have relied on this route for decades.
Failure to integrate restored phases
Could Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) not be considered?
The positioning of the lagoons means that restored areas cannot be connected to the rest of the park until the very end of the quarry's life. This prolongs disruption and prevents meaningful access for many years, contrary to the expectations set out in the 2000 Agreement and MLP Policy 18(x).
CADENT (main gas line)
It should also be noted that Brett, to date, have made no contact with CADENT regarding the revised plans and potential impact on the main gas line, appreciate they do not need to contact them until they get permission, but, for me, it seems remiss to not consult with CADENT prior to submitting revised proposes if it potentially poses a risk of significant changes to the plan and access strategy.
a) The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (DMPO)
Schedule 4 requires consultation with certain bodies where development affects their infrastructure.
Local planning authorities routinely consult Cadent when:
A high-pressure gas main is within or near the red-line boundary
Works could affect pipeline easements
Ground levels, access, or safety zones may be altered
Heavy plant or construction traffic may cross or load the easement
Landscaping, bunding, or drainage, vibration, changes could compromise pipeline integrity
If the revised Public Access Strategy alters routes, bunds, ground levels, or construction phasing near the main gas line, consultation is normally mandatory.
b) Health & Safety Executive (HSE) – PADHI requirements
If the gas main is a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline (MAHP), the HSE must also be consulted.
Failure to do so is a procedural defect.
What happens if permission is granted, and the plan is changed based on CADENT advise?
Not contacting CADENT at this early stage has the potential to impact on this plan, any revised plans and

subsequent changes could change the relationship between the development and the pipeline, this could have a knock on effect for safety zones, access and maintenance. I would have thought CADENT would have been consulted to ensure the revised plans are suitable, prior to formulating a revised access plan. Potentially, this could make any decision made unlawful because consultation is a statutory duty. These plan should have been sent to CADENT for comment, as I feel that this is a procedural failure / defect in the application.
For these reasons, I strongly object to the revised Public Access Strategy. It does not provide a workable or safe cross-park route for residents, and it significantly harms my ability to travel sustainably and independently.

Yours sincerely,

Mr & Mrs Wallace
Smallford, St Albans
Sent from my iPhone