From: [redacted]
To: Joanna Vincent
Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates - Ellenbrook Fields
Date: 13 March 2026 10:00:33

Dear Joanna Vincent,

I am writing to formally submit my objection to the updated Public Access Strategy proposed by Brett Aggregates for the Ellenbrook Fields site.

I'm a Smallford resident and I rely heavily on the existing infrastructure of Ellenbrook Fields to walk to Hatfield for work as well as using the fields for exercise, mental health and wellbeing.

1. Loss of Year-Round Commuting Infrastructure

The existing concrete taxiway is the only all-weather surface available. It provides a wide and safe route that allows me to walk regardless of the season.

The revised strategy replaces this with narrow, grass-based paths. According to the developer's own documentation, these paths are prone to becoming waterlogged and unusable in winter - already an issue in large parts of Ellenbrook fields. This proposal effectively forces me to walk down the busy, noisy and polluted Hatfield Road. I do not have a car and rely on the fields unconditionally.

2. Failure to Meet the Inspector's "Convenient & Unfettered" Standard

The Planning Inspector was explicit: public access must remain **convenient, attractive, and unfettered.** The current revised plan fails on all three counts:

- **Safety & Environment:** Routing pedestrians alongside heavy quarry machinery, high bunds, and fencing creates a hostile and intimidating environment for walkers.
- **Practicality:** The proposed route between the lagoons is far too narrow for shared use and will be impassable for much of the year due to mud.
- **Disruption:** The lack of integration between restored phases means residents are locked out of usable parkland for years longer than necessary.

3. Serious Procedural Concern: Cadent Gas Infrastructure

I am particularly concerned that this revised strategy has been submitted without formal consultation with **Cadent** regarding the high-pressure gas main.

Under the **Town and Country Planning (DMPO) 2015**, consultation is standard where development impacts such critical infrastructure. If the HSE or Cadent later requires safety easements or prohibits the placement of bunds/paths near the pipeline, this entire Access Strategy will be rendered physically impossible to implement.

Proceeding to a decision without this consultation is a significant procedural oversight. It risks a scenario where permission is granted on a plan that is technically unlawful or unsafe, necessitating further disruptive changes down the line.

Conclusion

The proposed strategy is seriously flawed. It takes a functional, safe community asset and replaces it with a series of fragmented, muddy detours that prioritise quarry operations over the legal rights of the public. I urge the board to reject this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Jason Mattu