

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates' Revised Public Access Strategy – Personal Access & Safety Concerns
Date: 14 March 2026 10:20:33

Dear Ms Vincent,

I am writing to object to the revised Public Access Strategy submitted by Brett Aggregates for the quarrying proposals at Ellenbrook Fields. My objection relates solely to **public access**, as required.

I am a regular user of Ellenbrook Fields, and the current layout—particularly the wide, open taxiway—provides me with a safe and accessible route that supports both my physical and social wellbeing. The clear sightlines and generous width allow me to see approaching dogs from a distance. This is essential for me because I previously experienced a dog attack, and I rely on being able to maintain space and avoid close encounters with large dogs that are not always kept on a lead.

The new strategy removes most of the taxiway and replaces it with **narrow paths**, many of which will be bordered by **bunds, fencing, quarry workings, or heavy vehicle routes**. The consultation document itself notes that these paths will be “narrow” and “bordered by bunds and fencing,” and that many will be **grass routes that become unusable in winter months**. This would significantly reduce my ability to use the park safely and confidently.

The proposed 3-metre grass path between the lagoons is particularly unsuitable. As the document states, this route will become muddy and impassable in winter, forcing long diversions. For someone like me, who needs predictable, stable, and open routes to manage anxiety around dogs, this is not a viable alternative. Being forced into narrow corridors with no escape space would put me in situations where I am unavoidably close to large dogs, which is distressing and unsafe for me.

The Inspector previously emphasised the need for “**attractive and unfettered**” cross-park access. The new proposals do not meet this requirement. Paths running beside quarry operations, bunds up to 4 metres high, fencing, and lorry routes cannot be considered unfettered or attractive. They also remove the clear sightlines that currently allow me to manage my safety and wellbeing while walking.

The strategy also creates multiple points where users must navigate crossings or walk close to quarry traffic. This further reduces the freedom and confidence with which I can use the park, especially given my need to maintain distance from dogs and avoid sudden encounters.

In summary, the revised Public Access Strategy does not provide safe, convenient, or accessible cross-park routes for people with social or health-related needs like mine.

The loss of the taxiway and the introduction of narrow, enclosed, and seasonally unreliable paths would effectively exclude me from using the park in the way I rely on today.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Inspector finds the revised Public Access Strategy inadequate.

Yours sincerely,

Becky James
Smallford, St Albans