From: [redacted]
To: Joanna Vincent
Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates' Revised Public Access Strategy – Ellenbrook Fields
Date: 14 March 2026 20:31:22

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 centres on two related concerns: the safety risk posed by the quarry access road for pedestrians, and the loss of practical, year-round walking routes through the park due to the removal of hard-surfaced paths.

Pedestrian and dog safety at the quarry access roads
Accessing Ellenbrook Fields from the surrounding residential area requires crossing the road that will carry quarry HGVs and heavy plant vehicles. For anyone walking with a dog, this crossing represents a serious and ongoing safety concern that the revised strategy does not adequately address.
I walk my dog on these fields daily and I would ask what provision has been made for a safe, segregated pedestrian crossing at this point. If none is proposed, this alone should be grounds for requiring significant amendments to the strategy. The access road, without adequate mitigation, effectively becomes a barrier to safe use of the park.

Seasonal flooding and the need for hard-surfaced paths
I walk my dog across Ellenbrook Fields daily (twice a day most days) and depend on the existing concrete taxiway to do so reliably throughout the year. The site is low-lying and prone to significant waterlogging, a fact well known to any regular user and acknowledged within the strategy documents themselves.
The fields regularly submerged under standing water, making the grass routes completely impassable on foot.
The proposed replacement paths are largely grass-based. In practice, this means they would be unusable for extended and recurring periods during autumn, winter, and early spring. Walking through waterlogged fields is neither practical nor safe, and for some residents it may not be physically possible.

The concrete taxiway is what makes Ellenbrook Fields a genuinely accessible, all-weather amenity. Removing it without providing equivalent hard-surfaced alternatives would significantly reduce the park's value to the community, particularly to the large number of residents who use it daily.

Failure to meet the Inspector's requirements
The Inspector was clear that cross-park access must remain convenient, attractive, and unfettered. The revised proposals fall short on all three counts.
Access that depends on crossing an active HGV route without a segregated crossing is not convenient or safe. Paths that flood extensively and repeatedly for months at a time are not unfettered, they are weather-dependent and unreliable. Routes running alongside industrial workings, bunds, and fencing are not attractive for recreational use

For these reasons, I strongly object to the revised Public Access Strategy in its current form.

Thanks for your consideration,
Rachel Loftus