

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Formal Objection to Revised Public Access Strategy – Ellenbrook Fields (Brett Aggregates)
Date: 14 March 2026 19:46:23

Dear Ms Vincent,

I am writing to formally submit my objection to the revised Public Access Strategy submitted by Brett Aggregates. As a local resident who regularly uses Ellenbrook Fields for family recreation, I believe the current proposal fails to meet the requirements set out by the Inspector and undermines the community's right to safe, accessible green space.

1. Loss of a Viable and Accessible Leisure Route

The existing concrete taxiway is the only reliable, year-round pedestrian route through the park. My family and I rely on this specific surface for leisure walks with our young children. Because it is wide, level, and solid, it is the only part of the fields that is truly "all-weather" and accessible for pushchairs or for young children who cannot navigate rougher terrain. The proposed strategy replaces this with narrow, grass-based paths. As the applicant's own documentation illustrates, these replacements are prone to becoming waterlogged and unusable during winter. For a family with young children, a seasonal grass path is not a viable alternative; it effectively bars us from using the park for a large portion of the year due to mud and safety concerns.

2. Proposed Routes are Unsafe and "Unattractive"

The Inspector was clear that cross-park access must remain convenient, attractive, and unfettered. The new proposals fail this test:

- **Industrial Environment:** Routing families alongside steep earth bunds, high-security fencing, and heavy quarry workings is not an "attractive" recreational experience.
- **Safety Hazards:** The proposed narrow grass path between the lagoons is a major safety concern for parents. Navigating small children between deep water bodies on potentially slippery, unmade ground is an unacceptable risk.
- **Operational Conflict:** Several routes require navigating crossings used by heavy quarry traffic. This is entirely incompatible with the free movement of pedestrians, especially those with young children who may not be as fast or visible to heavy machinery operators.

3. Impact on Sustainable Travel and Health

By removing the only practical, hard-surfaced route, the applicant is forcing residents into their cars. If we can no longer walk safely or cleanly through the fields, we will be forced to drive to alternative parks further

away. This contradicts local and national commitments to health, wellbeing, and sustainable travel. We use this route to provide our children with safe, car-free outdoor exercise; losing this accessibility removes a vital local resource for our family's physical and mental health.

4. Failure to Integrate Restored Phases

The current positioning of the lagoons ensures that restored areas remain isolated from the rest of the park until the very end of the quarry's life. This prevents any meaningful public access for many years, contrary to the expectations set out in the 2000 Agreement and MLP Policy 18(x).

I urge the council to consider if Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) could be used to maintain access rather than the wholesale removal of established routes.

5. Procedural Defect: Lack of Consultation with CADENT

It is a significant oversight that Brett Aggregates has failed to consult CADENT regarding the impact of these revised plans on the high-pressure gas main. Under the DMPO 2015, consultation is standard—and often mandatory—where development affects major infrastructure.

- The revised strategy involves changes to ground levels, bunding, and heavy plant movement near the easement.
- If the HSE deems this a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline (MAHP), the lack of prior consultation is a major procedural defect.

If permission is granted and CADENT later requires changes for safety or maintenance access, the entire Public Access Strategy could be rendered unworkable. Proceeding without their input risks an unlawful decision-making process.

Conclusion

The revised strategy is a regression that prioritizes industrial convenience over the safety and rights of the community. It removes the only accessible route for families, creates significant safety risks for young children, and ignores the procedural necessity of consulting infrastructure providers like CADENT. I urge that this strategy to be rejected.

Yours sincerely,

Carol & Simon Fung
Smallford, St Albans