

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Hatfield Quarry; APPEAL REF: APP/M1900/W/24/3346607: REPRESENTATION ABOUT RECONVENED INQUIRY - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS (CD17.01-CD17.05)
Date: 13 March 2026 18:15:56

Dear Joanna Vincent,

APPEAL REF: APP/M1900/W/24/3346607: REPRESENTATION ABOUT RECONVENED INQUIRY - ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS (CD17.01-CD17.05)

I am writing to express my disappointment with the revised public access strategy proposed by the appellant (Brett) in response to the concerns expressed by the Secretary of State relating to cross-park public access and integration with the unaffected eastern part of EP (Ellenbrook park). As the revised scheme does not result in a substantially different proposal to the original scheme, I wish to object to the proposal because the original public access strategy was inadequate and it remains inadequate.

As regular users of the Ellenbrook fields (walkers and cyclist) I think it unlikely that my wife and I would visit the proposed active quarry site because for our expected remaining lifetime all access will be compromised by routes being adjacent to the Hatfield Road, access roads, haul roads, plant site, and/or active workings. These routes will have restricted views (probably with fencing around dangerous works and waterbodies), suffer noise and dust, have hazardous road crossing points, often recently restored and muddy surfaces, and will be depleted of wildlife. We visit the country park for the views, peace, wildlife, safe exercise and fresh air; typically, this would be a circular walk from Sleafshyde involving the Alban Way (footpath/cycleway to the south) and entering/leaving at the University and the public footpath adjacent to the Notcutts garden centre. I cannot envisage any route through the west park to the relatively undisturbed east that would not suffer degradation of the neighbouring environment.

I am particularly concerned that the proposed lagoons cut the park in two resulting in a fundamental change in the landscape character and leaving just a few narrow points of access. I envisage problems of sharing narrow paths with walkers, children, cyclists and horse-riders which are constrained by fencing to prevent access to quick sand and deep-water bodies (as the case at our nearby Tyttenhanger quarry). An effective approach to address this particular issue would be to move the lagoons a short distance to the north west (at the confluence of the proposed Phases B and C workings) with the south lagoon being approximately where the north lagoon is planned. This would still provide a buffer between the workings and the bromate plume and provide a broad stretch of land that could be restored to biodiverse grassland and enable appropriate integration of the east and west areas of the country park.

The intention to create a number of reedbeds in the final restoration will also adversely affect access, and probably require extensive fencing for safety of the public. This is in conflict with the Hertfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy that does not classify the area for reedbeds in order to enhance biodiversity.

I also note document cd1705 (ES addendum) submitted on behalf of the appellant

and the statement under section 3.20;

'Any increase in public access over the previous scheme would not alter the significance the assessment in terms of the air quality impact (PM2.5 exposure) on the public, since public footpaths are not relevant locations for annual mean exposure (it is mainly only residential locations which are). For dust soiling, similarly, public footpaths are low sensitivity receptors so not vulnerable to significant adverse effects.'

This inappropriately seeks to downplay the risks of short-term peak exposure to air pollutants including particles. Adverse health effects of short-term exposure are recognised widely in the scientific literature and addressed in some National legal limits for pollutants such as PM10 and nitrogen dioxide. Many authoritative texts could be referenced but for this purpose I quote the Air Quality Strategy of Hertfordshire County Council;

*'There is no safe level of exposure to air pollution.^{xiv} The effects of air pollution exposure can be felt when **we are exposed to higher pollution levels for a short period of time**, often called a pollution episode, and from longer term exposure to lower pollution levels. For example, **elevated short term air pollution events can trigger the onset of a heart attack**. Exposure to pollution prenatal and as a young child can increase the likelihood of ill health later in life. For example, it can reduce a child's lung capacity in turn reducing our resilience to disease and ill health conditions later in life.^{xv} Exposure to poor air quality can also impact on our mental health and cognition impacting our decision-making ability.^{xvi} We can be confident that reducing emissions, especially near places where people live, work **and play**, will be beneficial for many people.^{xvii}'* (HCC Air Quality Strategy (DRAFT) Date: November 2025).

In summary therefore I consider the revised proposed public access strategy to be inadequate for addressing failings relating to cross-park public access and integration with the unaffected eastern part of EP. The appeal should not be allowed because of the harm to the environment and the public enjoyment of the country park outweighs any benefit of mineral extraction at this site.

Yours sincerely

Derrick Crump

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]