

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Objection – Brett Aggregates’ Revised Public Access Strategy (Ellenbrook Fields)
Date: 13 March 2026 15:46:27

Dear Ms Vincent

I am writing to object to Brett Aggregates’ revised Public Access Strategy for the proposed quarrying at Ellenbrook Fields.

My objection concerns compliance with the Inspector’s requirement for continuous public access across the site. As a local resident who uses Ellenbrook Fields daily to walk to work at Hatfield Police Station, I depend on the existing cross-park route as a safe, direct, and reliable way to travel on foot. The revised strategy would remove the only practical walking route available to me, leaving no viable non-car alternative for my commute.

Loss of an all-weather route

The current concrete taxiway is the only route that provides year-round accessibility. It is wide, hard-surfaced, and safe in all conditions. Under the new proposals, less than half of this route would remain. The replacement paths are narrow, grass-surfaced, and prone to flooding or becoming impassable during winter months — as the applicant’s own documentation illustrates. For those who rely on walking for day-to-day travel, this represents a complete loss of accessibility, not a minor inconvenience.

Proposals fail to maintain “convenient and unfettered” access

The Inspector’s direction was clear: cross-park access must remain convenient, attractive, and unfettered. The revised strategy does not achieve this:

- Several proposed routes pass close to bunds, fencing, or active quarry operations, creating safety and amenity concerns.
- The grass path between lagoons would be unusable for many months of the year, forcing lengthy detours.
- Some routes cross quarry traffic or heavy plant access points, making them unsuitable for pedestrian use.

These conditions do not support safe or realistic commuting for residents who currently walk.

Impact on sustainable travel

If implemented, the revised plan would remove my only feasible walking route to work, effectively forcing me to drive. This outcome runs counter to local and national sustainability objectives and adversely affects those who have used Ellenbrook Fields as a walking route for decades.

Integration of restored phases and access

The proposed phasing prevents restored areas from reconnecting to the wider park until the end of quarrying, prolonging public disruption contrary to the 2000 Agreement and MLP Policy 18(x). Has consideration been given to Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) to maintain safer interim connections?

Lack of consultation with CADENT

It also appears that Brett Aggregates have not consulted CADENT regarding the potential impact of their revised proposals on the high-pressure gas main. While formal consultation may not yet be legally required, omitting early engagement seems risky given the possible implications for safety zones, access routes, and ground level adjustments.

Under Schedule 4 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015, the local planning authority must consult relevant bodies where development could affect their infrastructure. Typically, CADENT would be consulted if:

- A high-pressure gas pipeline lies within or close to the site boundary.
- Proposed works could alter ground levels, easements, or access.
- Construction traffic or bunding could compromise pipeline integrity.

If the site's gas main qualifies as a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline (MAHP), the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) should also be consulted under PADHI regulations. Failure to do so would represent a procedural defect.

Should permission be granted and CADENT later recommend changes, the Public Access Strategy could require substantial alteration — undermining the basis for any prior approval. This underscores why consultation should have occurred before submission. I therefore believe this omission constitutes a procedural flaw in the current application.

For all these reasons, I must object to the revised Public Access Strategy. It does not provide safe or continuous pedestrian access as required, and it undermines both sustainable transport and public safety obligations.

Yours sincerely

Susanne Lam

Smallford, St Albans