

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates' Revised Public Access Strategy – Ellenbrook Fields
Date: 13 March 2026 14:21:48

Dear Ms Vincent

I am writing to object to Brett Aggregates' revised Public Access Strategy for the Ellenbrook Fields quarry proposal, ahead of the reopened inquiry on 21 April.

Loss of a viable year-round walking route

The existing concrete taxiway is the only surface that allows me to walk year-round without detours, mud, or safety concerns. It is wide, visible, and accessible, making it suitable for regular walking for health and fitness in all weather. Under the new plans, only around 40% of this route would remain, and the replacement paths would be narrow, grass-based, and often unusable in winter, as the applicant's own material illustrates. For someone who depends on walking in the park for their physical and mental wellbeing, this is not a minor inconvenience as it removes my only reliable all-weather route.

Routes are not "convenient, attractive or unfettered"

The Inspector has been clear that cross-park access must remain convenient, attractive and unfettered during quarry operations. The revised proposals do not meet this test:

- Many paths would run immediately alongside earth bunds, fencing, quarry workings or heavy vehicle routes, which is neither attractive nor reassuring from a safety perspective.
- The narrow grass path between the lagoons is likely to be impassable for months of the year, forcing long diversions.
- Several routes would require pedestrians to navigate crossings and quarry traffic, which is incompatible with genuinely free movement, particularly for those on foot or with mobility needs.

These are not realistic or welcoming routes for residents seeking everyday exercise and time in nature.

Strategy pushes people away from active, healthy travel

If these plans go ahead, I will no longer have a practical, all-weather walking route through Ellenbrook Fields. The combination of diversions, unsafe conditions and seasonal impassability means I would be far less able to walk regularly for my health and mental wellbeing. This directly conflicts with local and national aims to support active lifestyles, improve public health and encourage people to spend more time walking in green spaces.

Failure to integrate restored phases and consider alternatives

The positioning of the proposed lagoons means that restored areas cannot be properly connected to the wider park until the very end of the quarry's life. This prolongs disruption and denies meaningful public access to restored land for many years, contrary to the expectations set out in the 2000 Agreement and Minerals Local Plan Policy 18(x).

It is also unclear why alternatives such as the use of Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs), or other traffic-management measures, could not be considered to allow safer, more continuous access while extraction takes place. This suggests the applicant has not adequately explored less harmful options for maintaining cross-park connectivity.

Lack of early consultation with Cadent and potential procedural defect

It is my understanding that Brett Aggregates have not, to date, engaged with Cadent regarding the revised plans and their potential impact on the main gas line that crosses the site. While formal consultation may not be strictly required until permission is granted, it seems remiss not to consult Cadent before submitting revised proposals, given that any concerns could require significant changes to both the quarry layout and the access strategy.

Under The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015, Schedule 4 requires consultation with certain bodies where development could affect their infrastructure. Local planning authorities routinely consult Cadent where:

- A high-pressure gas main is within or near the red-line boundary.
- Works could affect pipeline easements, ground levels, access or safety zones.
- Heavy plant or construction traffic may cross or load the easement.
- Landscaping, bunding, drainage or vibration changes could compromise pipeline integrity.

If the revised Public Access Strategy alters routes, bunds, ground levels or construction phasing near the main gas line, consultation with Cadent would normally be expected. If the gas main is a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) may also need to be consulted under PADHI requirements. Failure to undertake appropriate consultation could amount to a procedural defect.

There is also a practical concern: if permission is granted on the basis of the current access strategy, and Cadent then requires changes, the relationship between the development, the pipeline, safety zones and public access could all shift. This would undermine confidence in the present Public Access Strategy and could render any decision vulnerable if consultation is a statutory duty that has not been properly discharged.

Conclusion

For these reasons, I strongly object to the revised Public Access Strategy. It does not provide a workable, safe or attractive cross-park route for residents, and it significantly harms my ability to maintain my health and mental wellbeing through regular walking in Ellenbrook Fields. I respectfully ask the Inspector to reject the current proposals and require a strategy that genuinely maintains convenient, attractive and unfettered access across Ellenbrook Fields throughout the life of the quarry.

Yours sincerely

Mr Chu

Smallford, St Albans