From: [redacted]
To: Joanna Vincent
Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates' Revised Public Access Strategy – Ellenbrook Fields
Date: 14 March 2026 16:18:37

Dear Ms Vincent,

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

My objection relates specifically to public access across the park, as required by the Inspector. I live locally and rely on Ellenbrook Fields as a safe and direct walking route for daily travel, including my commute to work [redacted]. The revised strategy would remove the only practical route I currently have to cross the park on foot, effectively forcing me into a car for journeys I am presently able to make sustainably.

Loss of a viable walking route

The existing concrete taxiway is the only route that allows year-round access without detours, mud, or safety concerns. It is wide, clearly visible, and accessible in all weather conditions, which makes it suitable for commuting.

Under the revised plans, only around 40% of this route would remain. The proposed alternatives appear to be narrow, grass-based paths which, as the document itself shows, are likely to be unusable during the winter months. For someone who relies on walking to get to work, this is not a minor inconvenience — it removes my only reliable non-car route.

Proposed routes are not "convenient, attractive or unfettered"

The Inspector was clear that cross-park access must remain convenient and unfettered. The proposals do not appear to meet that requirement:

- Several paths would run alongside bunds, fencing, quarry workings,

or heavy vehicle routes, which is neither attractive nor particularly safe for pedestrians.

- The narrow grass route between the lagoons is likely to be impassable for long periods of the year, which would force significant diversions.
- Some routes would require navigating crossings near quarry traffic, which does not align with the principle of free and safe pedestrian movement.

Taken together, these do not appear to provide a realistic or practical commuting route for residents.

Impact on sustainable travel

If these proposals go ahead, I will no longer be able to walk to work. The diversions, safety concerns, and seasonal usability issues mean I would have little choice but to drive. This runs counter to local and national objectives around sustainable travel and active transport, particularly where an established route has been relied upon by residents for many years.

Failure to integrate restored phases

Based on the plans provided, the positioning of the lagoons appears to prevent restored areas from reconnecting with the wider park until the very end of the quarry's operational life. This would significantly prolong disruption and delay meaningful access for many years, which seems contrary to the expectations set out in the 2000 Agreement and MLP Policy 18(x).

It is also worth asking whether Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) have been considered as a way of managing access safely during certain phases, rather than permanently removing viable routes.

Lack of consultation with Cadent

It is also notable that Brett Aggregates appear not to have consulted Cadent regarding the revised plans and their potential impact on the main gas pipeline that runs through the site.

While formal consultation may not be required until permission is sought, it seems unusual that Cadent would not be engaged at an earlier stage given the potential implications.

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

- A high-pressure gas main is within or near the development boundary
- Works may affect pipeline easements
- Ground levels, access routes, or safety zones could be altered
- Heavy construction traffic may cross the easement
- Landscaping, bunding, drainage, or vibration could affect pipeline integrity

If the revised Public Access Strategy changes routes, bunds, ground levels, or construction phasing near the pipeline, consultation would normally be expected.

In addition, if the pipeline is classified as a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline (MAHP), the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) may also need to be consulted through the PADHI process. Failure to do so could potentially represent a procedural defect.

More broadly, if permission were granted and Cadent later required changes following consultation, this could have a significant impact on the design of the scheme, safety zones, access routes, or maintenance requirements. Engaging with Cadent at this stage would help ensure the revised plans are workable before decisions are made.

In my view, the absence of this consultation raises questions about whether the application has been fully considered and may represent a procedural weakness.

Conclusion

For these reasons, I strongly object to the revised Public Access Strategy. It does not appear to provide a safe, practical, or reliable cross-park route for residents, and it would significantly affect my ability to continue travelling to work on foot.

Yours sincerely,

Dr George Woods

[redacted]