

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Objection to Brett Aggregates' Revised Public Access Strategy - Ellenbrook Fields
Date: 13 March 2026 16:58:01

Dear Ms Vincent,

I wish to object to the revised Public Access Strategy submitted by Brett Aggregates in respect of Ellenbrook Fields.

In accordance with the 2000 Agreement and as duly noted by the Inspector at the first Inquiry, there is a requirement for any access to be attractive and unfettered. The Inspector made clear that the proposal did not strike a fair balance between mining mineral resources for commercial gain and protecting local residents, whilst describing the Public Access Strategy proposed as 'a failure'.

It is clear that the Public Access Strategy will be impractical and indeed unsafe. The access will pass close to lagoons, require the use of public highways in some instances and be on inappropriate surfaces which will be unusable for many months of the year. My wife and I regularly use these walkways whilst walking our dog and our [REDACTED] son. The proposed access route will be full of many hazards which could result in catastrophic consequences, severely increasing our risk of use in the current proposal. Were something to happen to any users' pets or, even worse, children, responsibility for this would lie squarely with those who ignored the Inspector's recommendations and pursued commercial gain ahead of any other considerations. Reluctantly it appears political requirements to build at all costs and the desire for commercial gain has come ahead of safety and public health considerations, amongst other factors, but it quite simply is beyond comprehension that all appropriate safeguards and protections should be ignored and not put in place.

It is highly likely that many users would indeed be unable to use the area for much of the year, if at all, and I appreciate that the Inquiry has considered those concerns and decided they do not carry sufficient weight to reject the proposal in its entirety. However, again it seems a minor compromise to adhere to a relatively simple Public Access Strategy that maintains unfettered access to the area. If Brett Aggregates are unwilling to accommodate local users in any form, what can we expect from them in their behaviour going forwards in this development and future developments if they are aware authorities will give them whatever they ask for? All local residents and users are asking for is fairness.

As is clear in the 2000 Agreement, this was never the intended use of the land and indeed the CEMEX works in close proximity to Ellenbrook Fields would likely never have received approval without such Agreement being in place. To now scrap this and ignore the simple requirements set within would set an incredibly dangerous precedent for future developments nationwide in that compromises entered into by construction companies are always open to re-negotiation for the benefit of the applicants and that such Agreements can indeed simply be ignored to the detriment of local users if it meets 'the greater good'.

I would be happy to discuss my concerns and objections with you further. As I have mentioned, I reluctantly accept that the quarry is likely to receive approval despite the 2000 Agreement effectively being overwritten to achieve such an outcome. However, all we are asking for is some minor protections and a little fairness - is that too much to ask?

Kind regards,

Joe Beckett