

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: Re: Objection to Brett Aggregates' New Public Access Strategy – Ellenbrook Fields / Former Hatfield Aerodrome
Date: 09 March 2026 02:11:38

Dear Ms Vincent,

I am writing to formally object to Brett Aggregates' revised Public Access Strategy, submitted in February 2026 in response to the Secretary of State's concerns about public access to Ellenbrook Park. I am a local resident and regular user of Ellenbrook Fields, and I do not believe that the new proposals come close to addressing the Inspector's concerns.

My objection focuses solely on the issue of public access across the park, as directed.

1. The proposed paths are not attractive or unfettered

The Inspector was clear that cross-park routes need to be attractive and unfettered. The proposed paths simply do not meet this standard. They run alongside active quarry workings, large earth bunds up to 5 metres high, ditches, and lorry access roads. Walking along a narrow path hemmed in by fencing, machinery, and heavy vehicles is not pleasant or safe. It does not offer the kind of open, welcoming access that residents currently enjoy and have a right to expect.

2. Loss of the concrete taxiway — a vital accessible route

The old concrete taxiway is one of the most important and well-used routes across the park. It is accessible to cyclists, wheelchair users, and those with mobility difficulties. It is safe, has clear sightlines, and is usable in all weathers. Under the new proposals, approximately 60% of this route will be lost. There is no like-for-like replacement. Replacing a firm, surfaced path with gravel or grass alternatives is not a fair substitute — particularly for disabled users and those with pushchairs.

3. Grass and gravel paths will be unusable in winter

Most of the proposed replacement paths are grass or gravel. Anyone who uses Ellenbrook Fields regularly knows that grass paths here become waterlogged and muddy in autumn and winter, making them impassable. The photographs taken in February 2026 included in this consultation clearly show the current condition of such paths on the fields. Replacing usable, all-weather routes with paths that turn to mud for half the year is simply not acceptable.

4. The path between the lagoons is wholly inadequate

Brett Aggregates proposes a narrow grass path of approximately 3 metres between the two lagoons as a key cross-park route. This path will be fenced on both sides and bordered by deep water. In winter, it will turn to mud and become unusable, forcing residents into lengthy diversions around the lagoons. A route that is only passable in dry weather, flanked by fencing and water hazards, cannot be described as convenient or attractive cross-park access. This is particularly concerning for families with children and dog walkers.

5. Safety concerns for park users

Several of the proposed routes require users to cross roads used by lorries and dumper trucks. There are also internal quarry roads running alongside proposed footpaths. This introduces real safety risks, especially for children and dog walkers. Residents should not be expected to navigate crossings with heavy quarry vehicles simply to move from one part of the park to another. This falls far short of the free and convenient access the 2000 Agreement and planning policy intended.

6. Lengthy diversions and reduced freedom to roam

Throughout the life of the quarry, residents will be forced onto long detour routes around active quarry areas. The direct, open routes that currently connect Ellenbrook and Salisbury Village to Smallford will not be maintained. This is a significant loss of access for the many people who rely on the park for everyday walking, cycling, and recreation.

7. The restored phases will not be usable as part of the wider park

The Inspector also raised concerns that restored phases of the quarry could not be properly integrated back into the park because of the position of the lagoons. The new strategy does not resolve this. Residents will not benefit from the restoration of early phases while later phases are still being worked, meaning that for the entire life of the quarry, the park will never function as a connected, accessible open space.

Conclusion

The revised Public Access Strategy does not provide the convenient, attractive, and unfettered cross-park access that residents have a right to expect and that planning policy demands. Adding a few narrow grass paths alongside quarry workings and fenced lagoons is not a solution. It is a significant downgrade from the open, accessible park that residents currently enjoy.

I strongly urge the Inspector to reject the new Public Access Strategy and to require Brett Aggregates to produce a solution that genuinely maintains safe, convenient, all-weather, and attractive access across Ellenbrook Park for the duration of the quarry's operation.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Chris Nsiah

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Mr Chris Nsiah.