
**THREE OAKS RENEWABLE
ENERGY PARK
EXTENSION**

**Environmental
Statement Chapter 8: Traffic and
Transport**

MAY 2026



Contents

8	Traffic and Transport	8-2
	Introduction	8-2
	Consultation	8-2
	Legislation, Policy, Guidance and Standards	8-4
	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	8-5
	Assumptions and Limitations	8-18
	Baseline Conditions and Receptors	8-18
	Primary & Tertiary Mitigation.....	8-24
	Assessment of Effects	8-28
	Secondary Mitigation	8-43
	Assessment of Residual Effects	8-44
	Cumulative Effects.....	8-45
	Summary and Conclusions.....	8-47

8 Traffic and Transport

Introduction

- 8.1 This chapter presents the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park Extension (hereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Development') in relation to traffic and transport. It considers effects on the local highway network and on pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) users, as well as other highway users arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.
- 8.2 The assessment considers potential effects on the severance of communities, road vehicle driver and passenger delay, non-motorised user delay and amenity, fear and intimidation, road user and pedestrian safety, and the movement of abnormal or atypical loads (including abnormal indivisible loads).
- 8.3 Reference should also be made to Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, Appendix 8.2 (Personal Injury Accident Assessment) – Volume 4, Appendix 8.3 (Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Assessment) – Volume 4, Appendix 8.4 (Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) – Volume 4, Appendix 8.5 (PRoW Assessment) - Volume 4 and Appendix 8.6 (Surface Water Drainage Strategy) – Volume 4 which accompany this ES and the application.
- 8.4 This chapter has been prepared by James McGavin BA (Hons) MSc (Eng) FCIHT and George Easton BA (Hons) GradCIHT of The Transportation Consultancy ('ttc'). In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'EIA Regulations'). A statement outlining the relevant expertise and qualifications of the competent experts appointed to prepare this Environmental Statement (ES) is provided in Appendix 1.1 – Volume 4.

Consultation

- 8.5 Table 8.1 below summarises the pre-application consultation comments, summary responses to each comment, and where further information has been provided within this ES.
- 8.6 Consultation has been undertaken with East Riding of Yorkshire Council Highways (ERYC Highways) and Hull City Council (HCC) in relation to the scope of the assessment and potential effects of construction traffic on the local highway network.

Table 8.1 – Consultation undertaken

Reference	Comment	Response
East Riding of Yorkshire Council Highways		
Highways Consultation Response (22nd August 2025)	The principle of development is acceptable subject to mitigation. Key issues raised include: access constraints at A614 junction, abnormal loads, Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) passing widths,	The ES Traffic and Transport Chapter addresses these points. Appendix 8.4 (oCTMP) – Volume 4 sets out construction access strategy, HGV management,

Reference	Comment	Response
	visibility, drainage, turning radii, impact on opposite lay-by, pedestrian / equine / cyclist access, temporary works and reparations, liaison with Abnormal Loads team, and construction disruption management. Supporting documents requested: Transport Statement (TS), CTMP, and inclusion of staff movements in CTMP. EV charging to comply with standards. Legal agreements (S184 / S278) and consents required for highway works.	mitigation for non-motorised users. Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4 details the routing and mitigation for the movement of AILs. Engagement with ERYC Highways, National Highways and Abnormal Loads team is ongoing. Conditions and legal agreements will be adhered to at the appropriate time.
Abnormal Loads Ongoing Consultation	As part of the AIL process, Cascade Software were engaged on behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council (hereafter referred to as 'the Council') to undertake a structures assessment of the proposed AIL route within their administrative area.	Cascade Software confirmed that all structures along the proposed AIL route within the Council's administrative area are suitable to accommodate the proposed AIL movements. Full details are contained within Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4.
Hull City Council		
Abnormal Loads Ongoing Consultation	As part of the AIL process, initial engagement was undertaken with HCC regarding the suitability of their highway network to accommodate the proposed AIL movements. Following this, Cascade Software were engaged to undertake a structures assessment of the proposed route within HCC's administrative area. This assessment identified structural constraints associated with Holderness Bridge, which precluded the use of the original proposed route through Hull.	In response to the structural constraints identified by Cascade Software, a revised AIL route has been identified which avoids Holderness Bridge. This revised route has been suggested by the Authority and is presented in full within Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4. Ongoing engagement with HCC will continue through the AIL approval process.

8.7

This ES Technical Chapter, together with its accompanying appendices, has been prepared to fulfil the function of a Transport Statement (TS) for the Proposed Development, in accordance with the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG, 2024). A standalone TS has not been prepared, as this chapter and its accompanying appendices are considered to robustly and proportionately address all material traffic and transport related matters.

Legislation, Policy, Guidance and Standards

Legislation

- 8.8 No standalone legislation sets out a prescribed method for assessing traffic and transport effects within an ES. Accordingly, this chapter has been prepared in the context of the EIA Regulations and with reference to recognised assessment guidance, noting that implementation will be progressed through relevant statutory and regulatory mechanisms (including Highways Act section 278 agreements where applicable and established procedures for the management of abnormal indivisible loads, including liaison with the highway authority and police escort arrangements where required).

Policy

National Policy

- NPS for Energy (EN-1, 2023) – transport assessment, consultation, travel plan, demand management.
- NPPF (2025) – transport to be considered from the earliest stages; impacts only severe if residual cumulative impacts are unacceptable; requirement for travel plans / transport assessments.
- NPPG (2024) – offers guidance on assessing transport impacts for major infrastructure, highlighting the need for proportionate Transport Assessments that consider construction traffic, abnormal loads, and engagement with highway authorities.

Local Policy

- East Riding Local Plan (2025–2039): Policy EC5 – supports renewable and low-carbon energy where cumulative, amenity, traffic and environmental impacts are mitigated.
- East Riding Local Plan (2025–2039): Policy S8 – encourages renewable energy and low-carbon development where transport impacts can be managed safely and effectively.
- East Riding Local Plan (2025–2039): Policy C1 – requires infrastructure, including highways, to be provided or improved to support development through suitable mitigation and planning obligations.
- East Riding Local Transport Plan (2021–2039) – prioritises sustainable travel, freight routing and reducing environmental impacts across the transport network.
- Hull Local Plan (2016–2032): Policy 18 – supports renewable / low carbon energy, requires mitigation, effective decommissioning and integration of low carbon tech in new developments.

Guidance and Standards

- Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA), 'Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement' (2023), hereinafter referred to as ISEP (following the organisation's rebrand to the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals in January 2025).

Manual for Streets (MfS) (2007) – sets out principles for access design, visibility, and junction layout, supporting safe and context-appropriate connections to the local highway network.

- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – provides geometric design and safety standards for higher-speed roads.
- DfT TAG Unit A4.1 Social Impact Appraisal (2022)
- DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health (Revision 1, January 2020)

Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Data Sources

- 8.9 This ES along with Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4 and Appendix 8.4 (oCTMP) – Volume 4 present detailed information on the Traffic and Transport impacts of the Proposed Development following the review and analysis of the following data sources:

- Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping;
- Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping;
- Topographical Surveys;
- Department for Transport (DfT) Road Traffic Statistics – Count points;
- Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs);
- East Riding of Yorkshire Council Highway boundary information;
- Crashmap road traffic collision data; and
- An in-person site audit.

Study Area

- 8.10 The traffic and transport Study Area is defined by the construction vehicle route and AIL route.
- 8.11 Table 8.2 summarises the attributes of the road network in the study area breaking down the routes by potential use (general construction traffic and AILs)

Table 8.2 – Study Area Highway Links

Link	Description	Speed Restriction	Notes
General Construction Traffic Route (starting from M62)			
A614 (Howden Spur)	Dual Carriageway	70 mph	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles
A614	Single Carriageway	60 mph (30-40 mph through various villages)	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles routing towards Bridlington from M62
AILs Route (starting from the Port of Hull)			
A1033 (Hedon Road)	Dual Carriageway	40 mph	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles
A1033 (Hedon Road)	Single Carriageway	30 mph	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles
A1033 Mount Pleasant	Single Carriageway	30 mph	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles
A165 through Hull (Holderness Road)	Single Carriageway	30 mph	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles
A165 through East Riding	Single Carriageway (Dual Carriageway at Leven)	National speed limit (30-40 mph through various villages)	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles routing towards Bridlington from Hull
A614	Single Carriageway	60 mph (30-40 mph through various villages)	Key arterial road suitable for large vehicles routing towards Bridlington from M62

8.12 The traffic and transport Study Area is shown in Figure 8.1 (Site Location) – Volume 3.

Study Area Justification

8.13 The study area encompasses the indicative construction traffic route (shown in green) and the indicative AIL route (shown in blue), on Figure 8.1 (Site Location) – Volume 3. The construction traffic route has been determined on the basis that vehicles will access the Site from the Strategic Road Network to the south-west via the M62. This represents a reasonable worst-case scenario in the event that materials are sourced from outside of East Riding of Yorkshire.

8.14 The indicative construction traffic route is as follows:

- M62;
- M62 Howden Spur Road;
- A614; and
- Site Access Road.

8.15 The indicative AIL route is as follows:

- Port of Hull;
- A1033;
- Marfleet Avenue;
- Staveley Road;
- Diadem Grove;
- A165;
- A1035;
- A165;
- A165 Moor Lane;
- A614; and
- Site Access Road.

8.16 AILs are anticipated to originate from the Port of Hull, which has extensive experience in handling large wind turbine components. From there, the most direct and least disruptive route has been selected following a detailed site audit and consultation with the Council and HCC. The Study Area is therefore limited to these two identified corridors, based on the current best understanding of the likely AIL route. It is acknowledged that the final AIL route will be subject to confirmation closer to the time of turbine delivery, and it is proposed that the final route be submitted to and approved by the relevant highway authorities by way of planning condition prior to the commencement of AIL movements. Details of the route selection sifting process have been included in Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4.

8.17 Given the distinct character of AIL movements — limited in number, infrequent, operating under mandatory police escort and following a dedicated corridor separate from the general construction traffic route — formal assessment under the ISEP criteria of Severance, Driver Delay, Pedestrian Delay, Non-motorised User Amenity, Fear and Intimidation and Road Safety is limited to the construction traffic route. The AIL route is assessed under the Hazardous and Large Loads criterion only, with full details provided in Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) — Volume 4. Where relevant, the potential for AIL movements to give rise to incidental effects under other criteria is briefly acknowledged within the relevant sub-sections of the Assessment of Effects below.

Assessment of Effects

8.18 The approach for the assessment will be based on the ISEP Guidelines 2023. The impact of traffic and movement is dependent on a range of factors including the local environment, volume of development traffic, network operations, and composition of HGV traffic.

8.19 The Proposed Development's impact on the environmental impact criteria outlined in the ISEP Guidelines 2023 has been considered.

8.20 These criteria include:

- Severance;
- Driver delay;
- Pedestrian delay (incorporating delay to all non-motorised users);
- Non-motorised user amenity;
- Fear and intimidation (and degree of hazard);
- Road safety; and
- Hazardous loads / large loads.

Severance

8.21 The ISEP Guidelines define severance as:

“The perceived division that can occur within a community when it becomes separated by major transport infrastructure” that “...separates people from places and other people”.

8.22 There are no predictive formulae which give simple relationships between traffic factors and levels of severance. The ISEP Guidelines state:

“The Department for Transport has historically set out a range of indicators for determining the significance of severance. Changes in traffic flow of 30%, 60% and 90% are regarded as producing ‘slight’, ‘moderate’ and ‘substantial’ changes in severance respectively. Although these thresholds no longer appear in Department for Transport guidance, they have not been superseded by subsequent changes to guidance and are established through planning case law. However, caution needs to be observed when applying these thresholds as very low baseline flows are unlikely to experience severance impacts even with high percentage changes in traffic.”

Thresholds are expressed as a starting point for any assessment and typically have been derived from studies of major changes in traffic flow and therefore should be used cautiously in any assessment. The assessment of severance should pay full regard to specific local conditions, e.g. sensitivity of adjacent land uses, prevalence of vulnerable people, whether or not crossing facilities are provided, traffic signal settings, etc.”

8.23 In accordance with the ISEP Guidelines, the assessment of severance has been undertaken with full regard to local conditions and movement patterns within the Study Area. The assessment considers the nature and sensitivity of receptors, existing movement patterns and the characteristics of the highway environment, rather than relying solely on changes in traffic flow. The assessment has had regard to the following factors, which influence the likelihood and severity of severance effects:

- The presence of PRow, including footpaths and bridleways (addressed in Appendix 8.5 (PRow Assessment) – Volume 4);
- Informal pedestrian desire lines between residential areas, agricultural land, employment uses and local facilities;
- The availability and quality of existing crossing opportunities, including junction layouts, pedestrian refuge provision and signal control where relevant;
- Traffic conditions, including vehicle speeds, flows and visibility; and
- The sensitivity of receptors, with particular regard to vulnerable users such as pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians.

- 8.24 Having regard to the factors set out above, the sensitivity assessment has focused on locations within the Study Area where severance effects would be most likely to arise and where any environmental effects would be most pronounced. These locations are identified as the key settlements and movement corridors along the route and are presented in full within Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4.
- 8.25 The key locations considered as part of the sensitivity assessment comprise:
- A614 through Howden;
 - A614 through Holme-on-Spalding-Moor;
 - A614 through Middleton-on-the-Wolds; and
 - A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme.
- 8.26 The sensitive receptor locations identified above relate to the general construction traffic route along the A614. It should be noted that the unnamed access road, which is served from the A614, has been scoped out of the assessment of sensitive receptors along the A614 route on the basis that it is closed to all traffic other than construction vehicles throughout the construction period. The potential severance effects arising from the temporary closure of the unnamed access road are nonetheless addressed within the construction access assessment below. In addition, the AIL route has also been scoped out of the severance assessment, as it does not utilise the construction route. This is justified on the grounds that AIL movements are limited in number, infrequent and subject to detailed pre-planning and statutory escort requirements. Furthermore, AIL movements will utilise a dedicated route separate from the general construction traffic route, such that they will not materially alter traffic conditions at the sensitive receptor locations identified above. Accordingly, AIL movements are not considered to generate significant severance effects at any location within the Study Area.

Driver Delay

- 8.27 The ISEP Guidelines state that:
- “Delays are only likely to be significant when the traffic on the network surrounding the development is already at, or close to, the capacity of the system.”*
- 8.28 As such, the impact of a scheme on driver delay is typically considered in relation to background traffic. The ISEP Guidance does not define the magnitude of impact for driver delay. Therefore, for the purpose of this report, professional judgement has been used to assess the impact of driver delay.
- 8.29 A combination of DfT traffic count data and ATC survey data, together with forecast traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development, has been used to determine whether the introduction of additional vehicle movements during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases is likely to give rise to driver delay on the surrounding highway network. This assessment has been informed by a review of prevailing traffic conditions using the Google traffic tool, with reference to the AM peak period from 08:00 to 09:00 and the PM peak period from 17:00 to 18:00, which are typically the busiest times on the network. For consistency, conditions were reviewed at the midpoint of each peak hour. Peak traffic conditions on Fridays have been considered, as the ATC results presented below identify this as the busiest twelve hour period on the local highway network.

- 8.30 No specific traffic count data was obtained for the purposes of the driver delay assessment; however, the Google Traffic tool is considered a sufficient and appropriate means of establishing prevailing congestion conditions for this assessment. The tool draws on aggregated, anonymised GPS data from a large sample of road users, providing a representative picture of real-world network conditions across different time periods. It enables consistent review of peak and interpeak conditions and is widely used in transport planning practice as a supplementary assessment tool where the scale of development does not justify bespoke data collection. Given the modest scale of construction traffic movements relative to baseline flows identified through the DfT and ATC data, a qualitative review of congestion conditions using the Google Traffic tool is considered proportionate and robust for the purposes of establishing whether driver delay effects are likely to be significant.

Table 8.3 – ATC 12hr Two-way Flow

ATC	12hr two-way flow				
	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri
Site Access	8942	8247	7891	9077	10703
Market Weighton	6738	5441	5543	6337	9465

Non-motorised User Delay

- 8.31 The ISEP Guidelines state that:
- “Changes in the volume, composition or speed of traffic may affect the ability of people to cross roads. In general, increases in traffic levels are likely to lead to greater increases in delay. Delays will also depend on the general level of pedestrian activity, visibility and general physical conditions of the development site” (paragraph 3.24).*
- 8.32 There are a range of local factors that affect non-motorised user delay, including the level of pedestrian (and all non-motorised users) activity, visibility and general physical conditions of the site. However, the ISEP Guidelines do not set out definitive thresholds for judging the significance of changes in levels of delay and suggest that the assessor uses their judgement to determine whether pedestrian (and all non-motorised user) delay is a significant effect.
- 8.33 DfT traffic count data and ATC survey data, together with forecast traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development, will be used to assess its effects on the surrounding highway network. This will include consideration of potential severance effects on both formal routes, such as Public Rights of Way (addressed in Appendix 8.5 PRoW Assessment – Volume 4), and more general movement across the network between adjacent land uses, having regard to existing crossing opportunities where relevant.

Non-motorised User Amenity

- 8.34 The ISEP Guidelines state that non-motorised user amenity is defined as:
- “Broadly defined as the relative pleasantness of a journey, and is considered to be affected by traffic flow, traffic composition and pavement width / separation from traffic. This definition also*

includes pedestrian fear and intimidation, and can be considered to be a much broader category including consideration of the exposure to noise and air pollution, and the overall relationship between pedestrians and traffic.”

- 8.35 With regard to the assessment of changes in pedestrian amenity, the ISEP Guidelines explain that historic guidance provides an indicative starting point, stating:

“The 1993 Guidelines suggest that a tentative threshold for judging the significance of changes in pedestrian amenity would be where the traffic flow (or HGV component) is halved or doubled. Although these thresholds no longer appear in Department for Transport guidance, they have not been superseded by subsequent changes to guidance and are established through planning case law. Thresholds are expressed as a starting point for any assessment and typically have been derived from studies of major changes in traffic flow and therefore should be used cautiously in any assessment. The assessment of amenity should pay full regard to specific local conditions.”

- 8.36 In accordance with the ISEP Guidelines, the assessment of non-motorised user amenity has been undertaken with full regard to local conditions along the construction traffic route. DfT traffic count data and ATC survey data, together with forecast traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development, have been used to assess changes in traffic flow and HGV composition relative to baseline conditions. The assessment pays particular regard to pavement width and separation from traffic, the sensitivity of adjacent land uses, and the prevalence of vulnerable road users within the Study Area. The assessment of non-motorised user amenity is limited to the construction traffic route; the treatment of the AIL route is addressed in paragraph 8.17 above.

Fear and Intimidation

- 8.37 The ISEP Guidelines state that:

“...thresholds to define the degree of hazard to pedestrians by average traffic flow, 18-hour heavy vehicle flow and average speed over an 18-hour day in miles / hour”.

Table 3.1 of the ISEP Guidelines (which provides an example scoring system) will be referenced to assess the degree of hazard. This is summarised below in Table 8.4.

Table 8.4 – ISEP Guidance on Fear and Intimidation Degree of Hazard

Average traffic flow over 18-hour day – all vehicles / hour 2-way (a)	Total 18-hour heavy vehicle flow (b)	Average vehicle speed (c)	Degree of hazard score
+1800	+3000	>40	30
1200 – 1800	2000 – 3000	30 – 40	20
600 – 1200	1000 – 2000	20 – 30	10
<600	<1000	<20	0

- 8.38 The degree of hazard score from columns a, b and c are combined to create an overall level of fear and intimidation. This is contained in Table 3.2 of the ISEP Guidelines and has been summarised below in Table 8.5.

Table 8.5 – ISEP Guidance on Fear and Intimidation Degree of Hazard

Level of fear and intimidation	Total hazard Score
Extreme	71+
Great	41-70
Moderate	21-40
Small	0-20

- 8.39 The magnitude of impact is considered with reference to changes in the level of fear and intimidation relative to baseline conditions within Table 3.3 of the ISEP Guidelines. This is summarised below in Table 8.6.

Table 8.6 – ISEP Guidance on Fear and Intimidation Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Change in Step / Traffic Flows (AADT) from Baseline Conditions
High	Two step changes in level.
Medium	One step change in level, but with: >400 veh increase in average 18hr AV two-way all vehicle flow: and / or >500 HV increase in total 18hr HV flow.
Low	One step change in level, but with: <400 veh increase in average 18hr AV two-way all vehicle flow: and / or <500 HV increase in total 18hr HV flow.
Negligible	No change in step changes.

- 8.40 The degree of hazard score has been calculated for both baseline and assessment year conditions using the scoring system set out in Tables 8.4 and 8.5 above, with regard to average traffic flow, total HGV flow and average vehicle speed over an 18-hour day. The magnitude of impact has subsequently been assessed with reference to changes in the level of fear and intimidation relative to baseline conditions, in accordance with Table 8.6 and the ISEP Guidelines.

Road Safety

- 8.41 The ISEP Guidelines do not prescribe a specific methodology for the assessment of road safety impacts and advise that professional judgement should be applied, having regard to local circumstances and any factors that may increase or reduce the risk of accidents. In line with this guidance, the assessment has been undertaken with reference to the principles of the Safe System approach, which recognises that people will make mistakes and that the road

environment should be designed and managed to minimise the likelihood of serious injury or fatal outcomes.

- 8.42 Potential effects on road safety have been considered with regard to changes in traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development, the characteristics of the highway network along the construction traffic and AIL routes, and the presence of existing mitigation embedded within the network, such as speed limits, junction layouts and visibility. Consideration has also been given to the nature of construction traffic, including vehicle size and frequency, and how this may interact with existing road users.
- 8.43 Road safety has been assessed having regard to the nature and characteristics of the relevant traffic movements associated with the Proposed Development. Given the material differences between general construction traffic and Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements in terms of frequency, operating conditions and the statutory controls applicable to each, a differentiated assessment approach has been adopted. General construction traffic has been assessed by reference to Personal Injury Accident data and contextual road safety assessment tools, as described below. AIL movements have been scoped out of quantitative assessment on the basis set out at paragraph 8.46, for reasons that are intrinsic to the nature of such movements rather than a function of the data available.
- 8.44 Personal Injury Accident data has been reviewed for the construction traffic route for the most recent five year period available. The data has been interrogated to identify any existing accident clusters, patterns or contributory factors that may indicate an underlying road safety concern on the routes to be used by construction traffic. Contextual reference has additionally been made to outputs derived from the International Road Assessment Programme (iRAP) Star Rating Protocol, which provides an indication of inherent road safety risk based on road design features and operating conditions, and which is considered appropriate for assessing general highway safety trends along the local highway network.
- 8.45 Taking account of the baseline accident record, the characteristics of the highway network and the controlled nature of construction traffic movements, professional judgement has been applied to determine whether the Proposed Development would give rise to a material change in road safety conditions on the construction traffic route.
- 8.46 AIL movements have been scoped out of further road safety assessment within this chapter. AIL movements of this type are subject to a range of statutory controls and operational safeguards that fundamentally distinguish them from general construction traffic and render a conventional collision risk assessment neither necessary nor appropriate. These include mandatory police escort throughout each movement, low operating speeds, pre-movement route surveys to identify and address any physical constraints, coordination with the relevant highway authorities, and the implementation of temporary traffic management measures where required. Furthermore, AIL movements will be limited in number, will be pre-planned well in advance, and will typically take place outside of peak traffic periods to minimise interaction with other road users. The combination of low frequency, low operating speeds, statutory escort requirements and pre-planned traffic management is such that AIL movements present a fundamentally lower and inherently controlled collision risk profile compared to general construction HGV traffic. Any residual road safety considerations associated with AIL movements are addressed through the operational safeguards described above rather than through the conventional collision assessment framework, and no further assessment within this chapter is considered necessary or proportionate.

Hazardous / Large Loads

- 8.47 No transport of dangerous goods (Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR)-classified) is anticipated during the construction, operation or decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development. Should any ADR-classified consignments be required, they would be transported and managed in accordance with applicable legislation and agreed procedures with the relevant authorities. On this basis, a standalone risk or catastrophe assessment in relation to hazardous materials is not required for this chapter.
- 8.48 The Proposed Development will however require the transportation of AILs during the construction phase, including components such as wind turbine blades. An AIL is typically defined as a vehicle which exceeds 44 tonnes gross vehicle weight, exceeds 2.9 m in width, or exceeds 18.65 m in length. The estimated number, size and composition of these loads are set out in Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment), contained within Volume 4 of this Environmental Statement.
- 8.49 The ISEP Guidelines note that:
- “The movement of large (abnormal) loads is regulated by National Highways and will be subject to separate agreement with the relevant highway authorities and police through the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL) system.”*
- 8.50 Accordingly, all AIL movements associated with the Proposed Development will be subject to formal notification and agreement through the ESDAL process, with routes, timings and mitigation measures agreed with the Council, HCC and police prior to movement.
- 8.51 The ISEP Guidelines further advise that where the number of specialist or abnormal load movements is significant, a risk or catastrophe analysis may be required, with the extent of such analysis reflecting the nature of the load being transported. In this case, AIL movements will be limited in number, infrequent, and subject to detailed route planning, escort arrangements and temporary mitigation measures. As such, the potential for major accidents or disasters associated with these movements is considered to be low and is appropriately managed through established regulatory controls rather than a standalone quantitative risk or catastrophe assessment.
- 8.52 In addition, consideration has been given to whether AIL movements could give rise to secondary transport effects, such as fear and intimidation or driver delay. Given the infrequent and tightly controlled nature of these movements, any such effects are expected to be temporary and localised.

Spatial Scope

- 8.53 Following determination of the study area, the ISEP Guidelines provide two rules that are used as threshold impacts to define the scale and extent of the assessment, as follows:
- “Rule 1: Include highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%) and,*

Rule 2: Include highway links of 'high' sensitivity where traffic flows have increased by 10% or more".

8.54 ISEP Guidelines continues to state:

"It should also be noted that the day-to-day variation of traffic on a road is frequently at least + or -10%. At a basic level, it should therefore be assumed that projected changes in traffic of less than 10% create no discernible environmental impact".

8.55 The impact assessment will be based on guidance set out in the ISEP Guidelines. This follows a two-part approach to determine the scale and extent of environmental assessment.

Receptor Sensitivity

8.56 The first part involves the classification of the receptor sensitivity. The criteria used to assess receptor sensitivity is presented in Table 8.7.

Table 8.7 – Classification of Receptor Sensitivity

Receptor / Sensitivity	Receptor Type
High	Receptors of greatest sensitivity to traffic flow such as schools, colleges, playgrounds, accident hotspots, retirement homes, urban / residential roads without footways with high footfall, congested area.
Medium	Receptors with some sensitivity to traffic flow, where changes may affect amenity or the local environment but not severely. Includes conservation areas, residential streets with moderate footfall, tourist attractions, or small town centres.
Low	Receptors with limited sensitivity to traffic flow, such as properties fronting well-used distributor roads or areas with low pedestrian activity and good separation from traffic.
Negligible	Receptors with no material sensitivity to traffic flows.

8.57 Receptor sensitivity has been defined in accordance with the principles set out in the ISEP Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic, which require receptor sensitivity to be determined using professional judgement having regard to receptor type, vulnerability and baseline exposure.

8.58 In strict accordance with the ISEP Guidelines, Rule 2 (sensitive areas where traffic flows are predicted to increase by 10% or more) applies only to locations assessed as being of High sensitivity. However, as a precautionary measure, the Assessment Team has also applied Rule 2 to locations assessed as being of Medium sensitivity, in recognition of the potential for construction traffic to give rise to perceptible effects at such locations given the characteristics of the local highway environment. Locations assessed as being of Low or Negligible sensitivity are assessed against Rule 1, where traffic flows are predicted to increase by more than 30%.

8.59 The ISEP Guidelines identify general thresholds for traffic flow increases of 10% and 30%. Where the predicted increase in traffic / HGV flow is lower than these thresholds, then the

significance of the effects should be considered to be minor or Not Significant and further detailed assessment is not required.

8.60 Table 8.8 defines the criteria used to determine the magnitude of change.

Table 8.8 – Criteria for the Magnitude of Change

Potential Impact	Assessment Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Change
Severance	The ISEP Guidelines identify a range of indicators for determining the magnitude or severance effects. It suggests changes in traffic flows and associated magnitude of impacts as: <30% – negligible magnitude of change; 30-60% – slight magnitude of change; 60-90% – moderate magnitude of change; and >90% – substantial magnitude of change.
Driver Delay	The ISEP Guidelines do not provide set thresholds for determining when a change in driver delay is likely to be significant and refers to professional judgement. It is proposed to use professional judgement and the overall changes in traffic flow with reference to the typical ISEP Guidelines thresholds (as outlined above) to determine whether there is likely to be any significant changes to driver delay.
Pedestrian Delay	The ISEP Guidelines recommend the use of professional judgement to determine whether pedestrian delay is significant.
Non-motorised User Amenity	Magnitude of impact is based on professional judgement regarding the “pleasantness” of a journey and is affected by the composition, speed or volume of traffic introduced as a result of the Proposed Development. The ISEP Guidance suggests that assessors use their judgement to determine whether non-motorised user amenity is a significant effect and as such, the magnitude of change for non-motorised user amenity has been defined qualitatively based on professional judgement.
Fear and Intimidation	The ISEP Guidelines refer to an assessment for the ‘degree of hazard’ in Table 3.1 of the guidance. Each road link within the agreed Study Area will be assessed to determine the values of these parameters using traffic data. A comparison of the ‘degree of hazard’ will be undertaken for the peak construction month with and without construction traffic against the baseline traffic flows to determine any changes. The step changes as presented within Table 3.2 (summarised in Table 8.5 of this ES) of the ISEP Guidelines will be followed to determine the magnitude of impact. The magnitude of impact will then be determined as per Table 3.3 (summarised in Table 8.6 of this ES) of the ISEP guidelines.
Road Safety	In line with the ISEP Guidelines, which do not prescribe a specific methodology for the assessment of road safety impacts, professional judgement has been applied having regard to local circumstances and factors that may influence accident risk. The assessment has been undertaken with reference to the principles of the Safe System approach and considers changes in traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development, the characteristics of the highway network along the construction traffic and AIL routes, and existing embedded mitigation such as speed limits, junction layouts and visibility. Personal Injury Accident

Potential Impact	Assessment Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Change
	data for the most recent five year period has been reviewed to identify any existing accident clusters or patterns. In addition, contextual reference has been made to road safety tools aligned with the Safe System approach, including the iRAP Star Rating Protocol for the construction traffic route, recognising that such tools are less applicable to infrequent and highly controlled AIL movements.
Hazardous and Large Loads	The ISEP Guidelines do not set specific thresholds for the consideration of Hazardous and Large loads, only that professional judgement should be utilised based on the frequency and nature of any Hazardous and / or Large loads.

8.61 The significance of effect is determined by combining the assigned receptor sensitivity (Table 8.7) with the predicted magnitude of change (Table 8.8).

8.62 There are four categories which outline the significance of the effect:

- Negligible – very little change from baseline conditions;
- Minor – a minor change away from baseline conditions;
- Moderate – a material shift away from baseline conditions; and
- Major – a substantial change away from baseline conditions

8.63 The shading indicates that effects assessed as Major are considered significant, and those assessed as Moderate may be considered significant depending on professional judgement, taking into account the specific receptor context, duration, and potential for mitigation.

Table 8.9 – Significance of Potential Effects Matrix

Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Change			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

8.64 Following the classification of an effect, a clear statement is provided as to whether the effect is 'Significant' or 'Not Significant'.

- Effects assessed as Major are considered significant in ES terms. Effects assessed as Moderate may be considered significant depending on professional judgement, having regard to the specific receptor context, duration and potential for mitigation. Where a Moderate effect is identified in this assessment, a clear statement is provided as to whether it is considered Significant or Not Significant in EIA terms. Minor and Negligible effects are not considered significant. Effects can be temporary or permanent and short, medium or long term in duration.
- A short-term effect — an effect that will be experienced for 0-5 years;
- A medium-term effect — an effect that will be experienced for 5-15 years; and
- A long-term effect — an effect that will be experienced for 15 years or longer.

- 8.65 The ISEP Guidelines recognise that the assessment of traffic and transport effects involves the application of professional judgement, informed by available quantitative and qualitative evidence. This is particularly relevant for effects on non-motorised users, where local context (including crossing opportunities, frontage activity and route characteristics) is an important consideration.

Assumptions and Limitations

- 8.66 This ES chapter is informed by the baseline data and Proposed Development design information available at the time of writing.
- 8.67 Several assumptions have been made when forecasting the traffic generation of the Proposed Development, both during construction and operation (it is predicted that decommissioning traffic generation will not exceed that of construction). These forecasts have been developed by the Applicant and the assessor based on professional judgement and derived from experience with other developments similar in size, scale and nature to the Proposed Development. Therefore, they are considered to represent a realistic estimation of traffic generation for the Proposed Development.

Baseline Conditions and Receptors

Baseline Traffic Flows

- 8.68 DfT data has been reviewed for the A614 to inform traffic baseline flows:
- DfT Count Site: 27966 (A614) – 24/03/2023;
 - DfT Count Site: 91141 (A614 Kirkburn) – 28/09/2023;
 - DfT Count Site: 27365 (A614 Burnsea Lane Ends) – 04/04/2019; and
 - DfT Count Site: 7346 (A614 Howden) – 30/09/2022.
- 8.69 To supplement the DfT Data, ATC surveys were undertaken over a continuous seven-day period commencing on Thursday 11 September 2025. TAG Unit M1.2 (Data Sources and Surveys) states that traffic data collection should be designed so that observed data are suitable for the purposes of the study and accurately represent normal traffic conditions, avoiding atypical or abnormal influences on traffic flows. On this basis, and because the survey period falls outside major holiday periods, local events or known seasonal disruptions, the survey data are considered to provide a representative indication of typical baseline traffic conditions suitable for use in the assessment.
- 8.70 Figure 8.2 (Traffic Count Locations) – Volume 3 shows the location of the count sites.
- 8.71 Baseline traffic flows recorded by the ATCs are summarised in Table 8.10, with corresponding baseline flows at the DfT count sites presented in Table 8.11. To allow for a direct and like for like comparison, the flows in Table 8.11 have been factored to a common 2026 baseline using TEMPRO Version 8.1 growth factors derived from the National Trip Rate Model (NTRM) 2022 core growth dataset. The applied growth factors have been calculated using the Middle Layer Super Output Area (MSOA) within which each respective count site is located. The resulting adjusted flows represent an average weekday in the 2026 assessment year, ensuring that

traffic data collected in different survey years are normalised and assessed on a consistent, robust and proportionate basis.

Table 8.10 – ATC Baseline Traffic Flows

ATC Location	Original Survey Year	HGVs (two way)	Total Vehicles (two way)	2026 TEMPro Growth Factor (MSOA)	Adjusted 2026 HGVs (two way)	Adjusted 2026 Total Vehicles (two way)
Site Access ATC	2025	400	10,071	1.0093 (E02002689)	404	10,165
Market Weighton ATC	2025	541	7,922	1.0094 (E02002698)	546	7,996

Table 8.11 – DfT Baseline Traffic Flows

DfT Count Site (Road)	Original Survey Year	Observed HGVs (two way)	Observed Total Vehicles (two way)	2026 TEMPro Growth Factor (MSOA)	Adjusted 2026 HGVs (two way)	Adjusted 2026 Total Vehicles (two way)
27966 – A614	2023	890	14,234	1.0135 (E02002691)	901	14,416
91141 – A614 Kirkburn	2023	731	10,043	1.0135 (E02002691)	740	10,172
27365 – A614 Burnsea Lane Ends	2019	905	7,136	1.0193 (E02002701)	917	7,227
7346 – A614 Howden	2022	1,694	18,860	1.0163 (E02002721)	1716	19,101

Highway Safety / Collision Data

- 8.72 Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data has been reviewed within the Study Area to identify any existing clusters or locations of potential concern. A full copy of the review is included within Appendix 8.2 (PIA Assessment) – Volume 4.
- 8.73 The Applicant has scoped the AIL route as having a negligible potential for collision effects due to the inherently controlled nature of these movements.
- 8.74 Table 8.12 below shows the number of PIAs along the construction route in the most recent 5-years of data and how this relates to PIAs per km along the c.58 km route.

Table 8.12 – PIAs Along Construction Route (2020-2024)

Year	PIA / km	Accident Severity		
		Slight	Serious	Fatal
2020	0.40	16	5	2
2021	0.47	19	6	2
2022	0.40	17	5	1
2023	0.41	18	6	0
2024	0.40	16	6	1

- 8.75 Over the most recent five year period, PIA rates per kilometre along the construction traffic route have remained broadly stable, with values consistently around c.0.40–0.47. When comparing 2024 with 2020, the PIA per kilometre is slightly lower overall, indicating no increase in collision risk over time.
- 8.76 The severity profile is dominated by slight collisions across all years, with serious and fatal collisions occurring infrequently. Fatal collisions are isolated events, with none recorded in 2023 and a single incident recorded in 2024. Overall, the data indicates that there has been no material deterioration in road safety conditions along the route during the assessment period.
- 8.77 Notwithstanding the general trend along the construction traffic route, a spatial review of the accident locations has been undertaken, to determine whether any specific local clusters are evident that may warrant further consideration. To facilitate this exercise, the route has been split into 5 sections as follows:
- Section 1 (Howden Spur to Holme-on-Spalding-Moor);
 - Section 2 (Holme-on-Spalding-Moor to A614 / A1079 junction);
 - Section 3 (A614 / A1079 junction to A614 / B1246 junction at Bainton);
 - Section 4 (A614 / B1246 junction (Bainton) to Kelleythorpe Roundabout, Driffield); and
 - Section 5 (Kelleythorpe Roundabout to site access).
- 8.78 A summary of the accident number, severity and route length are presented within Table 8.13. The location of the accident clusters along the route are included within Appendix 8.2 (PIA Assessment) – Volume 4.

Table 8.13 – PIAs Summary

Section	Year	PIA/km	Accident Severity		
			Slight	Serious	Fatal
Section 1 14.3 km	2020	0.42	2	3	1
	2021	0.56	6	1	1
	2022	0.49	6	0	1
	2023	0.63	8	1	0
	2024	0.49	4	2	1
Section 2	2020	1.23	7	1	0

6.5 km	2021	1.23	4	4	0
	2022	0.31	1	1	0
	2023	0.62	4	0	0
	2024	0.62	2	2	0
Section 3 16.8 km	2020	0.30	4	0	1
	2021	0.30	4	0	1
	2022	0.24	2	2	0
	2023	0.30	4	1	0
	2024	0.36	6	0	0
Section 4 7.7 km	2020	0.13	0	1	0
	2021	0.65	4	1	0
	2022	0.39	1	2	0
	2023	0.52	0	4	0
	2024	0.13	0	1	0
Section 5 12.6 km	2020	0.24	3	0	0
	2021	0.08	1	0	0
	2022	0.56	7	0	0
	2023	0.16	2	0	0
	2024	0.40	4	1	0

- 8.79 The section-based analysis demonstrates some year-on-year variation in recorded collisions, which is typical of routes of this length and character. Across all sections and years, slight collisions consistently represent the majority of recorded incidents, with serious and fatal collisions occurring infrequently. In total, 86 slight, 28 serious and 6 fatal collisions were recorded across the route over the five-year assessment period. Fatal collisions were confined to Sections 1 and 3, with Sections 2, 4 and 5 recording no fatal collisions during any year of the assessment period.
- 8.80 Section 1 records the highest collision totals overall, with 26 slight, 7 serious and 4 fatal collisions across the assessment period. This reflects its greater length (14.3 km) and higher traffic exposure, although the severity profile remains dominated by slight collisions. PIA per kilometre values show moderate year-on-year variation, ranging from 0.42 to 0.63 across the five years.
- 8.81 Section 2 shows the highest PIA per kilometre values of any section in 2020 and 2021 (1.23 PIA / km in both years), followed by a notable reduction from 2022 onwards, with values of 0.31, 0.62 and 0.62 PIA / km respectively. Despite recording 8 serious collisions over the assessment period, no fatal collisions were recorded in Section 2 in any year.
- 8.82 Section 3 exhibits relatively low and stable collision rates, with 20 slight and 3 serious collisions recorded over the five-year period. Two fatal collisions were recorded, both occurring in 2020 and 2021, with no fatal collisions in any subsequent year.
- 8.83 Section 4 records consistently low slight collision numbers throughout the assessment period, with no fatal collisions in any year and generally low PIA per kilometre values. However,

Section 4 recorded 9 serious collisions over the five-year period, which is notably higher than any other section relative to its slight collision total. A review of the individual accident records for this section, presented in Appendix 8.2 (PIA Assessment) – Volume 4, indicates that the serious collisions are spatially dispersed across the 7.7 km section and do not form a cluster. The collision records do not identify any recurring theme, common location or highway infrastructure deficiency that would indicate an underlying road safety concern specific to this section. On this basis, whilst the proportion of serious collisions is noted, it is not considered to represent a systemic or deteriorating safety problem, and does not indicate a baseline constraint that would preclude use of the route for construction traffic.

- 8.84 Section 5 recorded the second highest number of slight collisions across the route (17) but only 1 serious collision and no fatal collisions across the entire assessment period. This gives Section 5 the most favourable severity profile of all five sections.

Conclusion

- 8.85 Overall, the five-year collision record indicates that baseline highway safety conditions along the proposed construction route are broadly acceptable, with no evidence of a systematic or deteriorating safety problem across any section. Whilst Section 4 exhibits a higher concentration of serious collisions relative to its length, this does not represent an unusual or worsening trend and does not indicate a baseline constraint that would preclude use of the route.

Baseline Evolution

- 8.86 Background traffic growth would occur on the local road network irrespective of whether the Proposed Development is constructed. For the purposes of assessing the development impact at its peak, baseline traffic flows derived from the ATC surveys and DfT traffic counts have been used. DfT count data and ATC count data has been adjusted to a common 2026 baseline using TEMPRO growth factors to allow fair comparison between datasets collected in different years. No additional background growth has been applied beyond this application to achieve a common baseline, as doing so would risk diluting the relative impact of the Proposed Development and would not represent a robust worst case assessment.
- 8.87 The baseline descriptions above represent the year 2026. Appendix 4.1 (Climate Projections) – Volume 4 of the ES provides an overview of the likely changes in climatic conditions at the Site resulting from climate change across the lifespan of the Proposed Development. It is not considered that the climatic projection identified would have a material impact upon the condition of the baseline as identified in this chapter.

Construction Route Description

- 8.88 The construction traffic route forms the shortest and most direct route from the M62 that typical HGVs use when accessing Bridlington from the M62. The route also maximises the amount of time spent on the A-classified highway network and avoids use of local rural roads. The route is as follows in Table 8.14.

Table 8.14 – Construction Route Sensitivity

Highway Link	Rationale	Receptor Sensitivity	Assessment (Rule 1/2)
M62 Howden Spur	Route commences at Junction 37 of the M62, connecting to the A614 which provides direct access to the site. This section is a dual carriageway, with no frontage.	Low	Rule 1
A614 through Howden	Majority of Howden lies to the north and west of the A614, limiting demand for crossings. A limited number of residential properties are present on the opposite side of the road. No sensitive receptors have been identified.	Low	Rule 1
A614 Howden to Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End	Predominantly rural in character with no sensitive receptors identified along its length.	Low	Rule 1
A614 through Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End	High traffic volumes, close to village centre. Sensitive receptors present including St John the Baptist Church and Village Hall. Footways both sides, limited crossings, some refuge islands.	High	Rule 2
A614 Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End to Middleton-on-the-Wolds	Predominantly rural in character with no sensitive receptors identified along its length.	Low	Rule 1
A614 through Middleton-on-the-Wolds	Dissects village into north and south. Footways both sides and zebra crossing present, but sensitive receptors nearby including St Andrew's Church.	High	Rule 2
A614 Middleton-on-the-Wolds to Burton Agnes	Predominantly rural in character with no sensitive receptors identified along its length.	Low	Rule 1
A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme	Passes through centre of both villages. Footways present and sensitive receptors nearby including Burton Agnes Hall and Burton Agnes Primary School.	High	Rule 2

8.89 Information used to inform the receptor sensitivity is included in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4.

Primary & Tertiary Mitigation

Primary Mitigation

- 8.90 A number of primary, or tertiary, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. These measures form part of the scheme being applied for and therefore do not rely on external approvals to be delivered, save for formal application procedures and approvals, such as Section 278, which are outlined under Tertiary Mitigation.

Construction Mitigation

- 8.91 During the construction phase, a package of traffic and transport mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure safe and efficient access to the Site and to minimise effects on the surrounding highway network. The principal measures comprise:
- Widening and formalisation of the site access junction onto the A614 to accommodate construction traffic and Abnormal Indivisible Loads;
 - Improvements to the unnamed access road (USRN: 45908633) to enable safe movement of construction vehicles within the Site; and
 - Approach from the south-west so that non-AIL construction vehicles can turn left in and avoid unnecessary conflict with oncoming vehicles.
- 8.92 These measures will enable construction vehicles to enter and exit the Site safely while minimising disruption to the surrounding highway network
- 8.93 Prior to the commencement of junction improvement works at the A614 site access, all sub-surface utilities, including the water main running parallel to the A614, will be identified and protected in accordance with the requirements of the relevant statutory undertaker.
- 8.94 Mitigation measures specific to AIL movements, including route selection and temporary highway modifications, are set out in full within the standalone AIL Assessment submitted in support of this application contained in Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4.

Operational Mitigation

- 8.95 No operational primary mitigation is required in respect of Traffic and Transport once construction activities have been completed and abnormal load deliveries are no longer required. During the operational phase, a simple boundary fence will be provided around the overrun area at the junction of the A614 and the unnamed access road to deter unauthorised access, informal vehicle use and fly tipping. This fencing is expected to comprise a lightweight solution, such as timber post and rail fencing, aligned with designated land ownership / highway boundaries.
- 8.96 The overrunning area will be constructed to allow flexibility in future use. The grasscrete surfacing will be retained following completion of construction, with the area available for temporary reinstatement or resurfacing should future maintenance activities require access. In the event that future maintenance activities require abnormal load movements, it is acknowledged that similar mitigation measures to those employed during construction would be

required, including escort arrangements, temporary traffic management and prior coordination with the relevant highway authorities. However, given the infrequent and isolated nature of any such movements, the associated impacts would be significantly less than those arising during the construction phase. Any abnormal manoeuvres associated with maintenance activities would be subject to prior notification and agreement with the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority, in accordance with standard protocols.

Decommissioning Mitigation

- 8.97 No decommissioning primary mitigation is required in regard to Traffic and Transport.

Tertiary Mitigation

- 8.98 Tertiary mitigation refers to measures that are legally required regardless of the Proposed Development and therefore do not need to be secured through the planning process. They represent good practice and are considered standard requirements under existing legislation.

Construction Phase

- 8.99 Abnormal Indivisible Loads will be moved under police escort where required and subject to temporary traffic management or road closures. Where permanent or temporary works to the public highway are necessary to facilitate these movements, such measures will be delivered through the appropriate legal mechanisms, including a Section 278 agreement with the Local Highway Authority, alongside any approvals required under the Highways Act.

Operational Phase

- 8.100 Ongoing compliance with relevant local and national policy.

Decommissioning Phase

- 8.101 As with construction, any AILs associated with decommissioning will be subject to statutory requirements for police escort and traffic management, ensuring that no unacceptable impacts occur.
- 8.102 The activities involved in the decommissioning process for the Proposed Development are not yet known in detail, noting that the scheme is anticipated to have an operational life of c. 40 years. Some traffic movements would be associated with the removal and, where appropriate, recycling of materials arising from decommissioning. However, vehicle numbers are not expected to exceed those experienced during the construction phase. This is partly due to the fact that improvements to the site access junction and unclassified access road (USRN: 45908633) will be permanent works delivered during construction, such that additional construction related trip generation associated with access upgrades would not arise during the decommissioning phase.

Construction Programme

- 8.103 For the purposes of this assessment, a concurrent construction programme has been assumed, whereby all turbines and associated infrastructure are assumed to be under construction simultaneously rather than sequentially. This represents a robust worst case scenario, ensuring that the cumulative traffic and transport impacts arising from overlapping construction activities within the Proposed Development are fully captured. It is noted that construction of the Proposed Development is not assumed to be concurrent with any adjacent development, including the Three Oaks Renewable Energy Park, as construction programmes are expected to be sequential. On this basis, an indicative eight month construction programme commencing in 2028 has been assumed.

Construction Vehicle Trip Generation

- 8.104 The construction vehicle trip generation has been considered using bespoke numbers anticipated to be required to facilitate construction of the Proposed Development.
- 8.105 It is expected that a range of vehicles will access the Site to enable construction and decommission phases, which will comprise, but not be limited to:
- Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs) – vans and small flatbeds – movement for plant and maintenance, Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), fixtures and fittings, small components, couriers, post, supplies;
 - Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) – 2-6 axle rigid or articulated lorries – movement for material and component deliveries, aggregate, spoil removal, cable and fencing; Cars and Minibuses – for staff transport; and
 - AIL – Turbine blades and tower components for the construction of wind turbines.
- 8.106 Table 8.15 sets out the anticipated total two-way vehicle movements during the construction phase for each month.

Table 8.15 – Total Anticipated Construction Vehicles Two Way Traffic Flow Per Month

Aspect of Development	Month No.							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Site set up	76							
Site entrance and track construction	792	792						
Turbine foundation		80	1080	520				
Foundation curing				0	0			
Crane hardstandings			264	528				
Cabling					80			
Turbine delivery and erection				4	90	94		
Grid connection works				28	36			
Energise and commission							0	
Reinstatement and demobilise							16	32
Completion								0
HGV Total	868	872	1344	1080	206	94	16	32
LGVs	360	520	560	560	420	400	200	120
Total	1228	1392	1904	1640	626	494	216	152

- 8.107 Based on the construction programme, the peak month for two-way HGV movements is anticipated to occur in Month 3, during which 1,344 no. two-way HGV movements are forecast. In accordance with Chapter 2, it is anticipated that construction activities will operate on a six-day working week (07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday). On this basis, the forecast HGV activity equates to an average of c.56 no. two-way HGV movements per day, based on a four-week month of 24 working days. When LGV movements are also taken into account, the total number of two-way vehicle movements during the peak month increases to 1,904 no., equating to an average of c.79 no. two-way vehicle movements per day.
- 8.108 For robustness, a conservative five-day working week scenario has also been assessed, whereby Saturday working is excluded. By concentrating the total construction vehicle movements across fewer working days, this scenario produces higher average daily HGV flows than would arise under a six-day working week. Under this scenario, the 1,344 no. two-way HGV movements equate to an average of c.67 no. two-way HGV movements per day, based on a four-week month of 20 working days, increasing to c.95 no. two-way vehicle movements per day when LGV movements are included. This conservative scenario has been assessed to ensure that potential peak weekday impacts are not diluted by the inclusion of Saturday movements, and represents a worst case for the purposes of this assessment.

Assessment of Effects

Construction Route

- 8.109 Table 8.16 shows the percentage change in traffic flows, with construction traffic on the local road network. The ISEP Guidelines screening exercise is also presented within this table. Percentage increases that exceed the relevant ISEP Guidelines threshold of assessment rule (see paragraph 2.16 of ISEP Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement) would be subject to further assessment. Any increase that is below the ISEP Guidelines threshold would not be taken forward for assessment.

Table 8.16 – Baseline Traffic with Predicted Construction Traffic

Highway Link	ISEP Screening Rule	Baseline DfT Count ID / ATC	Baseline Traffic Flow (Daily)		Construction Traffic Flow (Daily)		Baseline + Construction Traffic (Daily)		Percentage Change (%)		Further Assessment Required
			HGV	Total	HGV	Total	HGV	Total	HGV	Total	
M62 Howden Spur	Rule 1	7346	1,716	19,101	67	95	1,783	19,196	3.90%	0.50%	Does not exceed 30% threshold (Rule 1) – no further assessment required
A614 through Howden	Rule 1	7346	1,716	19,101	67	95	1,783	19,196	3.90%	0.50%	Does not exceed 30% threshold (Rule 1) – no further assessment required
A614 Howden to Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End	Rule 1	7346	1,716	19,101	67	95	1,783	19,196	3.90%	0.50%	Does not exceed 30% threshold (Rule 1) – no further assessment required
A614 through Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End	Rule 2	27365	917	7,227	67	95	984	7,322	7.31%	1.31%	Does not exceed 10% threshold (Rule 2) – no further assessment required
A614 Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End to Middleton-on-the-Wolds	Rule 1	ATC Market Weighton	546	7,996	67	95	613	8,091	12.27%	1.19%	Does not exceed 30% threshold (Rule 1) – no further assessment required

A614 through Middleton-on-the-Wolds	Rule 2	91141	740	10,172	67	95	807	10,267	9.05%	0.93%	Does not exceed 10% threshold (Rule 2) – no further assessment required
A614 Middleton-on-the-Wolds to Burton Agnes	Rule 1	27966	901	14,416	67	95	968	14,511	7.44%	0.66%	Does not exceed 30% threshold (Rule 1) – no further assessment required
A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme	Rule 2	ATC Site Access	404	10,165	67	95	471	10,260	16.58%	0.93%	Exceeds 10% threshold (Rule 2) – further assessment required

Note: Baseline traffic flows are TEMPro-adjusted 2026 figures derived from observed survey data. Refer to paragraph 8.71 and Table 8.11 for full derivation of baseline flows

Severance

- 8.110 As shown in Table 8.16, with the exception of the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme which is assessed separately below, no part of the construction traffic route exceeds the applicable screening thresholds set out in Rule 1 or Rule 2. For context, the original ISEP (1993) Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic reference historic Department for Transport severance indicators, whereby traffic flow changes of 30%, 60% and 90% are associated with slight, moderate and substantial severance effects respectively. Having regard to the sensitivity of receptors along the construction traffic route, as set out in Table 8.14 (Construction Route Sensitivity), the forecast changes in traffic flow associated with construction traffic are well below levels that would be expected to give rise to perceptible severance effects. Accordingly, the effect on severance for these links is assessed as negligible and Not Significant.
- 8.111 The A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme exceeds the ISEP Rule 2 HGV screening threshold, with a forecast increase of 16.58% against the 10% threshold. The section has been assessed as High sensitivity, reflecting its passage through the centre of both villages, the presence of footways, and the proximity of sensitive receptors including Burton Agnes Hall and Burton Agnes Primary School. A severance assessment has therefore been undertaken for this link, applying the same three-framework methodology used throughout this chapter.
- 8.112 In accordance with the ISEP Guidelines, there are no predictive formulae which give simple relationships between traffic factors and levels of severance, and thresholds should be applied cautiously with full regard to local conditions. The 16.58% increase in HGV flows, whilst exceeding the Rule 2 screening threshold, remains substantially below the 30% flow change historically associated with a slight severance effect under DfT indicators referenced in the ISEP Guidelines. The ISEP Guidelines explicitly note that these thresholds were derived from studies of major changes in traffic flow and should not be applied mechanistically.
- 8.113 Regard has also been given to the severance assessment methodology set out in Section 5 of DfT TAG Unit A4.1 (Social Impact Appraisal, November 2022), including the four-level severance classification at Section 5.1.3, the change in severance assessment matrix at Table 5.1, and the overall assessment guidelines at Section 5.2.3. The forecast construction traffic results in only a marginal increase in total flows through Burton Agnes and Thornholme, from a baseline of 10,165 two-way vehicles per day to 10,260 two-way vehicles per day during the peak construction month — an absolute increase of 95 two-way vehicle movements per day including 67 HGVs. Spread across a 12-hour working day (07:00–19:00), this equates to approximately 5 to 6 additional HGV movements per hour. Against a baseline of approximately 748 total vehicles per hour across that same period, this marginal addition is not considered sufficient to perceptibly alter crossing opportunities or sever community links through the villages. It is further noted that no formal pedestrian crossing points are present along this section, and as recorded in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, pedestrian crossing demand is expected to be low and crossing movements infrequent and opportunistic.
- 8.114 Further reference has been made to DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health (Revision 1, January 2020). In accordance with the Walkers, Cyclists and Horse riders (WCH) receptor sensitivity criteria set out in Table 3.11 of LA 112, rights of way crossing roads at grade with between 8,000 and 16,000 vehicles per day fall within the High sensitivity category. The baseline traffic flow through Burton Agnes and Thornholme of 10,165 two-way vehicles per day places WCH receptors at this location within the High sensitivity category. Under the construction scenario, the total flow of 10,260 two-way vehicles per day remains within the same 8,000–16,000 vehicles per day band and therefore within the High sensitivity category. The forecast construction traffic does not result in a material increase in the proportion of HGVs

such that any WCH receptor would move into the Very High sensitivity category (greater than 16,000 vehicles per day). The sensitivity classification of WCH receptors through Burton Agnes and Thornholme therefore remains unchanged during the construction phase.

- 8.115 Having regard to the findings across all three assessment frameworks, and noting the temporary nature of construction traffic, the effect on severance along the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme is assessed as Negligible magnitude and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Driver Delay

- 8.116 As shown in Table 8.16, with the exception of the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme which is assessed separately below, no part of the construction traffic route meets the screening thresholds set out under ISEP Rule 1 or Rule 2 and, on this basis, no significant impact on driver delay is anticipated as a result of construction traffic on these links.
- 8.117 In addition to the ISEP screening exercise, prevailing traffic conditions along the construction traffic route have been reviewed to provide further context, including consideration of AM peak, PM peak, mid-interpeak and school pick-up periods. Observed traffic conditions have been informed by hourly ATC and DfT traffic count data, supported by a Google Traffic review during the busiest surveyed weekday period (Friday), with screenshots captured at 08:30, 15:30 and 17:30 provided in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4 for auditability.
- 8.118 Construction traffic is forecast to result in a modest uplift of approximately c.8 two-way vehicle movements per hour, based on a 12-hour working day (07:00–19:00) and a peak daily total of 95 two-way vehicle movements (including both HGVs and LGVs) during Month 3. At the ATC on the A614 near Market Weighton, which recorded the lowest baseline flows, this equates to an uplift of approximately 1.5% in the AM peak hour and 1.1% in the PM peak hour — insufficient to give rise to perceptible effects on junction operation, queueing or journey time variability. AIL movements will be infrequent, temporary and undertaken under police escort. Whilst vehicles may experience momentary delay when following an AIL, such delay would be brief and isolated and would not give rise to any material or sustained impact on journey times.
- 8.119 Notwithstanding the above, the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme exceeds the ISEP Rule 2 HGV screening threshold and has therefore been assessed separately. The forecast increase in total vehicle flow is from 10,165 to 10,260 two-way vehicles per day — an addition of approximately 8 two-way total vehicle movements per hour. The Google Traffic review contained within Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4 confirms no congestion was observed along this section during any assessed period. The addition of approximately 8 two-way vehicle movements per hour against a free-flowing baseline is not considered sufficient to give rise to any material change in traffic conditions through the villages.
- 8.120 In addition to the construction route arrangements described above, the junction improvement works at the A614 will require the installation of two-way portable traffic signals on the A614 mainline to enable the junction improvement works to be implemented, which are estimated to take approximately two to three weeks. The signals will create a single-lane shuttle working arrangement across an active works length of approximately 40 metres. The signals will operate in Vehicle Actuation (VA) mode throughout, in accordance with Section 18.3 of the ARTSM Guidance on the Use of Portable Traffic Signals (Edition 1.1, 2024) (the ARTSM Guidance), which minimises unnecessary delay by adjusting green times automatically in response to detected demand on each approach.

- 8.121 Peak hour directional flows on the A614 in the vicinity of the works were recorded at 480 vehicles per hour in the north-eastbound direction and 410 vehicles per hour in the south-westbound direction during the 16:00–17:00 period (five-day average), representing a combined two-way peak demand of 890 vehicles per hour. Signal timing parameters applicable to this site have been established in accordance with Section 19 of the ARTSM Guidance. For a works length and WAIT HERE to WAIT HERE distance of the order applicable here, the ARTSM Guidance indicates an all-red clearance time of 5 seconds, with minimum and maximum green times of 12 and 35 seconds respectively. These parameters are consistent with routine shuttle-working arrangements commonly deployed on rural A-roads carrying flows of this magnitude, and there is no technical reason to consider that the combined peak demand of 890 vehicles per hour could not be adequately managed within the capacity of a signal-controlled single-lane section operating on these timings. Some degree of delay and queuing during the weekday peak hour is inherent in any temporary shuttle-working arrangement and is to be expected; however, at the flow levels recorded, such delay is expected to be manageable and self-limiting, with queues dissipating within individual signal cycles under normal operating conditions.
- 8.122 The significance of driver delay arising from the temporary signal-controlled working has been assessed in accordance with the ISEP Guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (2023) (the ISEP Guidelines). As noted at Section 3.19 of the IEMA Guidelines, traffic delays are most likely to be significant where the highway network is already at or close to capacity. The A614 is a two-lane rural A-road that, at the recorded peak flows, operates well within its normal two-way capacity. The temporary constraint to single-lane working will inevitably introduce some delay during peak periods; however, this is a characteristic and accepted consequence of temporary traffic management on roads of this type, and the recorded flows do not suggest that the controlled section will operate in a manner that gives rise to exceptional or unmanageable queuing. The short-term duration of approximately two to three weeks is a further material consideration, representing a limited and defined construction phase impact in the terminology of the IEMA Guidelines (Section 1.27). The effect on driver delay attributable to the A614 junction improvement works is accordingly assessed as Minor Adverse during peak periods for the duration of the signal-controlled works, reducing to Negligible outside peak periods, and Not Significant in EIA terms.
- 8.123 All signal timings, WAIT HERE to WAIT HERE distances, and controller settings shall be recorded and retained as part of the site documentation in accordance with Section 21 of the ARTSM Guidance, and the Traffic Management plan shall be updated to reflect actual deployed dimensions prior to the signals being brought into service. It is noted that recorded 85th percentile approach speeds of approximately 48 mph on both approaches exceed the 35 mph threshold identified in the ARTSM Guidance. Approach signing will accordingly be designed and deployed in accordance with the sighting distance requirements for a 40 mph speed limit road as set out in Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 8, and this will be confirmed within the Traffic Management plan risk assessment prior to the signals being brought into service.
- 8.124 In light of the above, it can be concluded that the temporary closure of the unnamed access road, the periodic management of the Westend Farm Lane crossing, and the temporary signal-controlled working on the A614 will not give rise to any significant adverse effects on driver delay in EIA terms. The effect on driver delay across all elements of the construction access and junction improvement works is assessed as Minor Adverse during A614 peak periods for the duration of the signal-controlled works, and Negligible in all other respects, and Not Significant in EIA terms overall.
- 8.125 Accordingly, the Proposed Development is expected to give rise to a negligible effect on driver delay across all links on the construction traffic route, including the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme. The effect on driver delay is assessed as Not Significant in EIA terms.

Pedestrian Delay

- 8.126 In addition, regard has been given to DfT TAG Unit A4.1 Social Impact Appraisal, including the TAG severance worksheet, which provides a structured qualitative basis for considering severance, informed by quantitative data on traffic flows and composition (including HGV proportions). The forecast changes in traffic flow associated with construction traffic are small in scale (as set out in Table 8.16) and would not be expected to result in perceptible hindrance to pedestrian movement.
- 8.127 Further reference has been made to DMRB LA 112 Population and Human Health, which sets out defined sensitivity thresholds for (WCH) based on daily two-way traffic flows and the proportion of heavy goods vehicles. In accordance with Table 3.11 of LA 112, sensitivity changes for WCH receptors are only triggered where baseline traffic flows move between the defined flow bands of <4,000, 4,000–8,000, 8,000–16,000, or >16,000 vehicles per day, or where changes in HGV composition are sufficient to alter receptor value. When assessed against these criteria, all links along the construction traffic route remain within their existing LA 112 traffic flow bands under the construction scenario. To demonstrate this, the lowest baseline flow recorded on the construction traffic route is on the A614 through Holme-on-Spalding-Moor / Moor End (7,227 two-way vehicles / day), increasing to 7,322 two-way vehicles / day in the peak construction month. This remains within the 4,000–8,000 vehicles / day band and therefore does not trigger a change in LA 112 WCH sensitivity banding.
- 8.128 AIL movements will be infrequent, temporary and managed under police escort and therefore are not expected to give rise to measurable pedestrian delay.
- 8.129 Notwithstanding the above, the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme exceeds the ISEP Rule 2 HGV screening threshold and a pedestrian delay assessment has therefore been undertaken for this link. As established in the severance assessment above, the baseline flow of 10,165 two-way vehicles per day remains within the 8,000–16,000 vehicles per day LA 112 flow band under the construction scenario, with no change in WCH sensitivity classification triggered. As recorded in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, no formal pedestrian crossing points are present along this section, pedestrian crossing demand is expected to be low, and crossing movements are likely to be infrequent and opportunistic. The addition of approximately 8 two-way total vehicle movements per hour against a free-flowing baseline is not considered sufficient to give rise to any perceptible increase in pedestrian delay or hindrance through the villages.
- 8.130 Having regard to the ISEP screening results, the TAG Unit A4.1 assessment, the LA 112 flow band analysis and the receptor sensitivity evidence contained within Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, the effect on pedestrian delay is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms across all links on the construction traffic route, including the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme.

Non-motorised User Amenity

- 8.131 The forecast changes in traffic flows associated with construction traffic are modest across all highway links, as demonstrated in Table 8.16. With the exception of the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme, which is assessed separately below, no highway link exceeds the ISEP Rule 1 or Rule 2 screening thresholds, and in all cases the percentage change in total traffic flow and HGV movements is well below levels that would approach a halving or doubling of traffic flows.

- 8.132 Given the limited scale of traffic change, the absence of exceedance of screening thresholds, and the rural character of the majority of the construction traffic route, the forecast changes in traffic conditions would not be expected to result in a perceptible change in the amenity experienced by pedestrians and other non-motorised users. This is also evidenced within Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4. Accordingly, having regard to the ISEP Guidelines, impacts on non-motorised user amenity for these links are considered to be negligible and are not taken forward for further assessment within this ES.
- 8.133 Notwithstanding the above, the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme exceeds the ISEP Rule 2 HGV screening threshold and a non-motorised user amenity assessment has therefore been undertaken for this link. As established in the severance and pedestrian delay assessments above, the addition of approximately 8 two-way vehicle movements per hour against a free-flowing baseline with no observed congestion is not considered sufficient to give rise to any perceptible change in the amenity experienced by pedestrians, cyclists or equestrians through the villages. As recorded in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, pedestrian activity along this section is low, crossing movements are infrequent and opportunistic, and footways are present providing physical separation between non-motorised users and traffic.
- 8.134 Having regard to the ISEP screening results and the receptor sensitivity evidence contained within Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, the effect on non-motorised user amenity is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms across all links on the construction traffic route, including the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme.

Fear and Intimidation

- 8.135 The forecast changes in traffic flows associated with construction traffic are modest across all highway links, as demonstrated in Table 8.16. With the exception of the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme, which is assessed separately below, no highway link meets the ISEP Rule 1 or Rule 2 screening thresholds and none of the three components of the ISEP fear and intimidation hazard assessment would move into a higher scoring band. The magnitude of impact is therefore Negligible for these links in accordance with Table 3.3 of the ISEP Guidelines (Table 8.6 in this ES).
- 8.136 AIL movements will be infrequent, temporary and managed under police escort and are not expected to give rise to perceptible changes in fear and intimidation.
- 8.137 Notwithstanding the above, the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme exceeds the ISEP Rule 2 HGV screening threshold and a fear and intimidation assessment has therefore been undertaken for this link with reference to Tables 3.1 to 3.3 of the ISEP Guidelines (Tables 8.4, 8.5 and 8.6 in this ES). The baseline and construction scenario hazard scores are set out in Table 8.17 below.

Table 8.17 – Fear and Intimidation Hazard Scores – A614 Burton Agnes and Thornholme

Assessment Component	Baseline	Score	Construction	Score	Change
Average 18-hr flow (veh / hr, 2-way)	~560 (<600) ¹	0	~565 (<600)	0	None
Total 18-hr HGV flow	~303 (<1,000)	0	~370 (<1,000)	0	None
Average vehicle speed (mph)	30 mph (20–30)	10	30 mph (20–30)	10	None
Combined hazard score		10		10	None
Level of fear and intimidation		Small		Small	

- 8.138 The combined baseline hazard score of 10 points places this section within the "Small" level of fear and intimidation (0–20 points), reflecting the significantly lower vehicle speed through the village environment compared to rural links on the wider construction traffic route. No construction scenario component moves into a higher ISEP scoring band, and the magnitude of impact is accordingly Negligible in accordance with Table 3.3 of the ISEP Guidelines.
- 8.139 Having regard to the ISEP fear and intimidation assessment and the receptor sensitivity evidence in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, the effect on fear and intimidation is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms across all links on the construction traffic route, including the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme.

Road Safety

- 8.140 The ISEP Guidelines recognise that professional judgement is central to determining whether changes in road safety constitute a significant effect. Accordingly, the magnitude of change has been defined qualitatively, drawing on professional expertise and supported by quantitative analysis where appropriate.
- 8.141 Based on this professional judgement, the effect on road safety warrants assessment given the existing incidence of accidents along the proposed construction traffic route. While a small number of locations display some clustering associated with typical junction / roundabout manoeuvres, the overall distribution reflects general accident occurrence along a heavily trafficked strategic corridor.
- 8.142 PIA data for the construction traffic route over the most recent five-year period (2020–2024) is presented in Appendix 8.2 (PIA Assessment) – Volume 4. PIA rates have remained broadly stable at approximately 0.40–0.47 PIAs / km, the severity profile is dominated by slight collisions, and the data does not indicate any material deterioration in baseline road safety conditions. A section-based review confirms typical year-on-year variation consistent with a

¹ Calculated using recorded ATC flow data

route of this length and function, with no subsection exhibiting a sustained pattern of elevated collision rates.

- 8.143 Reference has also been made to iRAP risk mapping, which shows a reduction in risk rating from medium (2018–2020) to low-medium (2021–2023) and a 22.2% reduction in fatal and serious collisions during the same period, as shown in Figures 8.3 and 8.4 – Volume 3. This indicates that, while the route carries relatively high traffic volumes, its geometric design and operational characteristics provide a reasonable level of inherent safety. The assessment has been undertaken using traffic generation from the busiest construction month, where HGV movements are approximately 20% higher than the next highest month, representing a deliberately robust worst-case approach.
- 8.144 With the exception of the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme, assessed separately below, the Proposed Development will not result in a tangible or significant impact on road safety. The effect is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan has been prepared to support the safe and controlled movement of construction traffic and is contained in Appendix 8.4 (oCTMP) – Volume 4.
- 8.145 Notwithstanding the above, the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme exceeds the ISEP Rule 2 HGV screening threshold and a road safety assessment has therefore been undertaken for this link. The construction scenario adds approximately 8 two-way vehicle movements per hour to a free-flowing baseline with no evidence of congestion or capacity constraint, and the absolute traffic increase does not approach a level that would materially alter conflict probability at junctions and accesses along this section. As recorded in Appendix 8.1 (Sensitivity Assessment) – Volume 4, pedestrian activity is low and crossing movements are infrequent, limiting the potential for pedestrian-vehicle conflict. The construction period is temporary and traffic management measures will be secured through the oCTMP contained in Appendix 8.4 – Volume 4.
- 8.146 Having regard to the above, the effect on road safety along the A614 through Burton Agnes and Thornholme is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Hazardous / Large Loads

- 8.147 The ISEP Guidelines do not set specific thresholds for the consideration of hazardous and large loads, only that professional judgement should be utilised based on the frequency and nature of any such movements.
- 8.148 Due to the nature of wind turbine construction requiring a number of Abnormal Indivisible Load movements to be transported to the site, the impacts of large loads have been assessed in detail in Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4. This assessment includes details of stakeholder correspondence with the relevant highway authorities, consideration of third-party and highways land, the movement of street furniture, police escorts and other operational factors.
- 8.149 As set out in Appendix 8.3, AIL movements will be infrequent and temporary in nature, occurring only during the construction phase, and will be subject to statutory controls including pre-notification requirements under the Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003. All movements will be undertaken under police escort with pre-agreed traffic management measures in place, at low operating speeds and during pre-planned timeslots to minimise disruption to other road users. Route feasibility and structures assessments have been undertaken in consultation with the relevant highway authorities,

providing confidence that the identified route is capable of accommodating the proposed AIL movements without giving rise to unacceptable highway or safety impacts.

- 8.150 Having regard to the low frequency of AIL movements, the statutory controls and management measures in place, and the findings of the detailed assessment contained in Appendix 8.3 AIL Assessment) – Volume 4, the effect of large load movements on the highway network and on other road users is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.
- 8.151 No ADR-classified dangerous goods movements are anticipated to be required for the Proposed Development.

Construction Access

- 8.152 The unnamed access road and Westend Farm Lane, which runs parallel to the west of the unnamed access road, form part of the construction access arrangements. As identified in Chapter 2 (Project and Site Description) – Volume 2, the unnamed access road would be temporarily stopped up and closed to all users other than construction vehicles for the duration of the construction period, whilst Westend Farm Lane would remain open to general users, subject to management at the points where access to T1 and T4 crosses the route.
- 8.153 Non-motorised user amenity, fear and intimidation, and road safety have therefore been scoped out of the assessment in respect of the unnamed access road, on the basis that these effects cannot be experienced by road users who are not present on the route. Assessment of these criteria is accordingly limited to the Westend Farm Lane, along which the construction access track crossings are proposed. Whilst the Bridlington Heritage Route runs along Westend Farm Lane, it does not appear on the East Riding Definitive Map as a public right of way and is not signposted. Nonetheless, it has been considered in the interests of completeness given its named status.
- 8.154 No DfT count data exists for either road and, given that the surface of both roads is informal and unmetalled, data collection via ATC is not achievable. Collection via other means, such as camera or enumerator, would not be practical given the requirement for a minimum representative sample in accordance with DMRB CA 185. In the absence of quantitative baseline data, professional judgement has been applied in accordance with the ISEP Guidelines.

Severance

- 8.155 Baseline traffic volumes on both the unnamed access road and Westend Farm Lane, along which the Bridlington Heritage Route is routed, are expected to be low, comprising occasional farm and access movements only. Whilst neither road carries a formal pedestrian or non-motorised user designation, it is acknowledged that both routes may be used informally by local walkers and other non-motorised users given their rural setting. The temporary closure of the unnamed access road during the construction period could therefore give rise to a perception of severance amongst such users, notwithstanding the absence of any formal reliance on the route.
- 8.156 However, having regard to the rural and unmetalled character of both roads, their primary agricultural function, and the absence of any community facilities or residential receptors directly reliant on traversing these roads, the construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development would not give rise to any perceptible severance of community links. The

addition of construction traffic, whilst representing the dominant flow during the construction period, would be modest in absolute terms and temporary in nature. Furthermore, two alternative routes connecting the A614 with Woldgate are available in close proximity, located approximately 1.8 km to the east and 1.4 km to the west respectively, both of which are surfaced and offer an improved travelling surface relative to the closed road. Whilst Westend Farm Lane and the Bridlington Heritage Route would be subject to periodic management during delivery movements crossing the road, these interactions would be brief and temporary in nature. The effect on severance is therefore assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Driver Delay

- 8.157 Both the unnamed access road and Westend Farm Lane provide a connection between the A614 and Woldgate, with access to the immediately adjacent fields. Whilst the roads do provide an onward connection, their unmetalled character and limited width make it highly unlikely that either road is used on a regular basis other than by the landowner for agricultural access purposes.
- 8.158 The unnamed access road will be closed for the duration of the construction period, with access restricted to the landowner(s) for the purposes of reaching the immediately adjacent fields. In the unlikely event that any other users had intended to use the unnamed access road during its temporary closure, two readily available alternative routes exist in close proximity, both of which connect the A614 with Woldgate. The first is located approximately 1.8 km to the east and the second approximately 1.4 km to the west; both are surfaced roads, offering an improved travelling surface relative to the temporarily closed unmetalled road. Westend Farm Lane, which runs parallel to the west of the unnamed access road, will remain open to general users throughout the construction period and provides a further proximate connection between the A614 and Woldgate for any users affected by the closure. Any additional journey distance associated with the use of these alternatives is considered negligible given the proximity of all available options.
- 8.159 Westend Farm Lane will remain open to general users throughout the construction period, subject to brief management at the points where the construction access track crosses the route. During delivery movements, users of the lane may be subject to brief delays at the crossing points whilst construction vehicles complete their movements. As noted at paragraph 8.153, the Bridlington Heritage Route does not appear on the East Riding Definitive Map as a public right of way but has been considered in the interests of completeness and will be managed at the crossing points in accordance with the Appendix 8.4 (oCTMP) – Volume 4. Priority will be given to users of the lane at all times, with crossing movements by construction vehicles only taking place when it is safe to do so and the route is clear. Whilst users of the unnamed access road may be subject to a minor degree of additional journey distance as a result of its temporary closure, the very low baseline usage of the route and the ready availability of surfaced alternative connections in close proximity would limit any such effect to a minimal level. Any delay experienced by users of either route during the construction period is therefore considered to be of minimal and temporary duration. The effect on driver delay across both the unnamed access road and Westend Farm Lane is accordingly assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Pedestrian Delay

- 8.160 The unnamed access route is proposed for closure to pedestrians during the construction period. Given this closure, a degree of additional walking distance could be experienced by any user wishing to travel between its northern and southern access points on foot.
- 8.161 Westend Farm Lane is situated c.450 m to the west of the northern access to the unnamed road and c.400 m to the west of its southern access. As Westend Farm Lane runs broadly parallel to the unnamed access route and connects to the same highway network at both ends, it represents a suitable and available alternative of a similar character to the closed route. In the worst case, use of this alternative would result in a pedestrian travelling an additional 850m compared to use of the unnamed access route. Appropriate signage will be installed at both the northern and southern access points to the unnamed road to clearly direct users to the alternative route via Westend Farm Lane, ensuring that the diversion is clearly communicated to all users throughout the construction period.
- 8.162 Westend Farm Lane will remain open and available to all users, including pedestrians and non-motorised users, throughout the entirety of the construction period. The only exception to this is during the temporary holding of users to facilitate the safe crossing of construction vehicles, at which point the needs of pedestrians and non-motorised users will be given priority over those of construction vehicles at all times.
- 8.163 Based on an average pedestrian walking speed of 1.2 metres per second (4.8 kilometres per hour), the additional 850 m diversion distance equates to an additional walking time of approximately 10 minutes in the worst case. The unnamed access route serves no residential or commercial frontages along its length, with the only accesses being agricultural in nature serving farm operations only, and any users of the route are therefore considered likely to be recreational rather than making purposeful journeys between defined origins and destinations. Whilst ISEP guidance does not set out discrete criteria for the assessment of pedestrian delay, it is considered on the basis of professional judgement that an additional walking time of 10 minutes does not constitute a severe or significant impact on pedestrians during the construction period.
- 8.164 On this basis, the effect on pedestrian delay is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Non-Motorised User Amenity

- 8.165 As noted above, the unnamed access road will be closed throughout the construction period meaning users will not be present on the road and will therefore not be exposed to non-motorised user amenity effects. Both roads are unmetalled, serve an agricultural function and carry no formal non-motorised user designation. Given its rural character and the temporary and modest nature of construction vehicle movements, the addition of construction traffic on the Westend Farm Lane would not be expected to give rise to any perceptible change in the amenity experienced by non-motorised users. The effect on non-motorised user amenity is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Fear and Intimidation

- 8.166 The unnamed access road will be closed throughout the construction period, meaning users will not be present on the road and will therefore not be exposed to fear and intimidation effects. The managed crossings of Westend Farm Lane accordingly represent the only locations at which non-motorised users could experience fear and intimidation associated with construction traffic.
- 8.167 In the absence of quantitative baseline flow data, a formal ISEP hazard score cannot be calculated for Westend Farm Lane. However, having regard to the unmetalled and rural character of the lane, its agricultural function, and the modest absolute number of construction vehicle movements crossing at this location, it is considered that the infrequent crossing of construction traffic would not give rise to any perceptible increase in fear and intimidation for non-motorised users. Furthermore, all crossings will be managed by banksmen, who will give priority to all users at all times unless a crossing movement is actively taking place. The effect on fear and intimidation is accordingly assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Road Safety

- 8.168 The closure of the unnamed access road throughout the construction period removes any potential road safety interaction between construction traffic and other road users on that route. The managed crossings of Westend Farm Lane therefore represent the only locations at which a road safety interaction between construction traffic and other road users could occur. No PIA data is recorded for either road, which is consistent with their rural and lightly trafficked character.
- 8.169 The temporary addition of construction traffic crossing Westend Farm Lane would not give rise to the sustained changes in traffic flow or composition that would be expected to materially alter conflict probability or accident risk. Having regard to the expected low baseline usage of the lane, its unmetalled and rural character, and the limited absolute number of construction vehicle crossings anticipated, the probability of conflict between construction traffic and other road users is considered to be inherently low. All crossings will additionally be managed by banksmen, providing active control of construction vehicle movements and giving priority to other road users. The effect on road safety is accordingly assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Operation

- 8.170 During the operational phase, site inspections will be undertaken on a weekly basis and turbine servicing will be carried out in accordance with the manufacturer's specification, typically once or twice per year per turbine. These visits will be made by light van, SUV or 4x4 type vehicles only, generating a small and infrequent number of vehicle movements relative to the construction phase.
- 8.171 Based on the operational activities described in Chapter 2 of this Environmental Statement, weekly site inspections are anticipated to generate approximately 52 light vehicle visits per year. Turbine servicing, undertaken once or twice per year per turbine, will generate a further de-minimis visits per year across the six turbines. In total, operational vehicle movements are estimated at approximately 56 to 60 two-way light vehicle trips per year — an average of approximately one to two per week — all of which will be made by light van, SUV or 4x4 type vehicles. No HGV movements are anticipated during routine operation. These figures are

negligible relative to the construction phase and represent no material addition to baseline flows on the surrounding highway network.

- 8.172 Whilst the temporary construction compounds will have been removed, space will be provided on Site for such vehicles to manoeuvre and egress in forward gear, ensuring that no reversing occurs onto the A614 or the unnamed access road.
- 8.173 In the event that turbine components require replacement, any additional vehicle movements would be ad-hoc and infrequent in nature and, where AIL movements are required, would be managed in accordance with the approach set out in Appendix 8.3 (AIL Assessment) – Volume 4.
- 8.174 Having regard to the low frequency of operational vehicle movements, their light vehicle nature, and the absence of any material change to traffic flows on the surrounding highway network during the operational phase, the effect on traffic and transport is assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Decommissioning

- 8.175 The Proposed Development has an anticipated operational life of up to 40 years, after which decommissioning would involve the removal of above ground infrastructure.
- 8.176 Traffic movements associated with the decommissioning phase are not expected to exceed those identified for the construction phase. However, unlike the construction phase, improvements to the site access junction and internal access road (USRN: 45908633) will have been delivered as permanent works and will therefore remain in place for the lifetime of the development.
- 8.177 As a result, decommissioning activities would not give rise to additional construction-related traffic associated with access upgrades, and vehicle movements would be limited to those necessary for the removal and transportation of materials. Traffic and transport effects during decommissioning are therefore expected to be comparable to, or lower than, those experienced during construction. Given the 40-year operational lifespan of the Proposed Development, it is not possible to predict baseline highway conditions at the time of decommissioning with precision; however, the permanent nature of the access improvements secured during construction means that the highway network will remain capable of accommodating the associated vehicle movements.
- 8.178 By analogy with the construction phase assessment, it is reasonable to assume that the unnamed access road would again be closed to general traffic during decommissioning, with access restricted to decommissioning vehicles only. Effects on the unnamed access road and the Westend Farm Lane during decommissioning are therefore expected to be comparable to, and no greater than, those assessed during the construction phase.
- 8.179 Accordingly, traffic and transport effects associated with the decommissioning phase are not anticipated to be significant. Any mitigation required would broadly reflect the measures identified for the construction phase and would be secured through an appropriate management plan if necessary.

Secondary Mitigation

- 8.180 Secondary mitigation measures are those which, although not physically embedded in the scheme design, will be secured through the planning process by way of conditions or legal agreement.

Construction Phase

- 8.181 A CTMP will be implemented during the construction phase of the project, based on the principles of the Outline CTMP (Appendix 8.4 (Outline CTMP) – Volume 4) and will be secured by an appropriately worded planning condition. The aim of the CTMP will be to minimise the impact of the construction phase on local residents, businesses and users of the highway network. Construction movements will be kept to agreed working hours where practicable and designed to minimise disruption on the highway network.
- 8.182 The CTMP contains a package of mitigation measures which are expected to include:
- Provision of contractor's compounds within the site, providing an area on site for HGVs to park and manoeuvre, off the local highway network including the unnamed access road;
 - The arrival and departure of the HGVs will be strictly managed by the site manager. The drivers will adhere to a delivery schedule and will be required to call ahead to ensure that any emerging vehicles can be held within the compound. No HGVs will therefore be required, or permitted, to wait on the public highway;
 - Details limiting the hours of construction on site and the routing of construction traffic to protect local residential areas from construction traffic, especially from HGVs where possible;
 - The introduction of wheel washing facilities, should ground conditions dictate, before allowing vehicles to return to the local highway. In addition, a road sweeping vehicle could be made available to remove any site residue upon the local roads as and when necessary;
 - Management of construction access track crossing points over Westend Farm Lane, including the use of traffic marshals and appropriate signage to ensure the safe passage of all users of the route during delivery movements;
 - Measures to manage surface water during the construction phase, including the provision of appropriate drainage controls within the site access and compound areas, to prevent surface water runoff, mud, or debris discharging onto the A614 or any other section of the public highway including the unnamed access road;
 - Construction is expected to take place between 07:00 and 19:00 Monday to Saturday;
 - Temporary signage will be erected in the vicinity of the Proposed Development as appropriate during the construction phase to indicate that heavy construction vehicles are turning; and
 - The contact details of the contractor and those of the highway department at the relevant council will be exchanged before commencement of works on site.
- 8.183 The above measures are indicative at this stage. If considered necessary by the Local Highway Authority, these could be secured separately in a final version of the CTMP, to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development.
- 8.184 Appointment of a Construction Logistics Coordinator to act as the point of contact with the Local Highway Authority and local residents.
- 8.185 Requirement for all AILs to follow the agreed AIL route under escort and with advance notification to stakeholders.

Operational Phase

- 8.186 No secondary mitigation measures are required for the operational phase.

Decommissioning Phase

- 8.187 Secondary mitigation measures for the decommissioning phase of the site will follow the aforementioned measures for the construction phase.

Assessment of Residual Effects

Construction

- 8.188 With the secondary mitigation measures in place, residual effects during construction are expected to be limited to short-term increases in construction traffic on the identified routes.
- 8.189 These changes will result in a temporary, minor effect which is Not Significant at a local level.
- 8.190 No other significant residual effects on severance, delay, pedestrian amenity, or road safety are anticipated during the construction phase. In all cases, the residual effects are the same as, or no greater than, the effects assessed within the construction phase assessment above.
- 8.191 In respect of the unnamed access road, the road will be closed to all traffic other than construction vehicles throughout the construction period. The residual effect on general road users is therefore Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms, on the basis that no general road users will be present on the route during construction. In respect of Westend Farm Lane, the modest and temporary nature of construction vehicle crossing movements, the low frequency of such events and the rural and unmetalled character of the route mean that residual effects on users are inherently limited. The residual effect is therefore assessed as Negligible and Not Significant in EIA terms.
- 8.192 In respect of the temporary signal-controlled works on the A614 required to facilitate the junction improvement, the residual effect following the application of secondary mitigation — principally the implementation of the Traffic Management plan and the deployment of approach signing in accordance with Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 8 — is assessed as Minor Adverse during weekday peak periods for the duration of the signal-controlled works, reducing to Negligible outside peak periods. This represents a short-term and defined construction phase impact of limited duration, estimated at approximately two to three weeks, and is Not Significant in EIA terms. No residual effect on driver delay associated with the A614 junction improvement is anticipated beyond the construction phase, as the junction improvement itself (see plans within Appendix A to Appendix 8.4 (oCTMP) – Volume 3) will deliver a permanent betterment to the access arrangement.

Operation

- 8.193 No residual effects on Traffic and Transport are anticipated from the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The scheme will not give rise to any impacts on the operation, safety,

or accessibility of the surrounding transport network. The residual effect is therefore assessed as Neutral and Not Significant in EIA terms.

Decommissioning

- 8.194 The Proposed Development has an anticipated operational life of up to 40 years, after which it will be decommissioned with all above-ground infrastructure removed.
- 8.195 Vehicle movements associated with the decommissioning phase are not expected to exceed those generated during construction. Given the long-term nature of the scheme, the precise condition of the local highway network at that time cannot be determined. Accordingly, no significant residual effects are anticipated in relation to decommissioning.

Cumulative Effects

- 8.196 Consideration has been given to the potential for cumulative effects when the Proposed Development is assessed alongside other committed developments in the vicinity. The long list of cumulative developments within the study area is presented in Appendix 4.2 (Cumulative Long List) – Volume 4 and Figure 4.1 (Long List of Cumulative Development) – Volume 3, which identifies schemes within 2 km, 5 km, 10 km and 20 km of the application boundary. Whilst this long list has been used as the starting point for cumulative assessment across all environmental disciplines, the approach adopted for Traffic and Transport is bespoke to this technical topic. Rather than applying a uniform spatial filter, schemes have been assessed with specific regard to whether they share sections of the highway network with the Proposed Development's construction traffic route and whether their construction traffic generation is of sufficient scale to give rise to a material cumulative interaction.
- 8.197 Of the 28 schemes identified within the long list, eight are assessed as having no temporal overlap with the Proposed Development and have accordingly been incorporated into the future baseline rather than assessed as cumulative schemes. Of the remaining 20 schemes assessed as having a likelihood of temporal overlap, the majority comprise small-scale residential, agricultural, commercial or wind turbine replacement developments. On the basis of professional judgement, having regard to the nature and scale of each scheme and its proximity to the A614 construction traffic route, only those schemes specifically identified below are considered capable of generating construction HGV movements of a material scale on shared sections of the highway network. All remaining schemes have been discounted accordingly.
- 8.198 In relation to the above, the following schemes have been identified as warranting further cumulative consideration:

Temporary

- East Yorkshire Solar Farm (EN010143) [**not included** in the Cumulative Long List] – Consented DCO: The East Yorkshire Solar Farm shares the A614 with the general construction traffic route for the Proposed Development, with access taken from the A614 at Access 15 as set out within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (EN010143 / APP / 6.2). Whilst the main construction phase for the East Yorkshire Solar Farm is anticipated to fall largely outside of the peak construction period for the Proposed Development, it is acknowledged that some degree of temporal overlap cannot be ruled out.

As a reasonable worst case, should overlap arise, the combined peak daily HGV movements from both schemes on shared sections of the A614 would remain modest in absolute terms relative to existing baseline flows. The East Yorkshire Solar Farm generates a maximum of 25 HGV deliveries per day during its peak construction phase, concentrated between 09:00 and 16:00 and therefore outside the network AM and PM peak hours. When considered cumulatively with the Proposed Development's construction HGV movements, the combined uplift on the A614 would not be sufficient to materially alter traffic conditions at the sensitive receptor locations identified in this chapter. No significant cumulative effect is therefore anticipated. (look at first section)

- Proposed Wind Turbine Development (10 / 04753 / STPLFE) [**included** in the Cumulative Long List] – Approved: For the purposes of a robust worst case cumulative assessment, it has been assumed that construction traffic associated with this scheme would utilise the A614, consistent with the strategic routing expected for a development of this nature in this location. However, even on this basis, construction traffic associated with a scheme of this scale would be modest in absolute terms. The A614 carries in excess of 10,000 two-way vehicles per at some points. The additional daily HGV movements generated by this scheme, when considered cumulatively with those of the Proposed Development, would represent a negligible proportional increase against this high baseline flow and would not be sufficient to materially alter traffic conditions at any sensitive receptor location. No significant cumulative effect is therefore anticipated.

Permanent

- Kilham Housing Development (22 / 02849 / STPLF) [**included** in the Cumulative Long List] – Approved: As above, for robustness it has been assumed that construction traffic associated with this 41-dwelling scheme would utilise the A614. A residential scheme of this scale would typically generate a peak of fewer than 20 two-way HGV movements per day during its construction phase. Against the high existing baseline flows on the A614, this represents a negligible proportional uplift. When considered cumulatively with the Proposed Development's construction traffic, the combined effect on traffic conditions at the sensitive receptor locations identified in this chapter would not be material. No significant cumulative effect is therefore anticipated.
- Land North East of Driffeld Housing Development (45.88 ha) (Local Plan Policy DRF-B - North East of Driffeld) [**not included** in the Cumulative Long List] – Large parts approved: As above, for robustness it has been assumed that construction traffic associated with this strategic allocation would in part utilise the A614. Whilst the overall allocation is substantial, construction traffic will be dispersed across multiple phases and development parcels delivered over an extended period of up to 15 to 20 years, meaning daily construction traffic generation at any given time will be low. Against the high existing baseline flows on the A614, any cumulative interaction with construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development would represent a negligible proportional change in traffic conditions. No significant cumulative effect is therefore anticipated.

8.199

On this basis, no significant cumulative effects on Traffic and Transport are expected. Even in the event of limited temporal overlap between the schemes identified above, any resultant cumulative change in traffic flows would be temporary and, given the small scale of forecast construction traffic changes on the assessed routes and the screening outcomes reported in this chapter, is unlikely to give rise to a significant effect at a local or regional scale. Notwithstanding this, the appointed contractor will review likely cumulative construction traffic when preparing the final CTMP, which is anticipated to be secured by planning condition, to ensure that the most up-to-date information on other planned developments is taken into account and that any additional mitigation, where required, can be agreed with the Council.

Summary and Conclusions

- 8.200 This chapter has assessed the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on Traffic and Transport during construction, operation and decommissioning.
- 8.201 The assessment has demonstrated that, with the embedded and secondary mitigation measures in place, the Proposed Development would not result in significant adverse effects on the local highway network, pedestrian or non-motorised users, or road safety.
- 8.202 Construction traffic will be managed through the implementation of a robust CTMP, with all abnormal indivisible loads controlled via an agreed routing and escort strategy. Operational traffic movements are limited to infrequent maintenance visits and therefore negligible. Decommissioning effects are anticipated to replicate those identified for construction and are not considered significant.
- 8.203 No significant cumulative impacts have been identified when the Proposed Development is considered alongside other relevant committed schemes in the area.
- 8.204 In conclusion, the Proposed Development is not expected to give rise to any significant residual or cumulative effects on Traffic and Transport, and the proposals are therefore considered acceptable in highways and transport terms.