

6. Transport and Access

Introduction

- 6.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects in relation to transport and access.
- 6.2 The Chapter describes the scope of the assessment and assessment methodology and a summary of the baseline information that has informed the assessment.
- 6.3 In line with **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, the assessment reports on the likely significant environmental effects, the further mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects, or further enhance beneficial effects. The conclusions are provided both in terms of the residual effects and whether these are considered to be significant. The assessment of effects takes into consideration both primary and tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for further details).
- 6.4 This Chapter, and its associated Technical Appendix (**Appendix 6.1: Transport Assessment**), are intended to be read as part of the wider ES with particular reference to the introductory Chapters of this ES (**Chapters 1 – 5**).
- 6.5 In addition, this Chapter should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 16: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**.

Summary of Consultation

2025 ES

- 6.6 The Project Team has undertaken an EIA Scoping exercise (described further under the 'Scope of Assessment' section below) in support of the 2025 ES, which included consultation with RMBC and RBC and other stakeholders. The outcomes of this process are documented in **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** and **Appendices 2.1 and 2.2**. No consultation has been undertaken over and above that completed during the EIA Scoping process.

2026 FEI ES

- 6.7 No further consultation has been undertaken as part of this ES. Statutory consultation responses received following submission of the 2025 ES that are directly relevant to the ES, and its supporting material have been considered with the outcomes documented in **Appendix 2.4**.

Scope of the Assessment

- 6.8 An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to RMBC and RBC on 16th December 2024, as presented as **Appendix 2.1**. At the time of writing (May 2026), no Scoping Opinion has been received. Therefore, the scope of assessment is the same as that submitted as part of the 2025 ES.

Effects Unlikely / Not Significant

- 6.9 The following effects were considered unlikely / not significant as part of the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**) and are not considered further in this Chapter:

- Transport effects related to the Electrical Grid Connection - It is noted that the Project for Assessment proposes an alternative grid connection route (Option C), which differs from the routes considered as part of the EIA Scoping; as such, this has been re-appraised. On the basis of the nature, scale and routing of Option C, no new or materially different likely significant effects are anticipated beyond those previously identified as part of EIA Scoping. The conclusions of the Scoping Opinion in respect of the grid connection therefore remain valid and the effect remain not significant;
- Transport effects (e.g. severance, delay, amenity, fear and intimidation, accidents and safety and abnormal loads) during operation; and
- Road safety audits.

Effects Likely / Significant

6.10 Since the EIA Scoping process, the approach to assessment has been updated, with all transport-related effects considered together. In addition, clarification on the non-motorised receptors on-site has been added.

6.11 **Table 6.1** outlines the effects that are considered likely / significant and are reported within this Chapter.

Table 6.1: Effects likely / significant

Likely significant effect		Receptor(s)	Applicable stage(s) ⁱ
Transport-related effects	Severance	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads. Users of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRoW users).	Construction
	Driver delay	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads. Users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRoW users).	Construction
	Pedestrian delay	Pedestrian users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads. Users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRoW users).	Construction
	Non-motorised user amenity	Active travellers (pedestrian, cyclists, horse riders, etc.) using the B6527 and A680. Users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRoW users).	Construction

ⁱ As outlined in the EIA Scoping Report, decommissioning has not been assessed for transport and access.

Likely significant effect	Receptor(s)	Applicable stage(s) ⁱ
Fear and intimidation	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads. Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users).	Construction
Accidents and safety	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads. Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users).	Construction
Abnormal loads	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads. Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users).	Construction

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

6.12 The following legislation, policy and guidance have informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 6.1**:

- Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) (2023) – Section 5.14¹;
- NPPF (2024) – Considering Development Proposals section²;
- PPG “Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements”³;
- The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (now the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP) (2023) “Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement”⁴;
- National Highways, et al, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 104: Environmental assessment and monitoring⁵;
- Rochdale Borough Transport Strategy, 2014 Refresh (2014)⁶;
- Rochdale Core Strategy, (2016)⁷ – Policy G3;
- Strategic Transport Plan, “Transforming the North” (2024)⁸;
- Rossendale Local Plan 2019 – 2036⁹, Policy ENV7; and
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority, (2024), Places for Everyone¹⁰.

Defining the Study Area

- 6.13 The study area has been based on those roads that are expected to experience increased traffic flows associated with the construction of the Project for Assessment. The geographic scope was determined through a review of the other developments in the area, Ordnance Survey (OS) plans and assumptions of the potential origin locations of construction staff and supply locations for construction materials (these are set out in **Appendix 6.1**).
- 6.14 It is estimated that construction personnel and materials will access the Assessment Boundary from via the M56 and M66 corridors, using the B6527 and A680 to access the Assessment Boundary. The site Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), to be delivered by a suitably worded planning condition, will set access routes to and from site to avoid unnecessary trips through Edenfield as far as is possible.
- 6.15 The study area for the assessment has therefore been assumed to be as follows:
- M65 between Blackburn and Burnley;
 - A56 between the M65 and Ramsbottom;
 - B6527 between the A56 and Edenfield; and
 - A680 Rochdale Road from Edenfield to the junction with Scout Road (Scout Moor Quarry access / site access junction).
- 6.16 The above study area is illustrated in Figure 4 of **Appendix 6.1**.
- 6.17 Effects associated with construction traffic generated by the Project for Assessment will be most pronounced in close proximity to the site access junction and on the final approaches to the Assessment Boundary. As vehicles travel away from the Project for Assessment, they would disperse across the wider road network, thus diluting any potential effects. It is, therefore, expected that the effects relating to construction traffic are unlikely to be significant beyond the study area identified above.

Background Studies to Inform the ES

- 6.18 **Table 6.2** summarises all studies / surveys / analysis / evaluations undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Table 6.2: Studies / surveys / analysis / evaluations undertaken to inform the ES

Studies / surveys / analysis / evaluations	Overview	Date of Completion
Desk-based study	Identification of PRoW routes.	Late November 2024
Automatic Traffic Counter (ATC) surveys on the A680 (near to the Scout Moor access junction), B6527 in Edenfield and the B6527 (to the south of Haslingden).	Baseline traffic surveys.	Late November 2024

Studies / surveys / analysis / evaluations	Overview	Date of Completion
Abnormal Load Route Survey (forms Annex A of Appendix 6.1)	Review of the proposed Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) access route from Liverpool to the Assessment Boundary.	June 2026
Transport Assessment (Appendix 6.1)	Assessment of impacts from the Project for Assessment on the road network.	May 2026

Assessment Process

- 6.19 The main transport impacts will be associated with the movement of general Heavy Good Vehicle (HGV) traffic travelling to and from the Assessment Boundary during the construction stage of the Project for Assessment.
- 6.20 Potential impacts that may arise during the assessment may include those potentially experienced by users of the road / pathway and those residents along the delivery routes.
- 6.21 The impacts on receptors within the study area have been reviewed during the construction stage, with a peak construction period assessment undertaken. The impact assessment has been based upon a comparison of the baseline condition versus the peak of construction traffic. This represents the maximum impact and presents a robust assessment of the effects of construction traffic on the local and trunk road networks. The assessment is both quantitative and qualitative in nature.

Reporting of the Environmental Effect and Significance Criteria

- 6.22 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the Project for Assessment has taken into account the construction stage. The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity, magnitude of change, the level of effect and significance.

Determining the Sensitivity of Receptor

- 6.23 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of **high, medium, low or negligible**.
- 6.24 The IEMA (now ISEP) 'Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment' (2005)¹¹ notes that the separate Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (1993)¹² should be used for characterising the environmental traffic and transport effects (off-site effects) and the assessment of significance of major new developments.
- 6.25 Recent guidance published by IEMA (now ISEP), namely 'Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement' (2023) (the 'IEMA Guidelines') provides an update to the previously used guidance, 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic' (1993) document, that should be used to characterise the environmental traffic and transport effects (off-site effects) and the assessment of significance of major new developments. The IEMA Guidelines intend to complement professional judgement and the experience of trained assessors.

- 6.26 In terms of traffic and transport impacts, the receptors are the users of the roads within the study area and the locations through which those roads pass as well as users of PRoW where these intersect with construction traffic on-site.
- 6.27 The IEMA Guidelines include guidance on how the sensitivity of receptors should be assessed. Using that as a base, professional judgement was used to develop a classification of sensitivity for users based on the characteristics of roads and locations. This is summarised in **Table 6.3**.

Table 6.3: Classification of receptor sensitivity

Sensitivity	Description
High	Where the road is a minor rural road, not constructed to accommodate frequent use by HGVs. Includes roads with traffic control signals, waiting and loading restrictions, traffic calming measures. Where a location is a large rural settlement containing a high number of community and public services and facilities.
Medium	Where the road is a local A or B class road, capable of regular use by HGV traffic. Includes roads where there is some traffic calming or traffic management measures. Where a location is an intermediate sized rural settlement, containing some community or public facilities and services.
Low	Where the road is Trunk or A-class, constructed to accommodate significant HGV composition. Includes roads with little or no traffic calming or traffic management measures. Where a location is a small rural settlement, few community or public facilities or services.
Negligible	Where roads have no adjacent settlements. Includes new or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic and suitable for Abnormal Loads, and new strategic trunk road junctions capable of accommodating Abnormal Loads. Where a location includes individual dwellings or scattered settlements with no facilities.

- 6.28 Where a road passes through a location, users are considered subject to the highest level of sensitivity defined by either the road or the location characteristics.

Determining the Magnitude of Change

- 6.29 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions or against prescribed thresholds and has been considered on a scale of **large, medium, small** or **negligible**.
- 6.30 The magnitude of change has been assessed in accordance with the following rules which are outlined in the IEMA Guidelines and are used to inform a screening exercise to determine which links within the study area are to be considered for detailed analysis in the assessment:

- **Rule 1:** Include highway links where traffic flows are predicted to increase by more than 30% (or where the number of HGVs is predicted to increase by more than 30%); and
 - **Rule 2:** Include any other specifically sensitive areas where total traffic flows are predicted to increase by 10% or more.
- 6.31 For the key receptors, Rule 2 applies and all other receptors (locations) within the study area Rule 1 applies. All receptors are listed in **Table 6.9**, and the key receptors are identified below.
- 6.32 Increases below these thresholds are generally considered to be not significant given that daily variations in background traffic flow may fluctuate by this amount. Such changes in traffic flow will therefore be assumed to result in no discernible environmental impact.
- 6.33 The IEMA Guidelines identify the key impacts when assessing the magnitude of change in relation to traffic and access effects from an individual development and this has factored into the assessment presented in this Chapter:
- **Severance** – The IEMA Guidelines advise that *‘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’* (Paragraph 3.16). The IEMA Guidelines acknowledge that changes in traffic flows should be used cautiously, stating that *‘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.’* (Paragraph 3.17);
 - **Driver delay** – The IEMA Guidelines note that these 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’* (Paragraph 3.20);
 - **Pedestrian delay** (incorporating delay to all non-motorised users) – The IEMA Guidelines advise that *‘pedestrian delay and severance are closely related effects and can be grouped together. 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). Furthermore, the guidance advises that *‘...it is not considered wise to set down definitive thresholds. Instead, it is recommended that the competent traffic and movement expert use their judgement to determine whether pedestrian delay constitutes a significant effect’* (Paragraph 3.26);
 - **Non-motorised user amenity** – The IEMA Guidelines advise that *‘The 1993 Guidelinesⁱ 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’ (Paragraph 3.30);

- **Fear and intimidation** – There are no commonly agreed thresholds for estimating levels of fear and intimidation, from known traffic and physical conditions. However, as the impact is considered to be sensitive to traffic flow, ‘*changes in traffic flow of 30%, 60% and 90% are regarded as producing minor, moderate and substantial changes respectively*’ in the IEMA Guidelines (Paragraph 2.19). As such, this has been used to assess the potential impacts associated with construction activities around fear and intimidation on people near the Project for Assessment;
- **Accidents and safety** – Professional judgement would be used to assess the implications of local circumstances, or factors which may elevate or lessen risks of accidents. In line with the IEMA Guidelines, those areas of collision clusters would be subject to detailed review; and
- **Abnormal loads** – The movement of the AILs associated with the construction of the Project for Assessment have been considered in full, within a separate route survey assessment, which identifies physical mitigation measures required to accommodate the predicted loads. Additional mitigation in terms of addressing potential impacts on sensitive receptors are included as standard within the mitigation section of this Chapter.

6.34 While not specifically identified, as more vulnerable road users, cyclists are considered in similar terms to pedestrians.

6.35 Table 2.2 of Volume 11, Section 2, Part 5 of the DMRB sets out four levels against which the magnitude of change for these impacts should be assessed – major, moderate, minor and negligible. These have been transposed into the categories used into those used in this ES. The impacts and levels of magnitude of change are discussed in **Table 6.4**.

Table 6.4: Classification of magnitude of change

Magnitude of change		Description
DMRB classification	ES classification	
Major	Large	These effects are considered to be material in the decision-making process.
Moderate	Medium	These effects may be important but are not likely to be material factors in decision making. The cumulative effects of such factors may influence decision-making if they lead to an increase in the overall adverse effect on a receptor.
Minor	Small	These effects may be raised as local factors. They are unlikely to be critical in the decision-making process

		but are important in improving the subsequent design of the project.
Negligible	Negligible	No effects or those that are imperceptible.

Determining the Level of Effect

- 6.36 The level of effect has been informed by the magnitude of change due to the Project for Assessment and the evaluation of the sensitivity of the affected receptor. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement and **Table 6.5** has been a tool which has assisted with this process.
- 6.37 Whilst **Table 6.5** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement.

Table 6.5: Matrix to support determining the level of effect

		Sensitivity			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Magnitude of change	Large	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

- 6.38 The following terms have been used to define the level of the effects identified and these can be 'beneficial' or 'adverse':
- **Major effect:** Where the Project for Assessment is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions and the receptor has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity;
 - **Moderate effect:** Where the Project for Assessment is likely to cause either a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which has a degree of adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or a less than considerable change at a receptor that has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability;
 - **Minor effect:** Where the Project for Assessment is likely to cause a small, but noticeable change from the baseline conditions on a receptor which has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity; or where the Project for Assessment is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which can adapt, is tolerant of the change and / or can recover from the change; and

- **Negligible:** Where the Project for Assessment is unlikely to cause a noticeable change at a receptor, despite its level of sensitivity or there is a considerable change at a receptor which is not considered sensitive to a change.

6.39 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is considered to be up to 2 years, medium-term is considered to be between 2 and 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.

Determining Significance

6.40 For each effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is '**Significant**' or '**Not Significant**'. This determination has been based on professional judgement and / or relevant guidance / legislation, where applicable.

6.41 Significance has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

Pedestrian, Equestrian and Cyclist Networks

6.42 A public footpath is provided along the A680. This varies in width and quality and provides connections from the south-east of the site access junction through to Edenfield. The footway is lit and is adjacent to a road with a 30 miles per hour (mph) speed limit that rises to 40mph when to the south of Edenfield.

6.43 The B6527 has public footways on either side of the road within Edenfield. Outside of the town, the continuous footpath is restricted to one side of the road between Edenfield and Haslingden. The footpath varies in width and is lit.

6.44 The A56 and A65 do not feature pedestrian facilities in line with their strategic nature.

6.45 Within the Assessment Boundary, there are a number of PRow and Bridleways, including the following:

- Rooley Moor Road;
- Pennine Bridleway;
- Mary Towneley Loop;
- Rochdale Way;
- Rossendale Way; and
- Knacks Lane.

6.46 These are subject to use by walkers, equestrians and cyclists. The extent of the network is illustrated in Figure 5 of **Appendix 6.1**.

6.47 There are also areas of common land and open access land which provide broader public access across the Assessment Boundary.

Road Access

- 6.48 The A680 provides local connection between Rochdale and Edenfield. The road is maintained by RMBC to the south-west of Cheesden and by RBC to the north-west (including the section to be used by construction traffic).
- 6.49 Within the study area, the road is subject to a 30mph speed limit within Edenfield and a 40mph outside of the town and around the site access junction.
- 6.50 The road is approximately 7-7.3m in width and is capable of accommodating HGV traffic. The road features on-street parking along residential areas on its length within the study area.
- 6.51 The B6527 provides connections from Edenfield to the A56 at Haslingden. The road is subject to a 40mph limit outwith the built-up areas of the towns and is maintained by RBC. A cycle advisory marking is provided on both sides of the road, although this is faded in sections and subject to some on-street parking incursions.
- 6.52 The road is approximately 6.5-7m in width and is considered suitable for HGV use.
- 6.53 The A56 provides strategic north – south connections from the M66 and M65. The road is operated by National Highways on behalf of the UK Department for Transport (DfT) and is a dual carriageway, all purpose road. The road is suitable for the movement of HGV and AIL traffic.
- 6.54 The M65 provides connections from the M6 to the south of Preston, through to Colne, Lancashire. The road is operated by National Highways on behalf of the UK DfT and is a two lane motorway, suitable for HGV and AIL traffic.
- 6.55 As set out in **Table 6.2**, to assess the impact of construction traffic on the study area, Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs) were undertaken on the A680 (near to the Scout Moor Quarry / site access junction), B6527 in Edenfield and the B6527 (to the south of Haslingden). The surveys were undertaken in late November 2024.
- 6.56 To compliment the ATC counts, Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows were also obtained from the UK DfT traffic database¹³. Data from count sites 84100 (A56), 38040 (A56), 56534 (A56), 48055 (M65 west of Junction 8) and 38068 (M65 east of Junction 8) have been obtained.
- 6.57 These sites were identified as being areas where sensitive receptors on the access routes would be located.
- 6.58 A National Road Traffic Forecast (NRTF) low growth factor was applied to the 2023 obtained from the DfT database in order to estimate future year flows for 2024 so that a common base year could be made with the ATC survey data. The NRTF low growth from 2023 to 2024 is 1.005. This factor was applied to the 2023 traffic flows retrieved from the DfT database in order to estimate 2024 flows. The calculated 24-hour average traffic flows are set out in **Table 6.6**. Flows contain car, Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV).

Table 6.6: 24-hour average traffic flow data (2024)

Count ref.	Survey location	Cars and LGV	HGV	Total
1	A680 Site Access	4,973	973	5,945
2	B6527 Edenfield	5,523	991	6,514
3	B6527 south of Haslingden	4,105	586	4,691
4	A56 near Edenfield	66,374	3,679	70,054
5	A56 south of Rising Bridge	37,185	2,147	39,332
6	A56 south of M65 Junction 8	41,065	2,949	44,014
7	M65 West of Junction 8	66,612	3,298	69,911
8	M65 East of Junction 8	74,627	3,994	78,621

Please note that variances may occur due to rounding.

- 6.59 The ATC sites (Count Points 1 -3) used to provide traffic volume data were also used to collect speed statistics. The two-way seven-day average and 85th percentile speeds observed at the count locations are summarised in **Table 6.7**. Similar data was not available at the DfT sites.

Table 6.7: Measured speed survey data summary

Count ref.	Survey location	Mean speed (mph)	85%ile speed (mph)	Speed limit (mph)
1	A680 Site Access	34.7	39.5	40
2	B6527 Edenfield	22.0	27.4	30
3	B6527 south of Haslingden	36.0	40.7	40

- 6.60 Overall, speeding is not considered to be a significant issue on the study area network where data is available, with speed limits being broadly adhered to, with only the 85th percentile speeds on the B6527 south of Haslingden being marginally over the posted speed limit.

Road Safety Review

- 6.61 Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the five-year period covering 2020 to 2024 for the roads within the study area, was obtained from the online resource CrashMap¹⁴ which uses data collected by the Police about road traffic crashes occurring on UK roads, where someone is injured.
- 6.62 The review has considered the B6527 and A680 within the study area, these roads being the most affected by construction traffic. In addition, the A56 (between the M65 and M66) and M66 (between the A56 and A58) was also reviewed.
- 6.63 The statistics are categorised into three categories, namely “Slight”, “Serious” and “Fatal”, for those accidents that result in a death. A summary analysis of the incidents indicated that:

- 107 accidents were recorded within the study area roads within the five-year period;
- Of those accidents, 79 were categorised as “Slight”, 26 were categorised as “Serious”, and two were categorised as “Fatal”;
- The majority of accidents occurred on the A56 and M56, with both roads accounting for 85% of recorded accidents. On the A680 and B6527, 16 accidents were noted, including four categorised as “serious” and one “fatal” accident involving a single motorcycle driven by a young driver;
- 29.9% of accidents occurred in winter months;
- 27.1% of accidents involved only one vehicle
- Young Drivers (drivers under the age of 25) were involved in 30.8% of accidents;
- 12.1% of all accidents involved a motorcycle, including the “Fatal” accident on the B6527. Pedal cyclists were involved in 4.7% of recorded accident, the majority occurring on the A56;
- The majority of accidents on the A56 and M66 occur on the approach to junctions, although one cluster of accidents occurred at a location where traffic management appears to have been in place during road works; and
- No accidents occurred at or near the proposed site access junction.

6.64 In general, there are no clusters of PIAs at any location in the immediate study area or high numbers of accidents involving HGV, for example. The majority of PIAs recorded occurred at or on approach to junctions / access to properties, where there is an increased interaction between vehicles and on bends.

Future Baseline

6.65 Construction of the Project for Assessment could commence during 2027 if consent is granted and is anticipated to take approximately 24 months.

6.66 To assess the likely effects during the construction, base year traffic flows were determined by applying a NRTF low growth factor to the surveyed traffic flows. The NRTF low growth factor for 2024 to 2027 is 1.016. This growth factor has been applied to the calculated 2024 data to estimate the 2027 base traffic flows, as shown in **Table 6.8**. This has been used in the construction peak traffic impact assessment presented below.

Table 6.8: 24-hour average traffic flow data (2027)

Count ref.	Survey location	Cars and LGV	HGV	Total
1	A680 Site Access	5,052	988	6,040
2	B6527 Edenfield	5,612	1,007	6,619
3	B6527 south of Haslingden	4,171	595	4,766
4	A56 near Edenfield	67,436	3,738	71,174
5	A56 south of Rising Bridge	37,780	2,181	39,961
6	A56 south of M65 Junction 8	41,722	2,996	44,718
7	M65 West of Junction 8	67,678	3,351	71,029
8	M65 East of Junction 8	75,821	4,058	79,879

Please note that variances may occur due to rounding.

- 6.67 In the absence of the Project for Assessment, it is anticipated that traffic growth will occur regardless throughout the study area as a result of other development pressures, tourism and population flows. It is anticipated that there would be negligible change on the PRoW networks in the absence of the Project for Assessment.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

Construction Stage

- 6.68 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which has been evaluated as part of the construction stage assessment is outlined below. These items are detailed in full in **Appendix 6.1**.

- The provision of a CTMP (as detailed in **Appendix 6.1**), including specific AIL measures;
- The provision of a public roads “Wear & Tear” Agreement to cover any incidental damage on the road network caused by the temporary increase in traffic;
- Public information campaign and Road Signage strategy;
- The use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce the level of single occupancy vehicle trips to and from site;
- The provision of an Abnormal Load Transport Management Plan (TMP) to support the safe and efficient access of turbine components to site;
- The segregation of path, bridleway and PRoW users from construction traffic movements by safe crossing points and the overall layout of access track infrastructure to minimise interactions; and
- No construction traffic will travel up / down Rooley Moor Road and associated access gates will be maintained.

Assessment of Effects, Secondary Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction Stage

Transport-related effects (e.g. severance, driver delay, pedestrian delay, non-motorised user amenity, fear and intimidation, accidents and safety and abnormal loads)

6.69 A review of sensitive receptors has been undertaken within the study area. **Table 6.9** details the receptors and their sensitivities for use within the following assessment. A justification for the sensitivity has been provided, based upon the details contained in **Table 6.3**.

Table 6.9: Receptor sensitivity summary

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
Users of the A680	Medium	Where the road is a local A or B class road, capable of regular use by HGV traffic. Includes roads where there is some traffic calming or traffic management measures.
Users of the B6527 in Edenfield	Medium	Where the road is a local A or B class road, capable of regular use by HGV traffic. Includes roads where there is some traffic calming or traffic management measures.
Users of the B6527 south of Haslingden	Medium	Where the road is a local A or B class road, capable of regular use by HGV traffic. Includes roads where there is some traffic calming or traffic management measures.
Users of the A56 near Edenfield	Low	Where the road is Trunk or A-class, constructed to accommodate significant HGV composition. Includes roads with little or no traffic calming or traffic management measures.
Users of the A56 south of Rising Bridge	Negligible	New or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic and suitable for Abnormal Loads and new strategic trunk road junctions capable of accommodating Abnormal Loads.
Users of the A56 south of M65 Junction 8	Negligible	New or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic and suitable for Abnormal Loads and new strategic trunk road junctions capable of accommodating Abnormal Loads.
Users of the M65 West of Junction 8	Negligible	New or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic and suitable for Abnormal Loads and new strategic trunk road junctions capable of accommodating Abnormal Loads.

Receptor	Sensitivity	Justification
Users of the M65 East of Junction 8	Negligible	New or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic and suitable for Abnormal Loads and new strategic trunk road junctions capable of accommodating Abnormal Loads.
Users of on-site paths, bridleways and PRoW	High	Pathway, bridleway or PRoW not constructed to accommodate frequent use by HGVs. Includes roads with traffic control signals, waiting and loading restrictions and traffic calming measures.
Individual dwellings on the A680	Negligible	Where a location includes individual dwellings or scattered settlements with no facilities.
Edenfield Residents living on the A680	Low	Where a location is a small rural settlement and few community or public facilities or services.
Edenfield Residents living on the B6527	High	Where a location is a large rural settlement containing a high number of community and public services and facilities.
Residents living on the B6527 between Edenfield and Haslingden	Low	Where a location is a small rural settlement and few community or public facilities or services.
Residents living on the B6527 in Haslingden	Low	An area of few community or public facilities or services located on a B Class road.
Residents living adjacent to the Strategic Road Network and or non-trunk sections of the A56	Negligible	Where a location includes individual dwellings or scattered settlements with no facilities.

6.70 Based on the indicators which are stated within the IEMA Guidelines, the following are the key sensitive receptors:

- Users of the A680;
- Users of the B6527 in Edenfield;
- Users of the B6527 south of Haslingden;
- Users of on-site Paths, Bridleways and PRoW; and
- Edenfield Residents living on the B6527.

6.71 The above receptors are identified as key sensitive receptors in this assessment. These locations are subject to the 'Rule 2' of the IEMA Guidelinesⁱ which requires a full assessment

of effects if the traffic count locations are anticipated to be subject to an increase in 10% of total traffic.

- 6.72 All other locations within the study area are subject to 'Rule 1' and are assessed if traffic flows (or HGV flows) on highway links are anticipated to increase by more than 30% as a result of the construction of the Project for Assessment.
- 6.73 During the 24-month construction period, the following traffic will require access to site:
- Staff transport, in either cars or staff minibuses;
 - Construction equipment and materials, deliveries of machinery and supplies such as concrete and crushed rock; and
 - Abnormal loads consisting of the wind turbine sections and a heavy lift cranes.
- 6.74 Average monthly traffic flow data were used to establish the construction trips associated with the Project for Assessment, based on the assumptions detailed in the following sections. Full details of the construction traffic derivation are provided in **Appendix 6.1**.
- 6.75 The peak of construction in terms of vehicular movements will occur in Month 10 and will see up to 208 daily movements (100 Car / LGV and 108 HGV journeys). This peak daily two-way traffic has been assigned to the road network, resulting in the daily flows summarised in **Table 6.10**.

Table 6.10: Peak daily two-way traffic flows

Count ref.	Survey location	Cars and LGV	HGV	Total
1	A680 Site Access	100	108	208
2	B6527 Edenfield	100	108	208
3	B6527 south of Haslingden	100	108	208
4	A56 near Edenfield	60	0	60
5	A56 south of Rising Bridge	40	108	148
6	A56 south of M65 Junction 8	40	108	148
7	M65 West of Junction 8	20	76	96
8	M65 East of Junction 8	20	32	52

- 6.76 The peak month traffic data was combined with the future year (2027) traffic data to allow a comparison between the baseline results to be made. The increase in traffic volumes is illustrated in percentage increases for each class of vehicle. This is illustrated in **Table 6.11**.

Table 6.11: Peak month construction traffic network impact

Count ref.	Survey location	Cars & LGV	HGV	Total
1	A680 Site Access	1.98%	10.93%	3.44%
2	B6527 Edenfield	1.78%	10.73%	3.14%
3	B6527 south of Haslingden	2.34%	15.27%	4.17%
4	A56 near Edenfield	0.09%	0.00%	0.08%
5	A56 south of Rising Bridge	0.11%	4.91%	0.37%
6	A56 south of M65 Junction 8	0.10%	3.60%	0.33%
7	M65 West of Junction 8	0.03%	2.26%	0.13%
8	M65 East of Junction 8	0.03%	0.79%	0.07%

- 6.77 The highest total traffic movement increase within the study area road network is on the B6527 with a 4.17% increase noted at the peak of construction activity. This figure is less than the generally accepted change in daily traffic flows which can vary +/- 10%. As such, the increase in traffic volume is not considered significant. The increase in HGV movements, however, is larger at 15.27%.
- 6.78 It should be noted the construction stage is transitory in nature and the peak of construction activities is short-lived, occurring over a relatively short time period when taking account of the whole construction programme. The number of HGV loads is high, as it is assumed that all stone required on-site is being imported.
- 6.79 The traffic impact results indicate there will be no road link capacity issues with the addition of the construction traffic associated with the Project for Assessment.
- 6.80 The sensitivity of users of the B6527 and A680 and residents of communities living alongside both roads is considered to be negligible to high. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, medium-term adverse effect which is considered to be negligible.
- 6.81 It should be noted that legal vehicle use within the Assessment Boundary is limited to operational and maintenance trips to the existing Scout Moor Wind Farm and any traffic associated with the upkeep of the path and PRow network. As such, the imposition of construction traffic during the temporary construction period will lead to a significant impact and as such, it is assumed that this increase will be in excess of 100% to ensure that a robust assessment is undertaken.
- 6.82 An evaluation of the effect on path, bridleway and PRow users has been undertaken. The level and significance of the potential effects on these receptors have been determined using the rules and thresholds previously outlined above. **Table 6.12** summarises the level of effect on the receptors for the construction stage prior to additional mitigation measures being applied. This has drawn from the sensitivity of receptors identified in **Table 6.9** and the matrix in **Table 6.5**.

Table 6.12: Construction stage effects on path, bridleway and PRow users summary

Receptors	Potential effect	Magnitude of change	Level of effect	Comment
Path, bridleway and PRow users	Severance	Major	Major	The presence of construction traffic within the Assessment Boundary where there was previously no traffic will lead to severance of some of the PRow network. Therefore, the level of effect is considered major.
	Driver delay	Negligible	Negligible	No changes to driver delay anticipated within the Assessment Boundary itself. Therefore, level of effect is considered negligible.
	Pedestrian delay	Medium	Major / Moderate	Pedestrians could experience delays if their movements interact with construction traffic along the PRow network which will not be experienced prior to the construction period. The level of effect is therefore considered major / moderate.
	Non-motorised user amenity	Large	Major	The presence of traffic flows along a location where there would have been no traffic prior to the construction stage could affect the amenity of the PRow network for users. The level of effect is therefore considered major.
	Fear and intimidation	Large	Major	The presence of traffic flows along a location, where there would have been no traffic prior to the construction stage could cause fear and intimidation of the PRow network for users. The level of effect is therefore considered major.
	Road Safety and accidents	Medium	Major / Moderate	There is potential to impact the safety of the PRow users interacting with construction delivery vehicles. The level of effect is therefore considered major / moderate.
	Abnormal Loads	Large	Moderate	There is potential to impact the safety of the PRow users

Receptors	Potential effect	Magnitude of change	Level of effect	Comment
				interacting with AIL delivery vehicles. The level of effect is therefore considered moderate.

6.83 The sensitivity of users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic (path, bridleway and PRoW users) is considered to be negligible to high. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible to large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, medium-term, adverse effect which is considered to be negligible up to major.

6.84 The application of a microsinning allowance does not change the level of effect reported above.

Secondary mitigation or enhancement

6.85 No secondary mitigation or enhancement measures are proposed for the users of the B6527 and A680 and residents of communities living alongside both roads.

6.86 A Path Management Plan (PMP) is proposed to address issues relating to traffic interactions with path, bridleway and PRoW users.

6.87 Within the Assessment Boundary, consideration has been given to pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists alike due to potential interactions between construction traffic and users of the paths, bridleways and PRoW. The **Outdoor Access Management & Enhancement Strategy**, submitted as part of the Applications, has been developed to outline the routes and crossing details that could be used to facilitate safe access for all. Findings from the strategy will be used to formulate a set of measures into a PMP.

6.88 The main measures are as follows:

- Users of the PRoW will be separated from construction traffic through the use of barriers. Crossing points will be provided where required, with path users having right of way. Appropriate Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 8¹⁵-compliant temporary road signages would be provided to assist at these crossing for the benefit of all users;
- The appointed contractor(s) will ensure that speed limits are always adhered to by their drivers and associated subcontractors. This is particularly important within close proximity to the Rights of Way and at crossing points. Advisory speed limit signage will also be installed on approaches to areas where path users may interact with construction traffic; and
- Signage will be installed on the site exits that makes drivers aware of the agreed site speed limit and reminding drivers of the potential presence of pedestrians and cyclists in the area. This will also be emphasised in the weekly toolbox talks.

6.89 Measures implemented on similar schemes and suggested by the British Horse Society will be given consideration as part of the Project for Assessment. These measures are predominantly focused around the interactions between HGV traffic and horses. Horses are normally nervous of large vehicles, particularly when they do not often meet them. Horses

are flight animals and will run away in panic if really frightened. Riders will do all they can to prevent this but, should it happen, it could cause a serious accident for other road users, as well as for the horse and rider.

6.90 The main factors causing fear in horses in this situation are:

- Something approaching them, which is unfamiliar and intimidating;
- A large moving object, especially if it is noisy;
- Lack of space between the horse and the vehicle;
- The sound of air brakes; and
- Anxiety on the part of the rider.

6.91 The British Horse Society has historically recommended the following actions that will be included in the site training for all HGV staff:

- On seeing riders approaching, drivers must slow down and stop, minimising the sound of air brakes, if possible;
- If the horse still shows signs of nervousness while approaching the vehicle, the engine should be shut down (if it is safe to do so);
- The vehicle should not move off until the riders are well clear of the back of the HGV;
- If drivers are wishing to overtake riders, approach slowly or even stop in order to give riders time to find a gateway or lay by where they can take refuge and create sufficient space between the horse and the vehicle. Because of the position of their eyes, horses are very aware of things coming up behind them; and
- All drivers delivering to site must be patient. Riders will be doing their best to reassure their horses while often feeling a high degree of anxiety themselves.

Residual effect

6.92 The sensitivity of users of the B6527 and A680 and Residents of communities living alongside both roads is considered to be negligible to high. The magnitude of change is considered to remain negligible (as no secondary mitigation has been identified for these receptors). Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, medium-term adverse residual effect which is considered to be negligible.

6.93 The sensitivity of users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic (path, bridleway and PRoW users) is considered to be negligible to high. The magnitude of change, following secondary mitigation, is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, temporary, medium-term, adverse residual effect which is considered to be minor.

6.94 Application of micro-siting allowance does not change the residual level of effect reported above.

Significance

6.95 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Limitations and Assumptions

6.96 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions have been identified.

- This assessment is based upon average traffic flows obtained from DfT database and project-specific 7-day ATC surveys. There may be localised peaks within the construction days where flows can be higher for a specific hour, such as a shift change on-site. However, using the assumptions outlined above, it is considered that the likely significant effects have been identified; and
- Changes in construction timetabling or delays caused by weather events may change traffic flows from those assessed. However, using the assumptions outlined above, it is considered that the likely significant effects have been identified.

Summary

6.97 **Table 6.13** provides a summary of the effects, receptors, residual effects and conclusions of significance considered within the Chapter.

6.98 The table only provides a summary of the residual effects identified within the assessment and details of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures that have been taken into account are set out in detail within the Chapter and summarised in the Environmental Management Plan included in **Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan**.

Table 6.13: Summary of residual effects

Effect		Receptor	Residual effect	Is the residual effect Significant?
Construction stage				
Transport-related effects	Severance	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads	Negligible adverse	No
		Users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRoW users)	Minor adverse	
	Driver delay	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads	Negligible adverse	No
		Users of PRoW crossed or interacting with construction traffic	Negligible adverse	

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the residual effect Significant?
	(Path, bridleway and PRow users)		
Pedestrian delay	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads.	Negligible adverse	No
	Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users)	Minor adverse	No
Non-motorised user amenity	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads.	Negligible adverse	No
	Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users)	Minor adverse	No
Fear and intimidation	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads.	Negligible adverse	No
	Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users)	Minor adverse	No
Road safety	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of communities living alongside both roads.	Negligible adverse	No
	Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users)	Minor adverse	No
Abnormal loads	Users of the B6527 and A680. Residents of	Negligible adverse	No

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the residual effect Significant?
	communities living alongside both roads.		
	Users of PRow crossed or interacting with construction traffic (Path, bridleway and PRow users)	Minor adverse	No

References

- ¹ DESNZ (2023) Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1).
- ² Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024) NPPF.
- ³ Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (online) PPG.
- ⁴ IEMA (now ISEP) (2023) Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement.
- ⁵ National Highways (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104 Environmental assessment and monitoring (Revision 1).
- ⁶ RBC (2014) Rochdale Borough Transport Strategy, 2014 Refresh.
- ⁷ RBC (2016) Rochdale Core Strategy.
- ⁸ Transport for the North (2024) Strategic Transport Plan, “Transforming the North”.
- ⁹ RMBC (2021) Rossendale Local Plan 2019 – 2036.
- ¹⁰ Greater Manchester Combined Authority (2025), Places for Everyone.
- ¹¹ IEMA (now ISEP) (2005) Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment.
- ¹² Institute of Environmental Assessment (now ISEP) (1993) Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic.
- ¹³ Department for Transport, <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/#6/55.254/-6.053/basemap-regions-countpoints>, accessed March 2025.
- ¹⁴ www.crashmap.co.uk, accessed March 2025.
- ¹⁵ Department for Transport et al, ‘Traffic Signs Manual’ accessed March 2025.