

Construction Traffic Hearing

Below is what I prepared as my oral representation on 18th March 2026. Because of time pressure at the Hearing, I was not able to present it all so I am now submitting it as a written submission as requested.

Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My comments today focus on the construction traffic impacts of the proposed development.

According to the developer's own Construction Traffic Management Plan, the construction phase would involve 5,278 HGV deliveries – equivalent to 10,556 two-way HGV movements – plus 790 light goods vehicle deliveries, or another 1,580 two-way movements over the 30-month construction period.

In addition, during the 18-month peak construction phase there could be between 700 and 854 daily two-way staff trips associated with the workforce.

However, those worker trip numbers rely on very ambitious assumptions about construction workers car-sharing. In reality, construction workers typically travel from a wide geographic area and often rely on individual vehicles. If those assumptions do not materialise, the number of daily vehicle movements could be significantly higher than predicted.

Reviews of the developer's documentation also suggest that the overall traffic estimates are serious underestimates, given the scale of the scheme and the volume of equipment and materials required over a long construction period.

Even taking the developer's numbers at face value, they represent many thousands of additional vehicle movements on a rural road network that was never designed for this level of heavy construction traffic.

The key corridors identified include the B645, B660 and B661, which are narrow rural roads used daily by residents, cyclists, horse riders, agricultural vehicles and school buses serving Kimbolton School and Longsands Academy.

The B645 in particular is already well known locally as a dangerous road, with tight bends, limited visibility and sections where large vehicles already struggle to pass safely.

The developer suggests construction traffic will follow a prescribed route, but in practice it is extremely difficult to prevent drivers diverting through villages and onto smaller rural roads to save time or avoid congestion. Experience from other large infrastructure projects shows that rat-run traffic across the wider rural road network is almost inevitable.

We also have a real-world example of what this can mean. At the Cleve Hill solar NSIP project in Kent, restrictions known as “golden hours” – periods when construction traffic was banned from local rural roads – were built into the construction arrangements from the outset.

Despite those measures, residents living nearby still described the experience of the construction phase as “a nightmare,” with large numbers of heavy vehicles moving through rural communities for prolonged periods, causing disruption and damage.

That example demonstrates that even where mitigation measures exist, the scale and duration of construction activity can still impose major negative impacts on surrounding communities.

Yet in East Park Energy’s case, the Construction Traffic Management Plan appears to include no binding guarantees on routing, no enforceable timing restrictions, and no clear system for monitoring or enforcing compliance.

Ultimately, this issue highlights a much more fundamental problem.

The scale of construction traffic required for a project of this magnitude is simply incompatible with the narrow rural road network that serves these villages. The risks to road safety, the disruption to daily life, and the pressure on local infrastructure are not incidental impacts – they are a direct consequence of placing a vast industrial-scale energy development in a rural landscape that lacks the transport infrastructure to support it.

For that reason, my submission to the Examining Authority today is that the construction traffic impacts alone demonstrate that this location is fundamentally unsuitable for development of this scale.

And if those impacts cannot be safely and credibly mitigated – which the current plans do not demonstrate – then the only responsible conclusion is that this scheme should not proceed in this location.

Thank you.

East Park Energy Development Consent Order (EN010141): Issue Specific Hearing 2, 18 March 2026, Construction traffic – response to the Applicant’s presentation

Traffic concerns via B645 and A1 junctions

I live very close to this junction and drive onto the B645 numerous times a day, also on foot and with bicycle.

With reference the traffic exiting the A1 from the north bound exit onto the B645. As mentioned before this junction is very busy and there are often accidents. Most of these accidents will go unreported as no fatalities.

I have two major concerns apart from the above.

If traffic returning home, wanting to go south, enter the A1 via the northbound junction they will discover a very sharp bend and then about a 5 mile journey to Buckden roundabout to then come back on the south side of the A1. Buckden roundabout gets very congested with long queues.

In reality it is likely that most of the vehicles wanting to go southbound on the A1 will cross the bridge across the A1, onto a narrow part of the road where vehicles have to wait to turn into the northern end of the Great North Road [REDACTED] then go around a fairly small roundabout that is always getting damaged, past The Eaton Oak and then onto the A1 via the southbound entry.

This will cause major problems as this road has a high number of vehicles and pedestrians, especially at school time.

I am a St Neots Town Councillor for Eaton Ford Ward. I am extremely worried about the impact this will have on Eaton Ford and all who use this already very busy route.

I do feel that this route is most definitely not suitable for construction of this size and will greatly affect and endanger many lives.