Rosefield Solar Farm

Environmental Statement

Volume 2
Chapter 15: Transport and Access

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

EN010158/APP/6.2
September 2025
Rosefield Energyfarm Limited

Table of Contents

15. Transport and Access

15.1. Introduction

15.1.1. This chapter presents an assessment of likely significant effects arising from the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development upon transport and access. The full description of the Proposed Development is provided within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010158/APP/6.1]**.

15.1.2. This chapter is further supported by the following technical appendix presented in **ES Volume 4 [EN010158/APP/6.4]**:

- **Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]**.

15.1.3. This chapter should also be read in conjunction with the following assessment chapter(s):

- **Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010158/APP/6.2]**;
- **Chapter 8: Climate [EN010158/APP/6.2]**;
- **Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2]**;
- **Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2]**;
- **Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2]**; and
- **Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2]**.

15.1.4. This chapter is further supported by the following documents:

- **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010158/APP/7.5]**;
- **Street, Rights of Way and Access Plan [EN010158/APP/2.4]**;
- **Traffic Regulation Plans [EN010158/APP/2.5]**; and
- **Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy (RoWAS) [EN010158/APP/7.8]**.

15.2. Legislative framework, planning policy and guidance

15.2.1. This assessment has been undertaken with regard to the following legislation, planning policy and guidance.

15.2.2. It should be noted that this chapter does not assess the compliance of the Proposed Development against relevant planning policy. Such an assessment is presented in the **Planning Statement [EN010158/APP/5.7]**.

Legislation

15.2.3. There is no legislation of relevance to the transport and access assessment.

National planning policy

- Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) (2023) – Section 5.14 details the planning policy for traffic and transport, including guidance on undertaking the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) using the Department for Transport 'Transport Analysis Guidance' [Ref. 15-1];
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3) (2023) – Section 2.10 considers solar development including the assessment of traffic and transport impacts during construction, inclusive of traffic and transport noise and vibration and large loads [Ref. 15-2];
- National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (NPS EN-5) (2023) – details issues relating to underground cables, although predominantly dealing with overhead cables [Ref. 15-3]; and
- National Planning Policy Framework (2024) –Section 9 outlines policies to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to promote sustainable transport [Ref. 15-4].

Local planning policy

- Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013 – 2033 (Adopted September 2021), specifically Policy T5 'Delivering transport in new development' **[Ref. 15-5]**, which states that transport and new development will only be permitted if the necessary mitigation is provided against any unacceptance transport impacts which arise directly from that development; and
- Buckinghamshire Council, Local Transport Plan 4 (2016), specifically Policy 3 'Managing the impact of new developments' **[Ref. 15-6]**.

Guidance

- Buckinghamshire Council, Highways Development Management Guidance, 2018 **[Ref. 15-7]**;
- Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 42-015-20140306) - Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements **[Ref. 15-8]**;
- The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (2023) **[Ref. 15-9]**;

- National Highways, *et al*.. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104: Environmental assessment and monitoring (2020) **[Ref. 15-10]**.

15.3. Stakeholder engagement

15.3.1. **Table 15.1** provides a summary of the stakeholder engagement activities undertaken separate from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping, Phase One Consultation, Phase Two Consultation and Targeted Consultation process. This table also details the matters raised, how such matters have been addressed, and where they have been addressed within the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application documentation.

15.3.2. **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.3: EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix [EN010158/APP/6.4]** presents the responses received in the EIA Scoping Opinion and the Applicant's response to each matter that has been raised.

15.3.3. **Appendices A4, J1, J2 and K3** of the **Consultation Report Appendices [EN010158/APP/5.2]**, which is submitted in support of the DCO Application, sets out the feedback received during Phase One Consultation, Phase Two Consultation and Targeted Consultation and how regard has been afforded by the Applicant to each matter raised.

Table 15.1: Summary of stakeholder engagement

Consultee	Date of engagement	Summary of matters raised	Outcome of engagement	Where this matter is addressed in the DCO Application documentation
Oxfordshire County Council	Email and telephone call on 3 October 2023.	Transport scoping for EIA and potential for the Proposed Development to impact on the Oxfordshire County Council road network. The Applicant made a request for detail of committed developments to be included in the EIA.	Impact review undertaken on A41 and A34 corridors. Use of Low National Road Traffic Forecast (NRTF) assumptions to determine future traffic flows.	**Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4], Chapters 4 and 6.**
National Highways	Teams meeting on 27 October 2023.	Transport scoping, study area and potential for impact on the trunk road network discussed.	Impact review undertaken for the M40 corridor.	**Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4], Chapters 4 and 6.**
Buckinghamshire Council	Teams meeting on 19 December 2023.	Transport scoping and potential for impact on the Buckinghamshire Council road network discussed.	Impact review undertaken of all relevant Buckinghamshire Council roads.	**Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4], Chapters 4 and 6.**

Consultee	Date of engagement	Summary of matters raised	Outcome of engagement	Where this matter is addressed in the DCO Application documentation
		Discussion on access routing and comparison of access options via Snake Lane/Claydon Road vs route through Grendon Underwood and Calvert was undertaken. Agreement on traffic survey locations between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council was reached.		
Buckinghamshire Council	Teams meeting on 30 May 2024.	Agreement with Buckinghamshire Council on the access route via Snake Lane/Claydon Road and study area. Review of initial traffic impact figures.	The agreed access route has been assessed and reported in this chapter.	Initial access works are included in the **Street, Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN010158/APP/2.4]** and **Traffic Regulation Plans [EN010158/APP/2.5]**.

Consultee	Date of engagement	Summary of matters raised	Outcome of engagement	Where this matter is addressed in the DCO Application documentation
		Discussion on potential road improvements was held.		

15.4. Approach to identifying the scope of the assessment

Study area

15.4.1. The study area is based on those roads that are expected to experience increased traffic flows associated with the construction of the Proposed Development. The geographic scope has been determined through a review of other developments in the area, Ordnance Survey (OS) plans and an assessment of the potential origin locations of construction staff and supply locations for construction materials.

15.4.2. Bulk materials for use on the Site will be sourced from existing supply locations located to the west. The appointed contractors will confirm the sources of materials in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan that would be secured pursuant to the DCO as a requirement.

15.4.3. Electrical component, plant and general deliveries are likely to originate along the M40 corridor from the Southeast and the Midlands.

15.4.4. Staff engaged during the construction process will likely be based within the major urban areas of Bicester and Aylesbury during the construction phase, this would bring construction traffic though both villages. The proposed construction routes avoid impacts on these and other nearby villages.

15.4.5. The access route agreed with Buckinghamshire Council is for all construction traffic to access the Site from the A41 corridor to the south via Station Road/Dewes Lane, Snake Lane/Fidlers Field and Claydon Road.

15.4.6. The study area therefore includes the road links most likely to be impacted by the proposed movements associated with Rosefield Solar Farm and comprises:

- The A34 to the southwest of Bicester;
- The M40 to the north and south of Junction 9;
- The A41 from its junction with the M40 through to Waddesdon;
- Station Road/Dewes Lane from its junction with the A41 to the Buckingham Railway Centre;
- Snake Lane/Fidlers Field from its junction at the Buckingham Railway Centre to its junction with Claydon Road;
- Claydon Road from its junction with Snake Lane/Fidlers Field to its junction with Quainton Road/Granborough Road; and
- Granborough Road between its junction with Claydon Road and the proposed Site access junction.

15.4.7. The study area is illustrated in **Figure 4** of **Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and has been discussed and agreed with Buckinghamshire Council and National Highways.

Scope of the assessment

15.4.8. The scope of this assessment has been established throughout the EIA process and design of the Proposed Development. Further information can be found in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010158/APP/6.1]**.

15.4.9. This section provides an update to the scope of the assessment from that presented in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and re-iterates/updates the evidence base for scoping receptors/matters in or out following further iterative assessment.

Receptors/matters scoped into the assessment

15.4.10. **Table 15.2** presents the receptors/matters that are scoped into the assessment reported within this ES, together with appropriate justification.

Table 15.2: Receptors/matters scoped into the assessment

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification
Transport and access issues resulting from the Proposed Development construction activities within the study area road links and affecting potential receptors (users of roads and residents)	Construction	The effects of construction traffic may lead to significant effects and require mitigation. This matter is scoped into the assessment, as detailed within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and confirmed within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN010158/APP/6.4]**.

Receptors/matters scoped out of the assessment

15.4.11. **Table 15.3** presents the receptors/matters that are scoped out of the assessment that are therefore not considered as part of this ES, together with appropriate justification.

Table 15.3: Receptors/matters scoped out of the assessment

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification
Transport and access issues resulting from the operation of the Proposed Development	Operation (including maintenance)	The low level of traffic generated during the operation (including maintenance) phase is such that a separate assessment is not required. This matter is scoped out of the assessment, as detailed within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and confirmed within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN010158/APP/6.4]**. The Planning Inspectorate did request that the ES description of development should clearly set out the operational vehicle types and numbers (with reference to relevant thresholds within guidance) to justify this position. Such information is presented in **Paragraphs 15.6.21 and 15.6.22**.
Transport and access issues resulting from the decommissioning of the Proposed Development	Decommissioning	The level of traffic associated with decommissioning is lower than that for the construction phase. In addition, the inability to predict a future traffic baseline is such that an assessment is not possible. This matter is scoped out of the assessment, as detailed within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and confirmed within **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN010158/APP/6.4]**. A Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be produced prior to decommissioning works commencing, secured by a requirement to the DCO either as

Receptor/matter	Phase	Justification
		a stand-alone document or as an appendix to the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, as confirmed in **Paragraph 15.6.23**.

15.5. Environmental baseline

Establishing baseline conditions

Data sources to inform the EIA baseline characterisation

15.5.1. The following data sources have been used to understand the existing transport and access baseline conditions:

- Buckinghamshire Council Public Rights of Way Map **[Ref. 15-11]**;
- Buckinghamshire Council Greenway map **[Ref. 15-12]**;
- OS data;
- Sustrans National Cycle Network route map **[Ref. 15-13]**;
- Crashmap **[Ref. 15-14]**; and
- Department for Transport (DfT) Road Traffic Survey Database **[Ref. 15-15]**.

Site visits/surveys

15.5.2. The following site visits/surveys have been undertaken to understand the existing transport and access baseline conditions:

- Site visits have been undertaken in late 2023 and June 2024;
- Traffic Surveys were undertaken between 18 and 24 January 2024 at locations and times agreed with Buckinghamshire Council. The locations surveyed were:
  - A41 west of the Station Road/Dewes Lane junction;
  - A41 east of the Station Road/Dewes Lane junction;
  - Station Road/Dewes Lane;
  - Snake Lane/Fidlers Field; and
  - Claydon Road.
- An additional survey was undertaken on Granborough Road between 5 and 11 July 2024.

15.5.3. All traffic flow data provided in this chapter has been summarised into Car/Light Goods Vehicle (LGV), Heavy Goods vehicle (HGV) and total traffic flows. All flows reported in this chapter are two-way flows.

Existing baseline

15.5.4. The following section presents a summary of the baseline conditions for the receptors/matters scoped into the assessment, as detailed within the **Table 15.2** above. The full details of the baseline conditions are presented in **ES Volume 4: Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]**.

15.5.5. A review of the Buckinghamshire Council Public Rights of Way (PRoW) map has been undertaken. There are a number of PRoW located within the Site and these are noted in the **Street, Rights of Way and Access Plan [EN010158/APP/7.8]**.

15.5.6. In addition to the PRoW network, the Buckinghamshire Greenway is proposed to pass through the Site. The established Bernwood Jubilee Way also passes through the Site.

15.5.7. A review of the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route map has also been undertaken. The closest NCN route is NCN 51 “Varsity Way – Oxford to Cambridge”.

15.5.8. NCN 51 passes to the north of the Site and does not interact with any of the proposed construction traffic delivery route roads. There is however a short interaction with the potential Abnormal Indivisible Load route on Vicarage Road in Winslow, where NCN 51 shares a 310m section of road with the Abnormal Indivisible Load route.

15.5.9. Construction of Rosefield Solar Farm is assumed to commence in 2029 and be completed in 2031.

15.5.10. To assess the likely significant effects during the construction phase, base year traffic flows have been determined by applying a National Road Traffic Forecast (NRTF) low growth factor to the surveyed traffic flows. The subsequent baseline traffic flows for 2029 are provided in **Table 15.4**.

Table 15.4: 2029 baseline traffic flows (vehicles per day)

Road link	Car & LGV	HGV	Total traffic
A34	62,731	86,04	71,335
M40 North	95,138	15,340	110,478
M40 South	63,519	7,690	71,209

Road link	Car & LGV	HGV	Total traffic
A41	31,980	2,193	34,172
A41 Bicester	21,820	1,956	23,776
A41 West	10,783	2,387	13,169
A41 East	9,718	2,368	12,086
Station Road/Dewes Lane	842	256	1,099
Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	93	31	124
Claydon Road	1,273	244	1,518
Granborough Road	271	83	354

Please note that rounding errors may occur

15.5.11. A review of traffic accidents on the online road safety resource Crashmap for a five year period (2019 – 2023) has indicated that there were five recorded traffic accidents on the proposed access route from the A41 to the proposed Site access junction.

15.5.12. The principal receptors to be considered are as follows:

- Users of the public road network;
- Residents living along the access route; and
- Users of the PRoW, bridleway and path network within the study area.

Future baseline in the absence of the Proposed Development

15.5.13. The future baseline traffic movements will include traffic from committed developments on or adjacent to the study area road network.

15.5.14. A review of committed development has been undertaken based upon the short list presented in **ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2]**.

15.5.15. In line with agreed transport planning practice, only committed developments (those that are complete or are likely to be completed by 2029) will be included in the baseline traffic flows of the assessment.

15.5.16. Committed developments to be included in the assessment are those of a significant scale, i.e. where their development impact exceeds a 10% increase in traffic flows on a link within the study area network.

15.5.17. Planning applications that are in development, scoping or are undetermined are not committed and are not included.

15.5.18. The committed developments that are included in the assessment are as follows:

- 22/00125/REF: New Category C Prison, known at Grendon Springhill 2; and
- High Speed Rail 2 ('HS2').

15.5.19. HS2 traffic flows that are accurate for 2029 are not publicly available and as such, the existing HS2 flows operating at the time of the traffic surveys are being retained and subject to traffic growth assumptions to provide a robust assessment.

15.5.20. Traffic flows from the proposed Grendon Springhill 2 prison development have been obtained from the Transport Assessment for that project. The daily traffic flows are provided for a short section of the A41 and have been extended to extremes of the Proposed Development study area on that road.

15.5.21. The Grendon Springhill 2 prison development only provides traffic flows for its operational phase. No construction traffic details are provided. It has been assumed that the prison would be fully operational at the time of peak construction traffic generation. This is an overestimate as the prison development will take some time to discharge planning conditions and start construction works, however it provides a robust assessment scenario.

15.5.22. The future baseline traffic flows with committed development in 2029 are provided in **Table 15.5**.

Table 15.5: 2029 future baseline + committee development traffic flows

Road link	Car & LGV	HGV	Total traffic
A34	62,731	8,604	71,335
M40 North	95,138	15,340	110,478
M40 South	63,519	7,690	71,209
A41	32,360	2,193	34,172
A41 Bicester	22,200	1,956	23,776
A41 West	11,323	2,387	13,169
A41 East	10,258	2,368	12,086

Road link	Car & LGV	HGV	Total traffic
Station Road/Dewes Lane	842	256	1,099
Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	93	31	124
Claydon Road	1,273	244	1,518
Granborough Road	271	83	354

Please note that rounding errors may occur.

15.6. Approach to the assessment

Approach to design flexibility

15.6.1. The parameters, as outlined in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010158/APP/6.1]**, and the parameter plans presented in **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.1: Height Parameters [EN010158/APP/6.3]** and secured in **Appendix 1: Green and Blue Infrastructure Parameters** and **Appendix 3: Vegetation Removal Parameters** of the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.6]**, **Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9]** and **Works Plans [EN010158/APP/2.3]**, set out the reasonable 'worst-case' parameters for the Proposed Development.

15.6.2. **ES Volume 1, Chapter 5: Approach to the EIA [EN010158/APP/6.1]** sets out those elements of the Proposed Development for which optionality is present within the design. The worst-case assessments detailed below are based upon materials / volumes, rather than locations as noted in Chapter 5 to provide worst case assessment of vehicle movements. The location options presented in Chapter 5 do not have a direct bearing on traffic numbers as all movements would use a common point of access. The reasonable 'worst-case' scenario that has been assessed in this transport and access chapter for each element of the Proposed Development where optionality is present within the design is outlined within **Table 15.6**.

Table 15.6: Reasonable worst-case scenario assessed for transport and access

Project element	Reasonable worst-case scenario that has been assessed
BESS	The maximum area of BESS development has been used to ensure a worst-case scenario for traffic generation.

Project element	Reasonable worst-case scenario that has been assessed
Rosefield Substation	The maximum size of the proposed substation development has been used to ensure a worst-case scenario for traffic generation.
Balance of Solar System (BoSS)	The maximum number of panels and materials has been assumed to provide a robust assessment scenario.
Main Collector Compound	The maximum size of compound has been assumed to be constructed and then removed from Site at the end of construction activities.
Satellite Collector Compounds	The maximum number of Collector Compounds has been assumed.
Interconnecting cable corridor(s)	All crossings under public roads are assumed to be constructed using Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to maximise the total number of construction trips on the network.
Grid Connection Cable Corridor	The longest reasonable route within the grid connection corridor has been used in the assessment to ensure that traffic flows are robust.
Indicative Site access locations	Site access junctions have been located to maximise road safety for all road users.
Primary and Secondary Construction Compounds	Temporary Construction Compounds have been included in traffic calculations. The exact location of the compounds is, however, irrelevant to the overall traffic impact review.

Assessment assumptions

15.6.3. The assessment of transport and access impacts has been based on the assumptions set out in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010158/APP/6.1]** and the **Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9]**.

15.6.4. It is assumed that construction will commence in 2029 and last for up to 30 months. The peak of construction traffic will occur in the early phases of construction (Month 8).

Assessment methodology and criteria

15.6.5. In accordance with **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.2: EIA Scoping Opinion [EN010158/APP/6.4]**, the assessment will only focus on the construction phase, that being the phase with the highest level of traffic generation.

15.6.6. The derivation of construction traffic is detailed in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]**. The peak of construction in terms of vehicular movements would likely occur in Month 8 of the indicative construction programme and results in 359 daily trips (218 Car/LGV and 141 HGV journeys) within the study area network.

15.6.7. The peak traffic flows have been distributed to specific road links within the study area network using the agreed access route and noting the assumed origin points. The construction phase traffic flows are detailed in **Table 15.7**. These flows have been used in this assessment.

Table 15.7: Peak daily construction traffic

Road link	Car & LGV	HGV	Total traffic
A34	10	0	10
M40 North	10	18	28
M40 South	10	24	34
A41	29	100	130
A41 Bicester	109	100	209
A41 West	109	138	247
A41 East	109	3	112
Station Road/Dewes Lane	218	141	359
Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	218	141	359
Claydon Road	218	141	359
Granborough Road	74	31	105

Please note that rounding errors may occur

15.6.8. In 2023, IEMA published guidelines entitled ‘Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement’ that should be used to characterise the environmental transport and access effects (off-site effects) and the assessment of significance of major new developments. The IEMA Guidelines (2023) intend to complement professional judgement and the experience of trained assessors and require consideration of the following:

- Severance;
- Driver delay;
- Pedestrian delay (incorporating delay to all non-motorised users);
- Non-motorised user amenity;
- Fear and intimidation;
- Road safety;
- Road safety audits; and
- Large loads.

Sensitivity of the receptor

15.6.9. In terms of transport and access impacts, the receptors are the users of the roads (vehicle users and non-motorised users) and those resident alongside the roads within the study area and the locations through which those roads pass.

15.6.10. The IEMA Guidelines (2023) includes guidance on how the sensitivity of receptors should be assessed. Using that as a base, professional judgement has been used to develop a classification of sensitivity for users based on the characteristics of roads and locations. This is summarised in **Table 15.8**. It should be noted that the criteria presented in **Table 15.8** have been augmented from the criteria presented in **Appendix D** of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4]** to include residential classes as well as the road user classes, thus ensuring a more robust approach to this assessment.

Table 15.8: 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.

Sensitivity	Description
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 Indivisible Loads, and new strategic trunk road junctions capable of accommodating Abnormal Indivisible Loads. Where a location includes individual dwellings or scattered settlements with no facilities.

15.6.11. 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.

15.6.12. A review of sensitivity for receptors within the study area has been undertaken and is summarised in **Table 15.9**.

Table 15.9: Summary of receptor sensitivity

Receptor	Description	Reason
Users of the A34	Negligible	Where roads have no adjacent settlements. Includes new or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic.
Users of the M40	Negligible	Where roads have no adjacent settlements. Includes new or existing strategic trunk roads that would be little affected by additional traffic.
Users of the A41, Bicester	Low	Where the road is Trunk or A-class, constructed to accommodate significant HGV composition.
Users of the A41	Low	Where the road is Trunk or A-class, constructed to

Receptor	Description	Reason
		accommodate significant HGV composition.
Users of Station Road/Dewes Lane	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 Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	High	Where the road is a minor rural road, not constructed to accommodate frequent use by HGV traffic.
Users of Claydon Road	Medium	Where the road is a local A or B class road, capable of regular use by HGV traffic.
Users of Granborough Road	High	Where the road is a minor rural road, not constructed to accommodate frequent use by HGV traffic.
Bicester Residents	High	Where a location is a large rural settlement containing a high number of community and public services and facilities.
Kingswood Residents	Low	Where a location is a small rural settlement, few community or public facilities or services.
Waddesdon Residents	Medium	Where a location is an intermediate sized rural settlement, containing some community or public facilities and services.
Residents living along Station Road/Dewes Lane	Low	Where a location is a small rural settlement, few community or public facilities or services.
Residents living along Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	Low	Where a location is a small rural settlement, few community or public facilities or services.

Receptor	Description	Reason
Residents living along Claydon Road	Low	Where a location is a small rural settlement, few community or public facilities or services.
Residents living along Granborough Road	Negligible	Where a location includes individual dwellings or scattered settlements with no facilities.

15.6.13. These sensitivity levels have been used in the following assessment to consider the significance of the effect of peak construction traffic.

Magnitude of impact

15.6.14. The magnitude of impact has been assessed in accordance with the following rules which are outlined in the IEMA Guidelines (2023), and is 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 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) is predicted to increase by more than 30%).
- Rule 2: Include any other specifically sensitive areas where total traffic flows are predicted to increase by 10% or more.

15.6.15. The IEMA Guidelines (2023) identify the key impacts when assessing the magnitude of impact from an individual development:

- Severance – the IEMA Guidelines (2023) advises 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.” (Para 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.” (Para 3.17).
- Driver delay – the IEMA Guidelines (2023) 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" (Para 3.20).

- Pedestrian delay (incorporating delay to all non-motorised users) – the IEMA Guidelines (2023) advises 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." (Para 3.24). Furthermore, the IEMA Guidelines 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." (Para 3.26).
- Non-motorised user amenity - the IEMA Guidelines (2023) advises that, "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." (Para 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 (2023) (Para 2.19). As such, this has been used to assess the potential impacts associated with construction activities around fear and intimidation on people near Rosefield Solar Farm.
- Road safety – professional judgement has been used to assess the implications of local circumstances, or factors which may elevate or lessen risks of accidents. In line with the IEMA Guidelines (2023), areas of collision clusters have been subject to detailed review.
- Road safety audits – It would be proposed to undertake any necessary Road Safety Audits post consent and it is considered that this can be secured via a requirement to the DCO through the **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.
- Large loads – The movement of the Abnormal Indivisible Loads associated with the construction of Rosefield Solar Farm has been considered, within a separate route survey assessment, which identifies if any physical mitigation measures are required to accommodate the predicted loads (within the existing limits of road adoption and covered within the **Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1]**). The actual number of Abnormal Indivisible Load movements is very low at 14 inbound

movements and as such, no further traffic percentage impact review is required.

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

15.6.17. The impacts and levels of magnitude are discussed in **Table 15.0**. The IEMA Guidelines (2023) states that there are useful references within Design Manual for Roads and Bridges that can be used cautiously to augment the assessment methodologies outlined in the Guidelines. Equally, the EIA suite of documents (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 101 to LA 104 inclusive) set out a framework for EIA, some of which can be utilised for an assessment of non-highway/road projects. Therefore, the criteria presented in **Table 15.10** have been informed by Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104: Environmental Assessment and Monitoring **[Ref. 15-10]**.

Table 15.10: Magnitude of impact

Magnitude of impact	Description
Major	These effects are considered to be material in the decision-making process.
Moderate	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	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	No effects or those that are imperceptible.

Significance of effect

15.6.18. The significance of the effect upon receptors is determined by combining the assessed magnitude of impact and the sensitivity of the receptor. **Table 15.11** sets out a matrix below used to determine significant effects.

Table 15.11: Significance of effect matrix

Sensitivity of receptor	Magnitude of impact			
	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
High	Major	Major	Moderate	Minor
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

15.6.19. Significance is categorised as **major**, **moderate**, **minor** or **negligible**. Effects judged to be of **major** or **moderate** significance are considered to be **significant** and require additional mitigation. Effects judged to be of **minor** or **negligible** significance are considered **not significant**.

15.6.20. Where an effect could be one of **major/moderate**, **moderate/minor** or **minor/negligible** significance, professional judgement has been used to determine which option should be applicable.

15.6.21. During operation, the Site will be subject to daily operational and maintenance visits, with up to 24 staff travelling to Site via cars or LGV. The average number of trips per day would be less than twelve trips per day, which is the equivalent to traffic impact of between 2% and 3% between the A41 and the main Site access junction on Claydon Road. This level of traffic is significantly below the established daily variance in traffic flows of 10% that can be normally expected and as such, there is no requirement to undertake an operational (including maintenance) phase assessment, as confirmed in **Table 15.3** above.

15.6.22. During the operation of the Site, it may be necessary to replace panels of BESS units as part of rolling lifetime enhancement plan. The level of HGV traffic associated with this will be significantly lower than the peak of construction traffic and is expected to be circa 12 HGV movements per day.

15.6.23. The decommissioning phase has not been considered within this assessment (as confirmed in **Table 15.3** above) for two reasons. The decommissioning phase will result in fewer trips on the network than the construction phase as elements such as the access junctions and section of the access tracks would be retained for future agricultural uses, therefore eliminating the need for vehicle movements associated with the removal of these elements from the Proposed Development. In addition, the decommissioning phase is too far in the future to accurately predict future traffic flows. To protect future stakeholders it is proposed that a Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan, to be included in the

Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan which will be secured under a requirement to the DCO) be prepared prior to decommissioning works commencing.

15.7. Mitigation embedded into the design

15.7.1. This assessment has been based on the principle that measures have been 'embedded' into the design of the Proposed Development to avoid or reduce potential significant effects as far as practicable, for example by the considered placement of infrastructure. The embedded mitigation relevant to this assessment is detailed in **Table 15.12** below.

Table 15.12: Embedded mitigation relevant to transport and access

Embedded mitigation measures relevant to transport and access	Function	Securing mechanism
The proposed access route avoids passing through villages as far as is possible and reduces its potential impact on sensitive receptors	Removes construction traffic from villages, reducing adverse impacts in sensitive areas.	Routing requirements set out in **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.
The Site access junctions are designed to allow for two-way traffic flows and sufficient visibility in all directions	Ensuring road safety and efficiency for all users.	**Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1]**. Secured via the appropriate DCO schedules and contained within the **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.
All HGV traffic for the BESS and Parcel 3 of the Site will be routed through the main access and will approach Granborough Road from Quainton Road, removing the need for a constrained 90 degree turn at the junction	Ensuring road safety and efficiency for all users and reducing the need for intrusive road enhancement works.	Routing requirements set out in the **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]** and the physical properties of the access junctions.

Embedded mitigation measures relevant to transport and access	Function	Securing mechanism
Layby works on the Granborough Road to accommodate the temporary increase in traffic associated with the construction phase	Improving road safety measures and reducing the need for large scale road widening measures.	Routing requirements set out in **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.
Road enhancement works on Snake Lane/Fidlers Field potentially undertaken by HS2 and/or Buckinghamshire Council	Improved access and enhanced safety measures for all road users.	Provided by the Applicant under the **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**, unless provided prior to works commencing by others (Buckinghamshire Council or HS2).
A Staff Travel Plan to reduce single occupancy journeys to and from the Site during construction. Details of the Staff Travel Plan is included in the Outline CTMP	Reduced traffic and delay on study roads.	Routing and staff travel arrangement requirements set out in **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.

15.8. Assessment of likely effects (without additional mitigation)

Construction

15.8.1. The construction peak period daily traffic flow presented in **Table 15.7** has been compared with the 2029 baseline traffic flows presented in **Table 15.5** to allow a comparison between the results to be made. The increase in traffic volumes is illustrated in percentage increases for each class of vehicle. This is illustrated in **Table 15.13**.

Table 15.13: Predicted % increase in traffic volume during construction

Road link (including those receptors along and using the link)	Car & LGV	HGV	Total traffic
A34	0.02%	0.00%	0.01%
M40 North	0.01%	0.12%	0.03%
M40 South	0.02%	0.31%	0.05%
A41	0.09%	4.58%	0.38%
A41 Bicester	0.49%	5.13%	0.88%
A41 West	0.96%	5.80%	1.88%
A41 East	1.06%	0.13%	0.93%
Station Road/Dewes Lane	25.88%	55.19%	32.72%
Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	234.59%	461.58%	290.87%
Claydon Road	17.12%	57.84%	23.68%
Granborough Road	27.32%	36.87%	29.56%

Please note that rounding errors may occur

15.8.2. The highest total traffic movement increase during construction occurs on Station Road/Dewes Lane, Snake Lane/Fidlers Field and Granborough Road. This is expected due to the relatively low baseline traffic flow on these roads at present. Claydon Road does not experience a total traffic increase in excess of 23.68% and is therefore below the 30% threshold to trigger Rule 1 of the IEMA Guidelines (2023). It, however, meets the HGV increase threshold for inclusion in the assessment (in excess of 30%).

15.8.3. None of the other links within the study area experience total traffic movement increases in excess of 1.88%. These are either at or significantly below the accepted industry standard estimate of daily traffic flow variation of 10%.

15.8.4. It should be noted the construction phase is transitory in nature and the peak of construction activities is short lived, occurring over a relatively short timeframe when taking account of the whole construction programme.

15.8.5. A review of road link capacities has been undertaken and is presented in **Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment**

[EN010158/APP/6.4]. This indicates that none of the study area road links are at capacity either now or with the imposition of peak daily construction trips.

15.8.6. Without additional mitigation, it is considered possible that adverse effects such as severance, driver delay, pedestrian delay, non-motorised amenity, and fear and intimidation may occur on or be experienced by users of Station Road/Dewes Lane, Snake Lane/Fidlers Field and Granborough Road.

15.8.7. Impacts on PRoW, bridleways and other paths located within the Site are expected, given that construction traffic will be of a higher flow than flows associated with the current agricultural uses of the fields that the Proposed Development is comprised of.

15.9. Additional mitigation

Construction

15.9.1. To address the temporary effects associated with the construction phase, the following additional measures shown in **Table 15.14** are proposed.

Table 15.14: Additional mitigation relevant to transport and access

Additional mitigation measures relevant to transport and access	Function	Securing mechanism
Outline CTMP	To control traffic movements, to facilitate community liaison and feedback, to detail signage, to include road wear and tear requirements and to cater for Abnormal Indivisible Load movements.	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.
Outline RoWAS	To ensure safe access across the Order Limits for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians	**Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8]**

15.10. Assessment of residual effects (with additional mitigation)

Construction

15.10.1. The receptor sensitivity is taken from the summary provided in **Table 15.9**. The magnitude of impact has been determined from the criteria outlined in **Tables 15.10** and **15.11**. The criteria outlined in **Paragraph 15.6.16** determine the magnitude of impact, with the highest rating noted in **Table 15.15**.

15.10.2. The residual significance of effect has been determined following a review of the impact of the proposed mitigation measures and how these measures can control of enhance the experience of users and residents within the study area. Professional judgement has been used where necessary.

15.10.3. As the effects reported relate to the peak of construction traffic, all of the effects are temporary in their duration.

15.10.4. Further justification is provided in **Table 15.16** which details the measures that impact on significance.

Table 15.15: Residual effects during construction

Receptor (sensitivity)	Magnitude of impact	Residual significance of effect	Effect duration
Users of Station Road/Dewes Lane (**medium**)	Minor	**Minor** **(Not significant)**	Temporary during construction
Users of Snake Lane/Fidlers Field (**high**)	Mainor	**Minor** **(Not significant)**	Temporary during construction
Users of Claydon Road (**medium**)	Minor	**Minor** **(Not significant)**	Temporary during construction
Users of Granborough Road (**high**)	Minor	**Minor** **(Not significant)**	Temporary during construction
PRoW, Bridleway and Path Users within the development areas (**high**)	Minor	**Minor** **(Not significant)**	Temporary during construction

Receptor (sensitivity)	Magnitude of impact	Residual significance of effect	Effect duration
Residents of Snake Lane/Fidlers Field (**low**)	Minor	**Minor (Not significant)**	Temporary during construction
Residents of Claydon Road (**low**)	Minor	**Minor (Not significant)**	Temporary during construction

15.11. Opportunities for enhancement

15.11.1. The following proposed enhancement opportunities have currently been identified in relation to transport and access:

- Enhancements to Granborough Road in the form of the passing places and road widening, should Buckinghamshire Council agree to the works being permanent, as noted in **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**;
- Widening of Claydon Road, to the east of Shipton Lee, should Buckinghamshire Council agree to the works being permanent, as described in **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**; and
- PRoW, bridleway and path enhancements within the Site, as detailed in **Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8]**.

15.12. Monitoring requirements

15.12.1. Monitoring of transport effects on Station Road/Dewes Lane, Snake Lane/Fidlers Field and Granborough Road will be undertaken via the **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**.

15.12.2. The CTMP is a reactive document and additional measures such as improved road signage, alterations in voluntary speed limits, etc can be initiated to address specific issues, in the event that such issues arise.

15.13. Difficulties and uncertainties

15.13.1. No difficulties or uncertainties have been encountered in the assessment.

15.14. Summary

15.14.1. A summary of this assessment is presented in **Table 15.15**. The sensitivity of each receptor is identified alongside any relevant embedded mitigation and the likely effects that could arise on those receptors. Any proposed additional mitigation measures are stated and the residual effects then

assessed. Finally, any monitoring requirements are stated where applicable.

Table 15.16: Summary of the transport and access assessment

Receptor/matter	Phase	Sensitivity of the area/receptor	Embedded mitigation	Likely effect (without additional mitigation)	Additional mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Residual effect (with additional mitigation)	Monitoring requirement
Users of Station Road/Dewes Lane	Construction	Medium	Agreed construction traffic access routes and the use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements.	Non-Motorised User Amenity	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the CTMP and Staff Travel Plan.
Users of Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	Construction	High	Agreed construction traffic access routes and the use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements.	Severance, Driver Delay, Non-Motorised User Amenity and Fear & Intimidation	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the CTMP and Staff Travel Plan.
Users of Granborough Road	Construction	High	Agreed construction traffic access routes and the use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements.	Severance, Driver Delay, Non-Motorised User Amenity and Fear & Intimidation	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the CTMP and Staff Travel Plan.
Users of Claydon Road	Construction	Medium	Agreed construction traffic access routes and the use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements.	Non-Motorised User Amenity	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the CTMP and Staff Travel Plan.
PRoW, Bridleway and Path Users within the Site study area	Construction	High	The use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements and basic traffic management	Severance, Pedestrian Delay, Non-Motorised User Amenity and Fear & Intimidation	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the RoWAS and Staff Travel Plan.

Receptor/matter	Phase	Sensitivity of the area/receptor	Embedded mitigation	Likely effect (without additional mitigation)	Additional mitigation	Magnitude of impact	Residual effect (with additional mitigation)	Monitoring requirement
			measures to reduce speed.					
Residents of Snake Lane/Fidlers Field	Construction	Low	Agreed construction traffic access routes and the use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements.	Driver Delay, Non-Motorised User Amenity and Fear & Intimidation	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the CTMP and Staff Travel Plan.
Residents of Claydon Road	Construction	Low	Agreed construction traffic access routes and the use of a Staff Travel Plan to reduce traffic movements.	Driver Delay, Non-Motorised User Amenity and Fear & Intimidation	**Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5]**	Minor	**Minor adverse (D, MT, T) Not significant**	Ongoing monitoring will be undertaken via the CTMP and Staff Travel Plan.

Key:
+ = positive or - = negative; D = direct or I = indirect; S T = short-term, MT = medium-term or LT = long-term; P = permanent or T = temporary

15.15. References

- **Ref. 15-1:** Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023). Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1). Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1
- **Ref. 15-2:** Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023). National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3). Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3
- **Ref. 15-3:** Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2023). National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-policy-statement-for-electricity-networks-infrastructure-en-5
- **Ref. 15-4:** Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024). National Planning Policy Framework. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2
- **Ref. 15-5:** Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013 – 2033 Adopted Plan (2021). Available online: https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Aylesbury_local_plan_L46JWaT.pdf
- **Ref. 15-6:** Buckinghamshire Council. (2016) Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan 4. Available online: https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/local-transport-plan-4.pdf
- **Ref. 15-7:** Buckinghamshire Council (2016). Highways Development Management Guidance: Managing the transport and travel impact of new developments. Available online: https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/highways-development-management-guidance.pdf
- **Ref. 15-8:** Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2018 to 2021) and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2014). Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/travel-plans-transport-assessments-and-statements
- **Ref. 15-9:** Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2023). Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement. Available online: https://www.iema.net/media/5mrmquib/iema-report-environmental-assessment-of-traffic-and-movement-rev07-july-2023.pdf:
- **Ref. 15-10:** National Highways, *et al*.. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 104: Environmental assessment and monitoring (2020).

Available online: https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/search/0f6e0b6a-d08e-4673-8691-cab564d4a60a

- **Ref. 15-11:** Buckinghamshire Council (2024). Public rights of way map. Available online: https://prow.buckscc.gov.uk/standardmap.aspx
- **Ref. 15-12:** Buckinghamshire Council (2024). Buckinghamshire Greenway Map. Available online: https://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-transport/walking-cycling-and-wheeling/plans-to-improve-walking-cycling-and-wheeling/the-buckinghamshire-greenway/
- **Ref. 15-13:** Sustrans (2024). National Cycle Network Map. Available online: https://explore.osmaps.com/?lat=51.869452&lon=-0.878530&zoom=10.7822&style=Standard&type=2d&overlays=os-ncn-layer
- **Ref. 15-14:** Crashmap (2024). Available online: www.crashmap.co.uk
- **Ref. 15-15:** Department for Transport (2024). Road traffic statistics. Available online: https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/#6/55.254/-6.053/basemap-regions-countpoints

Rosefield
Solar Farm

rosefieldsolarfarm.co.uk

Application Document Ref: EN010158/APP/6.2
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: EN010158