

As a local resident affected by these proposals, I wish to make the following comments on Traffic and Construction, and in particular in response to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) dated May 2025. It is apparent that further details are required and should be properly consulted with those affected before the project can be fully considered.

## **Green Hill Solar Farm**

### **Comments on Traffic and Construction**

As there was no public consultation specifically for the residents of our village, Bozeat, I attended the local public consultation at the nearest location on the 18<sup>th</sup> November 2024 at Grendon Village Hall.

The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) dated May 2025 has now been reviewed by myself, and I wish to raise the following comments.

As a resident of Bozeat, it is the South Area Part 2 that interests myself, and it is with this specific viewpoint that the OCTMP has been assessed.

Details on how the objectives will be achieved is included in paragraph 1.3.3, particularly to minimize the number of construction vehicles and to minimize the effects of construction traffic on the local community and other road users. However, after reviewing the OCTMP, it is not clear how any of this will be achieved.

From professional experience elsewhere, the premise that the Applicant is responsible to ensure that statutory regulations and guidelines (which presumably include those specific to this scheme) are complied with is somewhat unrealistic. I would question who is to enforce these regulations and guidelines. Furthermore, there is nobody answerable to the general public, local residents or road users if there are any issues.

Figure 2.4 on page 11 of the OCTMP shows less information than was available at the public consultation in November 2024. As there is no further information and no answers to the points raised, I am therefore unable to comment on whether my concerns have been answered or not.

Access F-2 and CR23 are near our house but there are no specific details of the routes to / from them, or what types of vehicles would use them. What are the arrangements for the use of these access points ? It reads as if it will be free-for all, and this cannot be allowed to proceed in this way.

To travel to these access points, all traffic will have to come through the relatively narrow streets in the village of Bozeat, namely along the old A509 / London Road and turn into Easton Lane. This is a residential area and should not be used for several years of continual large vehicle movements or other construction traffic. It is totally unsuitable for the vehicles indicated in paragraph 3.1.2. The Construction Vehicle Routing is indicated in Section 4 later in the OCTMP and Figure 4.3 appears to confirm that it is the intention that construction traffic will be using London Road from the north end into the village and Easton Lane to access the site. (Additionally, I would question how construction traffic is to be stopped from accessing the village from the south end and using London Road to come through the village and to reach Easton Lane to reach Access F-2 and CR23 ?)

The issue that Easton Maudit is impassable to large lorries appears not to have been considered. The existing road from Bozeat to Grendon, via Easton Maudit, is not suitable for large construction traffic. It is also worth noting that Access CR21 is on a single-track road that is not suitable for any large traffic; this was pointed out at the public consultation and I was told that this was shown in error, but it is still on the current plans in the current OCTMP.

Access F-1 and Access F-3 are positioned off the existing A509 (Wellingborough to Milton Keynes route), but it is not clear how these will be constructed and what volume of construction traffic

would use these access points in preference to others. The HGV traffic should use these access points and not be allowed into Bozeat village to access Easton Lane. However, as noted above, Figure 4.3 indicates that this is not the proposed plan. Table 7.1 indicates that Easton Lane would be used for abnormal loads of 95 tonnes; it is unlikely that the existing highway bridge over the A509 Bozeat bypass would be designed to take this weight and again one would question why these abnormal loads have not been planned to use Access F-1 and Access F-3 off the A509.

Paragraph 2.6.4 states that parking is to be at the Construction Compounds, but they are spread out and nowhere near the extremities of the works. For example, and not the worst example, but Access CR23 is approximately 3km from the nearest compound and I would question if workers are going to walk these distances ? This is unrealistic, impractical and not thought through.

Section 2.7 mentions internal haul routes, but these are not shown on the plans and there are no indications where these are to be constructed. If there are to be haul routes from Access F-1 and Access F-3, then Easton Lane would not have to be used for any construction traffic. (Note - the crossing F-1 has already been used for the advance works that took place in February / March 2025.) What plans are there for the long-term use of these crossings ? Will there be gates, with operatives in attendance, or will these be fitted with automatic traffic lights, and will these be operational for working hours only, and for how many days a week ? None of this information has been indicated. Without this information, as local residents, we cannot appreciate what affect the construction works will have on our day-to-day lives.

Section 2.8 indicates some of the other necessary works, but there are no details.

The HGV movements shown in section 3.2 appears to include all vehicle movements, but no details of the size of the vehicles is indicated, unless one refers to the previous paragraph 3.1.2 which may or may not be applicable. There are no details of the expected route for these vehicles and which access points would be used. It is not reasonable or realistic to presume that an even spread or average of the vehicles would take place spread across each access point for each area over the complete construction period.

These vehicle movements referred to in section 3.2 only refers to HGV movements and do not show smaller vehicles. For example, a peak number of 787 workers across the scheme would impose a considerable number of additional vehicle movements to the area, but none of this is detailed or considered. (However, paragraph 3.2.4 states a peak number of workers as 787 and also 1,099 construction workers; this is a 40% difference. Which figure should be used and considered ?) Paragraph 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 does consider these, but the total of the worker arrival figures when added up from table 3.3 does not equate to 787 or 1,099, and therefore the total vehicle arrival figures appears to be incorrect. (It is normal for a project of this size for some construction workers to live on site. However, from the current OCTMP, it is assumed that there would be no provision for accommodation on site for construction workers and that all construction workers have to arrive on site each day and depart the same day, but this is not clarified. Obviously, this creates considerable daily vehicle movements on to the existing highway network but the likely traffic flow figures and how this will affect the existing highway network has not been shown.)

Section 5.5 proposes the management of deliveries, but there does not appear to be any provision for the construction of suitable places to stop or wait before arriving at the site. The current highways in the area do not provide spaces or areas that would be suitable for HGV deliveries to park up and wait for a pre-agreed delivery slot.

The working hours stated in section 6.1 indicate that the standard working day would be an eleven-hour day. However, it is also stated that the arrival and departure of workers, start-up and shut down works, and other out of hours works are not included within these working hours. Therefore, the working hours need to be finalised and not left so vague.

The OCTMP is presumably only for the construction works. Is a separate plan to be prepared for the necessary on-going maintenance works over the life of the project, and for the later removal / reinstatement works ?

In conclusion, it is apparent that these proposals have not been developed or detailed since the public consultation took place in 2024, and that the feedback received has not been incorporated. The details contained within the current OCTMP are very generic and not particularly bespoke for this project. Further details are required and should be properly consulted with those affected before the project can be fully considered.

Andrew Morgan  
6<sup>th</sup> November 2025.

Number of words: 1444.