

Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 1: Text

Chapter 4: Transport



4.1 INTRODUCTION

- 4.1.1 This chapter has been prepared by ITP and reviews the revisions to the proposed development in relation to any changes to impacts on transport reported in the original ES, and the requests for additional information in respect of transport under Regulation 25 of the EIA Regulations.

4.2 RESPONSE TO REGULATION 25 REQUEST

4.2.1 The table below summarises the Regulation 25 requests for additional information and the key issues raised by consultees in relation to transport issues and how the chapter responds to them. The Regulation 25 letter received from NHC requests the submission of a Transport Assessment Addendum, following completion of the COMET modelling.

Table 4.1: Summary of Consultee Responses

Commentary from Consultees	Response from Applicant
Active Travel England BA2 should consider including zebra crossings on all arms of the Clothall Way roundabout. Bygrave Road corridor - unsure how this will work in practice due to existing vehicular access requirements.	The Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) confirms that access to BA2 will be taken from the A507 Clothall Road and that the Clothall Way roundabout will be upgraded to support safe and inclusive movement for all users. The precise form of crossing facilities, including the potential use and type of pedestrian crossings on individual roundabout arms, has not been fixed at this stage and will be developed and agreed with the Highway Authority at detailed design stage. The Bygrave Road corridor is considered within the TAA at a strategic level through review of vehicle flows on sensitive rural routes. This assessment indicates that forecast traffic changes are generally low and within normal daily variation. Detailed access and operational arrangements along Bygrave Road will be developed at the appropriate stage to maintain existing vehicular access while supporting walking and cycling, and will be subject to further consultation with relevant stakeholders.
National Highways National Highways has advised that modelling information submitted on 1 December 2025 requires further detailed review and that not all pre-application issues have been resolved. While a Transport Assessment has been submitted, it confirms that a Transport Assessment Addendum is required and, in the absence of this information, National Highways is unable to recommend approval of the application at this time.	The TAA has been submitted to provide the additional information requested and to address matters raised in relation to the modelling submitted in December 2025. The TAA includes further strategic validation of the transport impacts using Hertfordshire County Council's COMET model, together with additional local modelling where required. The Addendum addresses the outstanding technical issues identified by National Highways and sets out appropriate mitigation, phasing and a secured Monitor and Manage framework to manage future uncertainty. These matters are intended to support ongoing engagement with National Highways as part of the application determination process.

Network Rail Network Rail have no further comments to make on the additional information supplied other than those returned in response to the original application as detailed in the attachment which still apply	As confirmed by Network Rail, comments provided by Network Rail on the original application will be addressed at reserved matters stage but is mentioned here as a reminder of the issues that will need to be considered.
NHC Concerns regarding crossings on North Road and Royston Road, to improve pedestrian and cyclist permeability. NHC also requested clarification on the following topics: Proposed walking, cycling, and bus improvements, • Early phasing of upgrades needed to support safe and convenient active travel, • A consolidated understanding of obligations and design principles that will guide conditions and Design Code requirements, • Parking provision (including cycle parking, EV charging design and car club locations), • Station access arrangements, and • Separate consents for proposals outside the red line boundary.	Revised drawings of North Road have been prepared, submitted with the Interim Transport Response note (Feb 2026) , and these show a southbound connection from the shared path. Northbound cyclists will be able to access Football Close and Icknield Way using the dropped kerbs. Additional drawings of proposals along Norton Way have been prepared, included in Appendix C of the TAA. Further consideration of NHDC's comments are provided in Section 3.3 of the TAA.
HCC Concerns regarding crossings on North Road and Royston Road, to improve pedestrian and cyclist permeability. In addition to modelling outputs, HCC requested additional information relating to the following key points: • Scaled designs for key junctions and access arrangements, • Early delivery of sustainable transport connections, • Delivery and phasing of the scheme, • Securing infrastructure through conditions, • How the monitor and manage framework will be delivered, and • Clear commitments and trigger points for infrastructure interventions, including the active travel bridge and A1(M) Junction 9 interventions.	Revised drawings of North Road were submitted with the Interim Transport Response note and first ES Addendum (Feb 2026) - these show a southbound connection from the shared path. Northbound cyclists will be able to access Football Close and Icknield Way using the dropped kerbs. Additional drawings of proposals along Norton Way have been prepared, included in Appendix C of the TAA Further consideration of HCC's comments are provided in Section 3.3 of the TAA (ES Addendum Appendix 4.1).

BHS All new paths should be constructed as public rights of way rather than permissive so that they protected into the future along with their full legal status and inclusion on the Definitive Map and Ordnance Survey. General infrastructure strategy suggestions including providing a Pegasus crossing across the A507 (North Road)	This was addressed under the previous Reg 25 submission (February 2026) in which a revised North Road Plan incorporated minor addition to Greenway adjacent to North Road, and proposed changes to the North Road gateway and the introduction of a signalised pedestrian/cycling and equestrian crossing. In relation to other routes requested, the Proposed Development is not reliant on these routes to achieve mode shift, nor is it expected to generate a significant increase in trips along them. The status, design and delivery mechanism of individual routes will be considered and agreed with the relevant authorities through detailed design and subsequent application stages
Central Bedfordshire Council Central Bedfordshire Council raises strong concerns regarding the transport impacts of the proposed development, particularly its effects on the A1(M) north of Baldock and Junction 10, which already experiences congestion and has previously been identified as capacity-constrained. The Council considers the Transport Assessment to rely on overly optimistic assumptions on trip generation, internalisation and modal shift, inadequately account for committed growth and strategic schemes such as the A428 Black Cat DCO, and insufficiently assess wider impacts on the A1(M) and adjacent junctions, while also highlighting deficiencies in public transport provision to the north into Central Bedfordshire.	The issues raised are addressed within the Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) submitted with this ES Addendum. The TAA uses Hertfordshire County Council's COMET strategic model to independently validate the Transport Assessment assumptions and to test cumulative growth, rerouting behaviour and impacts on the A1(M), including Junctions 9 and 10. The assessment demonstrates that capacity pressures on the A1(M) corridor largely arise from baseline and plan-wide growth rather than the Proposed Development alone. Where COMET identified higher flows, targeted local modelling was undertaken. This confirms that the proposed mitigation at A1(M) Junction 9 is proportionate to the development impact and improves operation relative to baseline conditions, while Junction 10 operates within capacity, with the proposed interventions reducing pressure on the junction in future years. Trip generation and distribution assumptions have been validated through COMET, including a worst-case Local Plan sensitivity test, which shows that any residual congestion reflects cumulative growth rather than adverse effects attributable to the Proposed Development. Public transport and active travel measures form part of the mitigation strategy, but the assessment does not rely on optimistic modal shift assumptions. On this basis, the TAA concludes that the residual transport effects of the Proposed

	Development are not significant in EIA terms.
Bygrave Parish Council Bygrave Parish Council objects to the proposals on transport grounds, noting that updated submissions have not addressed previously raised concerns and that further transport modelling and phasing information is still awaited. The Council considers that the proposed Eastern Park sports facilities, with access from Ashwell Road, would generate unacceptable levels of traffic, noise and activity on the local highway network, harming the rural character of the village.	The TAA does not include specific modelling of Ashwell Road or the proposed Eastern Park sports facilities; however, it does assess the wider reassignment of traffic and potential effects on rural roads in the vicinity of the development as part of the strategic COMET modelling exercise. The COMET assessment and subsequent review of representative rural links, including routes serving Bygrave village, indicate that forecast changes in traffic flows are generally low and within the normal range of daily variation. No widespread increase in traffic on rural roads is predicted as a result of the Proposed Development. On this basis, significant adverse effects on the operation or character of the local highway network are not identified. The wider transport strategy seeks to discourage inappropriate through-traffic on rural routes through a package of network interventions, access controls and sustainable transport measures. Phasing and delivery of transport infrastructure are set out within the agreed Phasing Plan, and a Monitor and Manage framework is proposed to allow traffic conditions on sensitive routes to be reviewed as the development comes forward. Taking these measures together, the Proposed Development is not expected to result in significant adverse transport effects on Bygrave village or undermine its rural character.
Caldecote and Newnham Parish Council Caldecote and Newnham Parish Council raises concerns about the transport impacts of the proposed development, particularly the ability of existing infrastructure to accommodate a significant population increase. The Council highlights potential construction traffic disruption and increased pressure on Junction 10 of the A1(M), which already experiences congestion during peak periods, and notes uncertainty over delivery and funding of proposed transport infrastructure improvements.	Transport impacts associated with the scale and phasing of the Proposed Development are assessed within the Transport Assessment and Transport Assessment Addendum, including cumulative growth and effects on the Strategic Road Network. The TAA uses Hertfordshire County Council's COMET model to validate the original transport modelling and confirms that peak-period congestion at A1(M) Junction 10 is largely attributable to existing and plan-wide growth rather than the Proposed Development alone. With the proposed mitigation and traffic management measures in place, the junction is forecast to operate within capacity, with the proposed interventions reducing pressure on the junction in future years. Construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic

	Management Plan secured by condition, while the delivery and phasing of transport infrastructure are set out within the agreed Phasing Plan. On this basis, the Proposed Development is not expected to result in significant adverse transport effects in EIA terms.
--	---

4.3 UPDATE TO BASELINE CONDITIONS / ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- 4.3.1 No material changes to baseline transport conditions have occurred since submission of Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement that would alter the scope or findings of the original assessment.
- 4.3.2 The Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) provides additional analysis of future baseline conditions through strategic modelling using Hertfordshire County Council's COMET model. This includes updated future-year baseline scenarios and cumulative Local Plan sensitivity testing. This work supplements, but does not replace, the baseline conditions described in the original ES Transport Chapter.

4.4 ASSESSMENT OF SCHEME AMENDMENTS

4.4.1 The only scheme amendments that are relevant to this chapter are:

- Clarification and refinement of access arrangements and intervention layouts associated with the transport strategy, as set out in Section 3.3 of the Transport Assessment Addendum;
- Additional drawings of offsite proposals along Norton Way which include improvements to walking and cycling routes to Knights Templar School. Proposals include traffic calming measures such as speed cushions and raised tables, in addition to improved crossing infrastructure and improvements to pedestrian and cycling routes; and,
- Refinement of arrangements along the North Road / Station Road corridor previously supplied with a Interim Transport Response Note (dealt with under February 2026 submission).

4.4.2 These changes represent design development and clarification of transport mitigation measures already assessed within the Environmental Statement and Transport Assessment. No changes have been made to the scale, land use, access strategy or extent of the Proposed Development that affect transport, and no new transport infrastructure is introduced.

4.4.3 The refinements identified above provide further detail on how previously assessed transport mitigation would be delivered and secured. They do not alter the nature, extent or magnitude of transport-related environmental effects previously reported.

4.4.4 On this basis, the additional information provided in the TAA, including Section 3.3, does not give rise to any new or materially different transport effects. The conclusions on the significance of transport effects reported in Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement therefore remain valid and unchanged.

4.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

- 4.5.1 The TAA does not propose any new or additional transport mitigation measures beyond those identified, assessed and secured within Chapter 4 of the original Environmental Statement.
- 4.5.2 The TAA provides further detail and clarification regarding the design development, phasing, delivery and monitoring of mitigation measures already assessed. These refinements do not change the scope, function or environmental role of the mitigation strategy.
- 4.5.3 No additional mitigation measures are required for the purposes of this Environmental Statement Addendum.

4.6 RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Construction Stage

- 4.6.1 No changes to the effects reported in the original outline ES chapter are anticipated.

Post-Completion Stage

- 4.6.2 No changes to the effects reported in the original outline ES chapter are anticipated.