

Appendix 8.1: Transport and Access Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Introduction

- 1 As detailed within **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA** the effects on the Proposed Development are not considered to be significant in isolation but are potentially significant when considered in-combination with Cumulative Projects. The Proposed Development, in-combination with Cumulative Projects has the potential to affect users of the local road network. Details of the Cumulative Projects are provided in **Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**.
- 2 This Appendix, and its associated **Figures 8.5-8.7** and **Appendix 8.3** is intended to be read as part of the wider ES with particular reference to the introductory Chapters of this ES (**Chapters 1 – 5**), as well as **Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**. A standalone **Transport Assessment (TA)** (report reference ITB12069-021) and **Framework Travel Plan (FTP)** (report reference 12069-022) provide further details and have been submitted with the Application.
- 3 The **TA** has a different set of criteria for the selection of ‘cumulative projects’ or ‘committed development’ to that of the EIA. The only cumulative project considered as a separate cumulative traffic scenario is Cumulative Project 1. Given the location of Cumulative Project 1, immediately adjacent to the west of the Site and the likely common receptors with the Proposed Development, it is considered appropriate to assess the potential impact of this Cumulative Project separately. Other relevant Cumulative Projects have been included in the future baseline traffic flows as detailed under ‘Future Baseline’ (and in **Chapter 2: Approach to the EIA**).
- 4 This Appendix describes the technical consultation that has been undertaken during the EIA, the scope of the assessment and assessment methodology, and a summary of the baseline information that has informed the assessment.
- 5 The assessment reports on the effects taking into consideration both Primary and Tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for further details) and the residual effects following secondary mitigation measures for the Proposed Development. The assessment is informed by the EIA Scoping process (**Appendix 2.1 - 2.2**) and iterative scoping process where applicable.
- 6 The conclusions are provided in terms of the residual effects for the Proposed Development in-combination with relevant Cumulative Projects and whether these effects are considered significant.

Summary of Consultation

- 7 **Table A8.1.1** provides an overview of the consultation that has been undertaken to inform the Proposed Development and EIA, including the consideration of likely significant effects and the methodology for assessment.

Table A8.1.1: Summary of Consultation

Body / Organisation	Contact	Date and Form of Consultation	Summary
Wiltshire Council	Highways Development Control Officer	Submission of Scoping Note with request for pre-application advice – December 2025	Agreement of access arrangements and scope of TA and Travel Plan for application. The ES transport assessment was not specifically discussed, but the agreed scope provides the background to the ES assessment.

Scope of the Assessment

- 8 An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to Wiltshire Council on 4th November 2025, as presented as **Appendix 2.1**. The EIA Scoping Onion was received in January 2026 (**Appendix 2.2**). This section provides confirmation on the scope of the assessment presented within this Chapter following submission of the EIA Scoping Report.

Effects Not Considered to be Significant

- 9 The following effects were not considered significant as part of the EIA Scoping Report and are not considered further in this Chapter:
- Transport impacts arising during the construction stage – Proposed Development;
 - Transport impacts arising during the operational stage – Proposed Development;
 - Effects of hazardous Loads during the construction and operation; and
 - Effects of public transport during construction and operation.
- 10 In addition, the following impacts have now been scoped out:
- Transport impacts arising during the construction stage – Proposed Development in combination with Cumulative Project 1. The justification for scoping out the assessment of construction traffic is given below.
- 11 The IEMA guidelines recommend that highway links should be separately assessed when:
- Traffic flows have increased by more than 30% (or the number of HGVs will increase by more than 30%); or
 - Other sensitive areas are affected by traffic increases of at least 10%.
- 12 **Table A8.1.2** shows the 2028 plus committed development and cumulative development daily traffic flows and impact of construction traffic. The total anticipated construction traffic equates to less than a 2% increase in AADT while HGV traffic flows would temporarily increase by up to 12.5% on Sandridge Common (west of proposed site access) and Eastern Way.
- 13 On this basis, the predicted increases in flow will not exceed the above thresholds and, as such, the construction period of the Proposed Development (in-combination with Cumulative Project 1) can be scoped out.

Table A8.1.2: 2028 Future Year Traffic Flows with Construction Traffic (Cumulative) (AADT)

	2028 Future Baseline (AADT) with Cumulative Dev't	2028 Future Baseline (AADT - HGV) with Cumulative Dev't	2028 Future Baseline with Cumulative Dev't and Construction Traffic (AADT)	2028 Future Baseline with Cumulative Dev't and Construction Traffic (AADT - HGV)	% change - AADT	% change – AADT HGV
A3102 Sandridge Common Rd (West of Proposed Access)	13759	369	152	45	1.1%	12.26%
A3102 Sandridge Common Road (West of Blackmore Rd)	10983	132	60	0	0.5%	0.0%
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	10682	362	152	45	1.4%	12.51%

Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

14 The following effects (**Table A8.1.3**) were considered likely to be significant and are reported within this Chapter:

Table A8.1.3: Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

Likely Significant Effect	Receptors	Applicable Stage
Transport impacts of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1	- A3102 Sandridge Common West of proposed access; - A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road; and - Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road).	Operation

Assessment Methodology**Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance**

15 The following legislation and policy has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter:

- National Planning Policy Framework (February 2025)¹;
- Wiltshire Core Strategy Adopted 2015²;
- Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 4 2025-2038³;
- Melksham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) Consultation Draft⁴; and
- Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 2020-2038 (Adopted⁵).

16 The following guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter:

- National Planning Practice Guidance (first published in 2014 and which has been updated a number of times since then, including the latest update in February 2024)⁶;
- Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's (IEMA) 'Guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic and Movement' (2023) ('IEMA Guidelines')⁷;
- Active Design Guidance, Sport England and Active Travel England (2023)⁸;
- DfT Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design (July 2020)⁹;
- Manual for Streets, Department for Transport (2007) and Manual for Streets 2 (2010)¹⁰;
- The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)¹¹; and
- DfT's Healthy Streets Guidance¹².

Defining the Study Area

17 The full extent of the study area and the scope of assessment for EIA purposes is defined by two rules, in line with the IEMA Guidelines:

- Rule 1 - Highway links where traffic flows will increase by more than 30% (or the number of heavy goods vehicles will increase by more than 30%); and
- Rule 2 - Highway links of high sensitivity where traffic flows have increased by 10% or more.

18 The extent of the Study Area is as per the area defined at Scoping Stage, where the following highway links were identified:

- A3102 Sandridge Common West of proposed access;
- A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road; and
- Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road).

Background Studies to Inform the ES / Establishing the Baseline

19 **Table A8.1.4** summarises all studies/surveys/analysis/evaluations undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Table A8.1.4: Background Studies / Surveys / Evaluations / Analysis

Study / Survey / Analysis / Evaluation	Overview	Date of Completion
Traffic Surveys	Original Traffic surveys across the study network completed in 2022 and updated with further surveys in 2025. Included within TA .	June 2025
Transport Scoping Note	Transport note to set out proposed scope of TA for agreement with Wiltshire Council Highways Development Management Team	December 2025

Study / Survey / Analysis / Evaluation	Overview	Date of Completion
TA	TA report prepared for submission with the planning application	January 2026
FTP	FTP prepared for submission with the planning application	January 2026

Assessment Process

- 20 The IEMA Guidelines sets out a number of potential environmental effects relating to transport and highways considerations which may require assessment. These will be used as the basis for the method of assessment of the environmental effects of traffic. In addition, and where appropriate, reference will be made to the DMRB.

Completed Development

- 21 The key mechanisms through which the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in combination could lead to potential effects during the operational phase, which are considered in the assessment, include:
- New permanent access points from Sandridge Common;
 - Enhanced active and public transport infrastructure, including new walking and cycling facilities and crossings;
 - Increased vehicular and public transport traffic from the baseline conditions which could cause conflict between traffic, pedestrians and cyclists as well as increases/decreases in delay, severance and fear and intimidation; and
 - Increased propensity for road traffic collisions or other accident and safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 22 All other transport and access effects are scoped out of further assessment within this chapter and no objection was provided in relation to this approach by the Council, through the Scoping Opinion.

Assessing Likely Significant Effects

- 23 The following section sets out how impacts have been identified and assessed. The IEMA guidelines require assessment of identified links based on the rules of thumb identified earlier in this chapter.
- 24 The IEMA guidance identifies a number of environmental impacts that could arise from changes in vehicular travel demand. The following assessment criteria which will be referred to and assessed to are:
- Community severance;
 - Driver and passenger delay;

- Non-motorised user delay;
- Non-motorised user amenity;
- Fear and intimidation on and by road users; and
- Road user and pedestrian safety.

Community Severance

- 25 Severance is defined as the “*perceived division that can occur within a community when it becomes separated by major transport infrastructure*”. In addition, the assessment will include any effects from traffic flow changes, as well as effects from formal diversions or closures required to facilitate the Proposed Development.
- 26 The IEMA Guidelines acknowledge that the measurement and prediction of severance is extremely difficult. Factors which need to be considered when determining whether severance is likely to be an important issue at the sensitive receptors include: road width, traffic flow and composition, traffic speeds, the availability of crossing facilities, and the number of movements that are likely to cross an affected route.
- 27 The IEMA Guidelines suggests that a 30%, 60% and 90% increase in traffic flows will respectively have a ‘slight’, ‘moderate’ and ‘substantial’ change in severance. However, allowance needs to be made for the presence of existing crossing facilities.

Driver and Passenger Delay

- 28 Delays to road vehicles and drivers/passengers occur principally at junctions where vehicles are performing conflicting manoeuvres. Values for driver delay can be determined from the junction assessment analysis undertaken within the **TA**.

This assessment is carried out for the network peak periods, which are the times when the local highway network is at its busiest and so impacts of the Proposed Development on driver delay would be greatest.

Non-Motorised User Delay

- 29 Pedestrian delay is utilised as a proxy for other non-motorised user (NMU) delay when crossing a road. Changes in the volume, composition or speed of traffic may affect the ability of pedestrians to cross roads. In general terms, increases in traffic are likely to correspond to increased pedestrian delay. Pedestrian delay will also depend upon the level of pedestrian activity, visibility and physical conditions.
- 30 The IEMA Guidelines direct assessors to use their own judgement, based on experience, as to whether or not pedestrian delay is a significant impact. The determination of what constitutes a material impact on pedestrian delay and amenity is generally a matter of judgement of the assessor and knowledge of local factors and conditions.
- 31 The IEMA Guidelines refer to DMRB LA112¹³ to determine how pedestrians are delayed, and concludes 8 seconds at flows of 1,000 vehicles per hour and below 20 seconds at 2,000 vehicles per hour for various types of crossings. A two-way flow of 1,400 vehicles per hour has therefore been adopted as a lower threshold for assessment - equating to a mean 10 second delay for a link with no pedestrian facilities. Where there are controlled crossings, the levels of pedestrian delays are shorter.

Non-Motorised User Amenity

- 32 NMU amenity is defined as *“the relative pleasantness of a journey and is considered to be affected by traffic flow, traffic composition and pavement width / separation from traffic.”* The IEMA Guidelines state that a tentative threshold for judging the significance of changes in NMU amenity would be where the traffic flow is halved or doubled which would lead to a high impact, although that any assessment should pay full regard to local conditions.

Fear and Intimidation on and by Road Users

- 33 Fear and intimidation are defined as *“A further environmental impact that affects people [...] created by all moving objects. While the traffic and movement assessment has to consider motorcycles, cars, lorries and buses, this scope of consideration is not exclusive – it also has to consider other modes of travel, including horses, cycles, mobility scooters, e-scooters and e-cycles, if appropriate.”* For the assessment of fear and intimidation, the IEMA Guidelines refers to an assessment of the *“Degree of Hazard (DoH)”* but acknowledges professional judgement should be used with references to local conditions.
- 34 The IEMA Guidelines also notes that that *“the movement of hazardous / large loads will heighten people’s perception of fear and intimidation and, if this is likely to occur, it should be noted.”*
- 35 The IEMA Guidelines suggest thresholds based on 18-hour daily flow, 18-hour HGV flow and vehicle speeds and provide a formula for determining levels of fear and intimidation, based on the volume of traffic, its HGV composition and its proximity to people and / or the lack of protection caused by factors such as narrow pavement widths and is shown in **Table A8.1.5** below.
- 36 The degree of hazard is assessed with reference to the established thresholds, and a score provided for each combination on a highway link under consideration as shown in **Table A8.1.6**.

Table A8.1.5: Degree of Hazard

Average Traffic Flow over 18-Hour Day (all vehicles / hour 2-way) (a)	Total 18-Hour Heavy Vehicle Flow (b)	Average Vehicle Speed (mph) (c)	Degree of Hazard Score
+1,800	+3,000	>40	30
1,200 – 1,800	2,000 – 3,000	30 – 40	20
600 – 1,200	1,000 – 2,000	20 – 30	10
<600	<1,000	<20	0

Table A8.1.6: Levels of Fear and Intimidation

Level of Fear and Intimidation	Total Hazard Score (a) + (b) + (c)
Extreme	71+
Great	41 – 70
Moderate	21 – 40
Small	0 - 20

Road User and Pedestrian Safety

- 37 IEMA Guidelines do not include any definition of significance in relation to accidents and safety, suggesting that professional judgement would be needed to assess the implications of local circumstance, or factors which may increase or decrease the risk of accidents.
- 38 There can be some small changes in prevailing road safety conditions arising simply as a result of having a greater number of journeys being made on a network; very simply, the more people that are travelling, the more people that may become involved in an accident. However, consideration needs to be given to other factors including changes in vehicle speed. For example, lower speed limits play a critical role in reducing the severity of collisions. The full results of the accident analysis are reported in the TA and are summarised in this ES chapter.
- 39 The assessment has been informed by recent accident data (Personal Injury Data) obtained from Wiltshire Council and consideration of the effects of predicted traffic flows from the Proposed Development.

Reporting of the Environmental Effect and Significance Criteria

- 40 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in combination has taken into account the operational stage. The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity (or value/importance), magnitude of change (or impact), the level of effect and significance.

Determining Sensitivity of Receptor

- 41 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of **high, medium, low** or **negligible**.
- 42 The IEMA Guidelines states that it is essential to identify particular population groups that may be sensitive to changes in traffic conditions at an early stage. The following user groups should therefore be considered:
- Non-motorised users;
 - Public right of way users;
 - Motorists and freight vehicles;
 - Public transport; and
 - Emergency services.
- 43 The IEMA Guidelines identify that the following areas are considered to be 'sensitive':
- People at home and work;
 - Sensitive and/or vulnerable groups (including young age, older age, income, health status, social disadvantage, and access and geographic factors);
 - Location with concentrations of vulnerable users (e.g. hospital, places of worship, schools);

- Retail areas;
- Recreational areas;
- Tourist attractions;
- Collision clusters and routes with road safety concerns; and
- Junctions and highway links at (or over) capacity.

44 The criteria used to establish the sensitivity is based on the IEMA Guidelines shown in **Table A8.1.7** and have been informed by professional judgement.

Table A8.1.7: Value/sensitivity assessment

Value/Sensitivity	Receptor Description
High	Highway network with existing capacity issues or high sensitivity for driver delay to small changes in traffic levels. Highway link with high levels of pedestrian activity and commerce and residential accommodation e.g. schools, colleges, playgrounds etc.
Medium	Highway network with susceptibility/sensitivity to reach capacity for limited periods and limited sensitivity for driver delay following changes in traffic level. Highway links with pedestrian activity and commerce and residential accommodation.
Low	Highway network with little or no sensitivity to reach capacity and limited sensitivity for change in traffic flows. Low sensitivity to change such as people at work.
Negligible	Highway network operating well below capacity with little sensitivity for driver delay to changes in traffic levels. Little or no pedestrian activity or commerce and limited residential accommodation.

Determining the Magnitude of Change

45 The following magnitude criteria for all environmental effects are based on the broad significance thresholds contained within the IEMA Guidelines. These have been used to determine magnitude, although in addition as recommended by the IEMA Guidelines a qualitative approach has also been adopted for individual criteria, where appropriate. The IEMA Guidelines recommend that highway links should be separately assessed when traffic flows have increased by more than 30%. In sensitive areas effects could be significant when traffic increases are 10% or more. These thresholds principally apply to total traffic although similar changes to the total percentage of HGV flows equally warrant appropriate assessment. **Table A8.1.8** sets out the magnitude criteria applied in the assessment and has been considered on a scale of **large, medium, small** or **negligible**.

Table A8.1.8: Magnitude of impact

Magnitude	Description
Large	Over 60% change in traffic volume or composition
Medium	Between 30% and 60% change in traffic volume or composition
Small	Between 10% and 30% change in traffic volume or composition
Negligible	Less than 10% change in traffic volume or composition

46 For the assessment of Fear and Intimidation the following magnitude of impact thresholds are used:

Table A8.1.9: Fear and Intimidation – Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Change in Step / Traffic Flows (AADT) from Baseline
High	Two step changes in level.
Medium	One step change in level, but with 400+ vehicle increase in average 18-hour average two-way all vehicle flows; and / or 500+ HGV increase in total 18-hour flow.
Low	One step change in level, with <400 vehicle increase in average 18-hour all vehicle two-way flow; and / or <500 HGV increase in total 18-hour HGV flow.
Negligible	No change in step changes.

Determining the Level of Effect

47 The level of effect has been informed by the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in combination and the evaluation of the sensitivity of the affected receptor. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement and **Table A8.1.10** has been a tool which has assisted with this process.

48 Whilst **Table A8.1.10** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement. For each effect, it has been concluded whether the effect is '*beneficial*' or '*adverse*'.

Table A8.1.10: Matrix to Support Determining the Level of Effect

		Sensitivity (or value / importance)			
		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

49 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 in combination effects are 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 in combination effects are 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 in combination effects are 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 Proposed Development is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which can adapt, is tolerant of the change or/and can recover from the change.; and
- **Negligible:** where the in combination effects are 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.

50 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 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 and 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.

Determining Significance

51 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.

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

Baseline Conditions

53 The Site is located to the east of Melksham and to the south of the A3102 Sandridge Common.

54 The Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 are well served by the local network of PRoW, shown on **Figure 8.5**, and include:

- **Bridleway MELW40** – follows the eastern boundary of the Site and connects Sandridge Common Road to the farmland located to the southeast.
- **Footpath MELW26** – runs to the west of the Site (and partially through the south of the Site) and connects Sandridge Common Road to Bridleway MELW41.
- **Bridleway MELW41** – connects Eastern Way to the countryside south of the Site.
- **Footpath MELW27** – connects Footpath MELW26 with Footpath MELW104 located west of Eastern Way.

55 The closest bus stops are located on Skylark Road to the west of the Site. The stops provide access to bus service 15 which provides a circular town service serving Melksham and offers circa five services per day.

56 Melksham railway station is situated circa 3.6km to the west of the Site and is accessible by bus service 15 from Skylark Road. The station is also located within a reasonable cycling distance of the Proposed Development and can be accessed via a combination of dedicated cycle routes and quiet on-road recommended routes¹⁴. The railway station provides a direct service to Bristol Temple Meads, Bath Spa, Westbury, Salisbury, Romsey and Southampton for journeys further afield.

57 There is a good network of pedestrian and cycle facilities in the existing residential area adjacent to the Site. There is a continuous footway along the southern side of the A3012 Sandridge Common. To the west, Sandridge Common provides one of the main walking routes for pedestrians heading towards Melksham Town Centre which is located around 2.5km from the Site. Uncontrolled pedestrian crossing facilities with dropped kerbs, tactile paving and pedestrian refuge islands are provided at the roundabout with Eastern Way. A continuous footway along the southern side of the A3102 towards the town centre provides access to a range of local facilities on route such as convenience stores, educational facilities and the library.

58 Eastern Way can be reached from Sandridge Common. On Eastern Way there is a shared footway / cycleway and further walking/cycling connections towards the town centre facilities via Snarlton Lane and Blackmore Road. To the south, Eastern Way provides a connection to the Melksham Oak Community School via a new dedicated surfaced walking/cycling connection and along Spa Road and Pathfinder Way to Bower Hill Industrial Estate, an area of employment.

59 Based on traffic survey data undertaken in April 2022, Sandridge Common (to the north of the Site) has a baseline AADT of 7,750 vehicles.

60 Personal injury collision (PIC) data have been obtained from Wiltshire Police for the latest available period between 2020 to 2025 (60-months). This timeframe has been used to understand if there are any existing safety issues on the highway network in the vicinity of the Site which could be exacerbated as a result of the Proposed Development.

61 Collisions are classified into three separate categories based on severity: Slight, Serious and Fatal. The definitions of which are as follows:

- **Slight:** Injuries of a minor nature, such as sprains, bruises, or cuts not judged to be severe, or slight shock requiring only roadside attention (medical treatment is not a prerequisite for an injury to be defined as 'Slight');
- **Serious:** Injuries for which a person is detained in hospital, as in-patient, or any of the following injuries, whether or not a person is detained in hospital; fractures, concussion, internal injuries, severe cuts and lacerations, severe general shock requiring medical treatment and injuries which result in death 30 days after the collision. The 'Serious' category, therefore, covers a very broad range of injuries; and
- **Fatal:** Injuries which cause death either immediately or up to 30 days after the collision.

62 The recorded accidents within proximity to the Site were as follows:

- No accidents were recorded on A3102 Sandridge Common or the Site frontage or the road itself in the 5-year assessment period.
- One slight injury accident was recorded at the A3102 Sandridge Common/Eastern Way Roundabout in the 5-year assessment period.
- Four slight injury and one serious injury accident occurred at the Eastern Way/Skylark way roundabout in the 5-year assessment period. The serious injury accident occurred when a driver failed to give-way to a cyclist, causing serious injury.
- A 'slight' injury accident occurred at the Eastern Way/Cranesbill Road roundabout when an electric bike failed to stop when exiting the shared path, entered the roundabout and was struck by a car.

63 The PIC assessment is provided in full in Section 3 of the **TA**.

Future Baseline

64 The baseline traffic surveys were undertaken in 2022 and therefore adjustments have been made to the future baseline traffic flows to allow for completion of developments since the time of the surveys in 2022.

65 **Table A8.1.11** provides 2028 Without Development Opening Year traffic flows (AADT) for the potential receptors to include committed development as follows:

- Land South of Snarlton Farm (planning ref: PL/2023/07097) – 300 residential dwellings (Cumulative Project 13).

- Land North of A3102 (planning ref: PL PL/2024/10345) – 295 residential dwellings (Cumulative Project 8).
- Land East of Spa Road, Melksham (planning ref: 14/10461/OUT) – 450 residential dwellings, adjusted to 345 dwellings to allow for completions at the time of the traffic surveys (2022).
- Land South of The Spa, Melksham (planning ref: 16/01123/OUT) – 235 residential dwellings adjusted to 99 dwellings to allow for completions at the time of the traffic surveys.

66 All Cumulative Projects (with the exception of Cumulative Projects 8 and 13) listed in **Chapter 8** included for assessment in the EIA, have been excluded from the highway assessment due their negligible trip generation, or because traffic from that development does not affect the Study Area. This is likely to be with the exception of Cumulative Project 1.

67 It should be noted that the projects included have been included in the (future) baseline traffic data scenarios. This is because cumulative assessment outputs form part of the baseline assessment required for evaluation within the **TA** in line with standard transport assessment practices.

68 The only cumulative project considered as a separate cumulative traffic scenario (outside of the baseline scenarios) is Cumulative Project 1. Given the location of Cumulative Project 1, immediately adjacent to the west of the Site and likely common receptors with the Proposed Development it is considered appropriate to assess the potential impact of this Cumulative Project separately.

Table A8.1.11: 2028 Without Development Opening Year (AADT)

Road Link	24-Hr 2-way AADT	24-Hr 2-way AADT - HGV	% HGV
A3102 Sandridge Common Rd (West of Proposed Access)	9016	369	4.10%
A3102 Sandridge Common Road (West of Blackmore Rd)	8210	132	1.61%
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	9131	362	3.96%

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

69 Primary and Tertiary Mitigation is identified in The Proposed Development (**Chapter 4**) and for the Cumulative Project 1 development from report reference ITB12069-015B Transport Update Note (**Appendix 8.3**) and are summarised below.

Operational Stage

70 The following primary and tertiary mitigation which has been evaluated as part of the operational stage assessment is outlined below.

Proposed Development Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

71 The access location is shown on **Figure 4.1** and comprises a new simple priority junction onto Sandridge Common. The access proposal includes improvement of the existing footway between the proposed Site access and Cumulative Project 1 as shown on **Figure 8.6**. In addition, the proposed layout (**Figure 4.1**) will deliver two further pedestrian/cycle/vehicular accesses to Cumulative Project 1. This will allow:

- Pedestrian/cycle access to Eastern Way;
- Emergency vehicle access and extension of the Cumulative Project 1 bus service through the Site (see B on **Figure 4.1**); and
- Vehicular access from the southern access point (see C on **Figure 4.1**).

72 The routing of PRow MELK26 will be retained through the southern part of the Site without diversion. A connection to PRow MELW40 will be provided (see D on **Figure 4.1**) to allow for leisure walking trips to the wider PRow network.

Cumulative Project 1 Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

73 Cumulative Project 1 provides the following primary and tertiary mitigation for the Operational Stage¹⁵:

- Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access from Sandridge Common in the form of a ghost island priority junction as shown on drawing ITB12069-GA-066C (**Figure 8.7**);
- A scheme of footway improvements on Sandridge Common to provide a continuous 2m wide footway between the Cumulative Project 1 Site access and the Eastern Way Roundabout;
- A scheme of improvements on PRow MELKW 41 at Snarlton Farm to provide a 3m wide shared use footway/cycleway;
- A financial contribution to the improvement of bridleway MELKW 27 to provide an additional pedestrian connection to Eastern Way;
- Two new toucan crossings of Eastern Way;
- A financial contribution to the provision of a new town bus service connecting the Cumulative Project 1 site to Melksham town centre and railway station.

Assessment of Effects, Secondary Mitigation and Residual Effects

74 Based on the thresholds identified by the IEMA guidance, the following links are predicted to experience a greater than 30% increase in AADT with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in 2028 (see Table 9.4 of the EIA Scoping Report, **Appendix 2.1**) the 'Assessment Methodology' section of this chapter):

- A3102 Sandridge Common West of proposed access; and
- A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road.

75 The following links are predicted to experience between a 10%-30% increase in AADT with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in 2028:

- Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road).

Operational Stage

76 Development traffic flows are given in **Table A8.1.12** for the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in combination.

Table A8.1.12: Development Traffic Flows – Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 Development (AADT)

Road Link	Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1	
	24-Hr 2-way AADT	% HGV
A3102 Sandridge Common Rd (West of Proposed Access)	4743	0%
A3102 Sandridge Common Road (West of Blackmore Rd)	2773	0%
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	1551	0%

77 Future Year 2028 With Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 traffic flows are given in **Table A8.1.13**.

Table A8.1.13: 2028 Future Year Traffic Flows with Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 (AADT)

	24-Hr 2-way AADT	% change - AADT	24-Hr 2-way AADT - HGV	% AADT HGV
A3102 Sandridge Common Rd (West of Proposed Access)	13759	52.60%	369	2.68%
A3102 Sandridge Common Road (West of Blackmore Rd)	10983	33.77%	132	1.20%
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	10682	16.98%	362	3.39%

Community Severance

78 The proportional increase in AADT flows above, assuming full build out and occupation of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 is likely to result in the following:

- Change in flow over 90% - substantial (large) magnitude – No links identified in 2028;
- Change in flow of over 60% and up to 90% - moderate (medium) magnitude – No links identified in 2028; and

- Change in flow over 30% and up to 60% - slight (small) magnitude – A3102 Sandridge Common West of proposed access and A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road.

- 79 The change in flow on Eastern Way is forecast to be less than 30% and therefore the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 are likely to have only a negligible effect in terms of community severance for this link. On Eastern Way two new signal controlled crossings are proposed as part of Cumulative project 1 resulting in a moderate beneficial effect.
- 80 The sensitivity of Sandridge Common (west of proposed Site access and west of Blackmore Road) is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.
- 81 The sensitivity of Eastern Way is considered to be medium. With the introduction of toucan crossings the magnitude of change is considered to be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, beneficial effect which is considered to be moderate.

Driver Stress and Delay

- 82 Section 9 of the **TA** provides operational assessments for the local highway network, demonstrating the level of delay for drivers and vehicle passengers (private and public transport). The analysis demonstrates that:
- The proposed Site access arrangements would operate within capacity with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in 2028 with vehicle delay of less than 10 seconds and no queueing forecast on the Sandridge Common right turn into the minor arm in each of the peak hours.
 - Cumulative Project 1 access would operate within capacity with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in 2028 with vehicle delay of 12 seconds or less and a maximum queue of one vehicle on the Sandridge Common right turn into the minor arm in each of the peak hours.
 - The Eastern Way/Sandridge Common roundabout would operate within capacity with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 in 2028 with vehicle delay of 7 seconds or less and a maximum queue increase of one vehicle on the Sandridge Common arms in each of the peak hours.
- 83 The sensitivity of the assessed receptors to Driver Stress and Delay is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be minor.

Non-Motorised User Delay

- 84 All assessed Receptors are forecast to experience significantly less than a 1,400 vehicles per hour change in flows as a result of the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project¹ under all scenarios.
- 85 As a result, the assessed Receptors are classed as having a negligible change in pedestrian delay with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 compared with the Baseline Assessment.

86 The sensitivity of the assessed receptors to Non-Motorised User Delay is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, negligible effect.

Non-Motorised User Amenity

87 The IEMA Guidelines set out that traffic flow would have to half or double for the effect to be noticeable. The increase in traffic flows on the majority of links with the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 is well below this threshold, as follows:

- A3102 Sandridge Common west of proposed site access – 53% increase resulting in a negligible magnitude of change.
- A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road – 34% increase resulting in a negligible magnitude of change.
- Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road) – 17% increase resulting in a negligible magnitude of change. It is noted that Eastern Way includes a shared use footway/cycleway, separated from the road by a verge and the Cumulative Development 1 includes two toucan crossings of Eastern Way.

88 The sensitivity of the assessed receptors to is considered to be medium.

89 On Eastern Way two new toucan crossings are proposed. On these links the magnitude of change is considered to be medium. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, moderate beneficial effect.

90 On Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road the magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, negligible effect.

Fear and Intimidation

91 The IEMA Guidelines suggest how to determine what the level of fear and intimidation of vehicle movements may be on vulnerable users, and the magnitude of impact that occur as a result of the Proposed Development.

92 As detailed in the 'Assessment Methodology' section, **Table A8.1.14** sets out an analysis of the links without the Proposed Development. **Table A8.1.15** provides an assessment with the Proposed Development.

93 The Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 will result in changes to the degree of hazard for fear and intimidation on the following links as a result of the proposed increases in vehicle movements.

94 The sensitivity of the assessed receptors to Fear and Intimidation is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be small or negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is likely to be minor or negligible.

Table A8.1.14: Fear and Intimidation – 2028 Baseline with Committed Development

Link Name and Scenario	Average hourly two-way	Total 18hr HGV	Vehicle Speed	a score	b score	c score	Total Score	Degree of Hazard
A3102 Sandridge Common west of proposed site access	529	458	40	0	0	20	20	Small
A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road	471	194	30	0	0	10	10	Small
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	544	340	40	0	0	20	20	Small

Table A8.1.15: Fear and Intimidation – 2028 With Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1

Link Name and Scenario	Average hourly two-way	Total 18hr HGV	Vehicle Speed	a score	b score	c score	Total Score	Degree of Hazard
A3102 Sandridge Common west of proposed site access	798	458	40	10	0	20	30	Moderate
A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road	622	194	30	10	0	10	10	Small
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	620	340	40	10	0	20	30	Moderate

Table A8.1.16: Fear and Intimidation – Forecast Change

Link Name	Sensitive Receptors (Value)	Degree of Hazard	Change in Level	Magnitude of Impact
A3102 Sandridge Common west of proposed site access	Medium	Moderate	One step change in level, with <400 vehicle increase in average 18-hour all vehicle two-way	Small
A3102 Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road	Medium	Small	No change in level	Negligible
Eastern Way (South of Skylark Road)	Medium	Moderate	One step change in level, with <400 vehicle increase in average 18-hour all vehicle two-way	Small

Road Safety

- 95 The IEMA Guidelines are clear that an assessment on road safety is based on professional judgement. A review of the local PIA data presented in the **TA** and summarised in the 'Baseline Conditions' section confirms that there has been 6 slight and one serious injuries in the last five years and therefore is not considered to indicate an underlying issue with road safety (relating to personal injuries) on the links identified for assessment.
- 96 The sensitivity of the assessed receptors is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, negligible effect.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 97 A **FTP** has been provided for the Proposed Development. This document demonstrates that the Site is in an accessible location, with genuine opportunities to make journeys on foot, by bicycle and by public transport. The **FTP** will focus on promoting sustainable lifestyles amongst new residents through reducing the need for single occupancy car travel with a range of site-specific measures. It will provide an initial framework for implementation, management and review of the Full Travel Plan.
- 98 A FTP promoting the use of non-car modes of transport was also submitted for Cumulative Project 1¹⁶.
- 99 On Sandridge Common a footway widening scheme is proposed as part of the Proposed Development.

Residual Effect

- 100 The **FTP** seeks to reduce single car occupancy travel and increase the use of non-car modes. However for a robust assessment the residual effects are assumed to be the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario.
- 101 The footway improvements on Sandridge Common will improve the pedestrian environment. However the benefits cannot be quantitatively assessed. Therefore the residual effects are assumed to be the same as that reported in the pre-mitigation scenario. This provides for a robust assessment.

Significance

- 102 The following effects are considered to be **Significant**:

- Severance – Eastern Way only; and
- Non-motorised user amenity – Sandridge Common west of proposed site access and Eastern Way.

- 103 The following effects are considered to be **Not Significant**:

- Severance – All other Receptors;
- Driver stress and delay;

- Non-motorised user delay;
- Non-motorised user amenity – All other Receptors;
- Fear / intimidation; and
- Accidents and safety.

Limitations and Assumptions

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

- Traffic generation estimates for the construction of the Proposed Development are based on the surveyed construction activities of active construction sites but matters such as materials quantities, number of workers, indicative construction programme etc may vary over time;
- The basis of the traffic assessment used in this chapter and technical limitations associated with this is set out in the **TA**;
- A 2028 year of opening has been assumed which assumes that the Proposed and Cumulative Developments are fully operational, ensuring a robust cumulative assessment has been carried out;
- The construction and operational traffic data is not simultaneous – they are assessed separately so the peak construction activity has been assessed at the opening year of the Proposed Development assuming the Developments are fully operational. Therefore, the assessment presented provides a robust of the anticipated future year network conditions in the peak construction period;
- The Site, on completion, operates ‘normally’, and does not assess any one-off events that may have impacts on multi-modal transport flows; and
- All new travel demand to the Proposed Development and Cumulative Project 1 is assumed to be ‘new’ demand. In reality, a proportion of people living on the Proposed Development will move from the local area and will represent demands already on the network.

Summary

105 **Table A8.1.17** provides a summary of the effects, receptors, residual effects and conclusions of significance considered within the Chapter.

106 Details of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation for the Proposed Development that has been taken into account is summarised within **ES Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan**.

Table A8.1.17: Summary of Residual and Significant Effects

Effect	Receptor	Residual Effect	Is the Effect Significant?
Operational Stage			
Severance	Sandridge Common (west of Site access and west of Blackmore Road)	Minor Adverse	NO
	Eastern Way	Moderate Beneficial	YES
Driver Stress & Delay	All	Minor Adverse	NO
Non-Motorised User Delay	All	Negligible	NO
Non-Motorised User Amenity	Sandridge Common (west of Site access) and Eastern Way	Moderate Beneficial	YES
	Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road	Negligible	NO
Fear / intimidation	Sandridge Common (west of Site access) and Eastern Way	Minor Adverse	NO
	Sandridge Common West of Blackmore Road	Negligible	NO
Accidents & Safety	All	Negligible	NO

References

-
- ¹ National Planning Policy Framework (February 2025)
 - ² Wiltshire Core Strategy Adopted 2015
 - ³ Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 4 2025-2038
 - ⁴ Melksham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Consultation Draft
 - ⁵ Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 2020-2038
 - ⁶ National Planning Practice Guidance (first published in 2014 and which has been updated a number of times since then, including the latest update in February 2024)
 - ⁷ Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's (IEMA) 'Guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic and Movement' (2023)
 - ⁸ Active Design Guidance, Sport England and Active Travel England (2023)
 - ⁹ DfT Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design (July 2020)
 - ¹⁰ Manual for Streets, Department for Transport (2007) and Manual for Streets 2 (2010)
 - ¹¹ The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges

¹² DfT's Healthy Streets Guidance

¹³ The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA112 Population and Human Health

¹⁴ Connecting Wiltshire – Melksham Cycle. Available

at:<https://www.connectingwiltshire.co.uk/getting-around/cycling/cycle-maps-routes/>

¹⁵ Planning reference PL/2023/11188 <https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/>

¹⁶ Planning reference PL/2023/11188 <https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/>