

**Northampton Gateway SRFI - Stage 1 'Section 42' consultee responses**

Doc Number	Name	Company/Organisation	Date Received	Other responses by same Consultee - Document Number	Comments Summary	Consultant Team Response
OB1 01	Kim Wilson	Bedford Borough Council	29/12/2016		Bedford Borough Council raises no objection to the proposal. In terms of additional road freight movements generated by the site, any steps which can be taken to secure routing between the site and Bedford to use the M1/A421 rather than the A428 should be promoted. Ideally an appropriately designed strategy should be produced which will ensure that use of the strategic network is biased and that local engagement, if required, happens early in response to any resulting localised impacts.	No objection' noted.
OB1 02	John O'Neill	Environment Agency	14/12/2016	OB2 29	<p><b>Below is a summary of the response from November 2016.</b> The main points relate to managing flood risk; land contamination; and ecology and nature conservation.</p> <p><b>Main Site</b>                      Flood Risk - The main site lies within the Wootton Brook catchment where we will be delivering a flood defence scheme. We are looking at opportunities to further mitigate flooding by investigating a whole catchment approach. As such, this development provides the opportunity to contribute by providing 'betterment' in terms of the rate of runoff from the development. New woodland could slow run-off. We would encourage further discussions on this matter. A discharge rate of 2.5l/s/Ha will help to reduce flood risk downstream. There will also be the need to consider how the applicant plans to manage the woodland once the site is constructed.                      Land Contamination - Overall, we consider that the controlled waters of the site are of low environmental sensitivity. Furthermore, the site appears to be Greenfield in nature and therefore the potential risks from contamination at the site is considered to be low.</p> <p><b>Road Bypass Corridor</b>                      Ecology and nature conservation - the Applicant must show how potential adverse impacts will be prevented on all statutory and non-statutory sites within the development site and nearby. The sites considered should include: Roade Cutting SSSI and Road Quarry, a County Wildlife Site near or adjacent to the proposed Roade bypass route. It should be shown how watercourses will be protected from adverse impacts, including from pollution. The ecological surveys have highlighted the presence of protected species at or near the development site - it should be shown how these species will be protected. It should be shown how ecological and habitat enhancement opportunities will be sought and implemented.                      Land contamination - The site is considered sensitive as the Blisworth Limestone has high permeability and groundwater may be found at depths c.6 metres below ground level. We welcome inclusion of a preliminary risk assessment followed by a quantitative risk assessment. We would expect to see piling risk assessment and a gas risk assessment and recommend undertaking a full site investigation. This should include the depth to aquifer depth to groundwater and investigate potential for contamination. Investigation and appropriate engineering methods should be used to protect groundwater. Focus should be on the landfill and railway land. The developer should test for relevant pollutants for former land use, using DoE industry profiles for guidance. Appropriate drilling methods should be used. We would also expect to see baseline monitoring data to be collected from the underlying aquifers and identified surface water features.  <b>Applicant Advice</b>                      We consider any infiltration Sustainable Drainage System greater than 2.0m below ground level to be a deep system and are generally not acceptable. Recommendations are made for the appropriate guidance to follow.</p>	Comments noted, and fed into the ongoing work at Stages 1 and 2 and subsequently. The final ES has been undertaken, involving dialogue with the EA and Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the issue covered - a Statement of Common Ground was agreed with the EA relating to the groundwater, soils and contamination assessments undertaken.
OB1 03	Helen Woodhouse	Historic England	19/12/2016	OB2 34 / OB3 02	Historic England has so far provided a response directly to the Planning Inspectorate on the proposed scope of the EIA. We hope that you will have received a copy of that advice. Information included about pre-application responses and advice.	Noted.
OB1 04	Jill Stephenson	Network Rail	10/01/2017	OB1 14 / OB2 28	<p>Network Rail has twice met with consultants acting for Roxhill Developments Ltd to determine the scope of a feasibility study in relation to the proposal. This study will enable the viability of the proposal to be understood in relation to capacity and the connection arrangements, taking into account the effect on network performance and will be undertaken in accordance with the standard industry GRIP procedure.                      Network Rail has already noted that the scoping document is silent on the impact of the proposal on the rail network. As this is a key risk, Network Rail suggest that Chapter 12 of the EIA scoping report be expanded to consider the full impact of the proposal on the existing and future rail network, in terms of capacity and timetabling, with a detailed study scope to be agreed with Network Rail.                      Network Rail reserve the right to produce additional and further grounds of concern when further details of the proposal and its effects on Network Rail's land are available.</p>	Rail Reports form part of the Application. There has been ongoing work since Stage 1 with Network Rail, including jointly prepared information and analysis regarding rail network issues.
OB1 05	Mark Chant	Northamptonshire County Council	11/01/2017	OB2 18 / OB3 07	<p><b>Archaeology</b> - There is a high potential of the site for multi-period archaeological remains of late prehistoric, Roman and Saxon date. The bypass will need to be covered in the ES chapter on Cultural Heritage. A geophysical survey and Desk Based Assessment alone provide insufficient information re: archaeological potential, and intrusive survey/trial trenching also need to be undertaken. The potential for further presently unidentified assets which may or may not be responsive to geophysical survey remains unknown - trial trenching is needed to identify the character and extent of identified archaeological assets and confirm the presence or absence of assets. Further detailed geophysical survey would be appropriate within the areas which have not been assessed including the bypass route.  <b>Natural Development</b> - The Ecological Report and corresponding Environmental Statement chapter are generally satisfactory, with a few detailed issues (e.g. discrepancies between the pond numbers). Table 6.10 in section 5.4.94 does not include the Golden Plover foraging/roosting habitat. The bypass corridor includes an area of unimproved grassland considered to be of county-national importance. This should constitute an additional impact. The report must be clear and consistent with its use of terminology and should use terms defined. It is unclear as to whether non-statutory nature conservation sites located within 1-2km of the proposed development are to be evaluated.                      Minerals and waste - The applicant must demonstrate that the proposed development is compatible with minerals related development and would not prevent or prejudice the use of the allocated site in the future.  <b>Transport and highways</b> - the County Council is in ongoing dialogue with the applicant on the transport implications and we expect on-going consultation and a full Transport Assessment. The County Council expects to be in a position to provide a more detailed consultation response with regard to these proposals by the time the Stage 2 (statutory) consultation is undertaken.                      Flood and water - the developers have already been in discussions with the surface water team and therefore are aware of the surface water drainage assessment requirements.</p>	Comments noted, and fed into the ongoing work. The final ES has been undertaken and addresses the issues raised at Stage 1 by NCC. Geophysical surveys were undertaken on the Bypass, and a programme of trial trenching was also implemented to inform the ES - also see the response to comments made at Stage 2. A Statement of Common Ground is in preparation regarding the Transport Assessment. The ES includes consideration of the minerals issues.

OB1 06	David Mackintosh MP	Member of Parliament for Northampton South	13/01/2017		<p>As part of the consultation for the Northampton Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange I would like to outline a number of concerns and observations regarding the proposed development and the wider impact on Northampton and local residents, which I hope will be taken on board.</p> <p>One of the main issues raised with me by local residents in terms of commercial development in the area relates to the impact on the local environment. I note that you have allowed for extensive landscaping and creation of bunds to help obscure the view of, and noise from the facility from Collingtree, Milton Malsor and Blisworth. Local residents have in the past made it very clear that they will not tolerate any development around the proposed site that has a significant negative impact on the environment as viewed from the surrounding residential areas. Therefore I would strongly suggest that the provisions you have made to mitigate this factor be very carefully considered to ensure that they address the needs of those residents. The proposed facility would lead to an increase in traffic in the area, both through commercial vehicles and the estimated 6000 workforce that would be employed on the site. I recognise that your proposal takes this factor into account, but I would urge you to undertake thorough modelling to refine this as far as possible, as the impact on congestion on local residents could be significant if this part of your plan proved to be inadequate. Similarly, I am aware that residents in the area have concerns over the amount of overall pollution, which could of course increase if the proposed facility were built. I would be grateful if you could let me know what steps you would take to address this.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to emphasise the importance of having regular, open discussions with residents of Collingtree, Milton Malsor and Blisworth, as I am sure the feedback you will receive will be honest and useful. I would also suggest that you speak to members of the Northampton Rail User's Group, who have significant knowledge of the local rail network and infrastructure, and I would be happy to facilitate this.</p> <p>I am grateful to you for taking the time to meet with me on the 11th January to discuss your proposed development and answer my questions, and hope this feedback is useful.</p>	
OB1 07	Jim Stewart-Evans	Public Health England	13/01/2017	OB2 16 & OB3 17	<p>Given the proposed site's proximity to an Air Quality Management Area for traffic-related nitrogen dioxide and Northampton Borough Council's implementation of a Low Emissions Strategy, we recommend that the developer liaises closely with the Council. The proposed Environmental Health Impact Assessment Air Quality Chapter should also include proposals aimed at minimising the public health impacts of air pollution and maximising the co-benefits to public health and the wider environment.</p> <p>It is noted that the current proposals do not appear to consider possible health impacts of Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs). The proposer should confirm either that the proposed development does not include or impact upon any potential sources of EMF; or ensure that an adequate assessment of the possible impacts is undertaken and included in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The response also provided a generic list of areas which should be addressed by all promoters when preparing an Environmental Statement with an NSIP submission.</p>	Comments noted. The ES was scoped to include an Air Quality Assessment, and this has involved direct dialogue with Environmental Health Teams from the LPAs, as well as input from the Director of Public Health's team (based at the County Council).
OB1 08	Stewart Patience	Anglian Water Services Limited	16/01/2017	OB2 06 / OB2 32 / OB3 24	<p><i>This response included the comments submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for the site and an appendix for the recommended provisions for the benefit of Anglian Water.</i></p> <p>It is considered that protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water should be included in the Draft DCO. These protective provisions are in addition to that for utility companies as set out in the model provisions for DCO applications.</p> <p>We welcome the reference made to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems for this purpose. There is also a need to consider the introduction of additional foul water flows into the public foul sewerage network and the risk from downstream flooding. Anglian Water has previously provided pre-planning reports relating to both water and used water. A Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) is currently under preparation by Anglian Water to identify a feasible drainage solution for this site. It is recommended that reference should be made to the pre-planning reports and the DIA (once prepared) including the proposed mitigation e.g. off-site reinforcement as part of the DCO application. Illustrative Masterplan/Parameters Plan - there are existing water mains located within the boundary of the site. It is important to ensure that existing assets can continue to be accessed and maintained by Anglian Water. Therefore we would recommend locating these assets within the public highway or open space. The proposed masterplan/parameters plans should identify the location of these assets and how these have been considered as part of the proposed site layout. It is not possible to incorporate these assets as part of the site layout there may be a need to divert these asset(s). We have a duty to divert existing water mains where requested to do so although it would be at your expense. If a diversion(s) is required you would need to make a formal application to Anglian Water for this purpose.</p>	Comments noted, including support for the inclusion of SuDS into the drainage system on-site. The ES scope includes consideration of foul water, as well as surface. Subsequent discussions have agreed the approach to protective provisions in the DCO. Also see responses relating to Stages 2 and 3.
OB1 09	Jasbir Kaur	Warwickshire County Council	16/01/2017	OB2 36 & OB3 04	<p>The site is in a strategically significant location for logistics and distribution activity. Located at the heart of the 'golden triangle' for logistics there is considerable market demand and interest in national distribution activity. The site has immediate access to the M1 motorway and a direct rail connection and these connections also link to the Warwickshire highway network and West Coast Main Line rail links. The site is proposed to fulfil the Government's policy which seeks to encourage a 'network' of SRFIs.</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council is promoting a new station at Rugby on the Northampton Loop of the West Coast Main Line (WCML) known as 'Rugby Parkway'. The relationship of this scheme to potential rail freight growth is that the new station only requires an amendment to existing train services within the Northampton Loop principally utilising a small proportion of the generous dwell times at Northampton, with WCML paths north of Rugby and south of Northampton wholly unaffected. On this basis, and without any committed freight growth proposals, it is reasonable to assume that Rugby Parkway will not preclude any strategic development of freight services on the WCML.</p>	Noted,
OB1 10	Rachel Wileman	Buckinghamshire County Council	16/01/2017	OB3	<p>BCC is happy to review any supporting Travel Plan document.</p> <p>BCC request that the study area for any associated Transport Assessment should include (at the very least) the north of Buckinghamshire. The Transport Assessment should extend into Buckinghamshire to assess the impact of transport on the existing network. The modelling outputs and the Transport Assessment should be shared with BCC to ensure mitigation options are established. It would be helpful if the Environmental Statement (ES) details the proposed relationship between additional cargo trains and existing passenger trains on the rail network, both during construction and after the completion of the rail freight interchange. The West Coast Main Line (serving the Northampton loop branch) is a strategically significant commuter line recognised by the Department for Transport and West Midlands Franchise as requiring support to help with capacity challenges; this will take the form of more frequent services and extra carriages. To ensure that the existing service is not disrupted the ES should outline where the volume of rail freight will come from and how it will be accepted onto the track.</p> <p>BCC is developing a Development Management policy and Freight Strategy to manage the impact of growth in Buckinghamshire; we would encourage the ES to reference the need to consider these emerging strategies in the planning of the proposed development. BCC recommend the ES place a greater deal of emphasis on the way public transport can both mitigate the impact of development and provide a sustainable mode of transport for those people employed at the interchange. The Roxhill consultation references new site access via the A508, the design of this access point should consider how walking and/or cycling can be integrated into new or enhanced infrastructure. With regard to flood management, the site and the bypass corridor does not appear to affect Buckinghamshire.</p>	Noted. The Transport Assessment has been prepared with input and oversight by the Transport Working Group - BCC was invited to join this group. Rail issues (noise and vibration) are considered in the ES, but rail issues are otherwise covered by Rail Reports which form part of the Application.

OB1 11	Royal Mail	Royal Mail	16/01/2017	OB2 17 / OB3 10	<p>Royal Mail has no issues with the proposed Northampton Gateway scheme going ahead. However, Royal Mail is potentially concerned that its future ability to provide an efficient service may be adversely affected by the construction of this scheme. Royal Mail has a network of operational facilities in the area surrounding the proposed site. Insufficient information is presently available for Royal Mail to form a full view of potential impacts of the Northampton Gateway on its operations. but the biggest risk comes from the proposed works to Junction 15 of the M1. In exercising its statutory duties, Royal Mail vehicles use Junction 15 of the M1 on a daily basis. Any additional congestion on this section of the M1 during the construction of the Northampton Gateway has the potential to disrupt Royal Mail operations.</p> <p>Royal Mail has not been able to satisfy its concerns based on the information that has been made available to date. Consequently, at this point in time the level of risk to Royal Mail and the need for remedial measures cannot be accurately assessed.</p> <p>In view of the above concerns, Royal Mail requests that in pregressing the Northampton Gateway scheme through the DCO process, Roxhill Developments should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fully consult with Royal Mail;</li> <li>- include major road hauliers such as Royal Mail in its proposed public communications strategy;</li> <li>- keep Royal Mail fully informed in advance of all temporary road closures and/or delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads; and</li> <li>- consider the cumulative traffic effects during the year construction programme.</li> </ul> <p>Royal Mail reserves the right to alter its position or make further representations in due course once further information is available and advice is provided by its consultants on whether it satisfactorily addresses Royal Mail's concerns,</p>	<p>Noted. The construction effects of the proposals are assessed in the ES, and a comprehensive Transport Assessment forms part of the Application - this will enable Royal Mail to form an updated view in due course. The proposed programme would seek to minimise disruption to road-users.</p>
OB1 12	Andrea Leadsom MP	Member of Parliament for South Northamptonshire	17/01/2017	OB2 15	<p>A SUMMARY OF THE FULL LETTER RECEIVED IS PROVIDED: Letter senton behalf of constituents directly affected by the proposals - in Collingtree, Blisworth, Roade, Courteenhall and Grange Park. At our meeting in early February, I hope that you will be able to provide me with additional information and answers to these points ahead of a subsequent public meeting that I intend to hold in conjunction with Roade Parish Council. Whilst I am supportive of Government policy with regard to SRFIs, it is important to ensure that there is a workforce and housing availability in the local area as well as track capacity on the rail network. If these conditions are not met, then the viability of a particular SRFI proposal project in any one location would be called into question.</p> <p>The WCML is forecast to have severe problems by the mid 2020s. It is unclear exactly how much spare track capacity there would be for more freight pacts once Phase One of HS2 is operational. Given the expanding rail-connected warehousing capacity being delivered at DIRFT and its growing demands on the route network for increased WCML freight paths, my constituents have questioned the necessity and feasibility of one additional SRFI in the local area, let alone two. Information on how many trains the site would handle per day is needed. If Northampton Gateway is open prior to the completion of HS2 freight paths would therefore not be available. I raised this directly with Network Rail in December.</p> <p>It appears no alternative sites to Northampton Gateway have been considered. My constituents and I look forward to seeing details of the alternative sites assessment for Northampton Gateway as soon as possible. My constituents also have concerns around the availability of local labour, and traffic movements. Workers will travel from further afield undermining the environmental role of the SRFI. There are number of other developments taking place in the area and all of these development will require HGVs to access the primary route network and other trunk roads. Northamptonshire County Council's Transport Strategy aims to address traffic problems in the local area. Sustainable transport choices and reducing carbon through tackling congestion are key - local people do not believe the Northampton Gateway proposal is aligned with these priorities.</p> <p>My constituents are concerned that the public consultation events to date have been inadequate.</p> <p>I am broadly supportive of the suggestion to develop a bypass for Roade as part of the application. Roxhill may need to consult more widely on the design and suitability of their proposed route. There are very specific concerns that the bypass would lead to a further loss of the green belt and allow infilling of the land between the road and existing properties.</p> <p>The views that I have put to you are representative of those that I have received from people in the area and across South Northamptonshire and I look forward to your response on their behalf.</p>	<p><b>A LETTER in RESPONSE WAS SENT FROM ROXHILL DATED 27 JANUARY 2017 - IN SUMMARY, with updated references where relevant:</b></p> <p>The context of the scheme is provided by the Government's National Policy Statement (NPS) which confirms the 'compelling need' for an expanded network of SRFIs. Northampton continues to be a key location for the logistics sector due to its proximity to the M1, its location between London and Birmingham and the availability of labour. The market is also seeing a growing number of occupiers seeking to utilise rail together with some businesses who are specifically seeking directly connected units.</p> <p>The number of locations suitable for SRFIs is commercially limited. In this regard, we are currently aware of one nearby alternative location (Rail Central). We have, however, confirmed in our scoping submission that, in our view, Rail Central is not a suitable alternative because it would cause unacceptable harm to the environment. An assessment of alternatives forms part of the Application (ES).</p> <p>Ultimately there will be up to 16 trains running to and from Northampton Gateway each day. In addition to the intermodal terminal the proposels provide for over half the total floor area of the scheme to be directly rail connected. Our analysis of the Network Rail Working Timetable suggests that there are at least 20 train paths per day that are completely unused, and that the train paths booked less than half are used on a daily basis. When fully operational the Northampton Gateway scheme has the potential to remove significant volumes of HGV freight movements from the road network and onto rail, with consequent environmental as well as road capacity benefits. We fully recognise that the proposal will result in localised increases in HGV movements and their resultant impacts. The Application includes a Transport Assessment which fully assesses the potential effects of the scheme and through design and mitigation minimises effects where possible. It shows that significant local transport benefits will be delivered. The impact of road based traffic is inevitably a concern to local people and we have been working closely with the Highways Authorities to minimise it. This includes regarding the contribution to the objectives of the Northampton Town Transport Strategy through new bus services, and other measures to reduce congestion.</p> <p>The construction of a Bypass for Roade is an integral part of the SRFI proposal. A commitment is made to construct the Bypass early in the construction period - Roxhill has no interest in the land beyond the Bypass construction.</p> <p>The consultation strategy was adapted for Stage 2 to include a Saturday. We undertook our first consultation with as much information available as possible, to make it meaningful.</p>

OB1 13	Shirley Wong	Collingtree Parish Council	18/01/2017	OB2 20 & OB3 21	<p>The proposal is entirely 'developer led', based on the landowner making the site available for profit. It is in conflict with the adopted West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and the JCS specifically excludes the proposed site.</p> <p>Roxhill are seeking to circumvent local planning control by presenting this as a NSIP rather than just another large warehouse complex with some limited capacity to accept rail freight. The DIRFT facility is only a few miles away and has at least 20 years future capacity. There are fears that what Roxhill propose will simply offer an alternative to strategic warehouse facilities such as Mouton Park and Brackmills within Northampton Borough. Specialist consultants Baker Rose has concluded that this site is unlikely to attract Rail Freight based warehouse operators. They say that for FCMG operators, the scheme would be distributing into some of the most congested sectors of the M1 and M40, without the benefit of being close to a large conurbation to serve and that the scheme is too far south to service the UK's current manufacturing supply chain.</p> <p>The impact on the wider area surrounding Junction 15 will be devastating. The inevitable consequences caused by the sheer volume of traffic using the UK's busiest stretch of Motorway has always been somewhat mitigated by the open landscape in this part of Northamptonshire. The claimed major employment benefits of the scheme are illusory. This is an area of low unemployment and employees would largely commute and thereby add traffic to the overstretched road network. The proposal to construct a bypass would further erode valuable countryside and continue the never-ending cycle of more houses to support more jobs/to support more houses. Some of the land is considered the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Roxhill will need to demonstrate that the enormous run-off from a roof area of 5m sq ft can be accommodated within the site. The likelihood is that water will eventually drain into the already overstretched Wootton Brook which is already a flood risk to properties in Collingtree Park. Foul drainage is a long standing issue in this area and Roxhill will need to demonstrate how sewage from the site would be removed. We would expect the noise levels arising from a twenty four hour operation involving HGVs arriving and departing, warehouse loading machinery and intermittent rail operations, to be substantial. It will be for Roxhill to demonstrate beyond question that the overall noise volume and pattern will not rise over existing levels. Air pollution levels in the area are already over the legal limit of 40ug/m3, and the prevailing wind from the site is toward residential areas. It is likely that the perimeter bunding and height of the warehouse buildings will prevent the wind rapidly dispersing the pollution and allow it to build up into greater concentrations. There are already high light pollution levels in the area and Roxhill will need to demonstrate how operational and security lighting will be managed and controlled.</p> <p>There is concern over the drastic diversion of long established public footpaths KX 13 and KX 17, particularly the latter which is very well used. It is difficult to see how the improvements to Junction 15 offered by this proposal will help to increase capacity and this is a real problem. The A45 and A508 are already overcrowded and the Junction regularly congested, not only at peak times. The Junction was designed to accommodate the building of Grange Park and proved inadequate from the outset. The level of rat-running through surrounding villages and suburban roads can only increase if further pressure is placed on Junction 15 and A45/A508.</p> <p>It is fundamental to any planning decision on this proposal to take into account the scale of other recent or planned developments in the immediate area.</p>	Comments and concerns are noted, and are similar to those raised during public meetings and discussions. The Scope of the ES covers all of these issues regarding potential local effects, including Air Quality, Noise, Lighting, and drainage. The ES concludes that the effects overall will not be significant for Collingtree. Downstream flood-risk will be reduced as a result of the drainage strategy proposed. The Highways impacts are assessed in the Transport Assessment and shown as major beneficial for many communities, with reduced congestion and queuing at Junction 15 and other key junctions. Rat-running will reduce as a result of the A508 becoming more reliable and efficient, aided by the Roade Bypass and other improvements. Footpaths will be diverted, but retained within the Main Site, with new links and connections proposed. The Applicant has committed to deliver the rail terminal, hopefully helping address concerns that there may be warehousing without the rail interchange.
OB1 14	Diane Clarke	Network Rail	19/01/2017	OB1 04 / OB2 28	<p><i>Network Rail has previously provided a response which is almost identical to this response. Only the additional points raised in this letter are set out below:</i></p> <p>Network Rail would like to review the developer's proposed bund works adjacent, drainage plans, boundary treatments. The track remodelling/design etc where the developer proposes to have a spur that merges with the existing railway - this will have to undergo Interdisciplinary Check review and sign off by Network Rail's Track Design Group/Route Asset Manager.</p>	Noted.
OB1 15	David Craddock	Ramblers Association	20/01/2017		<p>Further to my email dated 22nd November 2016, your proposals were discussed by our Area Footpath Committee on 5th December 2016 as advised, and again at its meeting on 9th January 2017 when I was able to give an update following my attendance at your public exhibition at the Hilton Hotel.</p> <p>I can confirm the Committee has no objection to the proposed rail freight development. The Committee has also noted your proposals with regard to the two rights of way which cross the site, as illustrated in your draft indicative master plan, and again have no principle objection. In so far as the proposed Roade bypass is concerned as I observed previously a number of other rights of way will be impacted upon in Roade and possibly Stoke Bruerne Parishes, although as I understand it your plans are still not so advanced in respect of this scheme. You have committed to holding consultation with the relevant bodies, of which Ramblers is one of course, and we would welcome the opportunity to meet and discuss your proposals in so far as the effects on the rights of way are concerned as soon as it is practicable to do so. Thank you.</p>	<p><b>ROXHILL DIRECT RESPONSE:</b></p> <p>Many thanks for your email and confirmation that you have no objection to the principle of the SRFI. I note your comments about the Roade bypass and yes you are correct in that we have not fixed the route for the bypass yet. I am more than happy to meet again to discuss footpath implications affected by the bypass.</p>
OB1 16	Andrew Wintersgill	David Lock Associates on behalf of Bovis Homes	24/01/2017		<p>We write on behalf of Bovis Homes Limited for whom we act as planning consultants in delivering its Outline permitted Northampton South Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE).</p> <p>We welcome your intention to take appropriate account of the SUE in assessing the cumulative effects of your proposed SRFI through your EIA. This is entirely fitting given that the SUE already has Outline planning permission, as indeed you have recognised.</p> <p>We have also noted the request from Northampton Borough Council that your proposed noise monitoring should be extended to include locations within the SUE. We consider that, in fully accounting for the cumulative effects of your proposed SRFI, the noise monitoring should be extended accordingly.</p> <p>In response to the Inspector's consultation on your Scoping Report, Northampton Borough Council also state that it is essential that the TA considers in detail the relationship between the proposed development, the allocated SUE and the existing Collingtree community. We entirely agree and welcome the fact that the comments draw your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Given that the SUE already has Outline planning permission, it will be important that measures necessary to mitigate any significant noise, transport or other effects of your proposed SRFI in combination with the SUE are secured directly through any consent for the SRFI, to ensure its acceptability.</p>	Noted - the TA takes account of all committed developments in the JCS, including the Bovis site (Northampton South). All other ES chapters consider the cumulative effects with the Northampton South Urban Extension, and the potential for noise effects on the site from the proposed development considered through the inclusion of receptors on the northern/western side of Collingtree.
OB1 17	Mrs V Hartley	Blisworth Parish Council	07/02/2017	OB2 26	<p>Blisworth Parish Council would like to express our concerns regarding the recently released visualisations which form part of your Section 47 Consultation and in relation to your Statement of Community Consultation.</p> <p>The opinion of the Parish Council members is that the visualisations/modelling are inadequate, confusing, misleading and provide absolutely no clarity on the potential impact on residents and the wider community of this inappropriate and large scale SRFI development. The complete lack of supporting information to take away is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>There is also confusion and lack of understanding regarding the points stated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The statement that the site is a strategically important location for distribution activity. Roxhill has undertaken no market research to establish a demand for transport freight via rail at this location. Their sole justification appears to be the unconstrained GB freight model predictions.</li> <li>2) Lack of required transport modelling and the subsequent impact on the local area.</li> <li>3) Northampton Gateway is contrary to the adopted West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and in conflict with the commercial, transport and housing objectives of the whole region. A further development on this scale will result in a complete imbalance in this local planning strategy.</li> <li>4) Roxhill has not presented an alternative sites assessment.</li> </ol> <p>Blisworth Parish Council is extremely concerned about the poor performance and lack of compassion demonstrated by Roxhill and associated partners and the ongoing unrest this is causing the Blisworth residents. It is totally unacceptable to continue to allow residents to be uninformed and uncertain about their future in Blisworth village.</p>	The draft information displayed at the Stage 1 consultation events was intended to help inform early dialogue and input from local people - there were members of the professional team on-hand to help explain and discuss the information. There were Summary documents available at the events to take away, and many visitors did - these were displayed at the events. The market context and 'case' for the proposals is set out in the Market Analysis Report, but at all stages this has been discussed in the context of the national policy statement and the need for an expanded network of SRFIs. The transport modelling progressed throughout the Stage 1 process, with more detailed information available at Stage 2 - the final reports are submitted as part of the Application. The application includes an Alternative Sites Assessment.

OB1 18	David Craddock	Rambler's Association	22/03/2017	<p>Thank you again for meeting with us this morning. I promised I would firm up with you as to the minimum legal width of a footpath and I have to apologise because I misled you. Having checked, the stipulated minimum legal width of a cross-field footpath is 1 metre and a field edge footpath 1.5 metres. So the promised minimum width for the footpath of 1.8 metres which you mentioned therefore exceeds the specified limit. I would like to add, however, that naturally we would welcome it if you were to increase the width to say 2 metres throughout.</p> <p>In terms of the joint footpath/cycleway we welcome the proposed width of 3 metres. We also welcome your proposals for the surfacing of this and the footpath.</p> <p>We noted you have still to finalise your thinking regarding the means of crossing the access road to the development and would just like to reiterate that obviously this needs to be safe for all users.</p> <p>Thank you for offering to keep us informed of your schedule for the series of 'road shows' you propose to hold and I hope we meet up again at one of these.</p>	Subsequent work incorporated PROWs into the Main Site, and the Bypass site - this is set out in the final Application, and described in detail in the Transport Assessment.
OB1 19	David Craddock	Rambler's Association	10/04/2017	<p>Further to my email dated 20th March which was a follow up to our meeting of the same day, I reported back to a meeting of our Area Footpath Committee held on Monday 3rd April and resulting from this I was remitted to make the following additional points.</p> <p>It is not clear even on the large scale map but it seems that there may be a secondary entrance/exit road on to the A508 and if this is the case we would welcome similar assurances to those given in respect of the main entry point that a safe means of crossing will be provided.</p> <p>It is vital that Footpath KX17 should not be stopped up at the point shown on the map but continued on to join with its diverted section, ie there must be no 'missing link' in the right of way.</p> <p>Para 3.1.187 of the Environmental Statement Scoping Report states that the PROWs that cross the site will be diverted and extended. To resolve any possible ambiguity we would welcome confirmation, please, that it is indeed your intention that the extensions which complete the loop in the network will be dedicated as rights of way and not merely as permissive. If this was not the intention I would like to stress that this is an objective which we would wish to pursue and achieve.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could please give consideration to these matters and I look forward to receiving your response.</p>	<i>RESPONSE WAS SENT DURING STAGE 1 FROM ROXHILL AHEAD OF FURTHER DISCUSSION WITH THE RAMBLERS ASSOC.</i> As referred to above (OB18), subsequent work incorporated PROWs into the Main Site, and the Bypass site - this is set out in the final Application, and described in detail in the Transport Assessment.
OB1 20	Alan Hargreaves	Stop Rail Central	28/03/2017	<p>I have a copy of the Summary of Proposals which you made available during your public consultation presentations earlier this year, would it be possible to provide a scale copy of your illustrative masterplan depicted on Page 13?</p> <p>We would also like to know if your enquiries, and client enquiries list which we understand you have now discussed with Network Rail include addressing the issue of cumulative impacts on rail connectivity which would arise when combined with the Rail Central proposal, who intend to use the same section of the Northampton Loop of the WCML for their competing scheme.</p> <p>Look forward to your response.</p>	<p><i>RESPONSE WAS SENT FROM ROXHILL</i></p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>Roxhill has carried out its own initial engineering studies which have confirmed that it is possible to connect the site to the national rail network, as shown on the published site plans. We have discussed these proposals with Network Rail who have raised no fundamental technical objections. We are working with Network Rail through the Network Rail GRIP process and expect to be at GRIP 2 stage later this year.</p> <p>We understand that Network Rail is undertaking a capacity study reviewing all potential passenger and freight traffic demands on the network in this area. We have not been given a timeframe for the completion of this work.</p>