Stage 2 Consultation

Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker

Document No.	Name	Also consulted under S44 (S42)?	Street	Town/Village	Overall Clear Objection	Overall Clear Support	Yes/No Responses - Questions 1, 2 and 3 on Consultation Form (if relevant)						Reason for Objection or Comments																			Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment
							Q1 - Yes	Q1 - No	Q2 - Yes	Q2 - No	Q3 - Yes	Q3 - No	Commented previously - Document Number	Prefer this over Rail Central	Increase amount / height of screening/trees	General Traffic Concerns: Accessiegress / impact & suggestions	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/quality of life for village residents / not beneficial	Scheme NOT necessary / Not needed (DIRFT) DO NOT support	Scheme IS required / Support the proposal	Safety / security for public & HGV drivers/ parking	Building/ Devn't too close to Village	Disagree with location	Concern over Capacity/Proposals (incl rail capacity)	Support for Roade Bypass green route	Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Object to Roade Bypass	Drainage concerns / Flood Risk	Passenger Terminal required	Lack of final info/misleading info	Too much information - too technical to be understood	House price will Depreciate	Consultation queries or concerns			
CR2 01	Patrucia McCloskey				1											1		1					1	1									Jct 15 is a nightmare at the best of times and I will probably lose my job if you start work here.It's like the Heathrow jct on the M25 looked great on paper but it just caused chaos. The bypass worries me most - it's just an extra road and will do absolutely nothing to alleviate traffic. At the point of it meeting the A508 we have 2 lanes into 1 which always causes delays - it doesn't make sense. The minute you have a road joining another road in such short distance it will be a mess like the M25 at Heathrow - 3 lanes had delays but with 5 lanes twice the delay. Every time you add and then take away a lane it doubles the delay. Regards PS If the bypass goes ahead will walkers be able to cross this road? Can you not just do this at Jct 17 or 18??? Why can't you do it there?		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The Bypass includes retained and diverted bridleway and footpath links, including an underpass.
CR2 02	Paul Smith															1	1					1	1		1									Surely the Bypass further away from the village is better. Would the green route entail less noise, air & light pollution to the properties closest to the bypass? Were routes the other side of the village considered? - they may be more logical. Noise, light & air pollution already exists due to the proximity of the M1 and with all the new housing development on that side of the village a bypass there would help with the extra domestic traffic generated from these developments.		Bypass routes to the east of Roade were not favoured due to additional environmental constraints, including more sensitive landscape and local views identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, and due to highways considerations in dialogue with NCC. The air, noise and lighting effects of the Bypass are assessed in the ES, and all potential significant effects can be addressed and mitigated.
CR2 03	Jo Williams															1	1	1				1	1		1									Having seen the newsletter I have concerns about the proposed "blue route" for the bypass. I feel this route is far too close to the houses on the edge of the village and would have an environmental impact on my quality of life - i.e. noise. I live at this end of the village and currently do not suffer from road noise, unlike properties on the other side of the A508. It is difficult to tell but I feel that the "green route" may be better as it is further away from the houses. An explanation of the reasoning behind the difference in environmental impacts of the routes would be useful.		The Transport Assessment includes a Bypass Route Options Report - the preferred route would have lesser effects on an area of grassland habitats, and slightly reduced visual and landscape effects.
CR2 04	Dawn Attwood															1									1									Re traffic coming through roade. It might be worth contemplating putting in traffic slowing measures through the village which would discourage traffic from using Roade as a quicker route		Suggestion noted. Traffic calming measures are often not popular with local residents. In any event, the traffic modelling shows that the bypass would attract through-traffic ou of the village centre (with air quality and noise benefits).
CR2 05	Glenn Dudman					1																												Plans on web and posted newsletter are too small to be read properly ; and cannot be sized up at all can we get some better copies produced please. I am pro scheme		*Dialogue was entered into with Mr Dudman by email and telephone.*
CR2 06	Hywel H Davies			Roade													1	1					1		1									I am a SNC District Councillor, but writing as a Roade resident. The July Newsletter gives a very clear view and information as to your proposed application. As I mentioned at the annual Roade Parish Meeting, your route options for the potential Roade by-pass does not favour the route that residents would rather be provided. Your Newsletter states the 'Green route' is considered to have a greater environmental impact but I understand the economics of a longer by-pass not being acceptable. You should consider people rather than economic returns. You would have more local support in Roade if you chose the outer Green route. However i fear the inner Blue route would cause (in my personal opinion) considerable harm to the oldest house in the village of Roade regardless as to what ever other landowners have possibly agreed to. I look forward to hearing further from you at your Autumn public meeting.		The Transport Assessment includes a Bypass Route Options Report - the preferred route would have lesser effects on an area of grassland habitats, and slightly reduced visual and landscape effects. The local effects of the Bypass on local properties have been fully considered, and mitigation measures (planting, mounding and fencing) are proposed to minimise the effects. Part of the bypass is in cutting (the southern section). The benefits to Roade in terms of reduced congestion, reduced noise and air quality improvements in the centre of the village are significant. Residual effects on properties on the edge of the village are not significant.
CR2 07	Mr P R Hardy			Roade	1																		1		1									If the Blue Route is 'preferred', who says so? Would obviously be cheaper than the Green route as it is shorter and will cost less. Other than that it is only fields being crossed anyway.		The Transport Assessment includes a Bypass Route Options Report - the preferred route would have lesser effects on an area of grassland habitats, and slightly reduced visual and landscape effects. The benefits to Roade in terms of reduced congestion, reduced noise and air quality improvements in the centre of the village are significant. Residual effects on properties on the edge of the village are not significant.
CR2 08	Hayley & George Stride		Dovecote Road	Roade		1										1	1			1		1	1											For many years my husband and I have discussed the idea of a bypass. Although we both agree it is a good thing for the village we can't help be think it is too close to the edge of Roade. On your map both options seem to split either Hyde Farm, Blaize Farm or some small businesses and homes. How would the bypass travel through these? Would it cut through the farmland or via a bridge? We are concerned about the noise level during the construction and from the heavy traffic using it.We are happy with the idea of Strategic rail freight interchange as it will bring jobs to Northampton. We fully understand that it will at first during it's construction cause many inconveniences but our biggest fear is having a bypass at the end of our road.		Support for the SRFI is noted and welcomed. The benefits from the bypass to Roade in terms of reduced congestion, reduced noise and air quality improvements in the centre of the village are significant. Residual effects on properties on the edge of the village are not significant.
CR2 09	Frank Bedford																																	I see in the Sept. News Letter that you are holding an open day at Gray's Coffee Shop & Deli. It would be helpful to know where this is. Th		*These comments submitted in error to the Northampton Gateway address.*
CR2 10	Ian Marlow			Grange Park		1														1														As a long term resident of Grange Park I full support this development - it will not only bring much needed job opportunities but will also provide an improved Junction 15 that is much needed		Support noted and welcomed.
CR2 11	Tony Barrett		Deans Lodge 4 Deans Row	Gayton																								1						On the update newsletter it is a great pity that the Master plan, Route Bypasss and the Map on Page 3 (layout) is printed with such small letters that the majority is indecipherable even with a magnifying glass.		The newsletter/leaflets are intended to raise awareness, but the scale does need to reflect the realities of distributing information by post to around 6000 addresses. However, all of the Plans and Maps included on the leaflet/newsletters are also on-line and can be viewed at large-scale.
CR2 12	Mark Arley	**S42**	Bailey Brooks Lane	Roade	1														1															*Mr Arley was added to the 'Section 42 plus' list to receive future updates direct by letter. His comments relate to land purchase issues. Objection also noted.*		*Mr Arley was added to the 'Section 42 plus' list to receive future updates direct by letter. His comments relate to land purchase issues. Objection also noted.*
CR2 13	Kevin Hicks															1						1												Having attended the public consultation at the Hilton hotel yesterday the 9th of October, I am still not happy that traffic to and from this proposed site that connects with the A43 will not use the route through Blisworth as an even greater rat run than we have at present. The traffic must be stopped from doing so, even to the point of closing the junction at Towcester road to the A43. Whilst this will inconvenience many, I see it as a small price to pay to return the village to the quiet back water it should be and not the racetrack it has become. I know that there is pressure from the local council to get the crossover junctions closed along the A43 anyhow. I will leave the technical argument to the people that have knowledge o this but the traffic situation is a major concern to me.		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Staige 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. Rat-running in Blisworth and elsewhere is expected to reduce as a result of the Highways Mitigation measures and infrastructure improvements.
CR2 14	Miranda Glass																																	Having attended what was a very enlightening exhibition, I was advised by one of your people to visit your website for current and proposed Traffic Figures and Air Pollution and noise levels for the area within 300 Metres of the Proposed site. Unfortunately I have been unable to locate them, so could you please forward these to me.		*A response was sent to Ms Glass direct from the Air Quality consultant.*
CR2 15	Sally Cosford			Collingtree	1											1			1			1		1										I would like to add my objection to this proposal. As a long term villager in Collingtree, I understandably hate the thought of such a development on my doorstep. However my real objection is how anyone can think that increasing the volume of traffic onto the M1 by such a huge amount could possibly be a good idea. The M1 has been at a standstill for lengthy periods, either due to severe congestion or lanes being shut, many times a week for months now. This adds to congestion and long delays on all the surrounding major and minor routes. No matter how much improvement is made to Junction 15 the resulting "significantly improved capacity" will only add to the surrounding congestion, so I fail to see how this will serve "the needs of the local communities".		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Staige 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
CR2 16	Mary Koniewlenko		Dovecote Road	Roade	1											1	1	1	1			1			1									I would like to make it clear that the plans for the by-pass are too close to the village. Air pollution will be 'Sandwiched' for houses to breathe in between A508 and bypass. Widening of A508 for more traffic and putting in a single lane bypass will in no time be gridlocked with traffic as it is now with just with A508. It is hard enough to get out of this village with mor traffic going through and a bypass will not be any easier as soon as accident on either Road (even if not lorries) more vehicles will use other road and more chaos. Ambulance's , police , fire brigade will not get to our village . Roxhill is not needed here and bypass not needed. Also I live at 46 Dovecote Road Roade will I be compensated for my view,pollution,noise be taken into account? Moved here for my young son to breathe clean air.		The Transport Assessment includes a Bypass Route Options Report. The local effects of the Bypass on local properties have been fully considered, and mitigation measures (planting, mounding and fencing) are proposed to minimise the effects. Part of the bypass is in cutting (the southern section). The benefits to Roade in terms of reduced congestion, reduced noise and air quality improvements in the centre of the village are significant. Residual effects on properties on the edge of the village will not be significant, including air quality, and localised changes to noise levels will remain below significant levels.
CR2 17	Chris Dancer				1											1			1				1		1									1. Proposals are contrary to local plan. 2. There is already sufficient local B8 unit site capacity at DIRFT and other nearb sites. 3. no unemployment issues in South Northants, workers would have to commute. 4. low skilled jobs created, with increasing automation in distribution industry. 5. freight via rail is unsustainable in UK and WCML is 'at capacity' for commuters. 6. scheme will generate significant HGV movements onto the local 'at capacity' road network. 7. home shopping distribution is killing traditional retail and town centres. 8. growth in home shopping distribution increases HGV movements with uncontrolled returns policies etc. 9. distribution shed business rates are not in line with the impact caused on local communities. 10. very significant opposition from the public in all local villages, towns and communities, and from all local politicians and MP's.		These detailed and varied points are noted, and all relate to the information provided as part of the application. Planning and other policy issues are included in the Planning Statement (point 1). Market and economy issues are covered in the ES, and the Marke Analysis Report, including regarding skills and employment (points 2 - 4), and includes consideration of issues relating to DIRFT and the wider network of SRFIs needed to meet national policy. The Transport Assessment shows the significant transport benefits which would be delivered locally by the proposals (point 6). Rail and capacity issues are dealt with in Rail Reports (point 5). Local impacts are assessed in full by the Environmental Statement (point 9). Point 8 is noted as an observation or comment about larger economic and societal trends. Comments received by the Applicant are presented in this Consultation Report (point 10).
CR2 18	Chris Dancer				1																										1			following your recent public exhibitions I wish to registered my continued objection. You gave very short advance notice o the exhibitions - low turnouts do not mean local people are complacent. You have a negative public awareness campaign with poor signage of venues, lack of publicity and limited, inconvenient opening times. Misleading information has been used on the exhibition boards with selective paraphrasing of policies and market studies. Vast volumes of technical information were referenced, but whole sections relevant to numerous local communities were missing, and any summaries provided were too short and simplistic to be of any use. Fundamentally, these proposals provide NO community or national benefits, whilst delivering a devastating impact on the whole of this South Northants area.		Comments regarding the consultation process are noted, including criticisms both for providing too much information, and for providing summaries to help reduce the need to review large amounts of information. The exhibition material reflected the emerging ES and other information, with work ongoing, and this was made clear. The information was not final, or complete, with views sought on the emerging information to aid ongoing work, and the consultation process served useful in reinforcing key local issues, concerns, and questions. The final application provides a full ES, including a non-technical summary, with a final Planning Statement, and Market Analysis Report, all of which will be available for further comments through the Examination process.
CR2 19	Tony Marsh					1								1		1				1														Long email containing several technical questions about the emerging Transport Assessment (TA) findings and data - in summary: 1. I have struggled to find Table 8, but am keen to discuss further the likely levels of in and outward traffic to the site, particularly regarding potential issues around shift changes. it seems this will be managed through management of shift times which is good and should earn you credit. 2. The emergency crossing over the M1 could be used with radio controlled gates to make it easier to use. 3. Consideration of grade separated flyovers should be considered at the M1 J15 improvements. 4. Should consider widening Knock Lane to aid 2 way traffic.	YES - Highways mitigation includes Knock Lane widening	Responses were sent to Mr Marsh with responses to his technical queries from the Transport consultant in October, and a series of emails with qustions and responses were sent over several weeks into November. These included the Table 8 data, and directed him to Technical Note 2 re: trip generation which was part of the draft ES. The response confirmed that the worst-case peak hour traffic had been assessed to ensure a robust assessment was produced - this does not coincide with shift changes which are usually outside of this peak.
CR2 20	Maggie Petch			Grangewood	1											1	1	1			1				1									Due to a health problem I missed the series of exhibitions - I do however have the delivered leaflet. I live on Grangewood a small cul-de-sac off Hilldrop Road, and just above Rowtree Road. I am horrified at the scheme for reasons of air pollution and traffic concentration as we often have difficulty leaving our road. My additional (and for me catastrophic worry) is the alteration to the roundabout at M1 Junction 15. To negotiate to he Hilton Hotel where I (and many others) go to the gym several times a week we have currently to (with difficulty by crossing 3 lanes of fast traffic) join the A45 towards the motorway and then go round the Junction 15 roundabout to reach the opposite A45 carriageway, and thence back to the Hilton. With the proposed changes to that junction, it looks as if this manoeuvre would be impossible. It is bad enough being forced, as at present, to go around a motorway roundabout when you do not need the motorway, but to use Northampton's new Spaghetti Junction would seem dangerously foolhardy. Has no thought been given to the many local inhabitants who regularly make this manoeuvre.		The improvements to Junction 15 will improve the experience for residents from Grange Park as a result of signalisation, and additional capacity within the Junction, including the movement described heading north on the A45.
CR2 21	Mark Redding												59a						1				1								1			Selective and misleading references to planning policies, national policy statement network/logistics studies. Main concerns as follows: 1. totally misrepresents the local planning policy; 2. Your reference to the AECOM and Arup Study Future Potential for Modal shift in the UK Rail Freight Market 2016 has failed to make reference to the other nine factors that need to come together to facilitate a modal shift: the building of rail connected warehouses is but one of the necessar facilitators in a complicated economic environment. Your simplification of the current transitionary state of the rail freight market is highly misleading. 3. GVA Logistics Study March 2017. Paragraph 3.4 refers to a study commissioned by South Northamptonshire District Council. 4. Paragraph 3.6 quotes NPS NN paragraph 2.53 which refers to "improving the quality of life in the communities". 5. Paragraph 3.7 quotes only part of NPS NN 2.56 'a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFIs'. 6. Paragraph 3.27 'Commercially successful rail freight terminals already exist close to each other in the West Midlands and despite some overlap of core catchment areas they continue to increase the volume of goods handled by rail year on year'. ....The comparison is not valid. 7. I believe a major omission in the literature is a failure to reference NPS NN 2.50. 8. Paragraph 3.31 'Furthermore SRFIs must be located where the demand is greatest, in particular locations where there is a concentration of logistics space, particularly NDCs'. The NPS NN makes no referenc to being close to logistics space or NDCs it merely states 'near to the business markets they will serve. The NPS is being misquoted. 9. No reference to NPS NN 5.168. 'Where possible, developments should be on previously developed (brownfield) sites provided that it is not of high environmental value'. No attempt has been made to identify brownfield sites that may better satisfy Government aspirations. My comments, at this stage of the process, have been restricted to the mis-leading nature of the promotional material and		The alternative interpretation and summary of the NPS is noted, but there was no intention to mislead - the Applicants Planning Statement provides an assessment of the policy context for the proposals, including an NPS Compliance Assessment. The Application sets out how the proposals relate to the wider Market (see the Market Analysis Report), including in the context of a national network envisaged by the NPS. An alternative sites assessment forms part of the application material. The NPS refers upon the private sector taking a lead in the delivery of SRFIs, and the Applicant brings substantial experience of the logistics and distribution market, and now submits the application for Examination as a positive, sustainable response to the need for an expanded network of SRFIs. *Also see comments in response to Stage 1 ref 59a which respond to many of the same issues.*
CR2 22	Pat Hargreaves															1		1				1												You propose to make Courteenhall Road a left hand turn only going towards Junc 15. this would mean that all traffic that once turned right to Milton Keynes would then have to travel through the village to go either down the Knock Lane route (which is very narrow and not fit for more traffic) or go through Stoke Bruerne again over a small humped back bridge, (again not fit for more traffic). But most worryingly all traffic would be forced through the centre of the village and through Stoke Road. Stoke Road is already a rat run and extremely busy, it is made up of residential properties, mostly listed, one cottage even appears in the Doomsday Book, it also has the local Doctors, older people already find it difficult to cross the road. Your proposal would increase the traffic in an already very sensitive area ten fold. I think you seriously need to re think your routes.		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Staige 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
CR2 23	Mark Hudson			NN7		1														1	1									1	1			I live in the local area (NN7 postcode) and think this proposal is a good idea provided: a) Roade village definitely receives its bypass on the A508 and most importantly, b) A passenger station should be constructed between the Northampton line and Weedon line of the WCML, linked by road to the proposed dualled A508 leading to J15. Such a station should have platforms on both branches of the railway (subject to levels issues being overcome). This Parkway would provide enormous benefit to the local community as well as providing a station which can better serve the southern part of the Northampton urban area and surrounding villages. This would also provide a greater PR benefit for the project as a whole by enabling it to be seen as providing a facility for the local community, and not "just another warehouse park"	YES - clarification re: infrastructure phasing and commitments	The comments of support subject to commitments regarding delivery and phasing of highways infrastructure are noted, and welcomed. The final application confirms the Applicant's commitment to delivering the highways infrastructure, including the Bypass, early in the construction programme, and clear triggers for delivery are now proposed and secured in the proposed DCO (and have been subject to discussion with SNC). The proposed inclusion of a passenger Parkway Station do not form part of the proposals.

CR2 24	Nick Bryans	**S44**	Bailey Brooks Lane	Roade	1												1	1	1	1		1		1				1									I write to you to express my concerns as a resident of Roade. If approved the quality and nature of life in Roade will be changed dramatically, not for the better. This development is inconsistent with the stated national strategy. It is clear that the additional traffic for workers & freight will lead to congestion locally. A few upgrades to the A508 (and a bit more environmental ruin) will hardly compensate for the change to the character of the area. The M1 nearby is already congested regularly. It seems highly probable that this will not be sufficient to outweigh the traffic generated by the new facility - how will this help reduce road traffic overall? The suggested bypass for Roade will eat into our countryside. Many residents of Roade highly value the easy direct access to the countryside, without crossing, seeing and hearing busy roads, and this makes Roade a good place to live. The A508 is mainly a route to Milton Keynes - we should be encouraging traffic to/from MK to use the M1 instead. There would be unfortunate environmental effects - the site of the proposed railway bridge comprises a strip of rich meadow supporting many species of butterflies & other insects, moths and bats. These kind of habitats are increasingly rare and destruction would be a small tragedy. Also issues with air quality from traffic pollutants with prevailing winds carrying it over the whole village. Will also be noise & light pollution for those unfortunate to be close to the road. The Bypass is too close to residential areas and disgracefully inconsiderate. With roundabouts interrupting traffic flow it is likely there will be regular queuing around the bypass, generating more pollutants. How does Roxhill plan to mitigate all these ill effects? South Northants area has one of the lowest unemployment rates nationally, so it is very probable workers will need to travel leading to increased local traffic. Further housing development will no doubt follow. I fail to see any real benefit to the local population, again just more and more environmental degradation. I live at the end of Bailey brooks Lane - we have serious concerns about local impacts of the bypass and the bridge. Has the effect on water levels in Bailey Brook been studied? Can you guarantee that Bailey Brooks Lane will not be used for construction traffic? It also appears that the Southern part of the field to the West of the railway is expected to be accesse via Bailey Brooks Lane. None of this road is suitable for large vehicles or machinery and any change to the nature of the road and track would be totally unacceptable to the residents. Overall, I do not believe that these proposals will actually achieve the intended effect, nor do they appear to meet the governments own guidelines for SRFIs. The effects will simply ruin the character and quality of life in the surrounding area.		*Mr Bryans was also consulted under Section 44.* The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Statge 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The ES contains assessments of air quality, and lighting effects, as well as noise effects - these are shown to include a range of beneficial effects and mostly minor or negligible adverse effects. Flood-risk issues have been fully assessed, including regarding the Bypass with drainage strategies proposed to manage and control run-off water without adverse effects off-site. Bailey Brooks lane will not be used for construction traffic - agricultural access is proposed.
CR2 25	Helen Goate				1															1								1									I wish to register my objections in the strongest possible terms to any form of development of warehousing and/or bypass in the M1Jcc 15/ Courteenhall Area. The proposals are not in line with the current strategic development plans of this Government and, furthermore, would impact negatively on the surrounding villages and road network. Also, there is absolutely no requirement for such a development so close to DIRFT.		Objection noted. Accordance with Government policy is set out in the Planning Statement, as is assessment in the context of DIRFT and other SRFIs (in the Market Analysis Report). The presence of DIRFT does not reduce the need and demand for further SRFI capacity.
CR2 26	William Irlam	**S44**			1											1		1		1																	I am writing in response to the latest plan for the alteration to the Stoke Bruerne / Ashton junction on the A508. We are a farming family with land on both sides of this proposed development (drawing:- NGW.BWB.GEN-XX-SK-CSK19 (status 3) Revision P3). The plan shows the order limits at this road junction marked in red and shows an excessive area taken from our fields and excessive amounts of established hedgerows removed. Our objections are based upon unnecessary damage to well established habitats and the potential removal of excessive amounts of our farmland. The same can be said for the bypass. If this scheme is approved the land taken needs to be substantially reduced (by at least 50-60%) and hopefully reduce the amount of hedge taken. In the event that this scheme goes ahead we would ask that any replacement boundary features include new hedgerow with species native to this area and trees dispersed along the boundary and that any land not required for the scheme i.e. any temporary working width etc reverts back to us as quickly as possible so that we may put it back into production. On the matter of the bypass , the rail head and warehousing, local opinions against this are very strong and personally I would be quite happy if the whole scheme failed. Roads in the area at busy times are very congested , when the M1 is closed due to works or incidents, within a few minutes the country roads become congested making a short journey with a tractor almost impossible. I think this development is only going to add to the problems.	YES - changes to the Rookery Lane/Ahston Rd junction improvements.	*The Applicant was in regular contact with the Irlam family as sSection 44 consultee (landowner), and in the context of potential land purchase.* These comments were considered alongside others regarding the draft proposed junction changes at the Rookery Lane/Ashton Road junction - a number of local residents raised questions at the exhibitions in addition to in writing. Changes were made to the design which would assist local road-users wishing to access or cross the A508 - this formed part of the Further Stage 3 consultation which focused on this alongside a smal number of other issues. No more land than that required to deliver the proposed works would be used. The wider concerns about traffic are addressed through the Transport Assessment which shows improvements for many local routes and communities, aided by significant additional capacity created by the improvements at Junction 15.
CR2 27	Ralph Silverton																	1																			Following my visit to your recent exhibition and my study of the documents I understand that it will not be possible to turn right into Bliworth from the A508 at the Courteenhall Junction but will have to go via Knock lane and Stoke Rd. Can you tell me how much extra traffic you expect on Stoke Rd in Blisworth as this is already very busy in the morning and evening rush hours?		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
CR2 28	Maddy Clarkson		Davecote Road	Roade																		1							1									I am very concerned regarding the building of the bypass so close to my home in Dovecote road. There should be a ditch running along the back of the gardens of Dovecote road, it is the run off from the various fields that surround the properties and was last dug out in 1993 . It then flows under the Blisworth road into the a joining fields.The ditch has flooded into the houses in the past and has come very near to doing so in recent year with the field becoming very water logged. With the vast amount of building a road would cause its is worrying where all this surface water would go to.		The Transport Assessment includes a Bypass Route Options Report. The local effects of the Bypass on local properties have been fully considered, and mitigation measures (planting, mounding and fencing) are proposed to minimise the effects. Part of the bypass is in cutting (the southern section). The benefits to Roade in terms of reduced congestion, reduced noise and air quality improvements in the centre of the village are significant. Residual effects on properties on the edge of the village will not be significant, including air quality, and localised changes to noise levels will remain within acceptable levels. The drainage strategy at the Bypass will not increase local flood-risk, with new attenuation features delivered to store and manage surface water from the road.
CR2 29	Brian Sumpton (Cllr) Milton Malsor Parish Council																	1		1																	I have studied some of the documentation produced for the stage 2 consultation and have some issues regarding the proposed changes to Public rights of way (PRoW's).1. Your analys of visual impact (appendix 4.5 VET) for footpaths F1 and F2 gives a false impression of the magnitude of the impact at the 15 year stage. The scale of the impact must be considered high and the overall effect as major adverse. These footpaths currently enjoy wide ranging views of open countryside. Under your proposals the paths would be routed between what you call bunding (in fact a totally unnatural mound of earth) and the railway line or road network. The size of the bunding would mean the only views from the path would be either railway or roads. The general view of residents is that your proposed diversions would render these two paths obsolete. 2. I am unable to find your proposals for the connection between footpath KX2 and LA13/LA1. where it crosses the A43 at grade near Jnc.15A of the M1. This is part of a circular walk from Milton Malsor via footpath KX5, Bridleway KX1, KX2, LA13 and returning to Milton Malsor via the Grand Union Canal Northampton Arm towpath. Clearly any icrease in the volume or speed of traffic at the crossing point would cause severe problems. These footpaths also provide a longer distace walk to Rothersthorpe via the Canal Drawbridge.		A response was sent direct to Cllr Sumpton regarding the footpath adjacent to Junction 15A (22nd November 2017), and a short period of dialogue ensued. Details of that right of way are included in the final application (TA and ES Chapter re: Transport). The submitted comments refer to the draft Landscape & Visual assessment at Stage 2 - the final version as submitted identifies a range of likely visual effects on different receptors, including PROW in the area, with likely effects at Year 15 ranging from Negligible to Moderate Adverse - Appendix 4.5 contains the full assessment of visual effects, and the methodology and reasoning is explained. This includes an assessment at the opening year, when some greater effects are likely ahead of the landscpaing maturing.
CR2 30	Paul Langford			Grange Park														1	1	1									1								Sirs, I am very concerned over your plans to build the gateway. Air quality You are planning to increase traffic to junction 15 which is a notoriously congested junction, how to you propose to combat the air pollution issue If your junction redesig does not combat the issue of queuing traffic.This junction with the A45 needs to be continuous flow such as a flyover etc or diverted through junction 15a. Access to grange park You have made no consideration to the 3500 people who live on grange park that struggle to get in and out of our estate now, you will cause a serious accessibility issue with you inadequate junction redesign. I can understand the logic of building gateway at J15, however you are failing the residents of grange park with a penny pinching junction redesign that will only lead to further congestion, more stationary traffic and more pollution to local residents.Where is your duty of care to our residents?		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
CR2 31	Raymond Phillips	**S42**	Bailey Brooks Lane	Roade																									1								I would like to raise concerns about the new bypass planned for Roade Village. It has been proposed that baily brookes lane will be used as access to one side of the bypass. Can you confirm that this lane will not be used for construction traffic and heavy farm machinery. Can you also confirm that the drainage planned for the lane will not impact our brooke in any way regards to flooding during heavy rainfall.		Mr Phillips also forms part of the S42/S44 consultation list. A response was provided to several residents of Bailey Brooks Lane to confirm that construction (or other bypass) traffic would not use the lane.
CR2 32	John Exley			Blisworth	1															1																	As a resident of Blisworth I fail to understand how an SRFI can be proposed so close to the existing SRFI at DIRFT .10miles away. Surely strategic means in areas where they are required and NOT so close to an existing SRFI.		The national need for an expanded network of SRFIs across the UK is clearly identified by national policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks). The application is supported by a range of material, including the Market Analysis Report, to provide a market context for the proposals. However, emerging information about the need and justification for the proposals was shared at the exhibitions, in part in the context of the especially strong distribution and logistics sector in and around
CR2 33	John Exley			Blisworth																											1						I would like it noted regarding the Statutory public consultations that took place in October 2017 at various locations. 1. The signage to the venues was extremely small and very poorly located. The one in Blisworth was an A4 sign which seems inadequate compared to the size of the proposal. 2. The period of the consultations only covered 12 days in total. 3. There was misleading information on the display boards. 4. There was a distinct lack of any benefit to the community.		Comments or concerns about signage were not raised at the exhibitions, with events held in locally well known venues in a number of villages, and information shared by post and online well in advance. The Stage 2 (statutory) consultation was undertaken over the period from 9th October until 24th November 2017 (approx 6 weeks).
CR2 34	Jane Lawrence																																				Having attended a local meeting and having viewed the plans at the exhibition in October I wish now to put on record my thoughts on the proposed development:There can be no circumstances in which the company is allowed to renege on its promise to build, and finance in full, a bypass for Roade. Planning permission for this rail freight project must not be approved unless there is an unbreakable clause in the permission requiring Roxhill to build the proposed Roade bypass before work starts on the rail freight terminal. Having spoken to Consultants working on behalf of Roxhill, it seems that the bypass would not be built until part of the rail site had been developed and an income stream had kicked in, but if Roxhill don't have the money to develop the site and finish the project then perhaps planning should be denied until the company is able to show that the project is fully funded.I would be happy to discuss this matter in more detail.	YES - clarification re: infrastructure phasing and commitments	These comments and suggestions regarding the commitments and phasing of infrastructure are noted, and welcomed, as a condition on which local support could be provided. The final application confirms the Applicant's commitment to delivering the highways infrastructure, including the Bypass, early in the construction programme, and clear triggers for delivery are now proposed and secured in the proposed DCO (and have been subject to discussion with SNC).
CR2 35	Olivia Edmunds		The High Street	Collingtree														1	1			1															Having lived by the M1 since 1976 (near the bridge on The High street, Collingtree) I have seen enormous change. The motorway affects noise levels and air pollution, and I have seen an enormous change to volume of traffic, East Hunsbury has been built, Grange Park has been built, not to mention Collingtree Park and the golf course. I've seen the Hilton Hotel and warehousing built opposite. The buildings and golf course took away huge swathes of countryside which villages expect to have around them. I understand that more housing is needed across the country and appreciate that we needed to expand Northampton, but that does not mean enormous warehouse parks should be built taking away the last part of countryside. You are not coming up with answers for the pollution levels from your proposals. The noise and air pollution from the M1 will be reflected from these huge warehouses directly onto our village. What is going to be stored in these warehouses? Do we know there will never be noxious chemicals?		These concerns about local environmental and traffic change are noted. The Environmental Impact Assessment has considered all of these issues - air quality, noise, traffic, etc. Air quality is shown to be good now, based on data from the local authorities, and further analysis done by the Applicant. There would be very few direct impacts on Collingtree. The proposed development will have negligible impacts on local air quality, but will contribute to improvements nationally by enabling the removal of HGV miles from the national road network. Any storage of specialist or noxious chemicals by future occupiers would require relevant environmental or other permissions, but do not form part of the proposals.
CR2 36	Jana O'Brien				1													1	1	1									1					1			I strongly oppose the Northampton GatewaySRFI proposals. My reasons being:1/ Significantly increased traffic Currently, J15 of the M1 already suffers with a constrained physical design with tight radii on the roundabouts. Furthermore, the junction sees very high traffic demand at peak hours and regularly operates well over its capacity, resulting in significant queuing and congestion. 2/ Noise Currently, we already experience a wide range of existing noise conditions. At times, the noise levels are relatively high throughout the day and night any further noise would make living in this area unbearable as well as impact on the residents well-being. 3/ Air Quality The air quality in the area is already affected by the proximity to the motorway. Any additional traffic will therefore will have adverse effects on the local residents (especially children) health. 4/ Landscape and visual effects When we moved here, we were predominantly surrounded by farmland and woodland. However, recently warehouses were built close to our area and thus increasing the traffic and noise as well as spoiling the landscape of the area. Now, further warehouses and freight trains (I hope not) are to be constructed which are considerably larger in size than any existing warehouses in the area. The proposed site will in no way benefit local residents, who pay their council tax to live here and as such should have a say as to what is to be built in close proximity to their properties (The prices of their properties might be adversely		The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The ES assesses likely effects on air quality and noise, and these are shown to be negligible or minor for most local receptors, with wider air quality benefits nationally as a result of enabling HGV mileage to be removed from the road network. The landscape and visual effects are also assessed, and while there would be significalt landscape changes the visual effects from the built development are substantially screened by earthworks and planting.
CR2 37	Brian Mayland		Westbrook	Blisworth												39		1	1			1															Stoke Road in Blisworth is already congested at 'commuter' times and a hazard to pedestrians visiting the GP Surgery. The easier access to Knock Lane from Roade Bypass, avoiding Stoke Bruerne, will increase the Stoke Road cogestion. In the wider aspect, not opposed. A: why not join the north end of Roade By-pass to the A508 at Courteenhall Road junction at a roundabout? This would alleviate the prohibition of right turns. B: a relief road from Courteenhall Road, starting by the bend to the public footpath to the railway footbridge OS grid ref 740534, to Crafton Villas, by the old A43 main railway bridge, ref 728541, opposite Station Rd, would alleviate all the difficulties of Station Rd and the problems by Blisworth Primary School.		Stoke Road in Blisworth is already congested at 'commuter' times and a hazard to pedestrians visiting the GP Surgery. The easier access to Knock Lane from Roade Bypass, avoiding Stoke Bruerne, will increase the Stoke Road cogestion. In the wider aspect, not opposed. A: why not join the north end of Roade By-pass to the A508 at Courteenhall Road junction at a roundabout? This would alleviate the prohibition of right turns. B: a relief road from Courteenhall Road, starting by the bend to the public footpath to the railway footbridge OS grid ref 740534, to Crafton Villas, by the old A43 main railway bridge, ref 728541, opposite Station Rd, would alleviate all the difficulties of Station Rd and the problems by Blisworth Primary School.
CR2 38	Hilary Spurries		Towcester Rd	Blisworth	1											12		1	1	1	1	1															Q1: have you really considered the case with respect to other SRFI's e.g. DIRFT - rail network capacity and distribution networks? Local structure Plan? Q2: consider the congestion on the A45 from junction 15 to Barnes Meadow interchange.A508 congestion will just be moved? Q3: access to Courteenhall Road an issue & pressure on Knock Lane & Blisworth Village have yet to be considered. Q6: where will employees come from in an area of low unemployment? slowing the S.Northan 'Green Belt' buffer of the M1 should be maintained. GENERAL: In my view this is an opportunistic scheme whereby the developer is 'jumping ' on a bandwagon to find a use for the land paying scarp attention to: need, the environment, the road & rail networks, distribution centre, changing technology & move to electric vehicles and the quality of life in the villages affected		The application includes a full assessment of the market context for the proposals (Market Analysis Report), and considers the need for the expanded network of SRFIs envisaged by Government policy, including with DIRFT at Junction 18 of the M1. The full Highways Mitigation Strategy includes full details of the proposed improvements including at Knock Lane/Blisworth Road. There is no Green Belt in Northampton, nor affected by the proposals. The ES considers the local labour and economic benefits of the scheme.
CR2 39	Brenda Jenks			Milton Malsor															1																		I wish to comment on the section:'Noise & Vibration' - point 8.5.36 The analysis of noise levels when the site is fully operational is stated as ongoing and predictions are also stated as indicative. It is further stated that:"the predicted noise levels currently exclude noise from the gantry cranes, reach stackers and telehandlers at the terminal, as modelling work is still ongoing for these sources".Operational noise will be a major and ongoing factor for local communities and to read in the Environmental Statement that predictions are 'ongoing' and these have not yet been taken into account is a very serious omission at this stage in the process.		The Noise Assessment was ongoing at the Stage 2 consultation, although much of the assessment was well progressed. The final assessment includes full consideration of the operational noise, with assumptions made to ensure a robust assessment of effects. Noise effects are shown to be negligible or minor for almost all receptors closest to the Main SRFI Site, and negligible for receptors further away.
CR2 40	Lyn Bird				1													1	1																		I am underwhelmed by both the proposals and the apparently misleading nature of the exhibition. I though the venue was appropriate for the exhibition but signage to access the building was very poor. The display boards contained supposed 'fact' which does not marry up with equivalent data from other sources. The scale model was inadequate as it did not include all aspects of the proposal. Concerned that the benefits of Northampton Gateway to local people are very limited and may actually be detrimental to the village of Roade and its sense of community. The application is masked by a 'strategic' veil which seems to suggest that there is legitimate need for warehouses to be built on agricultural land. In fact we already have too much land committed to this type of activity.		The Stage 2 venues in the villages were in village halls, schools or pubs where there is signage to direct visitors to a generally limited number of entrances. However, additional temporary signs were used to help guide visitors and raise awareness to passing people. No complaints were received about signage at the time (although there were examples of signs being removed during the exhibition). The model measures approximately 6 sq.m and shows all of the main site, and Junction 15 - it was extended in response to suggestions by local people that the context to the we was of interest. It is an extensive aid to the consultation process, but did not include the Roade Bypass area. The exhibition material presented the emerging application material for comment. This included reference to the strategic policy context provided by national government policy, and to the Applicants understanding of the logistics and distribution market.
CR2 41	J Ward				1															1	1											1					Objection - inadequate consultation.There was insufficient advance notice of the dates of the public consultation. The dates for the consultation only spanned 11 days which precluded those who were away eg on holiday. Inadequate/misleading/missing information on website exhibition pages. The need for this scheme has not been fully scoped and is not in the interests of the local and wider community.		Objection, and comments regarding consultation, noted. Awareness was raised through a range of means direct by the Applicant, but also including via the Parish Councils who were active in making local people aware, as were the local objection groups. The consultation period extened over 6 weeks approximately - well in excess of the minimum of 28 days.
CR2 42	Derek Bird																																				Land boundary and mapping queries raised having seen Notices erected close to proposed development site.		Responses provided via the legal team to clarify.

CR2 43	NOT USED																																						
CR2 44	Colin Davidson				1									55			1	1	1	1					1														
CR2 45	Christine Barrand				1												1			1					1					1									
CR2 46	Anna Fox			Gayton	1																			1										1					
CR2 47	Mr & Mrs R W Glass			Collingtree	1												1	1	1											1									
CR2 48	Alastair Inglis		Hartwell Rd	Roade	1																													1					
CR2 49	Karen Hawkins	**YES, S44**	Bailey Brook Lane	Roade	1												1	1		1			1	1						1						1		1	
CR2 50	Martyn & Sonya Howell	**S44**	Bailey Brook Lane	Roade	1												1	1	1	1			1													1			
CR2 51	Barry & Pauline Talbot		Ashton Rd	Stoke Bruerne				1		1			1				1						1																
CR2 52	Sharon & Dino Nola	YES																1	1				1				1							1	1	1			
CR2 52A	Sharon & Dino Nola	YES																																					
CR2 53	Edmun James		Chestnut Close	Milton Malsor	1												1	1	1	1			1	1															
CR2 54	Stephanie Hurt & Mr Hurst	**YES**	Bailey Brook Lane	Roade	1												1	1	1	1			1																
CR2 55	Andrew Bodman		Homestead Drive	Bugbrooke	1									CR1 54						1														1					1

Not used		*Not used*
In breach of the Joint Core Strategy which seeks to balance employment and housing with the provision of public services. The JCS sets out that DIRFT is the preferred option and that a second (or third) freight terminal is un-viable. If this proposal goes ahead along with Rail Central there is no evidence that all 3 are viable as there is a limit to the number of train paths, workforce and road capacity. Studies need to be done on the cumulative impact. It fails to meet a number o JCS policies and objectives, including: ensuring the area does not become over-reliant on one employment sector and continues to provide diverse employment opportunities; retaining vibrant rural communities and villages retaining their local distinctiveness and character; ensuring new development promotes the use of sustainable travel modes [6,0000 lorries per day is NOT sustainable]; combat congestion in our main towns and town centres, reduce carbon emissions. [This will increase congestion and carbon emissions, thus it fails]. The JCS considered that new rail freight interchanges in West Northamptonshire, in addition to DIRFT, would not be deliverable within the plan period. Northampton has a shortage of suitable labour with companies needing to import labour. What evidence is there that a workforce is available for all 3 rail freight developments? Will this lead to people travelling long distances to work and cause massive congestion? Will additional housing be required? The plan also sets out that there should be no development beyond the M1. Adding a token length of railway is a blatant attempt to bypass the local planning system. The A508/A45 is already beyond capacity with frequent delays between the Wootton interchange and Barnes meadow. This leads to congestion with the subsequent impact on air quality. It is noted than you are not looking at particulates as NOX is seen as the greate problem, how can one be sure if you do not measure both? You mention that walking and cycling routes will be enhanced but I do not think freight can be moved by cycles.		Concerns over the potential cumulative effects are noted - cumulative effects are considered in the application, including with Rail Central. The Application also considers the market context and the presence of DIRFT - the demand and need for additional SRFI capacity means the presence of DIRFT does not reduce the viability of these proposals, and their core catchment areas would be different (see the Market Analysis Report for detailed analysis). Rail capacity has been assessed and Reports submitted - dialogue with Network Rail has been over an extended period, and us ongoing. The concerns raised about potential highways effects are noted - this was an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
I wish to object to your proposal for what is essentially warehousing and is contrary to the local government plan. It is a shameful abuse of the planning process: by positioning this as a strategic rail freight project rather than a massive warehousing facility for which the local community and Councils have no appetite this goes to the Secretary of State to decide. The road network cannot cope with the extra HGV movements and there is no contingency for when the M1 is closed and the proposed Roads bypass will not resolve this.	YES - clarification re: infrastructure phasing and commitments	The Applicant is committed to delivering the rail terminal prior to occupation of any warehousing, and is also proposing clear, early triggers for the key highways infrastructure. This was in part a response to local concerns about the potential for warehousing but no infrastructure. The local highways infrastructure will be more resilient and have more capacity to deal with traffic when there are M1 closures, but this is not something under the control of the Applicant.
I am expressing a strong objection to any application being submitted for the development a of SRFI between junctions 15a and 15 on the M1. The plans, though distributed widely still do not provide clear enough details of the extent of the disruption by a development such as this or realistic impact on the surrounding area with the potential for escalation of further opportunistic development of this nature. The idea of a rail freight interchange of this magnitude only a few miles from the well planned DIRFT complex shows a lack of any National strategic planning in this area. I am also highlighting the fact that the most recent Consultation meetings that did take place were publicized by the delivery of fliers with dates and venues in October in the afternoons on four and a half days only. The information arrived at rather short notice and I for one was unable to attend any of the sessions due to prior engagements.		Objection noted. The comments about not being able to attend any of the exhibitions are also noted, and regrettable. The construction effects of the proposals are assessed in the ES, and to be mitigated by a range of measures including via the submitted Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The context of the proposed SRFI with DIRFT and other SRFIs forming part of the network envisaged by Government policy is set out in the Market Analysis Report.
Having attended the consultation it was clear that no evidence was available with regard to Traffic, Noise and Air Pollution Figures, should the development go ahead, compared to the current levels. We would like to know the benefits of losing even more countryside from our locality. We have lived in Collingtree for just over 40 years and in that time the changes has been considerable, we can only assume Air Pollution has also suffered. Also there was nothing to show the impact o the amount of traffic travelling through Collingtree, in fact Collingtree was not mentioned much at all (the closest community to the proposed development). We reviewed the very large model of the proposals, but were confused as to why the proposed development and Collingtree were in a corner and the rest was mostly countryside. With regard to Congestion, the previous attempts at remodelling Junction 15 to reduce it, have failed miserably (hence your proposals) and again there was no evidence produced to show this time will be any different. Needless to say we are Totally opposed to any further development.		The exhibition material reflected the emerging ES and other information, with work ongoing, and this was made clear. The information was not final, or complete, with views sought on the emerging information to aid ongoing work, and the consultation process served useful in reinforcing key local issues, concerns, and questions. The final application provides a full ES, including a full assessment of Air Quality - this includes a comprehensive set of data regarding existing (baseline) conditions, as well as an assessment of the likely effects of the proposals. All of which will be available for further comments and dialogue through the Examination process. The data shows that existing air quality, including in Collingtree, is good with only a very small number of individual properties experiencing currently poor air quality. The effects of the proposals on air quality are shown to be negligible overall.
I attended four of the exhibitions in October and was surprised at the inaccuracy and misleading nature of much of the information displayed: there were a number of instances of Consultants' reports not having been finalised and the final versions may not support draft statements. There were also claims made of forecast growth quoting from unconstrained capacity studies. This is misleading. Some of the headline quotes from reports infer that local bodies are supportive are examples of cherry-picking out-of-context and also misleading. The 15 large files containing several thousand pages were accompanied by a Short Report of 35 pages. The files were delivered to our local library prior to the first exhibition which gave insufficient time to review them adequately within the 6 week consultation period. Many of them are still drafts which suggests they are likely to change. The 35 page summary document was woefully inadequate and contained many misleading statements. Documentation contained information which was presented in such a way as to suspect deliberate obfuscation. The local exhibitions were held over only 6 days, some people were unable to attend any of them - there seems no good reason for not spreading them over the consultation period. The above observations reflect on your inability to demonstrate any need for the proposals when there is an existing SRFI within 20 miles which has approved planned capacity for more than a decade. I can see no overall long-term benefit to our community, in fact the complete opposite. The misinformation, lack of critical documents and resulting lack of detailed information on mitigation proposals suggests unnecessary and unacceptable environmental damage. For a proposal with such huge implications for our community, environment and quality of life your consultation has been totally unsatisfactory.		Comments noted. The exhibition material reflected the emerging ES and other information, with work ongoing, and this was made clear. There was no attempt to mislead. The information was not final, or complete, with views sought on the emerging information to aid ongoing work, and the consultation process served useful in reinforcing key local issues, concerns, and questions. We note the criticisms both of providing lots of draft information, and for attempting to provide an overview summary. The issues of proximity to, and the relationship with DIRFT, is contained in the Market Analysis Report, as well as in the context of the NPS in the Planning Statement, all of which will be available in final form once submitted and accepted. Similarly, the final ES can inform further dialogue about the overall local impacts, and benefits, of the proposals.
I formally object to the above mentioned SRFI proposed just off junction 15 of the M1 motorway. My main questions are below:- There is a rail freight interchange at Rugby 18 miles why is that not being expanded? Why is Grange Park at junction 15 not the proposed site of the SRFI? If the build was to go ahead why can an additional junction not be added to the roundabout at junction 15 to feed straight into the SRFI? Why can traffic not go into the SFRI from junction 15 and out via the A43 at junction 15a? or vice versa therefore no bypass of Roade would be needed It seem that you have strategically only sent correspondence to a few residents in the village of Roade why? And not all correspondence has been received by those you deem affected by the SRFI why? I have only received letter dated 4th Oct not the 3 pages fold out leaflet showing proposed plan including maps. The newspapers mentioned in your letter are not free so why was your notifications published in them and not in ou local Roade News booklet? The proposed bypass of Roade initially was going south of the village why is that not an option? The proposed bypass is too near to the village and will not alleviate traffic through the village at all, how are you proposing to ensure only local traffic come through the village? The proposed bypass will damage the wild life and plants that current reside there – what are you proposing to do about this? I live on bailey brook lane I purchased my house on the grounds it was on the edge of the village with no planned housing development and surround by fields – the proposed bypass will now shatter my peace, quiet and tranquility. What are you prosing to do about this? My house price will depreciate by approx. 20/25% if this SRFI goes ahead – what are you proposing to do about this? You advise that the bypass will alleviate noise and air pollution through the center of Roade, but the bypass will bring these on to my door step – what do you proposing to do about this? Looking at the plans is seems you propose to purchase the side road (straight on not bearing left into the rest of the street) at the top of bailey brook lane for 'private means access' for what purpose? And why? Bailey brook lane is a busy road what with the village hall, playing fields and tennis located off of it – many people park on the street when using these facilities making the road not suitable for any types of construction traffic.		Objection noted. Mrs Hawkins was consulted under Section 44 regarding interest in land. The Application has considered the market context and the presence of DIRFT - the demand and need for additional SRFI capacity means the presence of DIRFT does not reduce the viability of these proposals, and their core catchment areas would be different (see the Market Analysis Report for detailed analysis). The access and highways strategy has been developed with input from Highways England and others, and a direct motorway access would not be supported. Consultation leaflets were delivered across a wide area, in addition to the letters received by local landowners and relevant interested parties, in addition to local newspaper notices. The Highways strategy includes HGV weight restrictions to help reduce such through-traffic in Roade and elsewhere. The noise and other effects of the Bypass have been assessed in full, and mitigation measures proposed to minimise the effects. Bailey Brooks Lane will not be used for construction traffic, but will be used, as it is now, for agricultural access when required.
I moved to the area for the privacy, quiet location and surrounding countryside. Impact on the house as its closest to the proposed Bypass, including further air pollution and noise, additional water being fed into the brook that runs around our property from the proposed road. The track that leads to our house and neighbouring properties has been maintained by the home owners for over 25 years. We now understand that the proposed road would cut off access to the Wakes estate field on the West side of the railway. Therefore Roxhill will need to gain access to the track to allow the agricultural vehicles which in turn will cause further wear and tear from the large amount of mud being dragged over the track from the ploughed field etc. If this was to proceed we require a contribution towards the up keep of the track. Reduce our house value,already have Drft at Daventry which has far better link roads being adjacent to the M1, M6 and A14 trunk road. They still have 7.8 million sq ft of distribution space available and can't fill the vacancies that they have? Therefore we can't see the need for a further rail hub!!!!		*Mr & Mrs Howell also consulted under S44.* Issues regarding the potential effects of the Bypass are assessed in the ES, including air quality and noise, and drainage/flood-risk. The assessments show that with mitigation, noise will be minimised through earthworks and additional fence screening, and air quality effects will be negligible on the nearest homes (and beneficial to homes nearer the centre of the village). Bailey Brooks Lane is used for access to farmland, and this will continue. The Market Analysis Report explains the market context and need for more SRFI capacity, and explains that the proposals would serve a different core market to DIRFT.
Q1: enough traffic problem on the A508 as it is. Dirft is just 18 m away, so couldn't see the necessity for this dev. Q2: No I don't believe this will be the case. If there is a problem on the M1 in either direction, we will have an issue, no matter what you do at J15. Q3: Changes to the Rookery Lane/Ashton Rd/A508 junction will just make it worse for us to get across the road as not enough thought has gone into reducing the traffic flow. Q4: not affected by them. Q5: It's a blight on the landscape. Cancelling the project would be a good idea. GENERAL: I don't believe that sufficient research has gone into looking at current traffic flows. adding 25% of the expected additional traffic to the A508 will make it unusable.	YES - changes to the Rookery Lane/Ahston Rd junction improvements	Concerns regarding traffic impacts are noted - the Transport Assessment deals with these issues in full, and shows that by attracting traffic back onto the A508 the proposals will help reduce pressure in the villages. The A508 itself will operate more efficiently, aided by the Bypass, and also by improvements at J15. The comments regarding the Rookery Lane/Ashton Road junction were noted - further changes to this junction were proposed (and subject to further consultation, Stage 3).
Concerned over loss of land, house is Grade II listed. Detailed and specific queries raised about land purchase by Roxhill as part of the Bypass corridor. Our comments and questions are as follows: We anticipate that our property value will be significantly reduced if your proposals are approved. We have unique circumstances - for example, we own the oldest house in the village (Hyde Farm House - 14th century, Grade II listed, which is of historic interest to the community at large). We are disappointed that this fact, coupled with the circumstances that we have planning applications to preserve/add value to our historic property have not been taken into consideration by Roxhill with regards to a) valuation based compensation and b) RICS survey(s). We have a number of concerns directly related to your proposals. I cannot find answers to our questions quickly or easily from your draft ecology report or within the vast amount of data on the disc that Roxhill sent to me, or within the 13 + level arch files of data in the library. It appears, from the attached plan that Roxhill intend to use our large pond (c. quarter of an acre plus) as a 'drainage outfall' from the proposed Roade Bypass. If our understanding is correct then there are a number of other critical points that we must discuss urgently, including but not limited to flood risk. Also, what consents will be required for Roxhill to discharge waters which will drain into our large pond? The draft Ecology report is of no significant value to us; there is no mention of bats, adders or swans – all of which are present on our land and it's not clear what Roxhill intend to do to protect the presence of GC Newts. Given that we have allowed Roxhill open access to our property for Ecology and many other surveys in last year (at Roxhills request) we are highly disappointed that, despite numerous requests, the results have not been made available to us. I am specifically referring to Topographical, Arboricultural, Geophysical, Archaeological Walkover and Noise Monitoring. On a related point, we are extremely concerned about the potential implications of a bypass being so close to our historic home, which as stated above is 14th century and grade II listed. What is the likely impact to our property in terms of damage/movement/flood risks as a result of a) significant vibration caused by traffic and b) water drainage from the bypass into our very large pond. No doubt a qualified RICS surveyor would be able to answer these questions but as you have declined to fund such a survey we await your most urgent response.	YES - Final Bypass route avoids Mr & Mrs Nola's land.	*Mrs Nola was also consulted under Section 44 - correspondence and dialogue was held direct with Mrs Nola by Roxhill regarding a range of issues regarding potential land purchase issues, and other concerns raised. A number of meetings were held with Mr & Mrs Nola.* As referred to in the comments, the consultation information and draft ES was shared direct with Mrs Nola. The effects of the Bypass proposals on the property as a listed building has been fully considered in the ES, as have the implications on biodiversity, with numerous surveys undertaken on and off-site where access was permitted. A full range of mitigation measures for bats, GCN and other species is proposed, with tree and hedgerow loss minimised, and replacements added to the bypass corridor. The drainage strategy does not increase flood-risk at this or any other property, and the discharge is not direct into the Nola's pond, but is into the network of which that pond forms a part. The Built Heritage assessment within the ES considers any effects on this and other listed buildings, and identifies no significant effects.
Following on from the email that I sent you yesterday, I would like to add the following in respect of the proposed Roade By-Pass route: We are aware that exit polls were carried out by local residents at your recent Phase 2 consultation events. Mr Blyth (a resident of Roade) who was involved in the exit polls has kindly shared the following information with us: 79% of people who ticked the bypass boxes i.e. green route or blue route within the exit poll questionnaire preferred the green route. This information, whilst important, clearly has no bearing on how local residents have reacted to your broader proposal i.e. the SFRI / warehousing / J15 changes. It only relates to the By Pass. We trust that you will take this information into account in an appropriately and timely manner and we look forward to receiving updates from Roxhill in due course with respect to how local residents have reacted to your broader proposals.		Also see response to CR252.
A number of issues concern me: **1.** The apparent discounting of Rail Central from any modelling is not appropriate - it too could come forward and should be considered. To pretend it may not happen is misleading. You also don't take account of other major developments - e.g. housing in Brackley, Towcester, and development at Silverstone. **2.** This sine is contrary to the Local Plan - the proposals are an attempt to get permission for warehouses without due regard to local policies or democracy. Development here is not supported locally. **3.** No evidence of demand, or rail paths - you refer to undersued existing paths, but this suggests no demand for rail freight. There is no certainty you secure the minimum of 4 trains per day. Is there any confirmation that both NGW and Rail Central could be connected to the network? **4.** Not convinced that earthworks (just a large hill) will mitigate noise and light pollution - you must also model rail noise. **5.** Traffic will increase significantly - what happens further down the A43? I am concerned about the potential effects of some of the local mitigation works - particularly the left turn only out of Courteinhall Road. This could encourage rat-running. You will add traffic to an already congested M1. **6.** The area is already well served by an SRFI - the Guidance is that SRFIs should be near markets, but another one in the Midlands is contrary to a 'network'. Work by Lord Adonis suggests little appetite for this type of logistics operations. Electric vehicles and local delivery networks are likely to evolve...	YES - clarification re: infrastructure phasing and commitments	**1**. Rail Central has not been dismissed or discounted, although is considered a less suitable alternative to Northampton Gateway - the cumulative effects with Rail Central have been assessed and form part of the final ES. The Transport Assessment considers all major committed developments as part of the County Council's transport model.**2**. The Applicant has committed to delivery of the rail terminal prior to occupation of any warehousing, and clear triggers for highways infrastructure are identified - this is in part in response to such local concerns as those raised here. **3**. The Rail Reports provide analysis of the evidence which provides confidence regarding the availability of the required paths. **4**. The Landscape & Visual Effects chapter of the ES contains a full assessment of how effective the proposed mitigation would be, and details were consulted on. Local highways effects have been fully modelled - the Highways Mitigation Strategy will deliver significant benefits with reduced rat-running, and improved traffic conditions, with improvements for many local routes and communities. **5**. The Market Analysis Report provides a full assessment of the market need and context - DIRFT serves a different core market to that served by the proposed SRFI. More SRFI capacity is required, and the network across the Midlands is expanding.
I have not heard one positive comment. Hundreds of acres of wildlife habitat and green belt will be under concrete forever. The increased air, light and noise pollution will not be solved by any of your ideas. We have an underused freight terminal at Daventry. The thousands of new jobs are not for our area as there are not local people wanting warehouse employment and existing companies are struggling to find staff. More traffic, more pollution and more grid locked roads. The people living in Roade have always wanted a bypass, but at what cost. Thousands of extra cars and lorries will back up in the peak times at the three new proposed roundabouts and many will still use the existing roads and create "Rat runs". Your preferred by pass route is not the one preferred by the residents of Roade, as it comes too close to homes and farms, and would create a lot of excess water which cannot be taken by the Bailey Brook, as proposed. We have lived in Baileybrook Lane for twenty five years and have maintained the lane and kept the brook free from debris. We do not accept a company coming in and trying to either purchase, or lease the lane for their own ends. We would, therefore like		Concerns and objections noted. The local environmental concerns raised are all addressed by the ES which confirms that the Bypass will not result in significant noise, air quality, or lighting effects - in fact, central areas of Roade will see benefits as a result of reuced through-traffic. The Bypass will also not create new or exacerbate any existing flooding or drainage risks. Rat-running will be reduced in the future by the proposed highways mitigation strategy as shown in detail in the Transport Assessment.
A number of misleading statements were made on your display boards and by members of your staff. I also thought the attendance levels were low. There is no need for Northampton Gateway when the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal is just 20 miles away.		Comments noted. A response to wider issues also provided for the Stage 1 process (response CR1 54). Issues of market need are dealt with in the context of the National Policy Statement, and in the Market Analysis Report.

CR2 56	Jane Keys		Covert Drive	Roade	1											1	1		1						1												I have framed my other concerns in the context of the four main objectives of Government policy for Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges. Policy 1: Government Policy objective to reduce road congestion: Will your proposed RFI really reduce road congestions?...Policy 2: Government policy objective to reduce carbon – will this proposed development reduce carbon emissions?...Policy 3: Government policy objective to support long-term development of efficient rail freight distribution logistics - to ensure a network of SRFI – .... in appropriate locations to serve our major conurbations; Is your proposal in an "appropriate location" to meet this objective?...Policy 4: Government policy objective to Support growth and create employment – through the transfer of freight from road to rail, where this is practical and economic. The recently adopted Strategic Plan for the region specifically excluded industrial development at this location. What is the compelling reason for ignoring the adopted Strategic Plan and allowing development on this Greenfield site?		The Application provides full details of how the Application accords with and meets the requirements of Government Policy, including with regard to traffic and congestion, carbon and emissions. See the Planning Statement for fuller details. The Environmental Statement presents the findings of the EIA process, regarding local effects - it identifies a range of benefits, including major improvements to local transport conditions and capacity. The site is
CR2 57	Gary Archer		Watering Lane	Collingtree												1	1	1	1					1	1												You have thus far failed to prove that your proposed development will not worsen air quality levels in Collingtree. I live in the village, have 3 young children and a South West facing garden (facing the proposed site), the direction of prevailing winds. I understand that the proposed site will result in up to 20,000 additional HGV movements daily – 1,000,000 movements annually. Please provide evidence that this enormous addition of highly polluting vehicles will not have a detrimental affect on air quality in Collingtree? I don't see that your consultation process has addressed this. By suggesting you could "sink" the proposed site you appear to recognise that air quality wil be impacted, otherwise why would you sink it? The prevailing W, SW winds will simply deposit toxic air in Collingtree village and surrounding areas. Your proposal for this development should not move forward one step until you provide unequivocal independent evidence that its unnecessary imposition on the local area will not have a damaging impact on the air that we breathe.		Concerns regarding local air quality are noted, and were discussed with numerous attendees at the exhibitions. The final Air Quality Assessment provides a detailed and robust assessment of the likely effects of the Proposed Development,
CR2 58	R Hennessy				1											1	1	1	1					1	1	1									1		I feel this is the wrong place for a Rail Freight Interchange. The Northampton Loop is already at capacity at times, I have stood on the platform at Northampton Station waiting for a commuter train to London and while it is being announced as delayed 2 different freight trains have chugged slowly through. I understand from talking to your staff at open meetings that you have customers asking for a depot between Northampton and Milton Keynes, given the proximity of DIRFT to Northampton, it would be much better to move the new terminal much closer to Milton Keynes this also gives the possibility of linking to the Bletchley/ Bedford line or the Bletchley/ Bicester line opening up new potential rail routes. Northampton is already listed as one of the most polluted Towns/ Cities in UK, mainly because of the volume of traffic on the M1 and the prevailing wind which carries exhaust fumes into the town, any increase in traffic is unacceptable. This is in addition to the regular (typically several hours a week) M1 closure as a result of an accident putting huge quantities of traffic onto local roads. Roade bypass and remodelling of the A508/ Courteenhall Road junction looks good on paper, but suggests that the designers have never visited the site. Blisworth Road, Roade or Knock Lane, Blisworth is narrow and in poor state of repair and would be unable to safely take the current traffic flow that Courteenhall Road handles let alone an increase. Finally I can have no confidence in a traffic flow prediction model which shows the traffic flow on the A43 changing at a point where the minor road from Milton Malsor to Rothersthorpe passes over the A43 but there is no connection between the two roads.		Comments regarding the site are noted, and are covered by the analysis provided in the application documents. The Market Analysis Report explains the market context and need for more SRFI capacity, and explains that the proposals would serve a different core market to DIRFT. Rail connectivity and capacity issues are assessed in the Rail Reports submitted, and are based on analysis of existing rail freight capacity. The potential highways and congestion impacts were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment, and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing will be much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The local improvements, including Knock Lane/Blisworth Road, have been discussed with the Transport Working Group (of NCC Highways and others) following the transport modelling.
CR2 59	Jane & Ronald Pretorius	S44	Bailey Brook Lane	Roade	1											1	1	1	1					1	1										1		We have a number of objections in particular the proposals for the bypass around the village of Roade. Firstly we do not understand why a new SRFI is needed at all when there is already a freight interchange at Rugby, which is not very far from the new proposed site. Why can the Rugby site not just be expanded? If the SRFI is going ahead regardless, then we would like to raise a number of objections around the proposed new bypass to Roade and changes to the A508. 1. Why can't the entrance to the SRFI not just be off junction 15, by adding an additional arm to the junction? 2. Why is the proposed bypass so close to the Northern edge of the Village? You state the bypass will reduce noise and air pollution in the Village, however for residents of Bailey Brooks Lane noise and air pollution will be doubled as we will be sandwiched between the bypass and the A508! Why can the bypass not follow a wider arch further way from the village? 3. What is going to be done to ensure that the bypass is used by through traffic? We do not see how it will alleviate traffic how do you intend to ensure through traffic uses the bypass? 4. The bypass will damage the surrounding countryside and destroy habitat for wildlife, what will be done to reduce the impact of this? We are keen walkers and saw the benefits of being able to access the countryside right from our doorstep so the proposed bypass will not only shatter our peace and tranquillity but will also impact greatly on our lifestyle. 5. It seems you will be buying the dirt road leading to the 4 detached houses that are also part of Bailey Brooks Lane - why? We have heard it is because you plan access for the heavy construction traffic needed to build the bridge across the railway line. If this information is correct then this is not acceptable to us. There is no way that this is a viable option for the construction vehicles. On a more general note, the value of our property is likely to decrease if this proposal goes ahead, what plans are in place to compensate residents for this potential loss?		1. The Highways proposals, including site access, have been devised in dialogue with the Transport Working Group, including Highways England - a direct link onto the M1 would not be achievable. 2. The Transport Assessment includes a Bypass Options Report - the chosen route balances a range of considerations, including local environmental effects. Air quality and noise effects close to the bypass have been assessed, and mitigation measures proposed to minimise them - no significant residual effects on these propertoes are likely. 4. The Ecological effects (and all other potential effects) of the bypass are considered in the ES - the loss of hedgerow and other habitats will be mitigated, with new habitats created. Existing bridleway and other links will be retained (some diverted), including with a underpass under the bypass. 5. Bailey Brooks Lane and other local tracks are not being bought or used for highways construction traffic.
CR2 60	Stephen Blyth		Church End	Roade									71																			1	1		1	The exercise in October 2017 comprised five exhibitions in less than half the villages and communities in the 'consultation area' plus Towcester, and lodgement of supporting documents in local libraries and some parish council offices. The intention of this statutory exercise is to inform the public of the proposal, (and, if possible, persuade them of its benefit). EXHIBITIONS:None of the exhibitions was well-attended – an average of 76 individuals at each venue (excluding the last exhibition, which had not been publicised in Towcester) compared with 108 for Rail Central's similar consultations in May 2016. This may be due to the limited time when the exhibitions were mounted and the very short notice period (formal letters were received less than a week before the first exhibition). Signage at all venues was low-key, without notices displayed on main village streets. Exit polls found very few attendees in favour of the project. In terms of informing the public (and gaining support), the exercise failed. DOCUMENTATION IN LIBRARIES/PARISH COUNCIL OFFICES: The deposit in early October of 15 ring-binders plus appendices, crammed with technical reports, some misfiled, others in draft, created an insuperable task for public scrutiny and comment in the allotted period. Scanning through it is evident that some reports contain much opinion and value-judgement masquerading as fact. The effect of the deluge of paperwork is to intimidate and deter public scrutiny of the proposals. SHORT EXPLANATORY DOCUMENT:This contains a series of assertions and slanted arguments including misleading quotations from reports, some of which actually oppose the proposals. In conclusion it is felt that the consultation was inadequate, with the vast majority of those who expressed an opinion, including ourselves, remaining unconvinced by and opposed to the proposals.		The exhibitions are one part of the overall consultation strategy, along with notices in the local newspaper, and people often prefer to access the information on-line. The Stage 2 consultation was undertaken in accordance with the SoCC, agreed with the Local Authorities - the approach to consultation was amended after Stage 1 in response to suggestions about venues in the closest villages to the proposals, and were held at venues familiar to the local community. Exhibitions were run into the evening to allow people to come after work. We welcomed the exit-poll which provided a useful check for our own informal recording of visitor numbers. The exhibitions are intended to help people understand the proposals, and provide an opportunity for discussion and questions. Experience suggests strongly that they tend to be attended by objectors rather than supporters. Around 370 visitors over the 5 events (with less than 30 visitors in Towcester) is considered an effective exercise. Draft document was labelled as draft, and the Applicant was open about the 'work in progress' nature of much of the work - consultation during, rather than after, the application is prepared is considered more helpful and useful to all parties.
CR2 61	Lynda Payton				1											1	1	1	1																		I am strongly opposed to a SRFI at this location: While there is a need, all the existing SRFI's are predominately sited in the Midlands or the North and these need to be spread more widely. The Daventry SRFI, only 18 miles away has been granted a DCO whichwill provide future capacity for 20 years, there are three other SRFI's in the East Midlands at the pre application stage, including the proposed Rail Central SRFI adjoining this site, as well as substantial existing warehousing. This doesn't include further SRFI's in the wider Midlands. This concentration of capacity is contrary to NSPSNN guidance. In addition the NSPSNN guidance states a SRFI should be capable of handling a minimum of 4 trains per day and I understand Network Rail has stated that the West Coast Mainline is nearing capacity so it isn't clear whether this minimum can be achieved. NCC's Rail Strategy says any released capacity should be used for passenger services. I understand the forecast is for over 14,000 extra traffic movements per day, of which most will be HGV's, impacting on the A45 and A508 local roads as well as Jnct 15 of the M1. These local roads are already heavily congested at peak times with long queues in either direction, and compounded when M1 closures cause traffic to divert. With existing and proposed house building and other development locally also having an impact it is clear that insufficient consideration has been given to the cumulative impacts in terms of capacity, congestion and pollution. SRFI's can have positive employment benefits but South Northamptonshire has very low levels of employment so the workforce would need to commute further adding to to vehicle movements, congestion and pollution. The site is in open countryside away from urban centres, in conflict with the need to provide links with existing and new communities, contrary to the aim of providing sustainable transport modes and it's adverse impact on the rural landscape setting. This is a rural area with a scattering of small picturesque villages and the sheer scale and size of the SRFI will overwhelm them. I am not satisfied that any environmental mitigation measures will be sufficient to reduce the impact.		Recognition of the need for, and importance of, SRFIs is noted and welcome. The NPSNN policycontext is presented in detail in the Planning Statement, but the NPSNN does not identify the locations or extent of the expanded network it envisages and encourages - the application shows how the proposals accord fully with the NPSNN, including in terms of the minimum 4 trains per day (with Rail Reports submitted to explain this). The issues raised about potential local highways effects are noted - the potential impacts at local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The landscape and visual and other local effects are all considered and assessed in the final ES which forms part of the application, and refer to the measures taken to minimise the effects.
CR2 62	Jim Morton		London Rd																																		Concerned about the proposed traffic signals at the Collingtree junction - suggested that a deceleration lane should be provided into properties on London Road, close to the golf course.		The Highways mitigation proposals have considered a range of issues regarding capacity, but also safety, in conjunction with the Transport Working Group. The works to the A45 are necessary to balance these issues, and to ensure efficient operation of the road network. Signals at the Watering Lane junction will aid access to the A45, and will assist local traffic.
CR2 63	Cecilie Holmgaard Petersen	S42																																			We have received a letter regarding Northampton Gateway SRFI. However, it is not clear to us why we have received the letter as we do not have any activities in the area the Northampton Gateway SRFI concerns. We would thus kindly ask you to provide us with a short clarification on why we have been chosen as reciever of this letter?		This consultee was contacted via S42, and a response provided to explain the purpose of the consultation.
CR2 64	Jacqui Landschaft - Singe																																				Concerned about increase in lorries and trucks using corner on Church Lane to turn around as a result of widening of A508 (large vehicles currently prohibited). Request for clarification on impact on existing street lights, bus stop and footpath. Concern in respect of recent accidents on both sides of the village – sensible to have less, slower traffic and to straighten and widen the road on either end outside the village. This is a Conservation area – traffic has a detrimental effect on the village (Grafton Regis), and Tudor Cottage rattles when lorries past as it is a building of some age and interest. A meeting with other residents (presentation) for more informationwould be useful. Other comments from residents in Grafton Regis: Crossing the road safely to get on /off buses is impossible due to volume and speed of traffic; access to footpaths adjacent to A508 impossible		*Response apparently sent in response to a Site Notice nearby. A brief response was sent at the time via WSP (who lead regarding site notices).* Comments and issues regarding local traffic are noted. The existing concerns regarding crossing points are addressed by the works proposed as part of the Highways Mitigation Strategy. A group of residents from Grafton Regis attended the Roade event in October 2017, and discussed these same local issues with the transport consultant.
OVERALL TOTALS					**30**	**5**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**		**1**	**4**	**34**	**25**	**24**	**24**	**4**	**4**	**34**	**12**	**12**	**6**	**0**	**10**	**4**	**1**	**10**	**2**	**6**	**5**			