Stage 2 - Collingtree Consultation Event - comments forms

Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Overall Clear/Explicit Objection	Overall Clear Support	Yes/No Responses - Questions 1, 2 and 3						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	Q1: Increase in traffic & impact	Q2: Concerned increase in traffic & impact	Q3:Traffic / impact & suggestions	Q4: Do you have any comments about proposed landscaping & screening	Q5: What do you think of the on-site layout and design of the SRFI site? Is there anything further you think we should be considering?	Landscaping - insufficent: more screening	Q6:Access/traffic concerns & suggestions	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/quality of life	Scheme NOT necessary / Not needed / DO NOT support	Scheme IS required / Support the proposal	Safety / security	Building too close to Village	disagree with location/site	Passenger Terminal required			
C01	Mrs Maria Glover	Glebe Farm Cl		1			1		1		1								1	1							1	General: with any proposed change you have to get local people's support so far I have heard no benefits to local people. A local rail passenger station onto the West Coast Main line would benefit local people and offset the inevitable disruption. The visual impact is an important factors but another key factor is the noise & light pollution this hasn't been addressed.		A passenger station is not being considered by the Applicant.
C02	Mr Glover	Glebe Farm Cl		1			1		1	1							It seems the rail element is an afterthought. If you could include a passenger terminal on the WCML then we would benefit.										1	GENERAL: As I feel this land is now likely to be developed at some stage, I feel small units may benfit this town better.		Comment noted - smaller units would not be required on an SRFI which will attract national or regional distribution activity, requiring generally larger units. A passenger station is not being considered by the Applicant.
C03	Mr Darren Davis	The Barn, Maple Farm		1			1		1		1		1	1	1							1						Q1: It is simply not needed. There is plenty of capacity at DIRFT. This will create unnecessary additional congestion at an already crowded junction - that will not be overcome as capacity of junction 15 will not increase sufficiently to cope with the increased demand. Q2: No - the model is inaccurate. showing all cars moving off simultaneously in reality this does not happen and these queues go back much further - this will not change, if anything this will increase. Q3: Roade cannot cope as it is and all the bypass will do is shift this traffic (plus thousands more trucks) to one village cut throughs that also will not cope - the bypass suggestion does nothing to deal with the A5 junction at Old Stratford that currently queues back to Yardley Gobion on a daily basis between 7-9am.		Issues regarding need, including the need for an expanded network of SRFIs, and the relationship with DIRFT and other SRFIs are covered in the Market Analysis Report, and the Planning Statement. The presence of DIRFT at Junction 18 does not reduce the need for these proposals. The Highways Mitigation works will deliver a range of improvements, with additional capacity and improved performance at J15 and associated routes, including the A508 corridor referred to in the comments.
C04	Mr M Grosse	High Street		1			1		1		1					Landscape insufficient for the village	Not to bother with the development	1				1			1			Q1: We have a site at Daventry 20 miles up the road that already deals with rail freight. We do not need another one here. Q2: ... see no improvement for any access to the village. Q6; ...too close to Collingtree & whatever you do it wil have an impact on this village!		Issues regarding need, including the need for an expanded network of SRFIs, and the relationship with DIRFT and other SRFIs are covered in the Market Analysis Report, and the Planning Statement. The presence of DIRFT at Junction 18 does not reduce the need for these proposals. The landscaping proposals will be effective in largely screening buildings from Collingtree, with other local effects also minimised.
C05	Mr Palmer	Grange Park		1			1		1		1					would it happen	Not doing it			1								GENERAL: Not at all happy too much theory?		Noted. The non-technical summary may be of use in presenting the ES in a more concise way.
C06		Spinney Drive			1	1		1		1						It is very necessary! Hope that it all goes to plan.	It seems that all likely problems have been considered & (hopefully) dealt with.						1					GENERAL: appear to be well considered. Good luck		Positive comments of supported noted, and welcome.
C07	Jane Laurence	Orchard Way			1											More trees please		1										Q3: That remains to be seen. GENERAL: I am in favour of a bypass for Roade, BUT this needs to be built at the start of the project NOT towards the end. Inevitably housing will 'infill between the bypass and the existing housing so we would need a larger surgery. Has any money been set aside by Roxhill for this type of improvement, or could it be?	YES - clarity regarding early phasing of Bypass delivery	Support for the Bypass noted and welcome, and comment regarding early phasing of delivery is noted. The Applicant has committed to early delivery, and this requirement is being incorporated into the DCO. Future housing in Roade is not of interest to the Applicant, and will be a matter for others.
C08	Mr William Turley	High Street				1		1		1				1									1		1			Q2: but for traffic coming from Northampton going to Collingtree would under the now plans for J15 involve 6 sets of traffic lights, instead of 3 currently. I can foresee many people getting confused. GENERAL: I understand the need for such a site but, of course, it's a shame the plans are so near Collingtree.		Recognition of the need for SRFIs is noted and welcome.
C09	Mrs Alison Turley	High Street		1		1			1	1				1		Hope the trees are very fast growing with a variety of foliage.	Move it onto a brown field site instead of using our diminishing green field site.			1	1				1			Q1: find a brown field site. Instead of farm land. Q2: not convinced as there will be more freight being delivered by road to a small area, more traffic light & confusing layout will cause even more accidents. Some visitors struggle with the existing layout. GENERAL: am seriously considering moving! we already suffer from high pollution, ugly buildings, traffic problems due to excessive traffic in the area why should we have to put up with even more.		An alternative sites assessment forms part of the Assessment (ES Chapter 2) - the Applicant is aware of no suitable brownfield sites nearby. Local effects would be minimised as a result of the mitigation and design proposals, with negligible effects on air quality, and light pollution for Collingtree.
C10	Mr Stewart McArthur	Lodge Ave					1		1		1		1	1	1	I acknowledge that previous concerns about impact on landscape have been noted.				1	1							Having been a resident of Collingtree for nearly 40 years. I appreciate progress must take place but hopefully not at the expense of what was once a lovely, peaceful village. It is no longer & this is before the Roxhill Plan! The roads are jammed at peak times, noise, air pollution, impact on infrastructure...the village is pretty much hanging to its identity by a thread and along comes this project		Local effects would be minimised as a result of the mitigation and design proposals, with negligible effects on air quality, and light pollution for Collingtree. The non-technical summary may be of use in understanding the ES findings as a whole in concise way.
C11	Mr B Skittrall	Fir Tree Grove																										There is an opportunity for onsite renewable generation of storage which would take pressure off the countryside. CPRE would consider this a benefit of the scheme.		Noted - a Sustainability Strategy forms part of the ES (Appendix to Chapter 2). BREEAM Very Good standard buildings would be delivered.
OVERALL TOTALS				**6**	**2**	**3**	**6**	**2**	**7**	**4**	**5**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**4**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**2**			