Stage 2 - Milton Malsor 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:Concerned increase in traffic & impact	Q2: Concerned increase in traffic & impact	Q3:Traffic / impact & suggestions	Q4: Do you have any comments about proposed landscaping & screening proposed to minimise impact	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?	Increase amount / height of screening or trees	Access/traffic concerns & suggestions	Support Bypass as proposed	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/quality of life	Scheme NOT necessary / Not needed	Scheme IS required / Support the proposal	Safety / security for public & HGV drivers/ parking	Build too close to Village	Disagree with location			
MM01	Mrs T Hughes Haynes	Towcester Road		1		1			1		1			1	1		Yes, Move it somewhere else					1	1				1	Q1: the roads are already over stretched & often grid locked. Q3: Move it to an area which can cope with this expansion, DIRFT. GENERAL: You are ruining our villages.		The Transport Assessment shows a range of benefits and improvements. A package of measures across the wider network is proposed, with local improvements along parts of the A508 corridor to aid improved efficiency and reliability, and improve the operation of several local junctions, with reduced rat-running in general (including the nearest villages). 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.
MM02	Mrs Pamela Hughes	Hodnet Close		1		1			1		1			1	1		Yes, Move it somewhere else					1	1				1	GENERAL: The villages and whole area will be completely ruined.		Concerns noted. The non-technical summary may be of help to understand the findings of the ES as a whole regarding likely local impacts. The various assessments shows that as a result of the design and mitigation measures proposed, there are few direct effects likely on Milton Malsor.
MM03	?	?		1			1		1		1			1		None of it is wanted or needed - we do not want this awful industrial eyesore in our rural communities.	There is nothing positive to say about it – NOT wanted.				1	1	1				Q2: it is not J15 that only causes queues – it is the volume of traffic currently on the Motorway. Any reduction in congestion that comes about by re-designing J15 will be negotiated by the increase in traffic generated by your scheme. Q3: The communities of Roade, Milton, Blisworth and Collingtree do not want this MONSTROCITY on their doorstep – as the it follows that the Roade bypass that goes with it isn't wanted as well. Q6: I bought a house in Milton Malsor because I wanted to live in a small historic rural community, not on the edge of a noisy, polluting industrial site. Therefore, your proposal is not wanted.		The Transport Assessment shows a range of benefits and improvements. A package of measures across the wider network is proposed, with local improvements along parts of the A508 corridor to aid improved efficiency and reliability, and improve the operation of several local junctions, with reduced rat-running in general (including the nearest villages).
MM04	Mrs Mariann Bicket	Tunnel Hill House																									GENERAL: Please send me the plans.		*Mrs Bickett also discussed this request in person at the exhibition, and she was subsequently sent the relevant plans by post.*
MM05	Mr Martin Enwistle	Gaytonway, Gayton Road					1	1		1		Prefer Roxhill Scheme over Rail Centrail				The impact on Collingtree Village is still significant but much better job than Rail Central											Q1: The proposal is not supported by local authorities. The rationale for SRFI is debatable. GENERAL: Dirft is nearby and still many years from being full. This area is attractive to NDC's for the road network, if the rationale for SRFI is to serve local areas this is not how a Northampton Gateway would be used. Prefer Roxhill scheme to the Rail Central proposals.		Objection to the principle is noted. The preference for Roxhill proposals over the Rail Central scheme is noted, and welcome.
MM06	Mr & Mrs Dermet /Tessa Roft	Thirlestone Crescent				1				1		Prefer Roxhill Scheme over Rail Centrail				Like the railway tunnel to screen development from Milton.	Rather this one than the other. 8m development near Milton	1									GENERAL: We would rather have no development to damage the local countryside. However, if we have to agree to one proposal, it would be the Roxhill one as opposed to the larger development near Milton / Blisworth which would be catastrophic for the villages. This is a lower impact of the two.		Objection to the principle is noted. The preference for Roxhill proposals over the Rail Central scheme is noted, and welcome.
MM07	Mrs Henley	Northants Police																							1		Q6: concerned to note no mention of queues and possible potential for HGV queues. The concept does not include an HGV lorry park and it is totally unacceptable to presume that HGV's will park alongside the road. They will be very vulnerable to thefts of loads and thefts of diesel plus attack on drivers. Other such sites - DIRFT near Crick have security rated HGV lorry parks as part of the development and this site should provide the same. Northants Police will formally object if no secure parking provision is included.	YES - specific HGV secure parking added	Comments noted re: HGV related issues - other similar points were made, and in response a specific, secure HGV parking facility has been added to the proposals (this formed part of the further Stage 3 consultation).
MM08	Mrs Kate Entwistle	Gaytonway, Gayton Road		1			1	1			1				1		Similar to either SRFI. Concerned about possible future buildings of cranes.						1				1	Q1: DIRFT is nearby & serves mainly road freight. If SRFI's are so important they should be forced to serve more rail freight. Q3: Roads are currently congested but the improvements will be undermined by the increase in traffic (both freight & employees) and force existing road users to use back roads. GENERAL: I am not convinced of either the need or the choice of location. Any government decision on this proposal needs to take into consideration the other SRFI proposed in the same area.		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.
MM09	Mr Adam Woby	Milton Court		1			1		1		1					Do not believe Noise & light pollution will be mitigated significantly enough					1						Q1: Logistically a site with this much warehousing doesn't make sense in consideration of local industry. Q3: Impact on tributary roads & incident management. (road closure/ repair). Q6: It isn't part of a strategic national network which is joined up.		The Transport Assessment shows a range of benefits and improvements. A package of measures across the wider network is proposed, with local improvements along parts of the A508 corridor to aid improved efficiency and reliability, and improve the operation of several local junctions, with reduced rat-running in general (including the nearest villages).
MM10	*Not Given*	*Not Given*		1					1					1													Q2: Traffic is bad now, it will only push more delays at Brackmills / Queen		The Transport Assessment shows a range of benefits and improvements. A package of measures across the wider network is proposed, with local improvements along parts of the A508 corridor to aid improved efficiency and reliability, and improve the operation of several local junctions, with reduced rat-running in general (including the nearest villages).
MM11	*Not Given*	*Not Given*					1		1		1																*No comments made.*		Noted.
MM12	Mr David Hubble	High Street			1	1		1		1						Looks alright to me. Despite being less than a mile away I don't think it will impact us.	No not really: however, I haven't fully investigated the logistics but as above I don't think it will affect us too much							1			Q1: Great presentation and graphics - explain well especially like the model. Q2: I live in Collingtree a flyover would be nice! To get to the Motorway without the traffic of East Hansbury. Q3:Absolutely. GENERAL: Works for me, represents progress and reasonable development		Positive comments regarding the model noted and welcome. Support for the proposals noted and welcome.
MM13	Mr Louis Hughes Haynes	Towcester Road		1		1			1		1			1			Move it elsewhere, ruining the social aspects of the quiet villages, it will leave it too congested and not as traditional.					1					1	GENERAL: Its wrong, ruins the social aspect of quiet villages which almost everyone moved to these locations for.		Concerns noted. The non-technical summary may be of help to understand the findings of the ES as a whole regarding likely local impacts.
OVERALL TOTALS				**7**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**3**	**7**	**3**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**4**			