Stage 2 Public Consultation - Roade exhibition comments

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	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?	Support principle of Bypass	Increase amount / height of screening	Q6:Access/traffic concerns	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/quality of life	Scheme NOT necessary / Not needed (DIRFT) DO NOT support	Scheme IS required / Support the proposal	Safety / security for drivers	Build too close to Village	Disagree with location	Passenger Terminal required			
R01	Mr Ron Johnson	The Ridings			1	1		1		1					1		Looks good							1					Q3:Weight restriction throught village 10 mph speed limit. GENERAL: one of the few in favour, I suspect!		Support noted and welcome.
R02	Mrs Cheryl Whitburn	Stoke Road																		1					1				Q6: A508/ Rookery Lane/ Ashton Road Junction proposal; To provide a ghost Island Junction here would prevent traffic from Ashton and Rookery Lane being able to cross the junction safely. The current single lane enables cars to block the road for each other to cross safely. In rush hour this is an extremely busy junction and cars are not able to get out unless someone else is turning. if the Ghost Island option is introduced - there will be no slowing down of traffic and drivers will not be able to help eact other get across the junction or get out; and drivers will be at greater risk of making snap decisions coming higher inactions of collisions. Please use this junction from all directions in the morning and evening rush hour to see the issues for yourself.	Yes - Rookery/ Ashton junction design	Comments about the Rookery Lane/Ashton Road junction noted - changes were subsequently made to the proposed design and scale of this junction improvement (Stage 3 saw consultation on a revised layout).
R03	Mr Ian Blackwell	Grafton Road			1	1		1		1						this will help the wildlife & keep the countryside looking green.	I think you will need to put a station in later years?							1			1	I'm all for them. I can see in the future this will be how to transport goods around the country instread of road. It will e cheaper too and - moving big loads by road.		Support noted and welcome.
R04	Mr Keith R Whitburn	Stoke Road		1			1		1		1		1	1	1	Not secure enough. No collaboration when spoke with Roxhill, Highways or Rail chaps here today	Needs to have another consultation would not support at all from what heard today			1			1?				1		Q1: thought about the impact on A508, A5 & A45 being used as a Rat run if M1 J15 closed. Q2:move whole design to J15a and close this Junction to enable the build. Q3: no-one today was honest with impact of traffic from J15 down A508 or A5. Q3: No-one today was honest with impact of traffic from J15 down A508 or A5. Q6: access & egress from Stoke Road & Rookery Lane needs to be round-about or traffic lights. GENERAL COMMENTS:1).Junc at Stoke Road/Rookery Lane needs redesigned 2) need assurance of 15 wheelers not being allowered A5 or A508 in either direction.Q3) site not secure enough from terrorist attacks. 4) need assurance no radioactive or toxic materials stored on site.	Yes - Rookery/ Ashton junction design	Comments about the Rookery Lane/Ashton Road junction noted - changes were subsequently made to the proposed design and scale of this junction improvement (Stage 3 saw consultation on a revised layout).
R05	Mrs Antoinette Edwards	Bailey Brooks Lane		1					1		1											1	1						I think you are going to destroy the vilage. All the bypass is, is a sweetener to get what you want. The path you wish destroys Farms & countryside		The proposed bypass is part of a wider Highways Mitigation Strategy to help mitigate the likely effects of the Proposed Development. The likely impact of the Bypass in terms of agricultural land, ecology and other impacts has been assessed. The non-technical summary may be of interest in gaining an overview of the findings
R06	Mr & Mrs Sonsome	Dovecote Road		1			1		1		1			1	1	Don't Do it	Build it somewhere else. Build up Daventry				1	1	1			1			Q1: Why have Slip Roads with traffic light as this will cause standing traffic not free flowing traffic. Q3: you should link the A43 M1 J15/15a building link roads to take away from Roade. Q6: House Prices.... GENERAL: why build the Road so close to Dovecote Road. The price of our houses is going to go down, the sound od A Bird Whistling in the Garden will be Replaced by the sound of truck, the traffic will increase by Dovecote Road. the House Brick Way will be affected		Comments noted, but the Transport Assessment shows a range of benefits and improvements based on the package of measures proposed across the wider local network, with local improvements along parts of the A508 corridor to aid improved efficiency and reliability, and improve the operation of several local junctions. Noise and other likely effects from the Bypass are assessed, and mitigated to minimise effects - residual noise effects will not be significant for the nearest properties.
R07	Mrs Martin	Bretts Lane		1			1		1	1			1	1	1	Unless considerably more very high screening is put in, it will be visable which ruins the countryside we see now.			1			1	1				1		Q1: there will be considerably more traffic. Q2: More traffic goes from 508 to Northampton than jgong the M1 & the road over the M1 won't be widened.Q3: the ONLY benefit will be to take throught traffic out of Roade Village. GENERAL: Totally against. Roade is not part of Northampton, we a Blisworth area villages in a rural setting and are popolar because of this. This is inappropriate development and should be build near other commercial developments.		Comments noted, including benefits of the Bypass. Wider concerns do not reflect the findings of the Transport Assessment which 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. The non-technical summary may be of interest to view a more concise summary of the overall likely effects.
R08	Mr (Cllr) Ray Smith	Deanshanger road				1		1		1				1						1									Q2: Yes in the J15 area, but it will add to the already chaotic congestion - at both rush hour times - which exists at the A5 roundabout / Old Stratford. GENERAL: Fine & dandy for the improved flow through/round Roade and better flow of traffic around J15. This said it will exacerbate the existing congestion on the A508, particularly at the A5 (Old Stratford roundabout). This Gateway Plan needs to be 'joined -up' with the Highways England propsal to 'improve' the A5 roundabout flow.		Comments noted, but do not reflect the findings of the Transport Assessment which 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.
R09	Mrs C Clake	Bretts Lane		1					1		1			1	1	Years of building,10 years for maturity of planting, years of an unsightely landscape.	Not buildingit at all.	1					1						Q1: Already exists in Crick & Daventry. Not near container terminals. Not required for Local Employment.Q3: But as a Roade resident this will ease current Village traffic.		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 to help deliver a shift from road to rail freight. Support for the Bypass is noted.
R10	Mr Nick Blake	Bretts Lane		1		1			1		1			1	1		An alternative Sites			1							1		Q1: Concerns regarding national needs vs local impact. Q2: access & egress from Grange Park will restrict traffic flow. Traffic lights on 'Slip roads' will restrict traffic flow. Concerns remain over the abilities of the J15 to cope with increased traffics. Q3: Traffic through Roade can be very congested without the additional restrictions proposed.		Traffic concerns noted - the TA provides a full assessment and shows that J15 would be more reliable and effective for all movements, with less congestion and more capacity. Local versus national issues are noted. Local benefits to traffic in Roade would be realised.
R11	?	?		1					1		1					Not enough. No noise reduction	Scrap it		1		1		1						Scrap it. It a load of rubbish.		Noted. The non-technical summary may be of interest in gaining an overview of the findings of the Environmental Statement as a whole.
R12	Mrs Jemma Bracher	Priory Crescent					1	1	1		1			1	1					1			1		1	1	1		Q1: Another SRFI is not required in this location due to the existance of DIRFT 20 miles away which is still expanding. Q2: YES - if done without introducting the SRFI & its traffic. NO- when you add the impact of traffic increases to J15 the imporovements won't regale this, the impact will still make the Junction worse than it is now. Q3: not when you add that level of additional vehicles each day.Q6: there has been no provision made for people accessing Woodley's Farm & Nursery. That Junction is currently very unsafe (there have been a number of accidents already). It is only down to the hold ups from people using the Courteenhall Road that makes exit from that Junction possible. By making no right turns at the Courteenhall Rd Junction, this situation would be made much worse as the 508 traffic would be fast & constant. GENERAL: If i had to have this SRFI, I would be asking for the bypass to be moved further away from the Village & the link back to the 508 north of the Village be at the Junction with the Courteen Hall Road.		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 to help deliver a shift from road to rail freight. Courteenhall Road junction would be improved. A footway is to be provided along the A508, aiding local access by foot between Roade and the Main Site.
R13	Mr Simon Dar	Northampton Road				1		1								would like more	more screening to Northampton Rd.		1		1					1			Q3: Not sure. GENERAL: Bypass is far to close to Village. Would like it to be further away even if it will cost more. Would you buy my house over market value?? 30% so I could move		The bypass route balances environmental issues as well as amenity issues - mitigation for noise and lighting will result in no significant effects for closest properties. Benefits re: traffic, air quality and noise in the village centre. The non-technical summary may be of interest in gaining an overview of the findings of the Environmental Statement as a whole.
R14	Mrs A Northau	The Leys		1			1		1		1			1	1						1	1			1				Q1: No rationale that local people would find effective. Q2: in the last few weks the motorway has had pronlems due to accidents including complete close for a day, causing complete chaos. I cannot imagine hoe the effects would be from this development. Q3 The road to Blisworth - Knock Lane cannot take extra traffic - dangerous using a small country road. The impact of pollution from a bypass.	Yes - Knock Lane widening added to mitigation	Air Quality impacts, including from the Bypass, are included in the ES. See the Non-Technical Summary for a summary of the ES.
R15	?	?		1			1		1		1			1		The landscape is fine as it is. Leave well alone. DIRFT	Yes Give up. Its an abomination. Pure opportunism for the sake of easy buck at the expenss of local people.						1						Q1: No need for it DIRFT. Q2: No - the traffic problem will not be allivialed at all - DIRFT.Q3: DIRFT Q4: Landscape is fine as it is. Leave well alone. DIRFT GENERAL: DIRFT - The idea is a brazen exploitation of a government notion to reduce trucks on the roads. Its pure opportunism by a company willing to cover the UK in concrete and ugly building for the sake of a quick buck. It's a disgrace.		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 to help deliver a shift from road to rail freight. General comments and objections are noted.
R16	?	?		1			1		1		1			1		why have the colours used at John Lewis in MK not considered they blend in with the skyline.				1									Q1: when Swan Valley & Rugby DIRFT are under utilised. Q2: as a Grange Park resident I envisage that we will still have problems getting onto A508/J15.Q6: impact does not take into account impact on roads around the area, using short cuts and creating 'rat runs' in villages such as Ashton.		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 to help deliver a shift from road to rail freight.
R17	?	?		1			1		1		1			1			Please do not build for health and mentality of all local residants.			1			1						Q6: A508 road need dual carriageway to A5 - then improve A5. The proposals show no consideration for local residents.		Local effects and impacts are fully assessed, and mitigation proosed to minimise the effect on local people and the environment. The NTS provides a summary of the ES.
R18	Mr P.R Hardy	Priory Crescent		1		1		1		1										1	1			1					Q4:I live in Priory Cresent so my concern would be traffic noise and bright lighting at night. Both of these must be minimised. We do need this bypass! Soonest.		Support for the Bypass is noted and welcome.
R19	Miss S R Chaplin	Marlow Richmond																											Everone has been most helpful and informative thanyou for arranging such an interesting exhibition.		Positive comments about the exhibition noted and welcome.
R20	Mr Stuart Shrubb	Crafton Road		1			1		1		1		1			1	The clipper building in grange Park is huge but only a 1/10 of these proposed building there would need to be a lot of building in place.	Remove the 3 that are not attached to the railway, if an SRFI then should only be for them!!!					1	1	1			1		Q1: there has to be a need, the idea is to reduce lorries by using the railway, however with an increase of 4000 lorries daily this defeats the whole idea. Q2: it has not taken into consideration any future developments for Northampton itself. The Junction needs to be improved before any development is done to get a true accurate record of it if it can take a development of this size. Q3: Roade Bypass is a waste of money & no benefite to the village, it is too small to make an impact. The A508 through the village would lose if 'A' road status, thus no longer maintained, gritted, bus ran ect. when the M1 closes it will be two roads clogged up. PISS POOR PLANNING HERE BY ROXHILL!!!Q6: By making improvements to A508 you will increase its capacity as more drivers can use it. This is before your development. GENERAL: This is completely in the wrong location as it will increase traffic, noise & air pollution when lorries collect/deliver to SRFI. The west coast main line is already at capacity so how can it take more!!! You already have DIRFT & DIRFT 2&3 in the pipeline, they will achieve full capacity around 2040. this is at J18. Your development will be a ghost town or used for general warehousing. ROXHILL WAKE UP & GET YOUR STATS & INFO RIGHT!!!		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 to help deliver a shift from road to rail freight. The Highways Mitigation Works as a whole are shown to improve traffic conditions, and would deliver major benefits to the local area, including local road-users. General comments and objections are noted. See the Non-Technical Summary for a summary of the ES.
R21	Mrs Marie Whitefield	Dovecote Road		1		1		1			1				1	what provisions during the building process regarding noise and air pollution? Also the prevailing wind will increase the pollution onto Roade from the west.	Dropping the whole idea. The increase in HGV traffic from the SRFI site will have a huge negative impact on the character of this area				1	1				1	1		Q3: The roade bypass includes a roundabout on a section 2.5km long - why a roundabout? Knock Lane is, and will remain a small, narrow road. The roundabout will mean increasing noise and pollution levels due to changing of gears and slowing down/speeding up - The roundabout is positioned close to existing dwellings. Could a straight, lowered bypass be considered, with a fly-over to connect Hyde Rd to Knock Lanr for local traffic (as it is used today). Alternatively why propose a bypass so close to the edge of Roade? What happened about the other propsed route?	Yes - Knock Lane widening added to mitigation	Comments noted, but do not reflect the findings of the Transport Assessment which 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. Knock Lane features as part of the proposals - this formed part of the further, focused consultation (Stage 3). The Bypass route was consulted upon during Stage 1 - the preferred route balances environmental as well as technical issues.
R22	Mr Peter Whitefield	Dovecote Road		1		1		1			1					1	I think you could scrap the bypass on enforce all entry & exit via M1 - A45 -A43.			1	1	1	1	1?			1	1		Q3: I do not see the need for a roundabout half way along the bypass, this will increase pollution&noise level due to HGV gear changing on approach & depature. Also it will increase pollution levels at this part. Q4: I would prefer the landscaping to be more extensive & feel it will not delete the noise levels or pollution levels. Q6:I think a bridge linking Knock Lane & Blisworth Road would be more suitable. GENERAL: Not happy, I feel it will have a harsh impact on the level of people in Hyde Road, Dovecote Road & Blisworth Road side of the village, I really dont think the bypass should be that close to the houses.		

R23	Mr Morris Pullering	High street					1								1					1							1		Q3: A bridge over the proposal bypass rather than a roundabout will prove more efficient for local people i.e from Hyde Lane onto Knock Lane Junction of A508 and Blisworth Road should have a roundabout forcing traffic to turn left from Blisworth Road onto A508. Will increase congestion up to M1.		Comments noted, but concerns expressed do not reflect the findings of the Transport Assessment which 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. Junction designs have been discussed with the Transport Working Group, informed by the traffic modelling, as well as consideration of local accessibility and other wider likely effects.	
R24	Mr Peter John Edwards	Lawfords - Bretts Lane					1		1	1				1	1												1		Q1: This proposal cannot be justified it is in the wrong place not near any major comercial centre. Q2: The increased leve of traffic due to this proposal will cause significant road problems due to the increased traffic on our road. Q3: It will take the pressure off the villages(i'e London Road and Stratford Road). GENERAL: The basic fault with this proposal is that it is not near any major commercial centre the location in my opion is not justified.		Issues regarding needand location are covered in the Market Analysis Report, and the Planning Statement. Transport comments noted, but do not reflect the findings of the Transport Assessment which 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.	
R25	Mrs Kerry Dar	Northampton Road				1		1			1				1	There is no proposed landscaping or screening at the roundabout at the north boundary of Roade. Deeply concerned about the increase in noise & light pollution at this junction.	There were no visuals to indicate screening between site and A508, there needs to be screening along this road also		1		1	1	1			1			Q1: only if forecast freight growth as claimed becomes fact as DIRFT is currently under capacity and is not far from this proposed development. Presently, I do not believe this is a need for the SRFI. Q3: Traffic will still use the old A508 through the village and the by-pass will attract more vehicles around the village boundaries. Noise and light pollution will become an issue for residents on the outskirts. Q6: The bypass is extremely close to the village. it seems that outlying villages and commuters will benefit at the cost of Roade residents. GENERAL: As a resident of Roade, I have seen a great deal of development in the area, most of which have been welcomed. The development of such a vast SRFI will have an enormous impact on our community, most notably noise and light pollution. We are already aware of traffic noise on the M1 and A508 - the increase in traffic on the proposed by-pass and the junctions/roundabouts on the village boundaries will bring an increase to these levels for the residents on the outskirts of the 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 to help deliver a shift from road to rail freight. The Highways Mitigation Works as a whole are shown to improve traffic conditions, and would deliver major benefits to the local area, including local road-users. The Bypass, coupled with an HGV restruction, will deter through-traffic, including HGVs. Noise and Lighting (and other) potential effects are assessed in the ES - see the Non-Technical Summary for a summary of the ES.	
R26	Mr P Solmebury	Roade							1		1				1	No noise considerations.	Too Large				1								The Highways works will only move faults and hold ups further down local roads.		The Highways Mitigation Strategy will result in a range of transport benefits for village centres and other road-users. See the TA for full details.	
R27	Mr Mark Webb	St Marys Way			1	1		1		1							very good idea								1				*No comments given*		Noted.	
R28	Mr C D Hillyard	The Leys			1	1		1		1															1				Q4: All seems adequate. GENERAL: I support the proposals.		Support noted and welcome.	
R29	Miss Stewart	Stephenson Court					1				1					Are you proposing to plant dense, fast growing trees & bushes (I hope you are)				1	1	1	1			1			Q1: Not both Roxhill & Milton Malsor. Q3: Roade bypass is far too close to the village. This will impact residents with noise & fumes. This will also impact on house prices.		Note comments regarding the Bypass - a mix of views were given to the Applicant about the route. The proposed route balances environmental and technical issues, and noise mitigation measures are proppossed to prevent significant effects.	
R30	Mark Smith														1					1									I am a resident of Roade, and I am currently looking at the proposed plans and have a couple of questions. 1. The Junction for Blisworth Roade, is being turned into a no right turn junction. While this appears to be a good idea, what will stop motorists heading south along the A508 from junction 15 from attempting to turn right onto Blisworth road? I'm concerned that cars may attempt to turn right and cause an accident. I would have thought the bypass would have terminated at this junction with a roundabout there. 2. What incentive will drivers have to use the Roade bypass instead of driving through Roade itself? It would be useful if at least entry into and out of the village along the old A508 was narrowed to a single lane or speed bumps added at the start and end of the village.		The design of the junction improvements will prevent right-turns at the Courteenhall Junction as amended by the proposals. The Roade Bypass will be a more direct and quicker/easier route, and the modelling suggests it will be attractive to drivers - a weight restriction will require HGVs to use that route.	
OVERALL TOTALS				**15**	**4**	**11**	**12**	**11**	**15**	**8**	**17**	**0**	**3**	**12**	**15**	**1**	**0**			**12**	**11**	**9**	**11**	**5**	**3**	**7**	**0**	**1**				