Stage 2 - Towcester Consultation Event - comments forms responses

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: 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?	Increase amount / height of screening or trees	Access/traffic concerns & suggestions	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/quality of life f	Scheme NOT necessary / Not needed (DIRFT) DO NOT support	Scheme IS required / Support the proposal	Build too close to Village	Disagree with location			
T01	Mr Robert Cox	April Rise - Station Road		1			1		1		1			1	1	Inadequate									1	Q1: there is already an SRI just up the road at Crick why not develop further there. Q2: too much traffic there already. Additional traffic wouldn't make it any better.Q3: M1 motorway is prone to snarl ups. Folks use A5 making local traffic delays inevitable. Q6: the apparent lack of SRI's in South West and Wales. Clear that a significant number of the 45 million in 4.3hrs live in this region. Why not develop there? GENERAL: Only limited capacity on the WCML. putting more slots for freight will reduce capacity for rail passengers. Need to develop SRI in the South west of England Bristol/Bath area.		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.
T02	Cllr Nicky Laurence	Chapmans Dr			1	1		1							1	seems acceptable			1				1			Q1: support need in the area. Q3: to an extent, however the wider impact at A508/A5 roundabout is a concern as no additional measures proposed. Q6: having seen Highways England proposals for A5 roundabout at old Stratford (A508 junction) additional traffic on A508 will not aid the poor attempt at improvements - requirements for filter - Lanes onto A5 overlooked, will result in further congestion. GENERAL: Also for what period will businesses be mandated to use rail freight. Experience @Birch Cooppice is that rail proved unreliable so businesses return to road transport instead.		Support noted and welcome - comments about local traffic issues noted. The Transport Assessment (TA) 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). The TA considered a wider area, and the focus of improvements and mitigation agreed in dialogue with the Transport Working Group.
T03	Mrs Suzanne Cox	April Rise - Station Road		1			1		1		1			1	1	We live with the M1 & Mainline Railway. I am not convinced that this is needed at all. It is bound to					1	1			1	Q1: I am not convinced that this is needed at this site and that it will not be used just as a storage depot for lorries to deposit & collect. Q2: What happens when the M1 is closed for 14+ hours? I do not agree that there will be limited impact on surrounding villages. What about the junction of A43/A5? GENERAL: Not needed because of the proximity of DIRFT. Is this at capacity?	YES - clarity regarding phasing of rail infrastructure	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 Applicant is committed to delivery of the rail infrastructure prior to any occupation of buildings, maximising the potentual for early use of rail freight.
T04	Miss Christine Barland	Chimney End		1			1		1		1			1	1	It does not provide sufficient mitigation	Reduce its size and impact on the environment. The railway should be a buffer to building on open countryside and the proposed development has severe adverse environmental impacts on villages.				1	1				Q1: there is a rethink over rail freight - even though there are numerous RFI there has been no appreciable increase in freight usage on the railways. Q2: it will add to existing traffic and will simply add pressure on local village roads. Q3: Traffic will simply fill the new roads - there is already a Roade bypass. GENERAL: Strongly against. The proposal would be refused if it was to local planning. This is a way to circumvent local planning process		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 meet longer term forecasts (and opportunities) for rail freight. 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. The local authorities have been involved in dialogue throughout, and will remain actively involved in the remaining process.
OVERALL TOTALS				**3**	**1**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**2**			