Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker

Document No.	Name	Also consulted under S44 (S42)?	Street	Town/Village	Overall Clear/Explicit Objection	Overall Clear Support	Comments previously - Document Number	General Traffic Concerns: Access and impact	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 for public & drivers	Buildings too close to Village	Disagree with location	Concern over Capacity/ Rail	Explicit support for elements of the Highways Mitigation Strategy	Support for Roade Bypass green route	Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Lack of final Info/misleading	House price will Depreciate	Consultation query or concern	Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment
CR3 01	Ann Thomas		Hyde Road	Roade	1			1	1	1	1												I think this development is totally unnecessary - we already have rail freight terminals in the County. I have the following questions:-**1)** For locals in East Hunsbury and Stoke Bruerne regarding additional HGVs using local roads, how does the 7.5 environmental weight restriction help? It may provide relief for these areas but the HGVs have to go somewhere and I am concerned where. I can only imagine chaos as other routes will be use **2)** Knock Lane/Blisworth Road (Roade)?. As you state this road is relatively narrow and we are concerned abo additional traffic. In your answer you merely address widening the road not our concern about additional traffi live in Hyde Road which runs into Knock Lane and I DO NOT want HGVs continually passing my house, is this one of the routes for the re-routed traffic from Hunsbury and Stoke Bruerne? If so this is unacceptable**3)** On top of all this madness, what on earth are you proposing an aggregates terminal for, more HGVs. I bought a house in Roade for peace and quiet and your proposal goes directly against this. I am not normally a NIMBY a am happy to go along with progress but this seems to me absolutely unnecessary. I am just one voice but I ho you do not get permission and make our lives hell.		In brief, the answers to these issues are**1)** The Highways Mitigation Strategy as a whole, including the HGV weight restructions, will make the main routes - including the A508 - more attractive as a result of more reliable journeys and reduced congestion at key junctions. Through traffic in the villages will reduce as a result of these measures, with traffic increasing on the more appropriate roa - this Strategy has been devised with input from the Transport Working Group**2)** The Knock Lane improvements would address existing safety concerns regarding the width of the road. As per 1) above, HGVs are not expected to use Knock Lane.**3)** The Aggregates Terminal will help remove HGVs from the national road network, and from central Northampton. The HGVs to serve that facilit are included within the Transport Assessment. Noise and other potential effects of the Aggregates terminal have been assessed in the ES, and are shown to be negligible.
CR3 02	Ref No. not used																								
CR3 03	Graham Cox		Rowtree Road		1			1	1	1	1					1							Your proposals for 7.5T weight restrictions for HGVs from adjoining link roads onto Rowtree Road is a must as minimum , but to police and enforce this restriction and at same time address speeding problems (Rowtree Ro is a 30 mph residential road) , would width restrictions not be an effective way to resolve both these issues? T new Collingtree Bovis development of 1000 new homes adjacent to Rowtree Road is due to commence early 2018 and will result in an estimated additional 1500 to 2000 vehicles accessing Rowtree Road. Will the allocat HGV parking area for 120 lorry capacity be free of charge to users - if not the likelihood is HGVs will look for fr alternatives in local lay bys etc.		The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety. Where road widening or other works are required these have been discussed and agreed with the Highways Authority and others via the Transport Working Group. Traffic from the Collingtree development, and from all other developments planned or committed through the Councils' Joint Core Strategy, have been taken into account in assessing the additional potential impacts of the proposed Northampton Gateway. The HGV parking would be available to users of the site and terminalm, and managed as part of the terminal - its use will be encouraged.
CR3 04	Wes Boswell			Grange Park		1						1											I am supportive of the scheme proposed as a Grange Park resident. I believe it will bring employment and improved infrastructure to the area. I will welcome the improvements to be made at junction 15 of the M1 as th is often very busy and can mean long delays to leave Grange Park during commuter times. I have just one observation. I believe that a weight controlled access should now be opened into Lark Lane, Grange Park from the Quinton Road to allow commuters to leave the estate more quickly. Although I live on The Ridings so wou be inaffected by the change, I do own rental property on Little Field. I tell you this so you can appreciate I am n approaching this for self-gain but for the overall good of Grange Park residents with the introduction of Northampton Gateway.		Support is noted and welcomed. The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety. Where new restrictions or other works are required these have been discussed and agreed with the Highways Authority and others via the Transport Working Group. The imrovements to Junction 15 will benefit Grange Park residents as well as other road-users, with improved reliability and predictabilty.
CR3 05	Janice Newbould		A45																				I live in one of the lodge houses on the a45, and when I came to the consultation, it said that the road widenin would come past our house. Can you let me know what is happening because I am really worried about the r borders as it seems it is right near to our house. Is there anyone that can help. I need more details as it is ve confusing.		Individual emailed responses were sent to Mrs Newbould in December 2017 with a plan/map showing the emerging detail of the proposed highways works locations. The response of December confirmed that the A4 road widening would not come past Mrs Newbouldts house, but the redline showed an area likely to be used f utility and drainage works or alterations to the footway and highway signs and street lighting. The informatio provided was acknowledged and welcomed by Mrs Newbould.
CR3 06	Ash Butler		Rowtree Road					1									1						With regard to Rowtree Road and increase in HGV usage: 3 months ago signs were erected from both directions stating "no access to HGVs unless delivering", but enforcement is needed (police or Council) against hauliers and drivers who ignore it. Only by prosecuting a few offenders will this be stopped. I used to manage my own Transport Company in the town and the 'grapevine system' between drivers is swift and the message would soon get around if some heavy fines were issued. The police often enforce against speeding on Rowtree Road and should also photograph a few HGVS. The hotspot time is between 6 and 8am.		Description of existing issues is helpful, and support the actions proposed by the applicant . The ne HGV restrictions would have a positive effect on those villages, but enforcement is an important part the process, and as is referred, is for others rather than for the Applicant
CR3 06A	Ash Butler		Rowtree Road																				In December you sent out a leaflet on the back of which you made comment about what you would do to manage and restrict hgv vehicles over 7.5ton using Rowtree road . You then went on to say you would welcome any comments.I replied straight away saying that notices had been put up stating "no access unless delivering".I went on to comment tha unless there was occasional monitoring this was a waste of time. I suggested what might help. I received a reply stating that a more comprehensive reply would be sent after Xmas.needless to say nothing happened. There is flagrant road offense happening with HGV vehicles on this road from 6am all day.,it will only be stopped when there have been a number of prosecutions for this and the word gets around the lorry drivers grapevine or better still prosecution of the transport companies involved.SEE CR3 06		A response was sent to Mr Butler in March 2018 in response to this email - this reassured Mr Butler that his comments were being considered as part of the consultation process. These comments were useful in reinforcing the relevance of HGV weight restrictions to existing, as well as potential future, issues. It also explained that the applicant is not able (or responsible) for enforcement now, and will continue to enage with the relevant parties in devising and implementing the strategy, if approved. Also see response to CR3 06.
CR3 07	Dominic Kramer (Morton Wykes Kramer Ltd)				1			1															Your proposals present us with a nightmare scenario. Junction 15 is no longer a 'Gateway' to Northampton bu traffic sewer clogged with HGVs.We have taken the decision to relocate our business next year away from the hell of trying to work from premises next to junction 15 and the distribution centres for Chinese and other imported goods that surround it.		Description of existing transpirt problems and issues is noted. The substantial upgrade to J15 will address existing issues, and create additonal capacity, resulting in improved performance at Junction 15 and associated parts of the local network following implementation of the package of Highways Mitigation Works.
CR3 08	Kevin Hicks		Towcester Road	Blisworth				1															Please can someone tell me how the staff and visitors to this proposed site that need to connect to the A43 wi be stopped from using Blisworth as a rat run. Any traffic coming from the south on the A43 will not go to junct 15A, then down to junction 15 to the site. Likewise traffic leaving the site will just head along the A508 and turn right onto Courtinghall Road and through Blisworth like the thousands of vehicles do already which is a hugely detrimental to Blisworth so adding to it is unacceptable. When I went to a consultation there was a vague plan the young mad did not seem too convinced) to stop traffic turning right into Courtinghall Road from the A508 can you confirm this? Closing the dangerous crossing from the A43 into Towcester Road (where I live) would also stop the rat running, so a combination of stopping traffic going to the site from the A43 through Blisworth and then leaving the site towards the A43 again through Blisworth will get my vote! I also live in a 60mph zone outside the village boundary so getting that reduced will also help with the 04.30 "race track" that the people h endure.		Comments about the emerging Highways Mitigation Strategy are noted. The confirmed proposals to prevent traffic turning right into Collingtree Road to Blisworth will directly address the issue - the prevention of HGVs turning right (south) out of the SRFI site is also relevant. The modelling and assessment shows that with improved Junctions 15, 15A, and A508 routes traffic will stay on the strategic routes and out of the villages. An HGV weight restriction in Blisworth is proposed which should also address the issues raised.
CR3 09	Christopher Wright (Secretary Collingtree PCC)																						You will recall that in early 2014, Collingtree PCC granted Roxhill Developments a 10-year option on 6 acres o land that the PCC owns, fronting onto the A508. In view of this land interest, it is considered inappropriate for Collingtree PCC to comment directly on the Northampton Gateway proposal.		Noted.
CR3 10	Stuart Manson								1														With regard to the proposed provision for an aggregate terminal within the intermodal terminal area, no indicat is given for the justification for this. If such a terminal is to be included in the proposals, I would expect to see a detailed and robust case for need, together with full details of what aggregates are to be handled; source(s) an destination(s); quantities; working hours; machinery to be used; noise, dust and light levels and mitigation measures; etc etc		The relevant parts of the ES consider any specific issues associated with the Aggregates Terminal, including regarding potential dust. This included data gathered from the existing operation in central Northampton (where the operations have not caused notable dust issues), and the aggregates terminal has been assessed as part of the SRFI as a whole (e.g. lighting, transport, etc. Specific mitigation/design measures including water supression and wheel washing facilities will be effective in minimising dust. Noise issues are also assessed based on an understanding of the likely plant used (the aggregate terminal would not include conveyors which are a common source of noise associated with this use).
CR3 10A	Stuart Manson						**CR3 10**																Comment re-submitted see above (29/12/2017)		See CR10 above
CR3 11	Roddy & Jane Grant			Stoke Bruerne	1			1					1				1						Whilst we remain opposed to the development as a whole, we were pleased to see the improvements to the junction of the A508 and Rookery Lane, Stoke Bruerne. This improvement will undoubtedly help villagers to tu onto the A508 when it is busy. Can we also suggest that similar improvements are made at the junction of The Greenway and the A508 (this is the other road that links Stoke Bruerne to this road)? Turning right onto the A508 when it is busy is already a long drawn out, not to mention dangerous, procedure. This is especially true early on weekday mornings. The potential increase in traffic, due to the development, would obviously make th worse. Hence, we see the need to also improve this junction.		Support for the Rookery Lane improvements are noted and welcomed. The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety. The strategy been discussed and agreed with the Highways Authority and others via the Transport Working Group.
CR3 11 A	Roddy & Jane Grant						**CR3 11**																Comment re-submitted see above (31/12/2017)		See above
CR3 12	Craig Thompson																						I have a document showing changes under stage 2 consultation. Specifically affecting an area on Wooldale Road, Wootton, Northampton. The document is unclear and shows a drawing asking us to look at a section highlighted in red but that in itself is also unclear. Can you clarify exactly what this change actually is.? It appears to be on an area of parkland off Wooldale Road and the A45.		The Wooldale Road area is at the very north of the DCO limits (application area), and relates to worl to the existing draiange infrastructure.
CR3 13	Alan Brittle		The Leys	Roade				1															**1**. if an aggregates terminal is provided adjacent to the rail freight terminal would some of the aggregate would excavated locally, as was applied for and turned down some years ago? This would surely create more traffic flow on the A508/M1 junction and local roads.**2.** If the junction with the Courteenhall Road to Blisworth and the A508 is made a turn left only junction for all the traffic coming from Blisworth, this will force extra traffic onto th single carriageway A508 to the new proposed Freight Terminal round-a-bout for them to turn around back onto themselves to the Blisworth turn to enable them to carry onto Roade village. Alternatively, traffic wishing to tra towards the A5 will cut through Blisworth village and along a very narrow Knock Lane to pick up the new by-pa or even to Stoke Bruene joining the A508 at the canal bottom lock, already a dangerous junction to turn right a Also, traffic from the M1 will not be able to turn right into Courteenhall Road forcing them to carry onto the new by-pass roundabout and then, back again or join the by-pass and travel down Knock Lane to Blisworth**3.** As far as the improvements to Knock Lane are concerned there is not sufficient Highways land available to significan improve vision as this road as its name suggests is just a lane.		**1**) The proposals are not for extraction of minerals/aggregates, only for the movement and storage of minerals **2**) The Highways Mitigation Strategy as a whole will make the main routes - including the A508 - more attractive as a result of more reliable journeys and reduced congestion at key junctions. Through traffic in the villages will reduce as a result of these measures, with traffic increasing on the more appropriate roads which will operate more efficiently and reliably. Traffic will increase on the A508 (and travelling conditions will improve), with the Roade Bypass removing traffic from the village centre.**3)** The Knock Lane improvements are feasible and deliverable to address the narrow bend, and to address existing safety concerns.
CR3 14	Mrs S P Rooney		Dovecote Road	Roade					1				1	1	1			1					How do you propose to cross over the Knock Lane/Blisworth Road if you build a bypass for the A508 which is what your 'Blue route' shows? At present, walkers, horse riders, cyclists as well as cars all use the Knock Lane/ Blisworth Road all the time. Will this be possible if proposed plans go ahead? why has the proposed Blue route been chosen, too close to our house (Air pollution) - suggestion to build it further away.		The Stage 2 consultation material showed the proposals for a roundabout at the junction of the proposed Bypass and Blisworth Road (this was proposed for both potential Bypass alignments/routes). An underpass also forms part of the proposals to enable the existing bridleway link to be retained for equestrians, cyclists an walkers. These details are shown on the proposal drawings (ARoW plans and Highways Plans).
CR3 15	Mrs S P Rooney		Dovecote Road	Roade			**CR3 14**																Comment resubmitted - See above CR3 14 above: letter requesting response to the CR3 14 comments		*A response was sent to Mrs Rooney in the post, including copies of the relevant plans re: Bypass proposals and crossing points.*
CR3 16	John Exley			Blisworth			**CR2 32**																comment resubmitted - Please see CR2 32		*See response to Stage 2 - ref CR2 32.*
CR3 17	Tony Marsh					1	**CR2 19**																Follow on from CR2 19		*See response to Stage 2 - ref CR2 19*

CR3 18	Lyn Bird		Fox Covert Drive	Roade	1		**CR2 40/ CR3 19**			1	1										1			As a local resident who uses the A508 and A45 to commute I have suffered the extended journeys to and from Northampton as a result of fairly low-key road works on the A508 which have required traffic lights to control vehicle flow. This resulted in slow commutes of long duration and increased levels of air pollution. Alternative routes were identified through the back roads - cyclists can not be passed safely, resulting in increased vehicu pollution. If one set of traffic lights causes this level of misery imagine what a grand scheme to 'enhance junctio 15 of the M1' and 'a Roade Bypass' will do even before the huge site becomes operational. As Collingtree Parish Council wrote in 2016 in response to the ES scoping report,,*'rather than become a 'Gateway' the junction will become a barrier into Northampton'*. During the recent roadworks I observed an ambulance negotiating its way through the traffic on the A508 to attend an emergency with vehicles trying to move aside t allow them to pass. This will become more difficult with more local vehicle movements as a result of the potent development. The needs of local residents must be considered more thoroughly. Potential small gains in the transfer of some freight from road to rail may render misery to the people who have to suffer living in its shado from both a health and well-being, transport and economic perspective. For us, this is our Home.		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 Mitigati 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 with less 'rat-running' traffic, and more traffic on more appropriate routes. The effects o or frequency of, closure of the M1 are not under the control of the Applicant, although the local highways network would be more resilient and better able to cope as a result of the highways works proposed than it is now.
CR3 19	Lyn Bird		Fox Covert Drive	Roade	1		**CR2 40/ CR3 18**																	Comments resubmitted see CR3 18		See response to CR3 18 above, (and Stage 2 CR2 40)
CR3 20	J Ward				1		**CR2 41**																	Comments resubmitted from Stage 2 - see CR2 41		*See response to CR2 41*
CR3 21	Jana O'Brien						**CR2 41**	1	1	1						1						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.Noise: current 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. Air Quality: additional traffic will have adverse effect on the local residents (especially children) health. Landscape and visual effects: When we moved here, we we predominantly surrounded by farmland and woodland, recently warehouses built close to our area - increasing traffic and noise, spoiling the landscape of the area. Now, further warehouses and freight trains (I hope not) a to be constructed which are considerably larger in size than any existing warehouses in the area. The propose site will in no way benefit local residents, who pay their council tax to live here and as such should have a say to what is to be built in close proximity to their properties (The prices of their properties might be adversely affected.)		The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety, and has been assessed and agreed with the Highways Authority and others via the Transport Working Group. The Junction 15 improvements will result in additional capacity, resulting in improved reliability, and less congestion for existing and new road-users. The likely noise and air quality implications of the proposals have been assesse and this forms part of the application. It shows a number of beneficial impacts on air quality (Chapter 9 of the ES), and no significant effects. The landscape and visual changes are also assessed (Chapter 4 of the ES), and while the landscaping (planted earthworks) proposed will be visible from many viewpoints, the proposed buildings and terminal will be effectively screened.
CR3 22	Ref No. not used																							*Not used*		
CR3 23	Mr David Shaw(behalf of Brian Shaw)		Knock Lane	Blisworth	1			1					1								1		1	In December a laminated notice was erected near to my father's house showing a plan (34b?) indicating land outlined in red that may be subject to highway improvements at the junction of Stoke Road and Knock Lane Blisworth. The notice refers to the December consultation Newsletter but having looked at the newsletter it on details changes to a bend on Knock Lane/Blisworth Road. Due to the scale of the plan it is also impossible to establish whether any of the land outlined in red is owned by my father or it simply adjoins his land ownership? The area outlined in red includes land immediately in front of my father's house, including the end of his driveway but it is impossible to ascertain what exactly is being proposed. However, if the highway mitigation works were to include this land I wish to make the following specific comments: **1.** My father's driveway is steep and the loss of the end of the driveway would make it extremely dangerous when accessing/leaving his prope in his car. The visibility in both directions would be extremely poor, greatly increasing the risk of a collision. **2.** Vehicles entering Knock Lane from Stoke Road already do so at speed regardless of the 30-mph speed limit a the junction. Any improvements to the junction are likely to (unintentionally) exacerbate this problem, again making it more dangerous when my father is accessing/leaving his property in his car. **3.** Running under the verge at the Stoke Road end of Knock Lane are both a gas main pipe and a mains water pipe. In addition to t above comments I also raise the following questions; Why was my father not notified in writing of these proposals which will have a significant impact on his property? Why are improvements to this junction needed all, when I understand all vehicular movements from the proposed rail freight terminal south of M1 junction 15 will be along the A508 and around a new bypass to the west of Roade? If the road does need to be widened at the junction, why could this not take place wholly on the south side of Knock Lane where the verge is considerably wider (at least double the width of the north side)? I would be grateful if your surveyors/representatives could visit my father's property to see for themselves the impact the mitigation work would have. I would also be grateful if you could show either my father or myself detailed plans of the propose works.		An individual emailed response was sent to Mr Shaw in January 2018 with a plan/map showing the emerging detail of the proposed highways works. The response confirmed that no changes would be made to Mr Shaw Snr's driveway. The response also offered more information if required, or a meeting in person if helpful, and included a link to the project website where the information sought was available. The response confirmed that the address had been sent an earlier consultation newsletter regarding the proposals. The email also briefly explained the justification for the improvements to Knock Lane as part of the wider Mitigation Strategy.
CR3 24	Brian Mayland							1									1							Welcome any widespread 7.5-ton restriction on our local road network. However, other than gain traffic associated with Heygates Mill, Bugbrooke, HGV's are rarely seen in the lanes. Speeding, horses & cyclists ar a bigger problem. Disagree with representatives met at the Collingtree & Blisworth Venues, who claimed that motorists would change habits after the J15 M1/A508 layout is improved, thus alleviating Blisworth village congestion. Traffic Flows were monitored over a wide area, I'm not aware of any driver census. All my town & rural contacts have a strong aversion to the M1 Junction/Queen Eleanor, North/South route & are very unlikely their change their habits. The Roade Bypass is a welcome proposal but it also offers easier route away from Stoke Bruerne. Then Knock Lane/Stoke Road becomes even more accessible to A508/old A43 traffic. This is acknowledged in the plans. The enclosure offers an alternative solution to our traffic problems. (please see ma attached to comments & alternative suggestions)		Support is noted and welcomed for the HGV restrictions as part of the Highways Mitigation Strategy The Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, and the final modelling confirms that as a resu of improved reliability and predictability more through traffic is attracted back to the key routes and away from the villages. The Strategy has considered how to best respond to the likely issues (or existing problems), and has been agreed through technical work with the Transport Working Group.
CR3 25	Jean Willett		Swallow Close					1					1											Having read the December leaflet we do not understand a lot of the technical details but are concerned about more heavy traffic on Rowtree Road. This is a very busy road now, with speeding issues, especially at certain times of the day when the majority are travelling at 50 or 60 mph. We need to cross the Rowtree Road to get bus into town, but it's also crossed by dog walkers and local people taking their children to school or the park Rowtree Rd. We need a Pedestrian Crossing at the Phygtle for a safe crossing, as the road going out to the A43 has a bad bend, which blocks the view of any oncoming traffic either way. Please consider this in your plans. Although there are cameras signs, which have been there for a number of years, there have never bee any cameras in use.		The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety. Where road widening or other works are required these have been discussed and agreed with the Highway Authority and others via the Transport Working Group. The strategy identifies those junctions considered to be most relevant to the Proposed Development, as discussed and agreed with the Working Group, and it is not appropriate, not necessary and not feasible for the Applicant to deliver improvements to all existing sub-optimal junctions in the vicinity of the proposals - instead, those of most direct relevance to the proosals form the focus of the improvements.
CR3 26	Christopher Mair		Milton Court	Milton Malsor	1		**60**				1													The "Further Consultation" newsletter issued in December 2017 refers to consultation focused "on a very limit number of small-scale changes to the emerging proposals". I note you are now including the provision for an aggregates terminal in your proposals, which is not a small-scale change. There is no detail on your project website relating to the increase in the volume of cars and HGVs, or of the environmental impacts, which an aggregates terminal will generate. This is very unsatisfactory. Besides, the proposed aggregates terminal (as the proposed SRFI) is contrary to the West Northants Joint Core Strategy (WNJCS) formally adopted in December 2014. The WNJCS is sovereign, and the foundation for all planning policy in our area until 2029. There is no policy or evidence in the WNJCS to suggest the need for an SRFI on land in open countryside off junction 15. The WNJCS inspector´s report issued in October 2014 concludes there is no need for any strategic employment sites in open countryside, as there is enough land allocated in the WNJCS for this purpose (at junctions 16 & 18 on the M1). The terminal you are proposing is in the wrong place as there is already an SFRI at Daventry International Rail Freight terminal (DIRFT) off junction 18 on the M1 (approximat 18 miles from junction 15). Permission has been granted for logistics space and for a new rail terminal there a DIRFT is set to expand until 2031. For these compelling reasons, there is no need for an aggregates terminal SRFI at junction 15 on the M1. Besides which, the WNJCS requires that any further SRFI development shoul take place at the DIRFT site off junction 18 on the M1 motorway, and nowhere else.		Significant volumes of aggregates and other materials are moved by rail, and the applicant was kee to ensure that the potential for the proposed Northampton Gateway to include provision for this type activity as part of the terminal was explicitly understood. It was previously implicit in the consultation material, and making this more explicit is not considered significant. The main text of the Consultati Report also refers to this. The Planning Statement provides an assessment of the policy context - national and local for the proposals, including the WNJCS content regarding additional SRFIs. National policy is clear that there is a need for an expanded network of SRFIs. The Market Analysis Report provides information about the national and local market context for the proposals including with regard to DIRFT and other existing SRFIs - the proposed SRFI would serve a different core market to DIRFT, and would be complementary as part of the network.
CR3 27	Michael Hornsby		Lock 16	Stoke Bruerne				1																We have had sight of your "Further Consultation" leaflet dated December 2017.Our property is at Lock 16, Stoke Bruerne, and accessed from the A508. We note improvements are proposed for the A508 junction with the Stoke Bruerne and Ashton Roads, and houses between Roade and Stoke Bruerne onto the A508 receive improved accesses, with improvements also proposed elsewhere, including n Grafton Regis. No alterations ar proposed for the A508 Stoke Bruerne South junction ("Green Lane"), the junction diagonally opposite this leading to Bottom Lock or for our access on the top of the bridge. Traffic speeds and densities will be identica these junctions as those closer to the proposed development and it is essential consideration be given to thes junctions. At present these accesses all have quite difficult access and egress compounded by the nature of t canal bridge and resulting in very restricted sight lines, braking areas and refuges. We would ask that equal importance be given to these junctions to ensure safe access onto the A508.		The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety. Where road widening or other works are required these have been discussed and agreed with the Highway Authority and others via the Transport Working Group. The strategy identifies those junctions considered to be most relevant to the Proposed Development, as discussed and agreed with the Working Group, and it is not appropriate, not necessary and not feasible for the Applicant to deliver improvements to all existing sub-optimal junctions in the vicinity of the proposals.
CR3 28	Christine Barrand		Chimney End	Stoke Bruerne	1				1						1			1						I do not believe your proposals are adequate. I find it hard to see how you will prevent HGVs from using local roads as South Northants police are too stretched to police the current 7.5+ ton usage. Only introducing lane narrowing on all local exits off the A508 will ensure HGVs do not use the Stoke Bruerne village road as a shor cut to the A5 and A508. You need to include road narrowing schemes in your submission. The proposed Roade bypass is too close to Stoke Bruerne and will adversely affect houses close to the proposed site. The pass should be located in a cutting to reduce intrusive traffic noise which will increase significantly. The overa proposal for what is essentially a warehousing scheme is not wanted by the local communities affected and is contrary to the local plan. Your proposal seeks to circumvent local democracy and my comments above in no way endorse your proposal.		The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues or effects of the proposals, and has been discussed and agreed with the Highways Authority and others via the Transport Working Group, informed by the Transport Assessment process. The likely effects of the strategy have been modelled and assessed. The strategy will make the strategic routes, including the A508, more attractive as a result of improved reliability and reduced congestion. New weight restrictions will help further reduce traffic in the villages. The applicant is not able to engage in (and is not responsible for) enforcement of weight restrictions now, but will continue to enage with the relevant parties in devising and implementing the strategy, if approved. Parts of the Bypass are in cutting, particularly the southern part of the proposed road, and the nois effects have been assessed - these are very positive in central Roade, and after mitigation measures (earthworks and fencing) shown to be below significant levels for the closest properties.
CR3 29	Paul Harper		Stoke Park	Stoke Bruerne				1					1											Thank you sending me the December 2017 update. I apologise for not responding by the requested date of 2 February. I would like to suggest that the speed limit is reduced to 30MPH on Shutlanger Road at the above mentioned junction. I would also suggest that "Warning. Concealed Entrance" signs are positioned on the approach to the junction from both the Shutlanger and Stoke Bruerne approaches. The reason for these suggestions is that when exiting from Stoke Park onto Shutlanger Road, visibility is limited to just a few yards i both directions and it is impossible to exit safely without nudging out into the carriageway to get a clear view. With the current speed limit of 60MPH, there are regular near misses and incidents of road rage. With increas commercial traffic the likelihood of accidents, potentially fatal, will be increased unless traffic can be slowed do and signage is in place.		The Highways Mitigation Strategy responds to a range of potential issues, including safety. Where improvements works are required these have been discussed and agreed with the Highways Authority and others via the Transport Working Group. It is not appropriate, not necessary and not feasible for the Applicant to deliver improvements to all existing sub-optimal junctions in the vicinity of the proposals instead, those of most direct relevance to the proosals form the focus of the improvements.
CR3 30	Tony Sampson (Clipper Logistics)		Saxon Avenue					1																I am the Facilitates Manager for the Clipper site adjacent to the roundabout on Junction 15 M1. I have an interest in understanding the details of the proposed development, especially the roadworks and traffic control around the junction as this may impact access or journey times to our 24/7 depot.There has been engineers adjacent site (A45) presumably completing surveys, preparatory works this morning. I have looked at the website and it provides in great detail the proposals, but do you have an outline/proposed programme. This wi assist us in site planning and informing staff.		*Details of the junction improvements proposed at Junction 15 were provided to Mr Sampson, with input from the Clerk at Grange Park Parish Council.*
OVERALL TOTALS					**10**	**2**		**14**	**6**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**5**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**1**				