

Northampton Gateway SRFI - Stage 3 responses to the Further Consultation from bodies (S42 bodies)

Doc Number	Name	Company/ Organisation	Date Received	Explicit Objection	Commented previously - Document Number	Comments Summary	Consultant Team Response
OB3 01	Robert Davies	Highways England	18/10/2017			With reference to your letter dated 4th October 2017 I have checked our records in order to establish whether or not the proposed development has an impact upon the estate we manage on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. As the proposals do not appear to affect this estate I confirm that we have no comments to make at this juncture.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 02	Neville Doe	Historic England	19/01/2018		OB1 03 / OB2 34	Historic England note the revisions as shown on the updated masterplan drawing, which shows HGV parking and an aggregate terminal, and we have no further comments to add to the previous advice that we provided in our letter to you of 27th November 2017.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 03	JJ Van Graan	Level 3 (Centurylink)	22/12/2017			Level 3 have no objections to the below listed changes to the proposals for the Northampton Gateway SRFI:- - minor changes to some of the highway mitigation works, some of which have implications for the extent of land affected; - explicit provision for an aggregates terminal within the intermodal terminal area; and -provision of a secure and dedicated HGV parking area for vehicle and drivers serving the site – not for HGVs in the wider area.	Confirmation of 'no objections' noted.
OB3 04	Jasbir Kaur	Warwickshire County Council	22/12/2017		OBI 09 & OB2 36	I note that the changes to the local highway are minor. Warwickshire County Council has no observations to make on these changes.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 05	Alan Slee	ESP	29/12/2017			ESP Gas Group Ltd has no gas or electricity apparatus in the vicinity of this site address and will not be affected by your proposed works. ESP are continually laying new gas and electricity networks and this notification is valid for 90 days from the date of this letter. If your proposed works start after this period of time, please re-submit your enquiry.	Noted.
OB3 06	Claire Duddy	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)	03/01/2018			This application relates to a site outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas. I can therefore confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal. I trust this adequately explains our position on this matter.	Confirmation of 'no objections' noted.
OB3 07	Stacey Wylie	Northamptonshire Country Council	04/01/2018		OB1 05 / OB2 18	Northamptonshire County Council Key Services - other NCC service areas will be responding separately. This response follows the principal guidance in our adopted Planning Obligations Framework and Guidance Document 2015, which follows the tests of paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and is therefore relevant to this proposed planning application. <b>Fire &amp; Rescue:</b> An assessment of the site will need to be undertaken by the Water Officer in order to establish the appropriate level of Hydrant provision that will be required. The preference is that fire hydrants should be designed into the development and enforced through a planning condition. Also see Fire and Rescue Design Considerations (information supplied) regarding site access for fire and rescue emergency service vehicles. The impact of this development will be considered as part of our Integrated Risk Management Planning process, and the NFRS will be keen to engage and work with the applicant and proposed developers during the design and build stage, to discuss any possible questions or issues pro-actively and so assist with this development. <b>Broadband:</b> new developments (both housing and commercial) should be directly served by high quality fibre networks and measures must be introduced at the earliest opportunity to provide the required specification to enable fibre connectivity. It is advised that ducting works are carried out in co-operation with the installations of standard utility works. Any works carried out should be compliant with the Manual of Contract Documents for Highway Works- specifically Volume 1 Specification Series 500 Drainage and Ducts, and Volume 3 Highway Construction Details Section 1 – I Series Underground Cable Ducts.	Detailed comments noted, all of which relate to detailed design considerations which will be fully taken on-board post any granting of DCO.
OB3 08	Reference not used					Reference not used	
OB3 09	Rachel Wileman	Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)	23/11/2017		OB1 10	BCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Northampton Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Stage 2 Consultation. BCC has no further comments to the comments submitted during the stage 1 consultation, see appendix 1.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 10	Daniel Parry-Jones	Royal Mail	22/11/2017		OB1 11 & OB2 17 & OB3 10A	Royal Mail have reviewed the minor changes to the scheme and confirm that they do not significantly affect the content of Royal Mail's earlier representations.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 10A	Daniel Parry-Jones	Royal Mail			OB1 11 & OB2 17 & OB3 24	On behalf of Royal Mail we have reviewed the minor changes to the scheme and confirm that they do not significantly affect the content of Royal Mail's Stage 2 representation (as attached for ease), the contents of which it is requested Roxhill still has regard to in progressing the scheme. SEE DETAILED COMMENTS at OB2 17	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 11	Deb Roberts	The Coal Authority	03/11/2017			The Coal Authority can confirm that the proposed development site is located outside of the defined coalfield. Accordingly, I can confirm that the Coal Authority has no comments or observations to make on this proposal. As this proposal lies outside the defined coalfield area, in accordance with Regulation 3 and Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribe Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, it will not be necessary for any further consultation to be undertaken with the Coal Authority on this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. This letter can be used by the applicant as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.	Confirmation of 'no comments' noted.
OB3 12	Julie Thomas	Borough Council of Wellingborough	08/01/2018		OB2 42	I refer to the information submitted regarding the above and can confirm that this is noted and that the local planning authority has no objections to make to the above application. Please revert to comments from previous responses provided by this authority.	Confirmation of 'no objections' and 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 13	Sharon Henley	Northants Police	10/01/2018		OB2 29	Northants Police are pleased to note the inclusion of a secure HGV parking area for vehicles and drivers serving the site. As per previous consultation comments this site should be designed in order to be PARK MARK accredited and as per the SETPOS guidance document previously forwarded to the applicant	Support for the addition of the proposed HGV parking is noted and welcomed.
OB3 14	Paul Instone	Aylesbury Vale District Council	10/01/2018		OB3 15	I refer to the application for the above proposal that is to be determined by your Authority which was registered with us on 22nd December 2017. The information you have provided will be considered and we will respond with any observations we may have.	Noted.
OB3 15	Paul Instone	Aylesbury Vale District Council	31/01/2018		OB3 14	I refer to your consultation letter dated 18th December 2017 setting out the changes proposed since the Northampton Gateway Stage 2 Consultation. The proposed amendments to the scheme have been considered and we have no objection and no comments to make on the proposed changes.	Confirmation of 'no objections' and 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 16	Dave Adams	HSE (NSIP)	17/01 2018		OB2 13	As no changes are proposed in the vicinity of the Pipeline, our previous advice dated 16 November 2017 remains current and is repeated. Please see comments OB2 13.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 17	Stuart Aldridge	Public Health England	18/01/2018		OB1 07 & OB2 16	The minor changes to the proposals do not change Public Health England's original response of 20 November 2017.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.

OB3 18	Ann Addison	Milton Malsor Parish Council	25/01 2018		OB3 02	In response to the amended plans issued by Roxhill Developments: The Council is concerned that the limited information supplied to local residents regarding the proposed amendments did not allow for adequate consultation. In particular, no information was given about the operation of the proposed aggregates terminal, for example, the number of extra trains that would use the site and its impact on light, noise and air pollution. A major concern of local residents is the volume of road traffic and again no details have been given as to the number of HGV and employee trips that would result from the inclusion of the aggregates terminal. Without such information it is not been possible for local residents to consult on the proposed changes. The overall conclusion of the Council is that the proposed re-siting of an aggregates terminal onto this site completely fails to help in achieving a primary objective of the NPSNN in that it does not transfer any goods from road to rail, it simply concentrates even more road traffic into what will become an even more congested area. It is felt that this is yet another example of a flawed consultation process in that it fails to provide adequate information to local communities.	Comments and points noted. The EIA considers any likely effects from the aggregates terminal as part of the overall rail terminal, and proposes required mitigation - the scope of the ES already includes air, noise, lighting, and transport, and the aggregates storage activity is included within this. Trains serving the aggregates terminal are within the total assumed for the terminal as a whole, not additional - the terminal will make a direct contribution to taking freight from road to rail, and will help deliver improvements as a result of relocation from central Northampton. The non-technical summary may be of value in gaining an overview of the ES as a whole.
OB3 19	Alison Collins	Natural England	25/01/2018		OB2 14	Natural England has previously commented on Stage 2 in our letter dated 17 November 2017 (our ref: 228153). The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this consultation as the proposed amendments are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal. Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. Before sending us the amended consultation, please assess whether the changes proposed will materially affect any of the advice we have previously offered. If they are unlikely to do so, please do not re-consult us.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 20	Ian Dickinson	Canal & River Trust	25/01/2018		OB2 22	We have reviewed the proposed changes and can advise that we have no further comments to make. The previous comments made in our response of 22nd November 2017 still stand.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' noted.
OB3 21	Shirley Wong	Collingtree Parish Council	29/01/2018	1	OB1 13 & OB2 20	The significant addition is the inclusion of an aggregates handling depot which further increases our concerns over air and noise pollution arising from the proposed development. These concerns were set out in our letter of 22nd November responding to your Stage 2 Consultation and programme of exhibitions and documentation. Collingtree Parish Council registered its objections to the original Scoping Document in October 2016 listing its concerns over the eleven Environmental Impacts highlighted by the Planning Inspectorate but particularly focussing on the issues surrounding air, noise and light pollution and traffic congestion on local roads. There has been no evidence provided by Roxhill that shows that these adverse impacts can either be avoided or mitigated. We would be grateful if you would ensure that these comments are fully noted.	Comments noted, as is the cross-reference back to comments made at Stage 2. Any specific potential environmental effects, including those listed, from the aggregates terminal are being covered by the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment.
OB3 22	Denis Winterbottom	South Northamptonshire Council	02/02/2018			I refer to the Further Consultation December 2017: <b>Proposed aggregates bulk materials transfer terminal within the RFI.</b> The Updated Illustrative Masterplan identifies an area adjacent to the proposed Rapid Rail facility and would appear to be served by a single 266m long rail siding, unfortunately the text referring to the areal extent of the aggregates terminal is obscured by overlaid annotation on the published document. No detail is provided on the operation of the aggregates terminal, eg scale, tonnage of materials, frequency or timing of trains, means of handling or storage of materials; it will not be possible to assess the impact of this additional facility until details are available. The introduction of an aggregates and the handling of bulk materials has the potential to have an impact on noise and for air quality and relevant impacts should be fully assessed within the ES and TA. <b>Secure HGV parking area.</b> This is referred to as a dedicated facility for HGV's serving the site only (not other HGV's) however the mechanism that will ensure this limited use is not explained. The Updated Illustrative Plan road layout appears not to include any control over vehicle access to the internal road layout within the SRFI site. A secure parking facility without an effective restriction in place is likely to give rise to additional HGV trips to the site. <b>Highways mitigation works.</b> The proposed changes are noted. In its response to the statutory consultation the Council commented on the need to do more to improve the opportunities to access to the site by means other than by car; Collingtree Rd to the north was identified as a potential opportunity to improve cycle and walking connections to Milton Malsor and villages to the west, this should be explored. The diversion of the public footpath around the north of the site also offers the potential opportunity to link the footpath to Collingtree Rd to improve pedestrian connections to the site from Milton Malsor.	Detailed comments and points noted. The EIA considers and proposes any required mitigation for likely effects from the aggregates terminal - the scope of the ES includes air, noise, lighting, and transport, and includes any effects from the aggregates terminal as part of the overall SRFI. The secure HGV parking area will be fenced (detail and spec to be agreed in due course with SNC subject to DCO requirements) - as a secure area it will be possible to control access to the facility, and prevent access by general HGV traffic. Walking and cycling access forms part of the Travel Plan, landscaping plans within the site, and illustrative masterplan.
OB3 23	David Diggle (Turley)	Reps Ashfield Land Management	02/02/2018		OB3 23	I can confirm that, in our view, these changes do not give rise to further material impacts, either in their own right or in relation to our scheme. We of course reserve the right to comment further on your proposals once a full environmental assessment has been completed.	Confirmation of 'no further comments' at this stage noted.
OB3 24	Stewart Patience	Anglian Water	02/02/2018		OB1 08 / OB2 06 / OB2 32 / OB3 24A	<b>Illustrative masterplan (December 2017)</b> It is noted that the masterplan has been amended to include reference to an aggregates terminal and secure HGV parking. We have no comments to make relating to the amendments made to the original masterplan dated October 2017. <b>Knock Lane and Blisworth Road: Bend Widening</b> There appear to be no assets in Anglian Water's ownership in the vicinity of the above proposals. Therefore we have no comments relating to the additional works on the bend at Knock Lane and Blisworth Road. <b>A508 Rookery Lane/Ashton Road: Revised Proposal</b> It is noted that it is proposed to amend the highway proposals in the vicinity of Rookery Lane/Ashton Road as part of the above project. There is an existing water main in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of these proposals.	Noted in terms of detailed design issues in due course - to form part of ongoing discussions with Anglian Water as required.
OB3 24A	Stewart Patience	Anglian Water	19/02/2018		OB1 08 / OB2 06 / OB2 32 / OB3 24	We understand the intention is to submit the above application to the Planning Inspectorate during the second quarter of 2018. Could I ask what is the current timetable for submission of the DCO and construction of the above scheme (if known)? The reason that I ask is that colleagues have asked that I clarify the timescale for this development.	A response was sent direct to Mr Patience by email providing an update regarding the anticipated application timetable.
OB3 25	C Austin	Bedford Borough Council	01/01/2018			Bedford Borough raises no objections to the proposal. In terms of additional road freight movements generated by the site, any steps which can be taken to secure routeing between the site and Bedford to use the M1 /A421 rather than the A428 should be promoted. Ideally an appropriately designed routeing strategy should be produced which will ensure that use of the strategic network is biased and that local engagement, if required,	Confirmation of 'no objections' noted.
OB3 27	Ian Long	Fisher German	09/04/2018		OB2 40 / OB2 40A/B/C/D & OB2 01	Please can you let me know if you have had any interactions with Cadent Gas regarding protecting/ diverting any of there equipment as it will take circa 2 years for us to plan these works. If we do not agree works we will have to object to the consent	Comments noted - ongoing separate discussions were also being held regarding protective provisions.
OB3 28							
<b>Overall Total Objections</b>				<b>1</b>			