

Stage 1 Consultation - Public Consultation (S47) responses



Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	Reason for Objection or Comments																Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment					
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Road Bypass	Q3. Support for Road Bypass green route	Q3. Support for Road Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Road Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev't on this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'store will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/ quality of life				Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events				
1	Mr Andrew Mileship	Foxfield Way	Grange Park				1												1				1) Traffic modelling not convincing. I believe that Junction 15 will become a nightmare. 2) What will the impact of 6000 employees be on the local communities? Will there be enough car parking and other amenities for those people to that the local community is not	Support the concept of SRFI, but not this particular site necessarily as concern the J15 will not cope with the increased traffic. It could work taking traffic off the roads for the country at large and providing employment for people of Northamptonshire. But it will not work making life intolerable for Grange Park residents. I also think that there has been no thought of the social impact of placing a large working population so close to a residential population. I can expand on this if you contact me.	Support for the concept is noted and welcome. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects versus the national benefit of less HGV traffic/mileage overall are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Social and economic issues are assessed in the ES (and Market Analysis Report), with beneficial effects identified. Detailed queries regarding parking would be addressed at the detailed stage, if approved.				
2	Mr Alan Lewis			1			1																						
3	Mr Stewart McArthur	Lodge Avenue	Collingtree	1																1			1	How on earth are you going to combat the bottleneck which is J15? For sure, based on your plan £8million is not going to do it.	Models were useful. We have lived in Collingtree for 3 years and this will be the last straw. What was once a lovely village to live in has been steadily developed both within and outside our boundaries to the extent that the village has been inherently damaged. You will call this progress, however, the damage to village life and quality therein can never be recaptured. Good luck with your plans but we will be long gone as our village has been negatively changed forever.	The value of the models to the consultation process is noted, and welcomed. The overall concerns about the principle of development are noted - however, the ES suggests that local effects, including on Collingtree will not be significant with regard to visual and other effects.			
4	Mr Barry Steer	Mary's Court	Gayton				1	1	1														1	You must consider a resolution to the Courteenhall Road/A508 junction - important for residents of Blisworth and Gayton to get to J15 of M1	Concerned about the impact on the environment generally from traffic and noise pollution. Particularly concerned about the Courteenhall Road junction.	YES re: highways mitigation/w/ rks	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local transport and traffic effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. The Courteenhall Road junction would be improved, and made safer as a result.		
5	Mrs W Steer	Mary's Court	Gayton																						Only if necessary as we are led to believe that DIRFT at Daventry is not yet working at capacity. Landscaping good idea in theory but hard to believe that the screening would reach the height shown on maps and the model in 10 years. Junction A508 Courteenhall Road already a busy junction with considerable difficulties turning right from J15 toward Blisworth. With heavier traffic this needs considerable improvement.	Concerned about the impact on the environment generally from traffic and noise pollution. Particularly concerned about the Courteenhall Road junction.	YES re: highways mitigation/w/ rks	The national policy is clear about the need for more SRFIs to help deliver a shift of freight from road to rail. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads, and includes improvements at the A508/Courteenhall Rd junction.	
6	Mr and Mrs Ford	St Mary's Way	Road																						Start of the Road Bypass needs to be north of Courteenhall Road. A508/Courteenhall Road junction needs to be addressed; it is a bottleneck now and any traffic increase will lead to accidents and gridlock.	Concerned about the impact on the environment generally from traffic and noise pollution. Particularly concerned about the Courteenhall Road junction.	YES re: highways mitigation/w/ rks	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. It includes works at the A508/Courteenhall Rd junction as suggested.	
7	Mr Gareth Sanders	Swale Close	Road				1																	1	What is happening to the turning on the A508 that goes to Blisworth as people sit and wait for cars to turn right which backs up the traffic to Junction 15. Also the turning to Quinton	Not sure why it is needed so close to DIRFT. Models were useful. The bypass should be the green route and humps should be put through Roade village to discourage through traffic into the village.	YES re: highways mitigation/w/ rks	The national policy is clear about the need for more SRFIs to help deliver a shift of freight from road to rail. The Planning Statement, and the Market Analysis Report provide a context for these proposals including with consideration of DIRFT which will not meet likely levels of demand alone, even with Phase 3 in place. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. It includes works at the A508/Courteenhall Rd junction as suggested.	
8	P Brittle	The Leys	Road	1																					Scrap all the plans, road and rail and leave it as it is.	Inconvenient viewing times. Ploy to rail-road these developments through. There seem to be no checks on how many people attend and if you arrive during the last half hour or so of your opening times there is a possibility of no comments forms. Put the address and email on the comments form. Another model of creeping urbanisation. Blot on landscape.	The comments about the consultation process are noted. While names and addresses were not taken, a manual count of attendees was undertaken at the exhibitions and provided an accurate understanding of the levels of attendance. There were ample comments forms at all events, including at the end of each exhibition. The project website address was on the comments form, and comments could be provided via the website - the email address widely available, as was the PO box address.		
9	Mr Brittle	The Leys	Road	1																				1	It seems to me that the Freight Interchange is a convenient way to override planning so that you can build 20ft high warehouses Roade side of the M1.	The Road Bypass would relieve some HGVs through Roade village but would cause congestion either side of Roade as it is not connected to the new proposed roundabout that will feed the interchange. It's just an excuse to build large warehouses.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. The Applicant is committing to delivery of the rail and road infrastructure, and will not be able to only build warehouses.	
10	Mrs Amanda Jones	Croft Lane	Road		1	1																							
11	Mr Peter Bincow	Woodpecker Way	East Horsbury																					1	Information about which data being used to plan capacity, requirements and environmental issues i.e. Government sources and date to justify and confirm validity.	Better than the Howdens scheme. Roade bypass OK for Roade, but what about Stoke Bruerne and A508 and beyond? Just moving the traffic away from the site and to another location. Model useful to visualise proposals. Rain water harvesting should be used on site and treated before entering existing water drains. Solar panels fitted to roofs to be contributed into site running costs. On site truck parking to reduce impact on local roads and parking in residential areas. Site rail engines to be electrical and not diesel and be fed from solar generated and on site stored energy.	YES re: HGV Parking, and solar	The value of the models to the consultation process is noted, and welcomed. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. The final proposals include an HGV Parking area as suggested - this was added in response to comments made during consultation. A Sustainability Strategy forms part of the proposals, including adoption of solar energy technology.	
12	Mrs Hilary Spurriss	Towcester Road	Blisworth	1																					Much more detail on every aspect. Clarity re: employment travel to and from the site. Road aspects. Rail capacity. Ecology etc	Roade Bypass - access on to the small/narrow road between Blisworth/Road will increase traffic in Blisworth and Stoke Bruerne. Against Structure Plan for Northamptonshire re no development immediately south of M1. Surely this kind of development should be on brownfield land? Is there a need with DIRFT just to the north and several SRFIs on edge of London? Surely SRFIs need to be on parts of East Coast Main Line. Felkstone is biggest container port so the East Coast Main Line is the relevant railway.	YES re: highways mitigation/w/ rks	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local transport effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project the primary source of policy is the National Policy Statement which explicitly identifies a need for more SRFIs, but the importance of local environmental concerns and issues are understood and assessed through an Environmental Impact Assessment.	
13	Mr Michael Thomas	Hyde Road	Road	1			1	1																	1	No - just abandonment of this ill-conceived plan.	Putting in a roundabout on a busy road to 'dump' the freight traffic onto the A508 seems very simplistic. All you are doing is moving the queue further back from the M1 J15. The Road Bypass is too close to Roade so noise will increase as road freight will leave the facility and some will head toward Milton Keynes. It's an all night operation so there will be more traffic noise at night. For these reasons I will be writing to the Council to oppose this development.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Noise impacts from the traffic and operations of the proposed SRFI are assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, with negligible and minor effects for the vast majority of receptors.
14	Mrs Ann Thomas	Hyde Road	Road	1																					1	Not really although I will be taking an active interest in the proposals.	How much noise would residents be subject to? Roade Bypass - too much additional traffic and to much noise whichever route is chosen. Also, why is a single road being planned, surely a dual carriageway would be more suitable? This is a vast proposal. Too many years looking at an eyre before screening is effective. Looking at the plans and reading the proposals I got the feeling that a quart was trying to fit into a pint pot. This is just wrong.		Local environmental concerns and issues are assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment including noise relating to the SRFI, Bypass and other infrastructure proposed. It shows largely negligible effects from the SRFI site. The design of the Bypass does not prejudice or prevent dualling in the future if deemed necessary, but the traffic modelling and transport assessment process does not indicate this is needed. The landscaping and earthworks strategy will substantially screen the SRFI site, including from opening, with the screening improving as it matures.
15	Christopher McCowen	Stoke Road	Blisworth	1																					1	How is this development going to co-exist alongside Rail Central?	Roade already has a bypass and this would be the second one. Keep the road as far as possible nearest the village to prevent further infill of housing. Loss of 400 plus acres of food producing land cannot be replaced by landscaping and SHEDS and then seen to be an advantage. This proposal is against the wishes of the local councils. SNC already has fighting fund against Rail Central in place and surely must spend against this development as well.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Noise impacts from the traffic and operations of the proposed SRFI are assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, with negligible and minor effects for the vast majority of receptors. The potential cumulative effects with Rail Central are assessed as part of the application.



Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	Reason for Objection or Comments																Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment											
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass green route	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Roade Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev't on this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra/structure will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/ quality of life				Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events										
16	Mrs Caroline McCowen	Stoke Road	Blisworth	1		1														1					1		1				To see how you will operate alongside the Rail Central proposals.	The site is already landscaped perfectly. Roade has already been blessed with having been given a bypass. The fact that the village has allowed housing infill and cause traffic restraints to be enforced is the decision they made. People living on the side of the proposed routes will see the same thing happen again. Live with it. Making developments such as this, stating that they are strategic and making them so vast and beyond local government decision is wrong. Local government does not want this development in the area and already are fighting Rail Central proposals. A large freight terminal is already in operation at Davenport with spare capacity for the future. There are already ongoing issues with lorries going through the nearby villages and local people are powerless to stop it. What are you going to do to stop this happening in this area?	The issues raised about potential local traffic effects are noted - a fuller Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads, with HGVs attracted to the A508 and away from many villages. A Market Analysis Report will help provide a context for these proposals including with consideration of DIRFT which will not meet likely levels of demand alone, even with Phase 3 in place. The Applicant has been in regular contact with the local authority which can play an active role in the Examination process.		
17	Mr N R Jones	Blisworth Road	Roade		1	1					1														1						To show Roade Bypass as the inner route only.	The Roade Bypass should be the inner route in order to stop infill on the land at a later date. The scheme is better situated in relation to the M1 than the Rail Central scheme. Improvements to J15 are well needed. I think that it is a very good scheme.	Support for the 'inner' bypass route is noted, as are the other comments of support which are welcome.		
18	Mr David Williams	High Street	Collingtree	1			1																			1					More helpful discussion of why there is a case for this. Can next meeting be out of working hours? How many truck movements per day?	J15 improvements are poorly considered. This proposal shows a staggering lack of joined up thinking with the consideration of the potential overall development with Rail Central. The case for the impact on the local economy is not made clear - how will 7,500 jobs be filled?	A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Cumulative effects with the emerging (separate) Rail Central proposals form part of the final application.		
19	Mr Martin Grosse	High Street	Collingtree	1			1																			1	1				There needs to be a greater awareness of what is happening and how this is going to affect the village of Collingtree.	Too close to existing development. There seems to be landscaping and screening on the edges of the site where there is no close housing. I totally oppose this proposal. It is going to remove good agricultural land from production. There are other areas of the Country where development would be better placed, i.e. DIRFT	YES - changes made to screening to Collingtree	Alternative sites are included within the final application, and the need for this site considered in the context of the wider distribution market. The landscaping and earthworks strategy is both to substantially screen the site from outside view, but also to ensure an earthworks balance on-site. Landscape and visual impacts are addressed as part of the Environmental Statement, as is the loss of agricultural land.	
20	Mr and Mrs Bowers	Meadow Way	Grange Park		1	1																										Models very useful to show low impact of visual and noise pollution. Following Clipper/Amazon constructions the signage has not been improved sufficiently to restrict HGVs entering domestic housing at Grange Park. It would be beneficial to include 'No HGV' type signage at entrance to Grange Park/exit/egress points.	Comments noted re: value of models, and regarding existing HGV routing issues.		
21	Mrs Mary Dean	Collingtree Road	Blisworth	1							1	1															1				I would like a truthful explanation on the choice of this site.	Roade Bypass is not that necessary. The village is not on the 508 I think this is cynical 'carrot' to the villagers. Loss of agricultural fields. Landscaping and screening would be totally inadequate. There is no way that you can hide 5 million sq ft of dreadful warehouses and tarmac and lighting. I am very worried and upset by the proposals. This is precious countryside which needs protecting. DIRFT already expanding into its third extension, please let us use the facilities which we have instead of creating and spoiling the ever shrinking green and pleasant land.	Comments re: the Bypass not being necessary is noted, albeit not supported by the Transport Assessment. Loss of Agricultural land is assessed in the ES. The earthworks and landscaping strategy, and impact assessment included in the ES, shows that the built development can be substantially screened, in part through the changes to development plateau levels and the height of the bunds. The need for the proposals in the context of DIRFT and other SRFIs is considered in the Market Analysis Report. Details of site selection are included in the context of Alternatives in the ES, and in the Planning Statement. Also see detail of the Consultation Report.		
22	Mr Andrew Masey	The Ridings	Grange Park	1																							1	1	1			Stop development now.	You will not be able to screen this development. Junction improvements bad as you are going to add more capacity. Reduce cars on the road including this proposal.	Landscape and visual impacts are addressed as part of the Environmental Statement - the assessment shows that built development will be effectively screened. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads.	
23	Mr Darker and Miss Forsyth	Abbots Way	Roade				1	1																								More about the Roade Bypass and projected traffic levels/flows along the A508 both northbound and southbound and how current Public Rights of Way will be addressed.	Can see the logic of the location with the current access road and rail links but concerned that there could be 100% warehouse occupation and no requirement for anyone to be using rail interchange. J15 improvements are long overdue, but not entirely clear that they cater for the increased traffic from SRFI and the projected increase in traffic there would be anyway. Roade Bypass - needed and either alignment would be beneficial; however, concerned about the staggered or t-junctions as can be bad enough trying to cross A508 now when speed limit is 30 mph. Would prefer roundabouts at either end. Models were useful and it would be good to see something similar for the proposed bypass.	YES re: highways	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Support for the Bypass are noted - comments regarding the emerging Bypass design are noted - the final design includes roundabouts at both ends, as suggested. Positive comments regarding the models noted.
24				1								1																				Access for building works. What employment will this actually bring - this is not sustainable and the type of employment that will bring anything to the surrounding villages you are destroying. What are Network Rail's views on the proposal?	Roade Bypass will not square issues at the Old Stratford end. This is already beyond capacity and this will further overload this. The model was useful but it will take so long for it to ever look like the landscaping proposals.	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects versus the national benefit of less HGV traffic/mileage overall are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads.	
25	Mr Steve Borondy	Towcester Road	Milton Malsor				1	1																									SRFIs are necessary, but DIRFT offers a better solution with reduced impact on a Brownfield site. Either option for the Bypass should be a reality as Roade needs it. Landscaping appears OK with regard to Blisworth, unsure how this will impact on Grange Park (and other nearby villages) - but the models good at explaining visual impact.	Support for the principle of a Roade Bypass is noted and welcomed, as is recognition of the need for SRFIs. Positive comments regarding the landscaping also noted and welcome. The relationship with DIRFT is considered in the application documents, including the Market Analysis Report. The presence of DIRFT does not alter the market demand and wider policy need for additional SRFI capacity.	
26	Mr Shrubb			1							1	1																				Get your figures rights, you are using outdated stats that you used for the first proposal in 2013.	Poor idea. There is already one at J18 which is going to expand in Phase 2 and 3. J15 improvements - within 10 years we will be back to the same problem we currently have. No development should be allowed until J15 has been improved. The Roade Bypass should not go ahead as it is too small to make any effect. It will cause gridlock in Roade and on the Bypass when the M1 is closed, it is also close to houses on the outskirts. The plan model was effective however, the development is too big for the area. You have put little/no thought into the development. It should be at least half the size. You have not got the transport issue right at all. It is an absolute disgrace that you have tried to bypass the Local Planning Authority. Everything you have presented is the same as your proposals in 2013 - you have not listed to any concerns issues raised then. I am also aware that Network Rail do not have this site as a proposal nor do they have capacity - go check it out!	The relationship with DIRFT is considered in the application documents, including the Market Analysis Report - the need for a network of SRFIs, and market demand in this general area, will not be met by DIRFT alone. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects versus were noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. The 2013 planning application was not for an SRFI, and was for part of the same site - therefore some of the environmental baseline information from that work was relevant, but has been extended and updated as required in this application. The Applicant has been in regular and ongoing contact with the local authority which will be able to play an active role in the Examination process. A Network Rail Strategy from earlier this year (2018) recognises the need for additional terminals, including in the Northampton area.	
27	Mr Peter Bennett	Stratford Road	Roade		1	1			1																							Traffic assessments.	Support if it brings employment and stability to the area, but not at any cost. J15 improvements look good but a dedicated lane for getting onto the M1 North is required i.e. new build so the existing lanes can be used for straight on. Roade Bypass - Blue route with a roundabout at each end of the A508. A roundabout (not junction) would be safer for the Blisworth Road (Knock Lane). Models useful but do not give height perspective.	Support for the economic (employment) benefits noted and welcomed. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. The models along with cross-sections and other plans do give details of the relative heights, as does the final ES - Parameters Plan and landscape and visual assessment in particular.	
28	Mrs E S Yule	Ash Lane	Collingtree	1				1																								Detailed plans for Junction 15 and forecasts of usage.	The Junction 15 improvements would be great if we could have them without greatly increased traffic. Landscaping is essential for such a huge scheme - models very helpful. Horrified at the extent of the development.	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Value of the models in communicating the landscaping proposals noted and welcomed.	
29	Mr Peter Mawby	Church Croft	Roade	1				1																								Which companies are proposing to use the rail freight terminal?	Roade Bypass was proposed many years ago in association with the 'Central Park' development that failed. That proposal was sensible, it went over the road to Blisworth, around Roade, avoiding Woodleys Park, around Roade, resealed the Stoke Bruerne/Ashton cross roads and passed over the Grand Union Canal. The current proposal is not a benefit to Roade or traffic traveling between MK and Northampton. If the Roade Bypass is built the village should be protected from further development by the provision of a Green Buffer similar to Brackmills Park at Hardstone. Use could be for safe cycle paths.	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The Bypass route has been tested and modelled, and is shown to contribute towards the significant benefits likely from the mitigation package as a whole. The Bypass includes landscaping and earthworks, as well as some fencing, to help minimise visual and noise effects, and makes provision for walker and cyclists with connections to the existing Bredfield network. There is green space retained between the bypass and village edge. An aggregates operator has signed-up to take space at the terminal, if approved.	

Stage 1 Consultation - Public Consultation (S47) responses



Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	Reason for Objection or Comments															Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment			
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Road Bypass	Q3. Support for Road Bypass green route	Q3. Support for Road Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Road Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev't on this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'store will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)				Loss of amenity/ quality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events	
44	Mr Dominic O'Flynn	The Ridings	Road	1			1														Road improvements to J15 and access/egress into Grange Park	I believe that the existence of DIRFT and potential expansion makes more logistical sense. The plan for the road improvements at Junction 15 look very weak and not fit for purpose. Traffic at this junction is already over capacity and needs complete rebuilding. In terms of landscaping - I believe that more could be done to turn the site into a useful 'feature' for local residents, such as more water features, a complete circular cycle and walkway, 9 hole golf course.		The Market Analysis Report provides a context for these proposals including with consideration of DIRFT which will not meet likely levels of demand alone, even with Phase 3 in place. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. Comments about the landscaping are noted, and measures will be included to ensure local access and opportunities for walking and cycling links.		
45	Mr Roger Laurence Tyler	Tarrant Way	Moulton	1								1									How long is the proposed construction period estimated to last, bearing in mind the additional traffic, noise, dust etc which will effect normal village life? Will there be any construction on weekend working? What will the extent of and likely effect of the daily working patterns ehnn the interchange is fully operational? Again, how will working effect the local community with lighting, noise and traffic levels?	Not a good idea. This is a most outrageous scheme which is basically intended to industrialise a huge area of currently open countryside, thus ruining the quality of life for the residents of the nearby villages which will bring about much noise pollution, traffic and utterly destroy the local environment for us and future generations. Junction 15 - whatever improvements become necessary the developers should be required to pay every penny to cover all road improvements in the area (not just the junction). I am not a resident of Roade village and they themselves should be consulted regarding what benefits such a bypass would provide. The landscape strategy is a complete farce. No artificial landscaping would be able to compensate for the total destruction of the local environment. Young trees and shrubs would take many years to mature before they would provide an effective screening of the huge warehouses. Local footpaths would be transformed into urban trackways/concrete/lighting etc and could be directed far from their original lines. The ultimate result could be an utter exclusion. Final decision should be made by the Local Planning Authority.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.		
46	Mr Kevin Hicks	Towcester Road	Blisworth	1																					The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities, and reduced rat-running in the future.	
47	Janet Brown																									The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
48	Jenny Hills																									email sent answering this question w/b 23rd Jan 2017, confirming 16 trains are assumed as the maximum to the intermodal terminal.
49	Miss Leah M Barlow	Grafton Road	Road	1			1																			The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
50	Mr and Mrs Andrews	Eastfield	Blisworth	1																						These general comments and concerns are noted, and all of the environmental issues are covered by the ES which forms part of the application. The local effects (air, noise, lighting, etc) are all considered, and the need to minimise and mitigate these effects has been a consideration from the outset of the proposed development. Concerns about traffic are not reflected in the Transport Assessment findings based on the modelling of the proposed highways improvements - local benefits and improvements to traffic and congestion would be delivered.
51	Mrs Marion Barlow	Northampton Road	Road	1																						Comments about the landscaping proposals noted, however the application documents (ES) shows that the proposed earthworks and landscaping (planting) will be effective in screening the buildings and terminal from most sensitive receptors and nearby viewpoints.
52	Mr Patrick Barlow	Northampton Road	Road	1																						The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential effects at key local junctions were an important consideration in the ongoing work. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and consulted on at Stage 2 (and Further Consultation at Stage 3). The effectiveness of the landscaping, and residual visual and lighting (and other environmental) effects forms part of the ES which shows that the proposals will minimise the likely effects, including Lighting effects. The SRFI site and buildings will not be visible from Roade (the site is not visible from Roade now).
53	Mrs N Perry	Stockwell Road	Milton Malsor																							The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.



Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	Reason for Objection or Comments															Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment				
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Road Bypass	Q3. Support for Road Bypass green route	Q3. Support for Road Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Road Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev't on this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'store will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)				Loss of amenity/uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events		
63	Jane Ward			1		1	1															1	1	<p>Whilst strategically Northamptonshire may seem attractive, the effect of this type of development on local communities is devastating, due to the detrimental impact on the local environment and the drastic changes in living conditions for local residents.</p> <p>Primary reason for opposition is the lack of suitable entry/exit nodes to/from the site and the restrictions of the surrounding rural road network which is unsuitable for the traffic generated by this form of development. There are weak and narrow canal bridges.</p> <p>HGVs using the congested M1, A5 and A43 will attempt to short-cut through the villages, including Blisworth, Pottishall, Gayton and Shullanger. A further significant weakness is that there is no contingency for emergency access/egress in the event of a major incident on-site.</p> <p>The increase in traffic in the area will not only have a detrimental impact on the local area but will also be a disadvantage to the site operators for whom an on-time delivery is critical, thus making the site of dubious economic value to all but the developer.</p> <p>Proposals for J15 improvements will always be welcome. However, will the increase in capacity be sufficient?</p> <p>For the Road Bypass a route which provides the minimum impact to the local population and environment would be preferable. The plans for the site however, do not appear to address the problems gaining access to/from the A508 from Courteenhall Road, Blisworth. This is known to be a hazardous junction for access onto the A508 and there is potential for the dual carriageway to exacerbate this.</p> <p>The models provided did aid in understanding the proposals for visual screening and containment and thus were helpful. However, there is no doubt that the character of the landscape will be destroyed not just in the physical sense but also by the impact of light and noise pollution. Noise will not be 'absorbed'. Please acknowledge receipt of my comments.</p>	YES - highways mitigation works at A508/Courteenhall Road	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local environmental effects were noted - the full Highways Mitigation Strategy (which formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities in terms of noise and congestion. This includes improvements at the A508/Courteenhall Road junction. Air Quality is currently good in almost every location, and existing (and the Applicant's) data shows that the main issues in Collingtree are very close to the M1 (not across the whole village). The proposals will have a negligible effect on air quality in the locality, but will create some localised benefits as a result of the Highways improvements. Noise and lighting impacts are also assessed, and shown to be negligible or minor for the majority of local areas.	
64	Paul Minton (Northampton Rail Users Group)			1																				<p>DETAILED RESPONSE SUBMITTED, BELOW IS A SUMMARY OF THE KEY POINTS RAISED:</p> <p>NRUG are very surprised to find no consideration of the existing rail users as receptors.</p> <p>NRUG do not support this proposal in any way. NRUG object on the basis that it will have an adverse impact on the rail services for Northampton, both in the short and long-term. Short term - in terms of capacity for passenger trains. Long term - limiting the potential for new frequent fast services for Northampton, the very basis for NRUG's continued support for HS2.</p> <p>We are not anti-freight and support DIRFT. Your sequential analysis will need to set out why a new railhead at DIRFT is not a better alternative.</p> <p>NRUG believe that it is better to maintain any freight capacity from DIRFT to the south of Northampton for freight services through the Channel Tunnel, than use them to access a facility that replicates DIRFT in a different, nearby, but troublesome location.</p> <p>You need to note that HS2 will not relieve capacity on the part of the WCML running through Northampton. This track takes all the Northampton and Long Buckby passenger traffic as well as freight, and is a key part of the limitations referred to in the freight RUS and NSPNN (quoted in the response - see full response). In forming this objection, we have had regard to policy documents covering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rail freight from the east coast ports into DIRFT is oriented along the Peterborough-Nuneaton route to get to WCML. - Routes and capacity for Shell Haven (now known as Thames Gateway), if developed, will be needed. - Freight would be routed via Peterborough. - There is no Bletchley east west agenda for freight. - Northampton southwards (identified as Daventry to Wembley) has a capacity gap. - Rail should offer a safe and reliable route to work. - Facilitate increases in both business and leisure travel. - Provide for the transport of freight. - Adverse interactions of freight and high speed passenger rail DIRFT to Birmingham. - Adverse interaction of freight with frequent suburban and interurban passenger services DIRFT to Wembley. 		The comments and objections are noted. The application includes a consideration of alternatives, and of the relationship with DIRFT which alone will not be sufficient to meet the expected levels of freight growth over the longer-term. Rail capacity issues are covered by the Rail Reports which form part of the application, and which are based on analysis which confirms there is capacity. Dialogue has been ongoing with Network Rail for some time.	
65	Ray Miller			1																			1	<p>As a stand alone project when viewed in isolation, Northampton Gateway is a disaster for the area and the region. Put in the context of decades of local planning policy failures, Northampton Gateway will prove to be catastrophic for Northamptonshire, its residents and those who work or travel near the area.</p> <p>Northamptonshire has suffered from over 40 years of incompetent councillors and planning officers, who have behaved more like a dissipated junta on the Costa del Sol. The scoundrels at WNCDC, who caused so much damage to the area, now continue their dirty work at the JPU and have orchestrated and presided over the wholesale destruction of the rural environment and the trashing of one of the nicest parts of middle England. The creation and over development of area for business and residential construction, without sufficient infrastructure has put extraordinary strain on local services, worst of all is the pressure of the road system.</p> <p>The proposed location for this hideous terminal at Milton Malsor between Junction 15 and 15a could not be worse for vehicular traffic. Junction 15 is a nightmare day and night. From 3pm most work days, traffic queues on the hard shoulder of the M1 in both directions to leave the motorway. At the same time the A508 from Milton Keynes is backed up to Roade and sometimes Stoke Bruerne to access the motorway. The traffic escaping the hell of Towcester, the country's biggest nightmare, on the A43 reaches a strangulation point at 15a. With traffic from the A45 joining the mix, it is a perfect storm.</p> <p>A 15 minute journey from Roade to Northampton can take an hour at peak times. The roads are completely clogged and terribly dangerous. With more housing and other construction taking place, it is only a matter of time before the entire region grinds to a halt and the first place that this is going to happen is along the M1 between 15 and 15a.</p> <p>South Northamptonshire is the worst area in the region for congestion, the Council is responsible for clogging up every major road in the District. For anyone to have suggested that this terminal should be placed at such a location is pure and simple lunacy. That anyone could be so stupid and reckless is beyond belief.</p>		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.	
66	Mrs Norma Bull	Buttmead	Blisworth	1																			1	1	<p>That you have found somewhere less disruptive to residents and wildlife to build your scheme.</p> <p>Too close to the villages of Milton Malsor, Collingtree and Blisworth. Even if Roade has a bypass, when there are traffic holdups, people will just divert through Blisworth and Stoke Bruerne (as they already do now!), so more traffic will only increase this problem.</p> <p>Especially concerned regarding the potential to use compulsory purchase powers for houses and land in order to build the bypass.</p> <p>Too many lives will be spoilt by the proposals and also the landscape. Also I understand there are no rules being applied to businesses to make them use the terminal for the rail connection.</p>		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.



Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	Reason for Objection or Comments																Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment	
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Road Bypass	Q3. Support for Road Bypass green route	Q3. Support for Road Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Road Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev't on this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'store will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light, noise, air)	Loss of amenity/ quality of life				Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events
67	Henry Newby	Northampton Road	Blisworth																			A detailed Alternative Sites Assessment, including the criteria which you have used to inform this assessment. A detailed overview of the anticipated workforce catchment area for the proposed development, including evidence of an available and local workforce. In light of the fact that it is widely acknowledged that both the West Coast Main Line and Northampton Loop are approaching capacity, I would welcome confirmation that the required train paths will be available to serve your proposed development.	Detailed Response - Below is a summary of the questions asked: I have reviewed the Environmental Statement Scoping Report, October 2016, I was struck by how thin this report was when compared to equivalent documents which I have reviewed in relation to other proposals - for example East Midlands Gateway, which raises a number of questions: - What do you mean when you refer to 'rapid rail freight' facility and can you provide any evidence of the demand for such a facility in this area? - Would the improvements to Junction 15 be identified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project in their own right, if not, why not? - What reassurances can you provide to the residents of local villages that construction traffic will not travel through the surrounding villages? - When you refer to the recent EIA scoping exercise undertaken for an SRFI nearby, can you confirm if you are relating to Rail Central? - Another SRFI is referred to later, can you confirm if this is also Rail Central and who the specific occupier referred to is? - It is intended for waste to be scoped out of the ES, can you explain the rationale for this? - There is no interest in a joint scheme with Rail Central. Can you explain why the Rail Central site is not considered suitable for the purpose? Public Exhibitions: Time, dates and location precluded people from being able to attend. The exhibitions were poorly publicised and this is likely to have negatively impacted on the number of attendees. There were very few Rothill representatives available to answer queries. The exhibition boards contained too much information for members of the public to assimilate and this was compounded by the lack of information to take away.	A response was sent to Mr Newby which confirmed that the comments together with other representations received would be reviewed and help to inform the next phase of consultation as well as the ongoing technical work for the scheme. The response also said: We are in ongoing dialogue with a range of statutory consultees and other bodies to help inform the technical work required for the Environmental Impact Assessment and other documents which will form part of the application for development consent in due course. That ongoing work will help to ensure that we are able to provide further detail about the proposals over the coming months and that further information, once available, should answer the detail of the questions you raise. With regard to the first phase of consultation, we note your comments regarding the exhibitions and value your input which will inform the next phase of consultation. I am sorry to hear that you felt there was too much information available at the exhibition - many people commented that they found the range and quality of information available to be very helpful. However, contrary to your comments, information was available to take away from the events, in the form of the 'Summary of Proposals' document, copies of which were laid out around the room and were taken away by many attendees. This document is also available on the project website along with a range of other preliminary information which can be viewed at any time. We will keep the Parish Councils up to date with progress and the overall programme in due course and will also use the project website to update the wider community.	
68	Mr CJ Dancer			1											1							Contrary to Local Authority Plans and the adopted Joint Core Strategy, conflict with the commercial and housing objectives of the region. The site is not of national strategic importance, but is being promoted because it is controlled by a developer. Because of the distances travelled the transport modal shift will not occur and there is no requirement for SRFI facilities to actually accept any freight by rail. DIRFT is in the near vicinity and has ample capacity. Local trunk road network already too congested. The suggestion that the site is supported by a rail link is unsupported with the rail network operating at capacity and little support from the rail operating authorities. The direct and immediate impact on all of the local villages and their communities will be both huge and permanent - no amount of mitigation will change this. The scheme will cause an increase in air, light and noise pollution. A huge area of agricultural land will be irreversibly destroyed and a number of rare habitats, along with animal and plant species that currently thrive there. Job creation is not required in this area with strong employment statistics. New workers would therefore either be forced to commute or move locally causing further strain on the very limited local housing stock.	The concerns about potential local environmental effects were noted, and addressed through the Environmental Impact Assessment which provides an informed assessment of the likely effects. There would be benefits in some local areas, for example to air quality, and to biodiversity through provision of a more diverse range of habitats on-site, and a net gain in hedgerow, aquatic and other habitat types. The design and mitigation measures seek to minimise or eliminate as many effects as possible, and most areas will see negligible or minor changes only, including regarding lighting and noise. Equally, the proposals will result in the loss of farmland which cannot be mitigated. The range of positive and adverse likely effects are identified across the scope of the ES which forms part of the application.		
69	Wayne Kensett		Grange Park	1																		this is a ridiculous suggestion. No way would I support this and the impact locally will be intolerable to say the least! Contact me to discuss further, I would be happy to contribute.	Noted.		
70			Milton Malsor	1				1														The proposal is in the heart of lovely countryside between Milton Malsor and Blisworth and the countryside will be ruined, plus wildlife and people's homes. The proposed changes for the junction are ridiculous and will only make (what is already a busy junction) an even worse one. As an ex-member of Grange Park, fighting the traffic every day was bad enough without this. The Road Bypass is an absolute must should this proposal unfortunately go ahead. There are so many downsides to this proposal. The traffic congestion will be horrendous no matter what measures are put in place to solve this. The Junction (15) is too busy even now. The environment will be ruined, the air quality, the open countryside, the noise pollution, the wildlife. We moved to Milton to be in a quiet village setting away from heavy traffic - this will be gone a few years later. House prices will almost certainly drop putting our future in the balance after working so hard to get into this position. Air pollution will be a constant worry for my children and for our own health.	The likely landscape, visual, lighting (and other environmental) effects form part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queuing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The application includes consideration of the air quality and landscape effects, as well as effects on biodiversity. Air quality is shown to be good in the vicinity of the site, and the effects are shown to be negligible.		
71	Mr and Mrs Blythe	Church End	Roads																			THESE COMMENTS WERE ORIGINALLY SENT TO INCORRECT EMAIL ADDRESS - THEY WERE RECEIVED IN APRIL 2017 - There is no evidence that another terminal (let alone two) in Northamptonshire is needed. DIRFT is presently underutilised, while a further 8 million sqft capacity is to come on stream there. A terminal also exists near Corby and further plans are mooted for terminals at Belmont and Hinckley. Further capacity will shortly be available at Castle Donnington. One or two more terminals here will result in undesirable clustering, over capacity and under use. There is insufficient capacity on the WCML to accommodate an increase of up to 147 daily freight movements. The proposal envisages around 7,500 jobs, but the area enjoys high employment so most will in-commute, plus 6,000 HGVs will further clog the road network. If rail use proves impractical most freight will move by road. The M1 and associated A roads are already at or above capacity at peak periods and volume will increase, resulting in gridlock for extended periods at pinch points. Air quality from the M1 is already dangerously poor at Collingree. It will worsen if this project is permitted. It is not known what markets would be served by the proposed terminal. Indications are that industry in general is uninterested in rail-freight logistics except for tax loss and greenwash purposes. It is understood that the Government recognises the present lack of use of rail freight believes that if more terminals are built more businesses will use them. Experience so far makes this very questionable and does not justify the damage to the countryside and communities plus traffic chaos which will result from the proposals. If the project is permitted 457 acres of productive farmland will be lost. This is contrary to national policy of increasing home crop production to reduce imports. The amenity value of the sites for leisure use will be destroyed together with rights of way. Air, light and noise from 24/7 operations will extend into rural areas well beyond the sites, reducing quality of life in neighbouring settlements. Archaeological sites will be destroyed, while the proposals for Road Bypass will have a deleterious effect on listed buildings. Wildlife habitats and corridors, particularly important strips along the M1 will be destroyed, breached or seriously impaired. Breach of the M1 boundary will open rural areas to further development contrary to general planning objectives. Making direct application to the Secretary of State over the heads of the Local Councils in defiance of their Local Joint Core Strategy, challenges the policy of Localism and should be discouraged. If new rail-freight terminals are in the national interest they should be located at places such as major seaports and in the north, for example at conurbations in association with the planned HS2 extension where growth is planned.	These comments were initially sent to an incorrect address, but on receipt a confirmation and response was sent. The response included assurance that the comments were added to the other representations received and would help to inform the then ongoing technical work as well as the approach to the next phase of consultation. It referred to the ongoing dialogue with a range of statutory consultees and other bodies to help inform the work required for the Environmental Impact Assessment, and referred the respondents to the project website for updates on progress in due course. The issues raised are addressed through chapters of the ES, and the Market Analysis Report regarding the need for a network of SRFIs, and the existing examples of the distances between terminals which is already seen elsewhere in the UK. Economic and Labour issues are also addressed through the Environmental Statement (Chapter 3). The Transport Assessment, and associated air quality assessment form part of the application and were available as part of later public consultation.		
59b	Mark Redding																					SECOND RESPONSE FOLLOWING ROXHILL RESPONSE LETTER OF 25TH MARCH 2017 Further to your letter, I do not intend to take issue with your responses, though I disagree with many of them. However, there are a couple of points where I would like more clarification. 1. - The claim that Northampton Gateway and Rail Central would serve different markets is not explained or clarified. Do you mean geographical market? If so, I would say that DIRFT is only 18 miles away and would serve the same geographical market. Or are you referring to market in terms of commodities being moved? My assumption is that you would be serving the intermodal container market, the same as DIRFT and other SRFIs. If, in fact, you are intending to serve other commodity markets, could you please specify? 2. - You have also failed to mention the cumulative effects of Rail Central. Will you be serving a different market to Rail Central? Clearly not geographically, but I would welcome your clarification on how you envisage the market (however you are defining this) would be split between these two very similar competing rail freight interchanges. 3. - Northampton Gateway is a viable distance from main intermodal ports and rail can compete effectively over these lengths'. There are many views on the 'break-even' distance that make rail transport competitive in relation to road. I have read a number of figures but none of them are low enough to make rail freight viable for anything other than the transport from Scottish ports. Could you please clarify what you believe this 'break-even' distance to be? 4. - Finally, I would take issue with your sentence that Northampton Gateway is in no way linked to Rail Central. Nothing could be further from the truth: the two are inextricably linked. The local communities are facing devastation from the arrival of two massive rail freight interchanges which will change the local environment forever. Whilst you may not be organisationally or professionally linked, to those that will suffer if either or both are considered, you are one and the same. You will be required under the PINS process to demonstrate that the cumulative effects of the developments are environmentally acceptable. I would say that this fact alone inextricably links the two development together.	These detailed further questions and queries are useful with regard to the ongoing and planned work to prepare the Application documents, and detail provided in the Market Report will give the answers sought. Early judgments are that there would be unacceptable environmental impacts from the Proposed Development with the alternative Rail Central, but the likely cumulative effects will be assessed as part of the final ES.		
OVERALL TOTALS						46	5	13	33	10	1	4	11	43	13	5	8	17	5	0	11	26	24		