Good evening I have read the developer's late submission.

Firstly I would like to protest my objection to this late addition to their application. It is outrageous that they should attempt to influence the process and decision by making comparisons with another, very different, RFI project by interpreting elements of text to their own advantage. Especially at this eleventh hour.

I refer specifically to semantics regarding interpretation of wording describing the requirement for the rail freight element. Whether it should form part of the initial, as opposed to long-term plans.

I believe that this is because the developer does not seriously expect any, or at least no more than minimal, rail freight interface to ever take place on the site.

Secondly, none of the objections made to the Gailey project has been in any way diminished by this further submission - it remains an application for a major warehouse complex based upon a total fantasy that any rail freight of any significant scale - if any at all - will ever be managed at the location.

This was clearly demonstrated in objections, which showed that a two track location sharing with high speed passenger services could not be viable.

To destroy hundreds of acres of open countryside based upon such misrepresentation would be a heinous crime.

Kind regards Paul Jones



Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.