

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support								Rease	on for Objection	or Comments				racker - Stage	_		Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised	
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass	Poado Rypaee	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'nt this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is Infra'sture will better not cope	Pollution Concerns (light noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
1		Foxfield Way	Grange Park				1						1								Traffic modelling not convincing, I believe that Junction 15 will become a nightmare. 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 Northamptorshire. But it will not work making life intollerable for Grange Park residents. It 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 orgoing. The issues raised about potential local effects versus the national benefit of tests HGV trafficinileage 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 benefical effects identified. Detailed queries regarding parking would be addressed at the detailed stage, if approved.
3		Lodge Avenue	Collingtree	1		1		1				1	1			1	1	1			J15? For sure, based on your plan £6million is not going to do	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 steady diverloped 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 thereir 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		Mary's Court	Gayton			1	1	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/wo rks	15 and on many local roads. The Courteenhall Road junction would be improved, and made safer as a result.
5		Mary's Court	Gayton									1	1									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 ASOB Courteenhalf Road already a busy junction with considerable difficulties turning right from J15 toward Bilsworth. With heavier traffic this needs considerable improvement.	highways mitigation/wo rks	The national policy is clear about the need for more SRF1s 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. At 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		St Mary's Way	Roade																			Start of the Roade Bypass needs to be north of Courteenhall Road. AS08/Courteenhall Road junction needs to be addressed; it is a bottleneck now and any traffic increase will lead to accidents and gridlock.	YES re: highways mitigation/wo 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		Swale Close	Roade			1			1			1									turning on the A508 that goes to Blisworth as people sit and	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/wo rks	The national policy is clear about the need for more SRF1s 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 Miligation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, (bits purple of the Stage 2 consultation, puts 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		The Leys	Roade	1			1					1			1	1			1			Play 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. Bits 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		The Leys	Roade	1			1									1			1		Interchange is a convenient	The Roade 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		Woodpecker Way	Roade East Horsbury		1	1				1			1				1				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. Closer to the A14 would make more sense. Roade bypass OK for Roade, but what about Stoke Brueme 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 treatment 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 HQV 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		Towcester Road	Blisworth	1			1				1	1	1								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 Bisworth/Roade will increase traffic in Bisworth and Stoke Bruene. 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. Felixstowe is biggest container port so the East Coast Main Line is the relevant railway.	highways mitigation/wo 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		Hyde Road	Roade	1		1	1				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 AS08 seems very simplistic. All you are doing is moving the queue further back from the M1 J15. The Roade Bypass is to olose to do 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		Hyde Road	Roade	1			1				1	1							1		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 booking at an eyesire 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 modeling 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		Stoke Road	Blisworth	1			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 Juncion 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.



Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support								Reasor	n for Objection	or Comments			sateway SRFI			_		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	Danda Dimana	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Roade Bypass	General Traffic L Concerns Pr	Q4. Landscaping oposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'sture will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
16		Stoke Road	Blisworth	1			1					1			1						1	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 tey 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 lighting Rail Central proposals. A large freight terminal is already in operation at Daventry with spare capacity for the future. There are arrianded youngen issues with forcing sping 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 H6Vs 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 Phases 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		Blisworth Road	Roade		1	1				1			1				1					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	_	High Street	Collingtree	1			1					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. Curulative effects with the emerging (separate) Rail Central proposals form part of the final application.
19		High Street	Collingtree	1			1													1	1	happening and how this is	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	screening to	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 addessed as part of the Environmental Statement, as is the loss of agricultural land.
20		Meadow Way	Grange Park		1	1																	Models very useful to show low impact of visual and noise pollution. Following Glipper/Amazon zonstructions 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 entrace to Grange Park/exit/egress points.		Comments noted re: value of models, and regarding existing HGV routing issues.
21		Collingtree Road	Blisworth	1			1				1	1		1	1					1		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 'carrott' to the villagers. Loss of agricultural fields. Loadscaping 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 Agicultural and 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		The Ridings	Grange Park	1								1							1	1	1		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 origing. 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		Abbots Way	Roade				1	1					1									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.	highways	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues reised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full highways Miligation 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					1				1						What employment will this	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 Milgation 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		Towcester Road	Milton Malsor				1	1				1	1									What are Network Rail's views on the proposal?	SRFIs are necessary, but DIRFT offers a better solution with reduced impact on a Brownfield site. Ether 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 DIRRT 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				1			1				1	1										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 outstirits. 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 to 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. I he 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 engoing. The issues raised about potential local effects versus were noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. Aftu Highlaways Milingation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, all 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 restended and updated as required for this application. The Applicant has been in regular and ongging 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		Stratford Road	Roade		1	1		1		1													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 that the existing larses can be used for straight on. Roade Spases - Dilue route with a roundabout at each end of the A508. A roundabout (not junction) would be safer for the Bisworth Road (Vinock Lune). 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		Ash Lane	Collingtree	1			1					1	1							1		and forecasets 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 Strately has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, pulse 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		Church Croft	Roade	1			1								1							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, resited the Stoke Bruemel/Ashton cross roads and passed over the Grand Union Coral. 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 continuout 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 valker and cyclists with connections to the existing Bridleway 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.



				_												N	orthampton (Gateway SRFI	Comments Tr	acker - Stage					
Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overal Explicit Support								Reason	n for Objection	or Comments								Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised	
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Roade Bypas	Dr Danda Dumana	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Roade Bypass	General Traffic Concerns P	Q4. Landscaping Yoposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1		Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'sture will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
30				1			1	1				1											Roade Bypass - it will be good to have the lorries off the road but we have a real concern about where it feeds back onto the A508. It is still a big shed that will look ugly. It is would be interesting to know how we are going to be compensated for the drop in our house prices. Do you even care what we really think?		General support for the bypass is noted and welcome. The buildings would be largely screened from view from most sensultive viewpoints (such as villages) by the earthworks and landscaping, and this is assessed in the ES.
31				1			1					1										Traffic - traffic - traffic!	£6 million not enough much more is needed to stop the congestion which happens now. The Roade Bypass won't stop the traffic building up at A45/408 Hunsbury area.		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 obtailed 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 Statge 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.
32				1			1				1			1		1			1	1	1	even distributed to houses 1 mile away	No - masive local damage to views wildlife house prices ruined and ruin rural villages Landscaping proposals only consider the west side not thought out properly and this is a highly funded GCSE project i.e. utter bullshit.	YES - changes made to screening to Collingtree	Concerns noted. The landscaping and earthworks provide screening around much of the western, northern and north-eastern perimeters of the site, and the levels (heights) of screening were increased following concerns raised during Stage 1 regarding views from Collingtree.
33				1			1													1			Pretty models - don't trust the scale of models and drawings. Sad depressing loss of countryside at what cost.		The references to the models was noted - many consultees found them of use as they are built accurately to scale (the physical and digital models). The ES includes assessment of the air quality implications of the proposals, as well as a full Transport Assessment giving details of the likely traffic issues.
34		Spring Drive	Collingtree	1			1	1												1		How the A45 will be changed. The pollution levels. The noise levels. The foul water to where? The surface water numbers?	The impact of the traffic on the A45 on the other side of the M1 has not been considered.		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 Statge 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. It includes consideration of issues north of J15 on A45, in agreement with NCC and the Transport Working Group.
35		Ash Lane	Collingtree	1			1													1		pollution.	Existing facility to the north of the County has spare capacity. Don't believe the employment is realistic for modern warehouses. Traffic numbers quoted only 3-8% before capacity to cope with newly generated traffic. Models were helpful.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. 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 Statege 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. Noise impacts have been assessed (traffic and operational), and are part of the final ES - draft information was consulted on at Stage 2.
36		Stratford Rad	Roade			1	1															works. Links to housing developments. Information (in more detail) about increased labour market.	Mixed views - the impact long term on local employment v impact on access transport etc. J15 improvements good but concern that overapeacy will be insufficient within short time. I am the Principal of the closest secondary school in Roade. My concerns are: - impact on student numbers - predicted growth long term but negative short term during construction. - impact on student movement particulary at key times such as exam season. - Good opportunity to lisize with large scale project on local area for benefit of students (e.g. geography/business) and to look at the skills of warehouse for next generation.		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 queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
37		Collingtree Road	Milton Malsor	1								1	1									Colingtree Road. How they propose to deal with electricity connection presently across	The development is on a Greenfield site. While improvements to J15 may help, the problem is that the M1 and A508 and A45 are regularly running at capacity. The Roade Bypass moves the problem toward MK, that's all. If they are bourne out in reality then the landscape proposals mitigate the visual impact.		The traffic modeling 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 Stateg 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. Positive comments re: landscaping proposals are noted and welcome.
38	-	Foxfield Way	Grange Park	1			1					1	1						1	1	1	became grounded before that point.	Sure that the villagers of Roade will be pleased to have less traffic run through their village. However, they will still need to get into the traffic if they want to leave the village. The landscaping looks good, but the whole of the Gateway project is too vast and will have a detrimental affect on the road infrastructure and environment. I don't agree with these proposals. There is another SRFI at Daventry and don't believe that another one should be built only a few miles away.		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 queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The Market Analysis Report refer to the presence of DIRFT which does not undermine the need for the proposals as part of the expanded network envisaged by national policy.
39		Westbrook	Blisworth			1																to alleviate flash floodingas well as ponds?	Mixed feelings about incressed local road traffic, particularly for potential employees. There is frequent congestion at Courteenhall Road and the A508 junction; many accidents. Why not start the Roade Bypass there with a roundabour? What happened to WWII camouffage technology? WHy do warehouses have to be eyescres? Will follow with interest.		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. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The Courteenhamm/A508 junction is to be improved, as suggested. The Bypass design does now include roundabouts, as suggested. Delated design and appearance of the buildings will be agreed and approved with the local authority in due course if the DCO is approved.
40		Collingtree Road	Blisworth	1		1	1					1				1				1			Over provision of this type of development within this area, this is not strateguc development. The J15 proposals are adequate for current traffic levels not so with a furtient 16,000 movements in a 24 hour period. Presumably occupants of Roade will be encouraged to think more kindly about this scheme by a provision of this nature. I feel that the timing and location of the exhibition displays a considerable degree of cyricism on behalf of the developers. I week before Christmas week, not located in any of the affected communities and finishing at 7.30 before people have the opportunity to get home and attend. The scheme is a large, unnecessary traffic/ pollution creation scheme, ill configured in context with other strategic developments of this type elsewhere.	YES re: consultation	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 Statge 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. Comments about the Stage 1 consultation noted - Stage 2 was undertaken differently.
41		Church Croft	Roade	1				1				1										views are listened to.	Yes we want a bypass; could there be a weight restriction for lorries coming through the village so they have to use the bypass? We will be the second to the second to the second to the second to the middle of a huge traffic jam twice a day for several hours.	YES - HGV restrictions as part of strategy	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about notential 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 Statege 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with berefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The Strategy includes a number of new HGV weight restrictions to help protect nearby villages, as suggested.
42		The Leys	Roade	1		1				1		1										figures on A508 and M1 so that the real impact can be seen. What is the knock-on effect on the A45 through Northampton which is already choked with traffic?	Not a good idea for local people living in the surrounding villages. Impact huge on our lives, making journeys toward Northmapton. Junction 15 improvements would give some improvement to the flow of traffic, however, considering the amount of traffic going through this junction will increase substantially meking journeys toward Northamtor impossoble at rush hour times. The blue Roade Bypass route las less impact on the environment, however, are there any guarantees tha This is a layes state, the whole thing will have a huge impact on the environment. Very against this proposal for the effect that it would have on the traffic. I don't think that unemployment is high in the Country, where are all the staff going to live, considering that most of the population in the area are village people, with high housing costs.	t	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was orgoing. 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 concilions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The Strategy includes an number of new HOV weight restrictions to help protect nearby villages, as suggested. Support for the blue (nine bygass arounceded. The help-learness no interest or plans in building inomes - this is an issue which could be addressed with the local authority in due course. Employment/labour issues form part of the ongoing Environmental Statement, and the Market Analysis Report.
43		The Leys	Roade										1									built in relation to the timescales for the main site works. Must be legally binding. 2) How many £ to be paid to the Wake family for the various bits of land to be aquired?	For anybody fiving in Roade or the surrounding urban areas, a resounding NO. The increase in traffic, particularly HGVs will be disastrous. Junction 15 improvements - I cannot see that the proposed changes will ease traffic flows. The current junction configuration is a disaster. No Adverse comments on landscaping - good models. Only 4 of the proposed 7 warehouse units are shown as rail linked. Therefore, presumably the 3 non-linked cannot be regarded as Strategic? and should be subject to seperate planning scrutiny/authority. Someone - possibly seperate from the developers of this proposed site - must say "If this goes ahead the Rail Fraight Terminal planned between Blisworth and Milton Malsor does not." and vice versa. We cannot possibly take 2 - 1 would be bad enough.		Support for the landscaping proposals is noted and welcomed. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential lacial flects were noted - the potential detailed impacts at key local junctions were an important consideration in the Transport Assessment and a full Highways Miligation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and quieting are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. An assessment of the potential (theoretical) cumulative effects of the proposals with the alternative Rail Central scheme will be part of the application in due course.



									-							N	lorthampton	Gateway SRFI	Comments Tra	acker - Stage	1				
Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	•							Reason fo	or Objection o	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 fo Roade Bypass	Panda Pumana	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Roade Bypass	General Traffic La Concerns Pro	anuscaping	andscaping	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'sture will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
44		The Ridings	Roade	1			1															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 - 1 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 Statge 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. Comments about the landscaping are noted, and measures will be included to ensure local access and opportunities for walking and cycling links.
45		Tarrant Way	Moulton	1								1		1		1				1	1	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 ehrn the interchange is fully operational? Again, how will working fleet the local	Not a good idea. This is a most outrageous scheme which is basically intended to industrialize a huge area of currenly open countrysied, 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 bysess 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 dopptaths would be transformed into urban trackways/concrete/lighting etc and could be directed far from their original lines. 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 Statge 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.
46		Towcester Road	Blisworth	1								1											Bisworth has become a frightful ratrun with enormous quantities of traffic of every type. I have done a lot of personal research over the last 2 years and Lost nell you that traffic to and from the proposed site that wart access to and from the A43, will use Bisworth for the connection. Sat Navs and computer route planners send vehicles through Bisworth NOT up to Junction 155. Askide from the junction of Towcester Road and the A43 being about the most dangerous in the area. As on one of the 'why here' maps the A43 was highlighted, connection to it as I see it is flawed and will further blight our community and as such I will strongly oppose this proposal. Roade was considered but not Bisworth.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Slage 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 Miligation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Slateg 2 (and Further Slage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities, and reduced rat-running in the future.
47												1											The AS08 does not currently cope with the volume of traffic carried at the moment, without the predicted extra 6.000 journeys each vay. The proposed roundabout at the south end of the by-pass with cause considerable issues for the traffic coming through the village. The roundabout (unless flow is controlled by traffic lights) will give priority to the heavy flow of traffic from the bypass, creating a bottleneck for the traffic trying to leave the village in a southerly direction. Travel from Roade to Milton Keynes is already difficult enough without the further disruption this roundabout is going to create. Traffic lights would probably alleviate the unfairness of this a little.		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 Statge 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.
48																							In the unlikely event that your plans get permission what is the maximum number of trains that would be able to enter and exit the site? 2 emails chasing response also received.		email sent answering this question w/b 23rd Jan 2017, confirming 16 trains are assumed as the maximum to the intermodal terminal.
49		Grafton Road	Roade	1			1				1	1									1	Pull out. Don't do it. We don't want it.	The distruction of the countryside and environment is criminal. It breaks my heart to think of all that being built on. The traffic in the morning getting out of Roade towards Mf can be horrendous and with new housing being built thereil be more to add lories and vars constantly will make a 15 minute journey into one of 45 minutes. Thave driven out of my village for 40 years between beautiful fields. I do not want to drive through an industrial estate which is what it will become. Is the future of our children really buildings rather than green fields just so you can have something delivered a few hours after ordering! No way, I'd rather teach our kids to be patient and breath clean air.		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 queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.
50		Eastfield	Blisworth	1								1				1				1	1		Whay do we need this? If we do, to what extent? Where are the truly best sites? The countryside, which may be easier, cheaper and more expedient? Or brown, already industrial areas? Would it be better to have more, smaller sites across the country? Thereby releiving the burdon and accompanying problems of concentrating it into the heart of the country and more easily fitting into brown, undustrial places. In this way avoiding the loss of the countryside, farmland and the important rural communities e.g., visual and twenty four hour sin, noise and light pollution. No amount of elever planning will avoid the devastating effect which the huge increase in traffic would produce creating potential insolvable problems for miles around and years ahead. It is vital to consider the bigger picture. We all have huge responsibility in the decisions we take about land, not just for ourselves but for future generations. What will they inherit? A green and pleasant land or vast expanses of concrete and monsterous warehouses? Can we not work together for a better land to live in?		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		Northampton Road	Roade	1							1	1		1		1						Go further up the railway, towards Daventry or further, where there is already urbanisation.	Don't think much to the landscaping proposals. The whole area is vast - bigger than Roade itself. No amount of trees will hide the huge warehouses, where there are green fields now.		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		Northampton Road	Roade	1			1				1			1		1				1		Yes! When will you stop imposing this type of development on green field sites?	There is no government directive that this area needs a rail interchange. The proposals for J15 do nothing to ease the traffic on the A508 for those people who have to travel into Northampton to their place of work. It will noly benefit those travelling North onto the M1. That is if it's not blocked by accidents. The landscaping proposals do not hide the 24 hour lighting which would light up the sky. Dorward pointing lights do not helo as the high ALBEDO of the ground reflects the light up into the night sky.		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 Miligianto 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		Stockwell Road	Milton Malsor									1								1	1	column.	COMMENTS RECEIVED IN LETTER BY POST: FULL LETTER AVAILABLE, BELOW IS A SUMMARY OF THE DETAILED RESPONSE: The proposed development is more close to the villages than the motorway. Attended the public consultation event and whilst it was a big improvement on the poor efforts at public consultation up to this point, the consultation still elia short in some areas. Whilst the models and pictures were useful, the explanations from the experts still did not provide all the relevant information I had hoped to glean from the event. No light and noise expert present, but it should have been expected that most villagers effected would be interested in this above other experts. How is the increase in noise and light assessment to be measured? Are the road work developments to junction 15 considered as part of the overall noise impact in this proposal? Stone the similar size proposal at East Midlands details up to 1800 HGV movements per day, what increase in noise volume will this create? Who decides how 'significant elements of built development are agreed upon as a number? I was told repetitively that there is a 'demand for this type of development, but how that demand had been assessed and confirmed was not clear. Has the agreed development of thousands of houses on the outskirts of Milton Keynes, adjacent to the Milbends, far from curing the problem of traffic overload, will only compound it? The NPSNN alreay explains that much of the SRFI development has already occurred in the Midlands and urges more investment in the South and East instead. Surely yet another development of this scale in the Midlands, far from curing the problem of traffic overload, will only compound it? Is any saving in road transport not then lost by further increase in cars on the sile for the proposed thousands of workers, since the site is not served by public transport, and given its location is never fikely to be so? NPSNN quote 'the logistics industry is required to develop new facilities that need to be located alongside to any		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 Statge 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queling are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.



								•	- *							N	lorthampton G	Gateway SRFI Com	ments Tracke	er - Stage 1					
Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support								Reasc	n 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	Roade Rypass	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Roade Bypass		Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is Infra better n	s'sture will Con not cope	Pollution cerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
54		Homestead Drive	Bugbrooke	1								1			1	1			1				ASOB is currently too busy and the proposals will generate additional HGV traffic. Some of the roads are narrow to pass with schools generating their own traffic twice a day. The consultation took place in one bocation on working days: Rail Central's was in different places and at a weekend. The location took place in one bocation on working days: Rail Central's was in different places and at a weekend. The location is too close to ports and other SRFIs and there are serious questions regarding the need in this area. Road congestion is expected to be severe on the MT between Junctions 15 and 16 by 2040. Regular congestion is unavailable location from a road congestion perspective. Description of the product of the proposed site is an insuitable location from a road congestion perspective. Part of the justification for 182 is that the WCML will be full by the 2020s - the number of paths freed up by HS2 will be very small and not on the stow freight lines. There are many other changes expected which make claims to how many trains will be served by the SRFI seem optimistic. It is uncertain as to whether the 4 train paths necessary to qualify an SRFI would be available. SRFIs need to be located near to densely populated areas, industry and retail stores to minimise the distance of travel by road. Northamptor in or to a real like this. The description of SRFIs is misleading as their locations are not being planned on a strategic basis by Government but led by developers on land close to a rall line and major and the strain of the same train paths and there are exchincial issues to be considered the town combination there would be a need for 480 meters of track to accommodate the requirement for northbound and southbound trains. It is questionated as to whether their is sufficient length to fit all of these points and provide for 75 metre trains within the finite space available.	consultation strategy for Stage 2	Comments about the consultation strategy noted, and changes were made for Stage 2. The market and policy considerations regarding this site/location are covered in full in the Market Analysis Report (and Planning Statement). The Highways Improvements and full Mitigation Strategy take into account the growth already planned over the period to 2029 by the Joint Core Strategy (and beyond), and the infrastructure and other measures will deliver additional capacity to help accommodate that traffic, as well as the traffic from this additional Proposed Development. Dialogue and joint working with Network Rail has been ongoing for a considerable amount of time. Rail reports are submitted which set out Applicant's assessment of rail capacity issues now and into the future and confirm that there is capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development. The potential cumulative effects if Rail Central were also approved is considered in the ES. The definition of SRFis, and the NSIP process, is not the responsibility of the Applicant.
55		Berry Lane	Wootton	1								1			1				1		1		I was disappointed to hear that you have held enhaltitions (in secret?) at the Hilton Hotel. It is essential that we have a proper consultation process. How were these publicised? When was W cotton Parish Council notified, and how? There were previous proposals for a Howdens warehouse facility on the site. The proposal did not comply with the local plan so was unlikely to be approved. This proposal was withdrawn. One can only assume that if the proposal was likely to be approved you would have progressed it, as land with planning permission is so much more valuable. The NPPF is clear that Local Plans are key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities. The proposal also fails to meet the requirements of the Local Plan and Joint Core Strategy. The proposal was little contribute to traffic issues with HGVs adding to the problems and the workforce which will most likely travel by car to get to the site. Junction 15 is already gridocked at peak times. There needs to be some consideration of the impact of all the proposed devlopments in the area. The JCS clearly shows the Northampton area of the development plan stopping at the M1 motorway, no large development beyond the M1 are planned, indeed they are specifically excluded. Northampton is now heavily dependent on the distribution sector, with many low paid and low skilled jobs. The development does not comply with the Local Plan and there is no point in preparing a Local Plan if a developer can simply bypass it. I am in favour Johns figliot notoral, but we need to nationally look at the rail infrastructure investment. One option could be to create new links to existing warehousing developments. Brackmills has a dissued line running through it and Magna Park Lutterworth could be connected to Nuneaton and/or Rugby. We need to plan for future growth but not just build monster warehouses just because it suits a developer's profits.		Support for the principle of shifting for ail freight is noted and welcomed. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was noging. 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 queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities. The Planning Statement provides an assessment of the policy contact for the proposals, including the WMLOS, although the primary source of policy is the National Policy Statement for National Networks. Representatives from Wooton Parish Council attended the Stage 1 consultation exhibitions and spoke with the Applicant's representatives.
56		Church Hill	Wootton									1				1			1	1	1		This is an apportunistic development. The detail relies on further work on traffic level and flows, environmental impact (inclusing air quality assessments), and some of the material was vague - e.g. about labour availability. It also appears to be predicated on previous work on the development of this site which was rejected for very sound reasons. Crick terminal serves a similar market and development near Castle Domington has recently been approved. Nationally Policy describes a network across the regions with a wide range of locations nationally. Why the duplication within the East Midands and particularly Northamptonshire? What needs assessment has been undertaken? Is there spare capacity on the rail line? How realistic is the source of this bloom? How does this development reduce carbon dioxide emissions? The summary document assents that this proposal responds to national policy guidance. What work has been done with individual firms within the scort to analyse through use the rail option? How much consultation has been done with individual firms within the scort to analyse through use the rail option? How much consultation has been done with individual firms within the scort to analyse through use the rail option? How much consultation has been done with individual firms within the scort to analyse through use the real option? How much consultation has been done with individual firms within the scort to analyse that use the second of the score of the sc		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 Stateg 2 (and Further Stage 3) consultation processes. It shows that traffic conditions and queing are much improved, with benefits for a targe number of local routes and communities. The ES was also ongoing, but the final application includes an ES which addresses the issues raised - noise, air quality, and socio-economic (labour). The Market Analysis Report includes information about the market context for the proposals, and a context for the level of likely demand for rail connectivity. The earthworks and landscape proposals do include a lowering of the ground levels to help screen buildings, as suggested.
57																							SEE COMMENT 49: Disgraceful. Not happy. Have lived in Roade all of my 40 years and the thought of all the green land and rare wildlife that you will destroy makes me feel physically sick. Constant noise and traffic will replace massive environment importance in 2016 is heart breaking, is this the way earth will look from the sky, blue sea and grey earth! God didn't create this world for this.		Noted - a response has been added to those above at Response 49.
58		Woodpecker Way	East Husbury																	1	1		I was unable to attend the events but I live close to the railway line. I was obviously aware of the railway line when I bought my house, but the trailine is not high. We also have noise and pollution from the motorway which has increased in the 20 years since I purchased my property. I would like to know if there is a plan to put in any noise reduction fencing or similar by the railway to help with noise levels from increased striffs as it will be impossible to sleep with the windows open during the summer. Also would there be any comensation considered as this may make properties on Woodpecker Way lose value and be less desirable to sell?		A Noise Assessment forms part of the ES - it shows negligible effects overall, including negligible levels of change to noise and witration for those properties already affected by railway noise. No mitigation for railway noise is proposed (or required), but the landscaping and earthworks do provide mitigation for noise from the SRFI site.



															N	orthampton (Gateway SRF	FI Comments Tra	icker - Stage 1					
Document No.	t Name	Street	Town/Village		Q1. Overall Explicit Support							Reaso	n 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	Poado Rypaee	Q3. Object to Roade Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central		is Infra'sture will on not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
59a		High Street	Blisworth	1						1	1			1	1				1	1		This is not strategic - reference to being a strategic real freight interchange is mideading. Contrary to the Joint Cons Strategy. I consented there will be nemberal being an interchange is mideading. Contrary to the Joint Construction of the Con		ADETALED RESPONSE WAS SENT BY ROWHL TO M. REDONG AS A KEY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LOCAL CAUGHTON GROVE THE can be shared if helpful. Below is an upstend response to the issues raised National Policy (NPSNN) identifies a compaling need for SERIs. Rothill are unaware of any suitable brownfield sites within the area which would meet the criteria. An Alternative Sites Assessment forms part of the Application as submitted (ES Ch 2 and Planning Statement). The SERI would serve a different market and be complimentary to other SRF is including at DIRT: a see the Market Analysis Report. As the network of SERI grows, as required by Government policy to meet demand, that network is likely to be more concentrated in areas of the country where the logistics market is strongest. Trains to Northampton Gateway will not return empty but will convey containers for either onward use or re-export. These containers would otherwise travel by road. Northampton Gateway is at a viable distance from the main intermodal ports and rail acro compete effectively with road for movements over these lengths. Submitted Rail Reports provide the assessment of frieght path capacity. Northampton, but also from South Northamptonshire, parts of Daventry District, Wellingborough, Kettering Borough and Milton Keynes. The local transport and congestion issues are addressed by the Transport Assessment - the Bypass has been modelled and as part of a wider Mitigation Strategy provides significant local benefits, including reduced rar-tunning and through-traffic in many nearby villages as a result of the ASOS control becoming more reliable. The full package of improvements used is not salely based on the unconstrained forecasts at valide to the policy and not under the control of the Applicant. Concerns about future inflit housing are noted, but not under the control of the Applicant. Concerns about future inflit housing are noted, but not under the control of the Applicant. Concerns about future inflit housing are noted, but not where the consultation of t
60		Milton Court	Milton Malsor	1							1				1				1	1		Scheme is contrary to the Joint Core Strategy and the need for an SRFI has been identified as DIRFT. There is no need for the scheme as there is already enough land allocated in the WNJCS for this purpose, or Junctions 16 and 18 of the M1. There is no need to the scheme on village residents will be devastating. Collingtree is adjacent to the M1 and is identified as at maximum nitrogen dioxide air quality levels. Lorries travelling in from all directions will be using the motionway with consequent diesel pollution. Lories travelling in from the south will impact on air quality in Towcester which is also identified as having high levels of introgen dioxide. Noise and light pollution from 24 hour ceptation, 7 days a week will destroy the relative peace in both our vallages. The reason we moved here in the first place was the rural tranquilty of the place. I am very concerned that our quality, indeed way of life, will be irrevocably destroyed by Roxhill's developer driven proposal, which is both unnecessary and unwanted, as there is already an SRFI in the locality at Junction 8 of the M1.		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 queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities in terms of noise and congestion. 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.
61			Grange Park		1		1				1											DETAILED RESPONSE IN TERMS OF TRAFFIC AND J15 ISSUES; BELOW IS A SUMMARY OF THE MANN POINTS: J15 is a problem due to the following elements: The 'dop-bore' shape of the roundbout provides for limited waiting areas at traffic lights on the junction used, causing tallbacks on the junction the prevent witing road users from joining the roundbout; the phasing of the traffic lights provides for limited time between traffic moving cycless the absence of any signoral control for wholeig prime between traffic moving cycless the absence of any signoral control for wholeig prime the junction Theosave May (in combination with the above factors) makes access to the junction from Crange Park both difficult and uncate at peak times. The junction currently operates at 127% capacity, the proposed improvements are suggested to make a 30% increase in capacity, which only allows for a 3% buffer based on current traffic levels. My request is that as part of the approval of this proposed development, more significant improvements to the junction should be integrated, and these should include, but not be limited to: which is not been proximity to another rail freight interchange has this configuration by expanding the junctions to the North West. In another rail freight interchange has this configuration by expanding the junctions to the North West. Addition of signal carmeras on major feeder roads (but especically A45 southbound) to discourage red light jumping. Increased capacity of waiting areas before signal controls on the junction itself. Increased capacity of waiting areas before signal controls on the junction itself.		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 cand 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. General levels of support for the principle noted.
62								1			1			1				1		1		Firstly, as a principal, I have no objection, more freight by rail is a good idea, job creation is helpful, will generally bring economic growth to the area. The proposals should consider the impact of both of the potential for both it and Rail Central to come forward. The plan breaches the M1 boundary and Roade will become part of the urban sprawl of Northampton. It looks like the railhead will be off the Northampton loop which would defeat or reduce the point of the project, surely it should come directly off the West Coast Man Line. Parking for the workers seems minimal. Carl see any HKV parking facilities. The local villages are blighted by HGVs parked in all sorts of unsuitable places and the needs of the drivers are not met, so the hedgerows are used as public conveniences/waste bins. The Bypass for Roade is welcome, in the short term that's good, but in the longer term there will be infill making the village bigger, putting extra starin on local facilities that are already strained and links to the point above that the village will become part of Northampton, so what's been considered to assist with this? Are public transport links going to be improved? i.e. the bus route ts that now end in Grange Park, are they going to be extended, ideally to Roade to improve public transport links? Other than the proposed bypass there is no evidence of anything for the local community, what about a parkway rail station, and improved community buildings/facilities? If the above issues are not addresses at inception whey will need to e addressed at a later point by the local Councils at their own costs and therefore the developers will have got away with it because they've not covered these costs, much as happened at Grange Park and their redevelopment of Junction 15 of the M1 which was a poor solution done on the cheap.	HGV Parking added.	The lack of objection to the principle of the proposals is noted and welcomed, as is support for the economic development benefits of the proposals. Support for the Bypass is noted and welcome. The detailed points are of relevance to the Environmental Impact Assessment which overs a full range of potential local issues, and includes a detailed Transport Assessment. The potential cumulative effects with Rail Central are assessed in the final ES.



									-							N	lorthampton (Sateway SRFI	Comments Tra	acker - Stage	1				
Documer No.	t Name	Street	Town/Village		Q1. Overall Explicit Support								Reason	n for Objection o	or Comments								Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass	Posdo Bunsee	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass blue route	Daniel Dimens	General Traffic L Concerns Pr		Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1		Better than Rail Central		Infra'sture will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
63	_			1		1	1					1								1	1	correct context. Evidence for viability of the site and its single entry point; proposed emergency access/legress routes; proposals for how these will be defined and managed; predicted traffic volumes for all normal routes so well as for potential rat-russ in the event of congestion on the M1, A43 and A5; traffic modelling results which take into account other proposed local area developments e.g. Rail Centrala dn Northampton South Sustainable Urban Extension; results of the environmental survey;	Bisworth, Patitishall, Gayton and Shutlanger. A further significant weakness is that there is no contingency for emergency access/egress in the event of a major incident on-site. 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. Proposals for 115 improvements will always be welcome. However, will the increase in capacity be sufficient? For the Roade 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 alliest a address the problems gaining access tofrom the ASOB and there is potential that the dual carriageway will exacerbate this. 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.	highways mitigation works at A508/Courtee nhall 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) can Further Stage 3) consultation processes shows that traffic conditions and quieng 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 ASOB/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 Colingtree are very close to the MI (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																			DETAILED RESPONSE SUBMITTED: BELOW IS A SUMMARY OF THE KEY POINTS RAISED: NRUG are very surprised to find no consideration of the sesting rat users as receptors. NRUG do not support this proposal in any way. NRUG doject 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 passinger trains. Long term - limiting the potential for new frequent fast services for Northampton, the very basis for NRUGs continued support for HS2. We are not artificiated and support DIRFT. Your sequential analysis will need to set out why a new respective through the Channel Turnel, than use them to access a facility that replicates DIRFT in a different, nearby, but troubles one location. 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 International Continuation of 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 Internations referred to in the relight RUS and NSPNN (quoted in the response - see full response). In forming this objection, we have had regard to policy documents covering the following: - Rail treight from the east coast ports into DIRFT is oriened along the Peterbrough-Nuneation route to get to WCML. - Rail treight from the east coast ports into DIRFT is oriened along the Peterbrough-Nuneation route to get to WCML. - Rail the transport of Field Haven (now known as Thames Gateway), if developed, will be needed. - Freight would be routed via Peterbrough. - Northampton southwards (identified as Daventry to Wembley) has a capacity gap. - Rail should off		The comments and objections are noted. The application includes a consideration of alternatives, and of the relationship with DIRTT which alone will not be sufficient to meet the expected levels of relating frowth over the longer-term. Rail capacity susue 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				1								1							1				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 fallures. Northampton Gateway will prove to be cascistrophic for Northamptonshire, its residents and those who work or travel near the area. Northamptonshire has suffered from over 40 years of incompetent counciliors and planning officers, who have behaved more like a dissipated jurta on the Costa del Sot. The socundrels at VMNC, 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 inciest parts of middle England. The creation and over development of area for business and residential construction, without sufficient infrastructure has put estraordinary strain in local services, worst of all is the pressure of the road system. 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 5pm most work days, traffic queues on the hard shoulder of the M1 in both directions to leave the motorway. The traffic excepting the heli of Towoester, the country's biggest inplumare, on the A43 reaches a strangulation point at 15a. With traffic from the A45 joining the mix, it is a perfect storm. A 15 minute journey from Roade to Northampton can talge an hour a peak times. The roads are completely ecrewed and teribly 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. 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 a		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 Statge 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.
66		Buttmead	Blisworth	1							1	1								1	1	residents and wildlife to build your scheme.	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 Brueme (as they aiready do now!), so more traffic will only increase this problem. Especially concerned regarding the potential to use compulsory purchase powers for houses and land in order to build the bypass. Too many lives will be spoil 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.		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 queing are much improved, with benefits for a large number of local routes and communities.



									4							N	orthampton (Gateway SRFI Comments T	racker - Stage					
					04 0																		Changes	
Documen	Name	Street	Town/Village	Explicit	Q1. Overall Explicit								Reaso	on for Objection	or Comments							Additional Comments	made in response to	Consultant Team Comment
				Objection	Support																		issues raised?	
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Roade Bypass			Q3. Object to Roade Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev'nt this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is Infra'sture will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light noise; air)	Loss of amenity/q uality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events			
67		Northampton Road	Blisworth																		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, it 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 immovements to Junction 15 be identified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project in their own right, if not, why nor? - 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 Eld 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 Exhibition: Time, dates and location precluded people from being able to attend. There while those were poorly publicised and this is likely to have negatively impacted on the number of attendoes. The exhibition boards contained too much information for members of the pubic 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, one evaluable, 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 that there was too much information available at the exhibition amany 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.
68				1								1				1		1	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 rall. DIRFT is in the near vicinity and has ampile capacity. Local trunk road network interesty 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 tirrecoverably 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 blookersity 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 farmatiand 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			Grange Park	1								1								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.
			Orange Fark									·												The Back land area of the English (and other as increased by the English Engli
70			Milton Malsor	1			1	1				1							1	1		The proposal is in the heart of lovely countryside between Milton Malsor and Bisworth and the countryside will be ruined, plus widdlie 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 Roade Bypass is an absoulte must should this proposal unfortunately go ahead. There are so many downsides to this proposal. The traffix 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 coutryside, 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.		The likely landscape, visual, lighting (and other environmental) effects form part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The traffic modeling was not complete at this Stage of 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 all Highways Mitigation Strategy was prepared and formed part of the Statep 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. 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		Church End	Roade																			THESE COMMENTS WERE ORIGINALLY SENT TO INCORRECT EMAIL ADDRESS - THEY WERE RECEIVED IN APPILL 2017 - There is no avidence that another terminal (let alone two) in Northamptonshire is needed. DIRT or presently understined, while a further of malion styl capacity is to come on interest prises. A capacity of the present of		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 them 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 the project website for updates on progress in due course. The issues raised are addressed through the Exp. 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 Ernvironmental 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	OTALS			46		13	33	_10		4	11	43	13			.47		0 11	22	24		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 coupled 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 Pis o, I would say that DIRFT is only 18 miles away and would serve the same geographical market Pis o, 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 DirRT 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 reight 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 all reight viable for anything other than the transport from Scottish ports. Oxid Joy please clarify what you believe this "break-even" distance to be? 4 Fianly, I would take issue with your sentence that "Northampton Gateway is in no way linked to Rail Central. Northing could be further from the truth: the two are inexticably linked. The local communities are lacing devastation from the arrived of two massiver all tright interchanges which will be required under the PiNs process to demonstrate that the cumulati		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 judgements 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.