



Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

Document No.	Name	Street	Town/Village	Q1. Overall Explicit Objection	Q1. Overall Explicit Support	Reason for Objection or Comments															Additional Comments	Changes made in response to issues raised?	Consultant Team Comment			
						Q2. J15 Proposals Support	Q2. Concern over J15 Proposals	Q3. Support for Road Bypass	Q3. Support for Road Bypass green route	Q3. Support for Road Bypass blue route	Q3. Object to Road Bypass	General Traffic Concerns	Q4. Landscaping Proposals Good	Landscaping inadequate	Do not want any dev't on this side of the M1	Scheme not necessary / question necessity	Better than Rail Central	Rail Central is better	Infra'store will not cope	Pollution Concerns (light; noise; air)				Loss of amenity/quality of life	Response to Q5: What information would you like to be included at 2017 consultation events	
1		Foxfield Way	Grange Park				1													1) Traffic modelling not convincing. I believe that Junction 15 will become a nightmare. 2) What will the impact of 6000 employees be on the local communities? Will there be enough car parking and other amenities for those people to that the local community is not	Support the concept of SRFI, but not this particular site necessarily as concern the J15 will not cope with the increased traffic. It could work taking traffic off the roads for the country at large and providing employment for people of Northamptonshire. But it will not work making life intolerable for Grange Park residents. I also think that there has been no thought of the social impact of placing a large working population so close to a residential population. I can expand on this if you contact me.		Support for the concept is noted and welcome. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects versus the national benefit of less HGV traffic/mileage overall are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Social and economic issues are assessed in the ES (and Market Analysis Report), with beneficial effects identified. Detailed queries regarding parking would be addressed at the detailed stage, if approved.			
2				1		1		1																		
3		Lodge Avenue	Collingtree	1																How on earth are you going to combat the bottleneck which is J15? For sure, based on your plan £8million is not going to do it.	Models were useful. We have lived in Collingtree for 3 years and this will be the last straw. What was once a lovely village to live in has been steadily developed both within and outside our boundaries to the extent that the village has been inherently damaged. You will call this progress, however, the damage to village life and quality therein can never be recaptured. Good luck with your plans but we will be long gone as our village has been negatively changed forever.		The value of the models to the consultation process is noted, and welcomed. The overall concerns about the principle of development are noted - however, the ES suggests that local effects, including on Collingtree will not be significant with regard to visual and other effects.			
4		Mary's Court	Gayton			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/wrks	The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local transport and traffic effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. The Courteenhall Road junction would be improved, and made safer as a result.			
5		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 A508 Courteenhall Road already a busy junction with considerable difficulties turning right from J15 toward Blisworth. With heavier traffic this needs considerable improvement.	Concerned about the impact on the environment generally from traffic and noise pollution. Particularly concerned about the Courteenhall Road junction.	YES re: highways mitigation/wrks	The national policy is clear about the need for more SRFIs to help deliver a shift of freight from road to rail. The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads, and includes improvements at the A508/Courteenhall Rd junction.			
6		St Mary's Way	Road																	Start of the Road Bypass needs to be north of Courteenhall Road. A508/Courteenhall Road junction needs to be addressed; it is a bottleneck now and any traffic increase will lead to accidents and gridlock.	Concerned about the impact on the environment generally from traffic and noise pollution. Particularly concerned about the Courteenhall Road junction.	YES re: highways mitigation/wrks	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	Road			1			1											What is happening to the turning on the A508 that goes to Blisworth as people sit and wait for cars to turn right which backs up the traffic to Junction 15. Also the turning to Quinton	Not sure why it is needed so close to DIRFT. Models were useful. The bypass should be the green route and humps should be put through Roade village to discourage through traffic into the village.	YES re: highways mitigation/wrks	The national policy is clear about the need for more SRFIs to help deliver a shift of freight from road to rail. The Planning Statement, and the Market Analysis Report provide a context for these proposals including with consideration of DIRFT which will not meet likely levels of demand alone, even with Phase 3 in place. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. It includes works at the A508/Courteenhall Rd junction as suggested.			
8		The Leys	Road	1			1													Scrap all the plans, road and rail and leave it as it is.	Inconvenient viewing times. Ploy to rail-road these developments through. There seem to be no checks on how many people attend and if you arrive during the last half hour or so of your opening times there is a possibility of no comments forms. Put the address and email on the comments form. Another model of creeping urbanisation. Blot on landscape.		The comments about the consultation process are noted. While names and addresses were not taken, a manual count of attendees was undertaken at the exhibitions and provided an accurate understanding of the levels of attendance. There were ample comments forms at all events, including at the end of each exhibition. The project website address was on the comments form, and comments could be provided via the website - the email address widely available, as was the PO box address.			
9		The Leys	Road	1																It seems to me that the Freight Interchange is a convenient way to override planning so that you can build 20ft high warehouses Roade side of the M1.	The 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		Croft Lane	Road		1	1																				
11		Woodpecker Way	East Horsbury																	Information about which data being used to plan capacity, requirements and environmental issues i.e. Government sources and date to justify and confirm validity.	Better than the Howdens scheme. Close to the A14 would make more sense. Roade bypass OK for Roade, but what about Stoke Bruerne and A508 and beyond? Just moving the traffic away from the site and to another location. Model useful to visualise proposals. Rain water harvesting should be used on site and 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 HGV Parking area as suggested - this was added in response to comments made during consultation. A Sustainability Strategy forms part of the proposals, including adoption of solar energy technology.			
12		Towcester Road	Blisworth	1			1													Much more detail on every aspect. Clarity re: employment travel to and from the site. Road aspects. Rail capacity. Ecology etc	Roade Bypass - access on to the small/narrow road between Blisworth/Roade will increase traffic in Blisworth and Stoke Bruerne. Against Structure Plan for Northamptonshire re no development immediately south of M1. Surely this kind of development should be on brownfield land? Is there a need with DIRFT just to the north and several SRFIs on edge of London? Surely SRFIs need to be on parts of East Coast Main Line. Felixstowe is biggest container port so the East Coast Main Line is the relevant railway.	YES re: highways mitigation/wrks	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	Road	1		1	1													No - just abandonment of this ill-conceived plan.	Putting in a roundabout on a busy road to 'dump' the freight traffic onto the A508 seems very simplistic. All you are doing is moving the queue further back from the M1 J15. The Roade Bypass is too close to Roade so noise will increase as road freight will leave the facility and some will head toward Milton Keynes. It's an all night operation so there will be more traffic noise at night. For these reasons I will be writing to the Council to oppose this development.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Noise impacts from the traffic and operations of the proposed SRFI are assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, with negligible and minor effects for the vast majority of receptors.			
14		Hyde Road	Road	1																Not really although I will be taking an active interest in the proposals.	How much noise would residents be subject to? Roade Bypass - too much additional traffic and too much noise whichever route is chosen. Also, why is a single road being planned, surely a dual carriageway would be more suitable? This is a vast proposal. Too many years looking at an eyesore before screening is effective. Looking at the plans and reading the proposals I got the feeling that a quart was trying to fit into a pint pot. This is just wrong.		Local environmental concerns and issues are assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment including noise relating to the SRFI, Bypass and other infrastructure proposed. It shows largely negligible effects from the SRFI site. The design of the Bypass does not prejudice or prevent dualling in the future if deemed necessary, but the traffic modelling and transport assessment process does not indicate this is needed. The landscaping and earthworks strategy will substantially screen the SRFI site, including from opening, with the screening improving as it matures.			
15		Stoke Road	Blisworth	1			1													How is this development going to co-exist alongside Rail Central?	Roade already has a bypass and this would be the second one. Keep the road as far as possible nearest the village to prevent further infill of housing. Loss of 400 plus acres of food producing land cannot be replaced by landscaping and SHEDS and then seen to be an advantage. This proposal is against the wishes of the local councils. SNC already has fighting fund against Rail Central in place and surely must spend against this development as well.		The traffic modelling was not complete at this Stage 1 consultation, and was ongoing. The issues raised about potential local effects are noted, and were an important consideration in the final Transport Assessment. A full Highways Mitigation Strategy has been prepared and formed part of the Stage 2 consultation, plus Further Consultation (Stage 3). It shows significant local transport benefits, at Junction 15 and on many local roads. Noise impacts from the traffic and operations of the proposed SRFI are assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, with negligible and minor effects for the vast majority of receptors. The potential cumulative effects with Rail Central are assessed as part of the application.			







Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

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







Northampton Gateway SRFI Comments Tracker - Stage 1

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

