

Northampton Gateway SRFI - Stage 2 Section 42 responses schedule

Doc Number	Name	Company/Organisation	Date Received	Explicit Objection	Explicit Support	Previous/other comment refs - Document Number	Comments Summary	Consultant Team Response
OB2 01	Mark Gilkes	Cadent Gas				OB2 40 / OB2 40A	see response sent by Fisher German (on behalf of Cadent Gas)/ref OB2 40 on 30/01/2018	See below re: dialogue with Cadent Gas.
OB2 02	Ann Addison	Milton Malsor Parish Council	28/11/2017			OB3 18	A number of issues have come to our notice during the course of the consultation: <b>1.</b> Some of the information on the exhibition display boards and documentation was found to be misleading. For example a "Short Explanatory Document" issued to attendees contained a brief outline of the proposed Development. The "Local Plan and Policy Context" section is misleading in its selective use of one paragraph from the adopted West Northamptonshire JCS, and infers that the proposed site is included as a site for development. The JCS specifically excludes the Northampton Gateway site from development and concentrates future major employment at DIRFT, Silverstone and land near junction 16 of the M1. <b>2.</b> The stage 2 consultation page of the website provides a comments form that allows people to submit questions and comments. However it is apparent that when questions are submitted by this method they are not acknowledged nor answered. This is a significant failure in the consultation process. <b>3.</b> The Parish Council Offices were provided with a set of consultation documents relating to the proposal to enable members of the public to view a 'hard copy', important for those without access to the website. Hundreds of pages were found to have been omitted, and other sections were misfiled, or information difficult to find. Some content was added to these binders during the consultation process. A major concern regarding missing information was that it related to proposed changes to the local highway network which may have major implications for local residents. <b>4.</b> It is the view of the Parish Council that Roxhill has not conducted the consultation process with the degree of transparency that should be expected with a proposal of this size and its potentially devastating effect on many thousands of people living in the local communities. The Council will expect the issues outlined above to be included in the consultation report that Roxhill have to prepare for submission to the Planning Inspectorate.	Comments about the consultation material is noted - however, the Short Explanatory Document was intended to help, not to mislead. The Planning Statement forms part of the Application and provides an overview of the Planning Policy context. Individual responses were not provided to each comment submitted by email, although some responses were sent when considered helpful in response to specific questions or enquiries. All comments received have been recorded and the issues responded to in the Consultation Report. The draft ES was not complete - this was explained and made clear at the time. Errors with some contents pages and filing of some Appendices were rectified. All information was on the website, and the Local Authorities and Parish Councils also reported informally that demands to view the hard copies had been very low (or non-existent). Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the SoCC. The final application documents will also be available for comment and scrutiny in due course.
OB2 03	Brian Skittrall	CPRE	02/10/2017				I am the CPRE representative who will be assessing this proposal. Please alert me when there are any developments. I will be attending one of the forthcoming consultation	Noted.
OB2 04	Mrs T J Nicholl	Peterborough City Council	11/10/2017				We have no further comments to make regarding this proposal	No further comments noted.
OB2 05	Jonjo Robb	Department for Transport	13/10/2017				As one of the officials leading on rail freight at the Department for Transport, it has been passed to me for reply. The Government recognises that strategic rail freight interchanges (SRFIs) are a key element in reducing the cost to users of moving freight by rail and are important in facilitating this transfer of freight from road to rail, thereby reducing trip mileage of freight movements on both national and local road networks. As you will be aware, under the Planning Act 2008, decisions on major transport infrastructure projects are referred to the Secretary of State for Transport at the conclusion of the planning process. I am afraid therefore that Ministers and officials are unable to comment on, or influence, individual scheme proposals.	Noted, as is reference to the over-arching national policy position regarding SRFIs.
OB2 06	Savills UK	On behalf of Anglian Water Services	17/10/2017			OB1 08 / OB2 32	We have been passed a letter from Anglian Water Services Limited as they are our client and we deal with land ownership queries on their behalf. This letter refers to the proposal of freight interchange at Northampton Gateway SRFE - Stage 2. As the letter did not attach a plan we took the liberty of looking at your website to try and obtain a copy of the relevant plans so that we can check land ownership along the route, unfortunately there were several plans and we were unable to determine which were relevant to Anglian Water Services Ltd. Therefore can we ask that you forward either by email or post the plans that are relevant and need checking. Once received we can check our records and respond accordingly.	Dialogue subsequently entered into with Anglian Water - Statement of Common Ground agreed.
OB2 07	Rober Davies	Highways England	18/10/2017				With reference to your letter dated 4th October 2017 I have checked our records in order to establish whether or not the proposed development has an impact upon the estate we manage on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. As the proposals do not appear to affect this estate I confirm that we have no comments to make at this juncture.	Noted.
OB2 08	Craig Jiggins	Civil Aviation Authority	18/10/2017				Having reviewed the details of the location of the proposal, whilst there would be no mandatory requirement for aviation warning lights to be fitted to the warehouses, however, I would recommend the following organisations are advised of this proposal and for the reasons noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due to the unique nature of operations in respect of altitudes and potentially unusual landing sites, it would be sensible for you to establish the related viewpoints of local emergency services Air Support Units through the National Police Air Service (NPAS) organisation via email npas.obstructions@npas.pnn.police.uk;</li> <li>Due to the unique nature of operations in respect of altitudes and potentially unusual landing sites, it would be sensible for you to establish the related viewpoints of local emergency services Air Support Units through the relevant Air Ambulance Units - <a href="http://www.associationofairambulances.co.uk/member/the-air-ambulance-service/">http://www.associationofairambulances.co.uk/member/the-air-ambulance-service/</a></li> <li>The proposal should be brought to the attention of the Safeguarding Department within the MOD's Defence Infrastructure Organisation, email: DIO-safeguarding-statutory@mod.uk, to ensure that military aircraft safety is taken into consideration.</li> </ul>	The NPAS was consulted. Detailed, operational issues of relevance to the post-consent stage are noted.
OB2 09	Alison Benson	West Hunsbury Parish Council	02/11/2017				In order for this project to work the infrastructure improvements need to be of the highest quality. This includes not just the trunk roads but also all local roads. Without first class improvements the traffic congestion and pollution will have a lasting and significant detrimental impact to the whole of the area. All local communities deserve guarantees that traffic levels will not increase within those communities and local roads will not bear the burden of this development.	Comments regarding the importance of the Highways infrastructure improvements are noted, and supported. The TA shows that the proposed package of mitigation works would deliver major benefits to the local area, with reduced congestion, improved capacity, and less rat-running through villages.
OB2 10	Hannah Seymour-Shove	Cambridgeshire County Council	08/11/2017		1		Thank you for your recent letter containing the proposals for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange on land to the west of Junction 15 of the M1 motorway and associated highway works. In response to your consultation, Cambridgeshire County Council support the proposals. It should be noted that in the future should there be an opportunity to propose to divert freight onto the East-West Rail Link: there could be an opportunity for such freight to perhaps utilise the Northampton Gateway SRFI.	Support for the proposals noted.
OB2 11	Alison Benson	Quinton Parish Council	13/11/2017				The minor country roads around Quinton and through Quinton need very careful protection during the construction process and beyond. A detailed traffic management plan needs to be put in place to prohibit construction vehicles from rural villages and narrow country lanes. Quinton is likely to suffer from local traffic avoiding the construction area and full mitigation of this is required - additional traffic calming/road maintenance & traffic management. The infrastructure improvements promised need to be of the very highest standards and again ensure that rural roads are not adversely affected. Our residents us Roade & Towcester for GP visits, shopping etc. and full and easy access needs to be maintained at all times.	The Highways Mitigation Strategy developed further since Stage 2 focused on making the A508 corridor more attractive and effective - the modelling shows this had a subsequent reduction in through-traffic for many local villages and communities.
OB2 12	Miss L Rarcliffe	Yardley Gobion Parish Council	14/11/2017				Yardley Gobion Parish Council would request that a comprehensive review of the road network around the proposed site is carried out. They have serious concerns about the expected increase of traffic along the A508 and request that the proposed road system improvements be looked at in totality rather than just small sections - for example the Roade bypass comes out just before a dangerous crossroads and two 'S' bends. It should connect with the Old Stratford roundabout which would alleviate traffic along the A508 which has been designated an active Red Route from the M1 to the Old Stratford roundabout (Routes Nos 15, 16 & 74).	The final TA provides a full assessment of the likely effects, and a mitigation strategy to address potential impacts - this is shown to deliver benefits to numerous villages by removing through-traffic and attracting it back to the A508. The modeling has included the bypass.
OB2 13	Dave Adams	HSE (NSIP)	16/11/2017			OB3 16	From the information provided, it can be determined that the proposed interchange itself (i.e. Zones A and B on drawing R007) will not fall within the consultation zones for any major hazards sites or pipelines. Within the context of the overall scope of proposed works, it is noted that the extreme north end of the A45 improvements will interact with the consultation zones for the Rothersthorpe/ Sherington major accident hazard pipeline operated by Cadent Gas Ltd. We would not advise against the proposed development. However, it is recommended that Roxhill (J15) Ltd liaise with Cadent Ltd to ensure that risks to Rothersthorpe/ Sherington major accident hazard pipeline are managed appropriately during the A45 improvement works. This finding assumed that all occupied buildings and public facilities such as footpaths are located within the interchange and/or its immediate surroundings (taken as the area shown on drawing R001), however further consultation should be sought from the Health and Safety Executive if any developments of this kind are to be introduced in the vicinity of the pipeline. Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed? The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) may require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC). Hazardous Substances Consent would be required if the site is intending to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances and Preparations at or above the controlled quantities set out in schedule 1 of these Regulations.	Noted.
OB2 14	Alison Collins	Natural England	17/11/2017			OB3 19	Natural England has previously made comments on the Stage 1 consultation (email dated 12 January 2017 from Kayleigh Cheese). <b>Draft Development Consent Order:</b> We advise that the draft DCO should provide a safeguard against impacts on Roade Cutting SSSI. The draft DCO contains reference to a Construction Environmental Management Plan (section 9) which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local authority. Natural England is satisfied that the protection of the SSSI can be handled through a CEMP (rather than directly referenced in the DCO), provided that we are a signatory to the agreed document and the DCO contains a statement that requires compliance with the agreed document. <b>3</b> The draft DCO references a Biodiversity Management Plan (section 8). If mitigation is considered necessary to address impacts on Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA/Ramsar site, the mitigation measures could be included in this plan; in which case Natural England requests that we are also a signatory to this Plan. <b>Draft Environmental Statement:</b> Ecology and Nature Conservation. Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA/Ramsar site - there could be indirect impacts for overwintering and breeding bird populations, including wintering golden plover, as the site for the new rail freight interchange consists of suitable supporting habitat for certain bird species. Natural England requests that further justification is required to support the decision to not provide any mitigation. Appendix 6.5 - Wintering Bird Survey Report shows that there was regular use by golden plover in one field during the winter of 2013-14 as well as in October and November 2014 which suggests it could be a regular feeding site. This justification could include more recent survey information. Protected species - Natural England has produced standing advice. We advise you to refer to this advice. Natural England will only provide bespoke advice on protected species where they form part of a SSSI or in exceptional circumstances. Natural England considers that the development will not cause any impact to the SSSI provided that the foundations and abutments and any other aspect of the construction, either temporary or permanent, avoid the designated interest features. <b>Landscape and Visual Effects:</b> This proposal does not appear to be either located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscape. <b>Air Quality:</b> We note that further air quality modelling work will be carried out. Natural England and Highways Agency advice states that sites within 200m of the edge of a road affected by the project need to be assessed in terms of the air quality impact from traffic. <b>Agricultural Land:</b> we advise that if the development proceeds, the developer uses an appropriately experienced soil specialist to advise on, and supervise, soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make the best use of the different soils on site. <b>Environmental enhancement:</b> Development provides opportunities to secure a net gain for nature and local communities. Opportunities for enhancement might include planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape, designing lighting to encourage wildlife.	Comments noted, and considered as the ES was progressed and completed, including with regard to the ongoing winter bird surveys which were undertaken in winter 2017 and 2018, and which were discussed with Natural England - these confirm the site is not used regularly by golden plover and is not supporting habitat to the SPA. This is reported in full in the ES (Chapter 5).
OB2 15	Andrea Leadsom MP	MP - South Northamptonshire	19/11/2017			OB1 12	Summary of 5 page letter submitted on behalf of constituents who have raised questions and issues - structured around several headings: I am supportive of Government's policy on SRFIs (in the NPS), and their role in delivering economic and environmental benefits. SRFI proposals are open to scrutiny in the context of the NPS and local impacts. <b>Location</b> - concerns exist about whether a concentration of SRFI in the Midlands meets the national guidance which refers to a network across the regions. <b>Rail capacity/feasibility</b> - The WCML is nearing capacity and it is uncertain if freight paths are available for the minimum 4 trains per day. There may be tensions locally with the priority given to passenger services. <b>Impact on Local Roads</b> - Residents are worried about the potential for 14,116 vehicles on a 24 hour operation, including travel to work. This volume of traffic could negate the benefits of the SRFI. When the M1 is closed the local effects of diverted traffic are substantial on a number of villages near to Junction 15. There are concerns that the cumulative effects with other developments are not being considered fully, including Rail Central. <b>Employment</b> - it is well known that unemployment is low so the majority of workers would be from further afield, with limited local benefits. <b>General comments</b> - the site was not allocated through the Joint Core Strategy. It is detached from the urban area and would extend urban development into the countryside with potential impacts on landscape character. No further SRFIs were expected or planned for in the JCS. There are concerns about visual blight and that efforts to mitigate this will be inadequate.	A meeting was held with Mrs Leadsom soon after this response was submitted, and the issues discussed. The issues and queries raised are addressed in full by the final Application - both through the ES (regarding local visual and transport effects), and through the Market Analysis Report and Planning Statement, which provide the strategic context and reference to the market conditions and characteristics which make this an appropriate and viable site for an SRFI. The results of the assessments undertaken show that the effects for the closest villages include many positive effects, including with regard to transport and highways. The visual mitigation is shown to be effective in screening the buildings from most viewpoints, with the bunding and planting visible in the landscape instead.

OB2 16	Jamie Bond	Public Health England	20/11/2017		OB1 07 & OB3 17	<p>We have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm that we are broadly satisfied with the approach taken in preparing the ES and the conclusions drawn so far. We note your predicted air quality and noise impacts from development and operation of the site and that forecasts are long term and worst case. Public Health England (PHE) welcomes the intention to reduce traffic and air pollution at a regional and national scale and note the relative impact of this development compared to other existing sources and proposals destined for delivery in the shorter term such as "smart motorway" working on the adjacent M1.</p> <p>PHE are aware that this is a draft document with final outputs dependant on the design finalisation; the assumptions made with regard to incomplete assessment at some receptors seem appropriate given that they are likely to be less affected by the development than those already assessed.</p> <p>PHE would welcome refinements to further reduce local impact from operational emissions, particularly those associated with worker transport and local traffic congestion, in addition to the design facilitating any longer-term schemes to reduce emissions from associated HGVs.</p> <p>Site plans show a proposed electricity substation in an indicative location within the development area; there are no nearby residential receptors but we recommend that the final location is assessed for the potential impact from electromagnetic fields in line with PHE's position in the scoping response dated 13 January 2017.</p> <p>The current submission does not include a specific section summarising the potential public health impacts. We understand that the promoter will wish to avoid unnecessary duplication and many issues including air quality, emissions to water, waste, contaminated land etc. are covered elsewhere in the ES, but we believe that the summation of relevant issues into a specific section of the report provides a focus which ensures that public health is given adequate consideration.</p> <p>Such a section should summarise key information, risk assessments, proposed mitigation measures, conclusions and residual impacts, relating to human health. Compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statements and relevant guidance and standards should also be highlighted.</p>	Noted.
OB2 17	Not used						
OB2 18	Lesley-Ann Mather	Northamptonshire County Council	21/11/2017		OB1 05 / OB3 07	<p>I provided advice to the applicant in connection with the Stage 1 consultation. I identified that further geophysical survey would need to be undertaken especially but not specifically within the bypass corridor. I understand that this has been undertaken but unfortunately the report is not available on the website. I discussed the additional geophysical survey with the archaeological consultant in March this year. I took the opportunity to remind him that the trial trenching component was still outstanding and that I was happy to engage in discussing covering the outstanding trial trenching strategy. The undertaking of trial trenching within the proposed development area as previously advised would help to clarify the site's potential and to allow an informed decision to be made regarding the impact of the development. This is in accordance with the guidance given within NPPF paragraph 12B. The results from this stage would provide information on which to make an informed assessment of the impact on the historic environment and also allow the formulation of an informed mitigation strategy which may involve preservation in situ.</p> <p>I look forward to engaging with your consultant at the earliest opportunity in order to rectify the lack of archaeological assessment and progress matters.</p>	A programme of Geophysical surveys were undertaken on the Bypass, and a programme of trial trenching was also implemented to inform the ES on the Main Site and Bypass Corridor - the results from this programme of targeted trenches was implemented to both test the results of the earlier surveys, but also to focus on key areas of potential interest on the site. The results confirm much of the expected results as indicated from the Geophysical surveys, and it has helped inform a fuller understanding of the site's importance regarding buried features. A further phase of trenching is proposed post any consent and pre-construction, if approved.
OB2 19	Chrys Rampley	Road Haulage Association	22/11/2017			<p>Unfortunately I have not been able to attend any of the exhibitions and am seeking clarification on theorry parking mentioned in the proposal. Could you please confirm what facilities are being proposed for visiting HGV drivers? For example, toilets, showers, refreshments Will HGV drivers be able to take their 45 minute break on site?Is there any provision for HGVs to park overnight for their rest? If not where will you be directing them to take these rest breaks? Shortage of safe and secure parking for HGVs across England is well documented and I know Northamptonshire County Council have undertaken their own studies on the subject in the past. We are concerned about driver welfare and the knock of effect of HGVs parking inappropriately in the surrounding area.</p>	The secure HGV parking is now a formal part of the proposals - details will be confirmed post any consent, but the proposals will include welfare facilities. The Applicant would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with the RHA in due course.
OB2 20	Shirley Wong	Collingtree Parish Council	22/11/2017		OB1 13 & OB3 21	<p>We write in response to your recent exhibition and publications which form part of your Stage 2 Consultation Programme. We refer specifically to the 'Short Explanatory Document' distributed at the exhibitions as we regard the full set of detailed binders supplied to Parish Councils and Libraries, as unreasonably complex and difficult to access.</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that many of the references in the document to planning policies, national policy statements, market potential and particularly likely environmental impacts, are highly selective and misleading for members of the general public. The following comments are representative of our concerns but not exclusively so.</p> <p>Section 2 - The site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is disappointing that in your description of the site location, you do not mention Collingtree and Grange Park which are the closest communities. As Collingtree previously been omitted from many of your initial maps of the area, we feel this is deliberate.</li> <li>Under 2.5 it is stated that 'The number and precise location of the proposed buildings and their detailed appearance are not yet known or fixed.' This is an insufficient basis for a pre-application consultation.</li> <li>2.13 describes Government policy as 'encouraging a shift of distribution activity from road to rail to both help deliver environmental improvements, such as air quality and climate change objectives, and remove HGV's from the roads to help reduce congestion' However, elsewhere the document concedes that there will be a decrease in air quality close to the site and an increase in HGV's in the immediate area.</li> <li>Under 2.16 it states that 'the proposal responds directly to national policy on the need for a NETWORK of SRFI's across the UK' This proposal does not contribute to a strategic network with DIRFT only 18 miles away and only 2 current proposals for SRFI's outside the Midlands.</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 3 Policy &amp; Market Context:</b> The justification for an SRFI in this location (in 3.3) is based entirely on the 'Golden Triangle' concept. This may apply to warehouse location but not necessarily, an RFI. The claim that the proposed location brings the 'vast majority of the UK within a four hour drive' can be made for any of the RFI proposals currently in the pipeline. Policy guidance calls for a NETWORK of SRFI's. This proposal and other emerging schemes from developers are creating a CLUSTER of proposals in the Midlands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been concern since the 1970's over Northamptonshire's dependence on logistics and the limited type of employment they provide. It remains the 'vision' of Northamptonshire County Council to attract high quality, high skill employment. This in turn depends on the offer of living in a high quality environment. NCC Planning policy also remains to encourage large scale development in the north of the County.</li> <li>The consultation document concedes that a further study is underway to assess the market for Northampton Gateway. We take this as an admission that at this stage, the application is largely speculative.</li> </ul> <p><b>National Policy:</b> The document (3.7) quotes NPSNN which states that SRFI's 'allow rail to undertake the long-haul primary trunk journey with other modes (usually road) providing the final leg'. It also states that RFI's can 'optimise the use of rail in maximising long haul by rail and minimising the secondary leg by road'. The consultation has provided no evidence that Northampton Gateway will optimise the use of rail, that rail trunk haul would be minimised, that secondary distribution would be minimised, that costs to rail users would be reduced and that overall trip mileage of freight on national and local networks would be reduced.</p> <p><b>Local and Planning Policy Context:</b> The Consultation document refers (3.16) to the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy but fails to make clear that the J15 site is specifically excluded from the planning strategy for industrial development. This view was endorsed by the Planning Inspector at Public Inquiry. The impression is given in the consultation document that Northampton Gateway somehow complements the Core Strategy - it does not.</p> <p><b>Distribution Market Context:</b> The Short Explanatory document concedes (3.17) that a further study is being undertaken to assess the local market for rail freight. Even if the demand is there for greatly increased freight by rail - it is still unclear whether the rail network has the ability to provide the capacity. Once again the Stage 2 Consultation is premature in the absence of key data. The government's principal adviser on infrastructure (The National Infrastructure Commission) has discounted a significant switch to rail freight and said that a one third reduction in road freight would need a threefold increase in rail freight capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document argues (3.27) that Northampton Gateway is close to another SRFI at Daventry but serves a different core catchment and on the other hand it argues that core catchments can successfully overlap. Either way this is not consistent with Government policy to achieve a 'Strategic Network' of SRFI's throughout the UK.</li> </ul>	The range of issues addressed in this detailed response are covered in fuller detail in the Consultation Report. Issues regarding need and the 'network' of SRFIs envisaged by the NPS are covered in the Market Analysis Report, and Planning Statement in further depth, including with regard to the existing network and distribution of SRFIs. Local policy issues are also addressed. The detail of the number and appearance of buildings will be agreed, if the DCO is approved, with the local authority in accordance with requirements included in the draft DCO.
OB2 21	Caroline Holgate	East Hunsbury Parish Council	22/11/2017			<p>East Hunsbury Parish Council does not believe that there is a need for a development of this scale in this location. A small number of our councillors had an opportunity to attend the public exhibitions and we write with our comments as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The turnout to the exhibitions was very low considering the scale of the proposal. We are concerned that sufficient advance notice was not given, or distributed widely enough, to allow local communities to attend. The exhibitions were not long enough or at convenient times to allow people to attend. Furthermore the venues for the exhibitions were not clearly signposted.</li> <li>We believe that sections of information were missing from the exhibitions, and misleading information provided on the exhibition boards.</li> <li>The information that was available throughout the consultation period was too technical and not intended to be understood by members of the public.</li> <li>We are particularly concerned about the traffic issues arising from the development, and the impact it will have on Rowtree Road.</li> <li>East Hunsbury Parish Council does not consider the proposal to have any community benefit.</li> </ul>	Issues regarding need and the 'network' of SRFIs envisaged by the NPS are covered in the Market Analysis Report, and Planning Statement in further depth, including with regard to the existing network and distribution of SRFIs. Local policy issues are also addressed. Around 6000 addresses were contacted with newsletters and leaflets, in addition to notices in newspapers and on land around the proposed development. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the SoCC agreed with the local authorities.
OB2 22	Ian Dickinson	Canal & River Trust	22/11/2017		OB3 20	<p><b>M1 Junction 15A</b> Junction 15A lies immediately adjacent to the Northampton Arm of the Grand Union Canal, which passes under the motorway. There is a flight of locks at this point (the Rothersthorpe Lock Flight) which comprises 13 locks, which are Grade II listed structures. Currently the A43/M1 northbound link road crosses over the canal via a bridge before meeting the southern roundabout onto the A43. The proposed works are described in Appendix 12.12 of the Transportation chapter of the Draft Environmental Statement. The red line shown on Drawing NGW-BWB-GEN-XX-SK-C-SK20 Rev P2 extends up to the canal towpath in the vicinity of the bridge carrying the A43/M1 link road over the canal. The works proposed to the southern roundabout appear unlikely to affect the canal or the bridge carrying the link road over the canal. However, the Trust considers that it would be appropriate to clarify the exact extent of these works and whether or not any access to Trust land will be required and ensure that any requirement for access is addressed in the final application documents when they are submitted. We recommend that you contact the Trust's Infrastructure Services Team to discuss these works in more detail and to establish whether or not any consents may be required from the Trust for any works that may affect the canal, and to ensure that any such works comply with the Trust's current Code of Practice for Works Affecting the Canal &amp; River Trust. <b>Knock Lane/Blisworth Road</b> The proposed works are described in Appendix 12.14 of the Transportation chapter of the Draft Environmental Statement, and involve some minor widening of Knock Lane on the approach to the junction with Stoke Road, together with some drainage improvements. The red line shown on Drawing NGW-BWB-GEN-XX-SK-C-SK29 Rev P2 identifies a working area that is approximately 20m east of the line of the Blisworth Tunnel on the Grand Union Canal. The tunnel is identified on this plan. We do not expect that these minor works will affect the canal tunnel, however account must be taken of the proximity of the tunnel in finalising the design of the works at this junction. The Trust recommends that you confirm the final extent of the works in order that we can be satisfied that there will be no adverse impacts on the canal tunnel.</p> <p><b>Heritage</b> We note that the Cultural Heritage chapter of the Draft Environmental Statement does not identify the proximity of the Grade II listed Rothersthorpe Lock Flight to the works proposed at Junction 15A of the M1. The conservation area status of the Northampton Arm of the Grand Union Canal south of the M1 (within South Northamptonshire District) should also be acknowledged within this chapter. The potential impact of the proposal on the significance of these designated heritage assets should be fully assessed within the final application documents, together with consideration of the need (or otherwise) for mitigation measures to address any adverse impacts.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> The Trust appreciates that at this stage, potential issues and options may still be under consideration, but hopes that the comments detailed above will assist in identifying matters of relevance to the Trust and ensure that they are fully taken into account in the final application documents. We would welcome the opportunity to review further plans and documents as they become available and to provide feedback on any matters of relevance to the Trust.</p>	Comments noted - the application includes an assessment of the likely effects on nearby cultural heritage assets (Chapter 10), and this includes consideration of nearby conservation areas and other assets. No significant effects are likely on the canal given distance from the Main Site, and the nature of the nearby proposed highways works at J15A.
OB2 24		Rothersthorpe Parish Council	23/11/2017			<p>Rothersthorpe Parish Council is concerned about the proposals for the Roxhill Northampton Gateway SRFI proposal and community consultation and exhibitions held in October 2017 for the following reasons: 1. There was lack of sufficient advance notice of the exhibitions leading to a poor turnout. 2. There was misleading information on the exhibition boards and selective paraphrasing of policies and market studies. 3. There was sections of missing information. 4. There was vast volumes of information that can never be read or understood by the public. In contrast the summary was too short to be of much use. 5. There is no perceived community benefit when compared to the numerous disbenefits. 6. There was poor signage of venues.</p>	Comments and concerns noted, some of which echo those made by local people. The draft ES was not complete, and this was clearly stated - there was ongoing work during and beyond Stage 2, but a large amount of information was shared (as reflected in the comments). The summary was intended to aid those deterred by the technical information provided. Venues were chosen local to the communities closest to the Proposed Development in response to local requests that this be the approach taken, and it was considered to work very well in engaging local people.

OB2 25	Fiona Young	Roade Parish Council	23/11/2017			<p>Roade Parish Council wishes to make the following observations on your most recent series of exhibitions: 1. A huge volume of information was delivered at the last moment together with a short summary. This latter is very selective in the policies quoted and is misleading. A 35 page document is inadequate to précis the thousands of pages in the 15 large files and beyond the time available for the majority of residents to review in any meaningful way in only 6 weeks. 2. The advance notice of the exhibitions was insufficient. The July newsletter was vague over timing and then the dates were announced just days before the first exhibition. We are aware of residents unable to attend due to holidays and work commitments as all the immediate exhibitions were held over only a 6 day period. This we consider to be inadequate when they could have been spread over a longer period during the 6 week Consultation period. 3. There are documents that have been prepared in a way that is not intelligible to the general public which results in disengagement and give rise to impressions of deliberate obfuscation. 4. There are a number of areas where you have made assumptions when you will be relying on reports from Consultants that are not yet available and, when completed, may not support your claims. 5. Some of the information on the display boards at these exhibitions was also misleading, with highly selective quotations from external reports and government documents, and claims made that are unsupported by the documentary evidence. 6. We are concerned at the lack of direct contact with residents who will be adversely affected by your proposals. This gives us cause for concern at your processes and, in our view, is inadmissible. 7. In all the documentation and information provided we cannot foresee net benefits for our community. As much of your documentation is in draft form we do not consider it appropriate to comment further at this stage in the process. Roade Parish Council remains totally opposed to the Northampton Gateway development proposed by Roxhill (J15) Ltd. We remain completely unconvinced by the 'strategic' claims of the proposed development, as we can only see a SRFI cluster developing around this part of Northamptonshire at very</p>	<p>Comments, and objections noted. The main issues are covered in the main body of the Consultation Report. The consultation process was undertaken in accordance with the SoCC agreed with SNC and NBC - we understand SNC sought views from some Parish Councils before providing comment to the Applicant about the SoCC. The reference to lack of contact with the community is contrary to the Applicant's view based not only on the holding of an exhibition in the village, but also having taken part in 2 public 'open floor' meetings, including the Annual Parish meeting in April 2017 with an audience of over 300 residents, and Mrs Leadsom MP. This followed an earlier public meeting held in Roade earlier in the process. The consultation material was not complete, but was well advanced - there were gaps, but this was explained clearly. The summary was intended to help, not mislead - we note the concerns raised both about there being too much information, and there not being a long enough summary.</p>
OB2 26	Viv Hartley	Blisworth Parish Council	23/11/2017		OB1 17	<p>Blisworth Parish Council is unanimous in its opposition to Roxhill's proposed Northampton Gateway development, that opposition being on both strategic and environmental grounds. The Parish Council has engaged in the consultation process to defend the rights and wishes of the local community. The Parish Council's observations on the exhibitions held in October 2017 are as follows:</p> <p>1. On the basis of the information provided there are no perceivable benefits to the local community of this development proceeding. In the exhibitions the Applicant failed to provide a clear and balanced view of the benefits versus the dis-benefits, the latter of which are numerous. 2. We believe that there was lack of sufficient advance notification of the exhibitions leading to a disappointingly low turnout. As a comparison, the average turnout at the Roxhill exhibitions (excluding Towcester) was 76 whilst the average turnout at the exhibitions held by Ashfield Land in May 2016 was 108. It should be noted that the Ashfield Land exhibitions were held at a time when awareness of such developments was much lower (May 2016) and fewer villages were directly affected, giving us good reason to question whether the events were adequately publicised. 3. The information on the boards at the exhibitions and in the summary documents available was highly misleading and the real facts obscured by the selective paraphrasing of policy statements and market studies. 4. The information on the application was incomplete with vital sections missing. We also question the currency of the information provided on the basis that sections were being replaced at the time of the exhibitions. 5. We feel that the Applicant has failed to present the information in a form that allows those wishing to engage in the process to do so effectively. The choice between thousands of pages in 15 large volumes and a 34 page short explanatory document precludes the majority of concerned residents from engaging to any worthwhile extent. We suspect that there may be method behind this information overload. 6. The signage of the venues was poor and may well have led to the poor turnout experienced. We trust that our observations will be duly noted and taken into consideration at the appropriate stage in the application process.</p>	<p>Comments, and objections noted. The main issues are covered in the main body of the Consultation Report. The consultation process was undertaken in accordance with the SoCC agreed with SNC and NBC - we understand SNC sought views from some Parish Councils before providing comment to the Applicant about the SoCC. The consultation material was not complete, but was well advanced - there were gaps, but this was explained clearly. The summary was intended to help, not mislead - we note the concerns raised both about there being too much information, and there not being a long enough summary.</p>
OB2 27	Martin Seldon	Highways England	23/11/2017			<p>As you are aware, a Transport Working Group (TWG) was set up in July 2016. Since then, Highways England has engaged with the applicant and Northamptonshire Highways in order to provide advice on the necessary traffic impact assessment and highway mitigation to accompany the DCO submission to the Planning Inspectorate. The information contained in the following documents has already been agreed by Highways England:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoping Report for the Environmental Statement (October 2016).</li> <li>• Technical Note 2: Trip generation (report ref. ADC1475 TN2, dated November 2016). This set out the methodology used to determine the vehicular trip generation associated with the SRFI development</li> <li>• Technical Note 3: HGV Trip Distribution (report ref. ADC1475 TN3, dated January 2017). TN3 presented the methodology used to determine the HGV trip distribution associated with the development.</li> <li>• M1J15 Northampton Gateway SRFI Local Model Validation Report – v.2.1 (report ref. 70026370, dated March 2017). The report details the transport modelling work undertaken in order to assess the transport proposal related to the development using the 2015 Northamptonshire Strategic Traffic Model (NSTM).</li> <li>• Technical Note 5 v.4: M1 Junction 15 (report ref. ADC1475 TN5, dated March 2017). TN5 presented the evolution of the M1 Junction 15 layout design and detailed the junction modelling that informed the design process. Some concerns were raised by Highways England regarding the design of the proposed mitigation schemes.</li> </ul> <p>Notwithstanding this, preliminary design presented in TN5 was considered appropriate from a capacity point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport Modelling Scenarios – ver1., which includes the scenarios that are required as per Circular 02/2013</li> <li>• 02664TN_LMVR Addendum_170426_v1, which outlines the changes made to the base VISSIM model Highways England provided in order to be a suitable tool to test the development proposals</li> <li>• NGW-BWB-HGN-XX-RP-D-01-S3-P6_Briefing paper on scope of design work prior to DCO submission TN4</li> <li>• M1 Gateway SRFI_M1 Distribution Technical Note_230617_v1</li> <li>• ADC1475 TN5 v5 - M1 Junction 15 - which reports the evolution of the design for the proposed works at M1 J15.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, and the issues for part of ongoing dialogue and joint working with Network Rail.</p>
OB2 28	Helen Hartshorne (on Behalf of Jill Stephenson)	NetworkRail	23/11/2017		OB1 04 /OB1 14	<p>Network Rail is a statutory consultee as the proposed development sits within 10m of the rail boundary, and the development site includes land in which our interest is held. Modal shift towards rail freight supports sustainable economic growth, with Network Rail working towards a growing rail freight sector by increasing capacity for more trains, improving the efficiency of the network, enabling the infrastructure to cater for longer, more productive trains, and speeding up freight journeys to improve productivity and profitability for operators and value for end users.</p> <p>Our in-principle support for new rail freight proposals needs to be balanced by a robust analysis of the local and national network to ensure such proposals can operate efficiently without detriment to other timetabled services. We are currently working with the scheme promoters (Roxhill) and anticipate imminent formal engagement to develop and validate a formal feasibility study. This detailed work will allow us to consider and review the conclusions contained within the Draft Rail Operation Report and the Draft Rail Capacity Report carried out by consultants on behalf of the scheme promoters.</p> <p>Protective Provisions - upon submission of the development consent order application, Network Rail will require the developer to enter into an undertaking for legal costs associated with negotiation of protective provisions to protect Network Rail's operational and land interests.</p> <p>Bridge Agreement - The developer will need to enter into a bridge agreement for the proposed new bridge over the West Coast Main Line railway. Network Rail's Property team will manage this process.</p> <p>In conclusion, we would recommend you continue to work with Network Rail via the LNW Route Sponsorship team.</p>	<p>Comments noted, including the general comments regarding the importance of modal shift, and in-principle support for new freight proposals. The response reflects some of the same content as the ongoing dialogue between Network Rail and the Applicant.</p>
OB2 29	Sharon Henley	Northants Police	23/11/2017		OB3 13	<p>Further to my visit to the consultation event at Milton Malsor and a subsequent opportunity to look at the plans and documentation submitted for this stage 2 consultation I would make the following comments on behalf of Northants Police.</p> <p>Impact on Crime - I can find little information on any crime prevention measures to be implemented as part of this development to reduce opportunities for crime and disorder on the site. Northants Police would expect to see evidence of how the applicant is going to address the issues of crime and disorder, which will arise as a result of this development, within the chapter on the socio-economic aspects of the Draft Environmental Statement. There is no mention whatsoever. The applicant should indicate how such adverse effects will be mitigated by the application of the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, an adherence to the key principles contained within the SPG on Planning out Crime, a willingness to develop both the site and any HGV lorry park to independently approved secure standards such as Secured by Design and Park Mark and compliance with policy S10 of the WNJCS.</p> <p><b>HGV Crime</b> There are very few secure HGV lorry parks in Northamptonshire and many lorries have to park up in lay-bys and along trunk roads if they arrive too early for their 'just in time' delivery slot on an industrial estate. This puts both the load, the fuel and the driver at risk from criminals and Northants suffers from a considerable amount of HGV related criminality. It is therefore astonishing to note that the potential for such crime has not been recognised and it is considered appropriate to suggest that HGV lorries can park up in lay-bys by the side of the spine road. (point 12.6.50). This is unacceptable on a green field site where the provision of an HGV lorry park can be easily accommodated. Northants Police strongly OBJECT to this negligent approach to the potential for crime thus demonstrated and would ask that when the final layout for the site is submitted a secure lorry park is provided. Guidance on the security necessary for such a site can be found in the attached SETPOS document.</p> <p><b>BREEAM</b> Points can be awarded towards your target of BREEAM 'very good' by the achievement of a Secured by Design accreditation for the buildings on site. Further advice and guidance on the necessary standards to adopt can be found at <a href="http://www.securedbydesign.com">www.securedbydesign.com</a> (see commercial developments 2015 version 2) for the latest recommendations regarding standards to adopt. Consultation at an early stage is recommended to ensure the points available can be awarded.</p> <p><b>Traffic Modelling</b> In addition in chapter 12 Transportation the applicant should include the impact this development will have on diversionary routes such as the A5, the impact of the interlinkage with the existing and proposed industrial estates. When this is developed there will be major industrial development off every junction of the M1 as it travels through the county. The impact of the traffic this will generate plus that generated by events at Silverstone such as the Grand Prix should also be included. The applicant should show how the impact of additional traffic on the existing road network will be mitigated.</p> <p><b>Illustrative MasterPlan</b> Whilst it is recognised that this is submitted to indicate that the necessary level of development can be accommodated on the land in question should this be submitted as the final layout I would like to make the following recommendations:</p> <p>The roads should be covered by ANPR enabled monitored CCTV cameras.</p> <p>Car parking for the individual units should be included in the demise of the individual unit and be more closely aligned to the unit it serves. Car parking and cycle parking should be covered by CCTV and surrounded by a secure fence line – this is especially important where the footpath and car parking abut each other.</p>	<p>In response to the conversations had at the exhibition, and the written comments sent afterwards, changes were made to the Proposed Development - particularly the inclusion of a secure, dedicated HGV parking area on-site.</p>
OB2 30	Tom Cotton	Road Haulage Association (RHA)	23/11/2017			<p>We would like to thank Northampton Gateway SRFI for the consultation and the opportunity to comment on the issues raised. The road network is very important to members of the RHA. For RHA members the road network is more than just a piece of infrastructure, it is their everyday place of work, as such RHA members have a unique appreciation of the road network.</p> <p>The RHA response is confined to the intermodal freight terminal and HGV parking. HGV drivers must take regular and specified rest periods which are defined in various national and international regulations. These rest periods can be for as long as 48 hours. These rest periods are essential for road safety purposes, preventing tired HGV drivers. It is essential that there are adequate parking spaces with overnight facilities - in the Northampton area there is a deficit of about 900 parking spaces per night. Overnight facilities must provide a safe, level and well lit parking area. Toilets and showers with hot and cold running water are a minimum. Provision of permanent accommodation and restaurant facilities, together with refuelling are also important. This location is at a major junction of the M1 and A45. It is important to ensure any change to the road network does not delay HGVs.</p>	<p>Comments noted - the proposals now include a secure, dedicated HGV parking area. HGV Parking was always included on-site, but a specific, dedicated area was added after Stage 2 line with comments made by more than one consultee.</p>

OB2 31	Danny James (Turley)	Reps Ashfield Land Management	24/11/2017		OB3 23	<p>Overview - Ashfield Land has significant development interests within the area to which the consultation relates, with the ongoing promotion of a next generation SRFI (Rail Central) on land immediately to the west of Northampton Gateway.</p> <p>As part of this response to the ongoing consultation exercise, Ashfield Land would again like to take this opportunity to invite you to positively engage with us and I set out in more detail below and enclosed, the topic specific information we feel would be helpful to complete our own cumulative assessment. We will of course be willing to share copies of these documents at whatever stage of draft they are in at the time.</p> <p>We note that the Description of Development includes an area of land to the east of the Northampton Loop Line, which lies within the Rail Central draft order limits. This area of land is integral to the Rail Central scheme and is required as an area to partially offset the loss of farmland to facilitate the development and allow the diversion of a public footpath as part of our wider mitigation strategy, which seeks to maintain and enhance the existing connectivity across the site. The area will continue to be farmed but will be enhanced to provide farmland bird cover plots, annual wildflower seeded field edges and the field sizes will be further broken down to allow for new hedgerow planting. Ashfield Land has secured the benefit of an option of this land, which is evidenced on the registered title. There are a number of references stating that the cumulative impact assessment will take account of the Rail Central proposal. Whilst we welcome this, we wish to ensure that you take account of the full extent of the Rail Central development within the assessment, which includes the integral proposed farmland bird mitigation which is within the proposed application boundary for your scheme. Furthermore, we are aware that from the outset of the DCO process you have held the view that only one of Rail Central or Northampton Gateway can be delivered in this location due to market demand and environmental impacts.</p> <p>Substance of Consultation Material - Following a detailed review of your consultation documents, it is our view that not enough detail or evidence has been included in the documents to allow us to provide sufficient representations on the proposals. We have a few concerns about the draft ES, principally that the survey work appears to be incomplete and there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that formal agreements with statutory consultees has been reached. Until such a time as we have had the opportunity to review the requested information set out below (and enclosed) prior to the submission of your DCO, it is not possible for us to provide substantive and detailed comments in response. As set out above, Ashfield Land are keen to engage with you in an information sharing exercise to allow both parties to produce robust assessments and draw meaningful conclusions, which will allow both parties to move forward positively in the DCO process.</p> <p>Turning specifically to highways matters, we note that your highways modelling work appears to be incomplete and that Highways England has raised a number of concerns about your proposed mitigation.</p> <p>We would welcome sight of the updated operational noise modelling work when it is available, in order to enable us to complete our Cumulative Impact Assessment.</p>	Comments noted and a response was sent regarding the assessment of cumulative effects, with a similar request made for details regarding the Rail Central Scheme.
OB2 32	Stewart Patience	Anglian Water	24/11/2017		OB1 08 /OB2 06 / OB3 24	<p>Plans and Drawings :There are existing water mains located within the boundary of the site. It is important to ensure that existing assets can continue to be accessed and maintained by Anglian Water.</p> <p>Draft Development Consent Order :We have reviewed the wording included in the Draft DCO and have significant concerns relating to paragraphs 8 and 31 as proposed.</p> <p>Paragraph 31 of the Draft DCO states that:  "31. The undertaker may, subject to Schedule 15 (protective provisions)—  (a) extinguish the rights of statutory undertakers within the Order limits; and  (b) replace, reposition, renew, alter and supplement the apparatus belonging to statutory undertakers within the Order limits."  However Schedule 15 of the Draft DCO does not include any protective provisions for Anglian Water as water and sewerage undertaker.  Anglian Water has statutory obligations to supply water and drain premises under the provisions of sections 41 and 94 the Water Industry Act 1991. It is therefore unclear how we would be able to fulfil our statutory obligations given that the undertaker (Roxhill) would be able to extinguish rights over any existing assets within the Order land.</p> <p>Paragraph 8 also grants power over sewers in this respect:  "8.—(1) The undertaker may for the purposes of the carrying out of the authorised development, enter on so much of any of the streets specified in Schedule 3 (streets subject to street works) as are within the Order limits and may—  (a) break up or open the street, or any sewer, drain or tunnel under it;...  (d) maintain apparatus in the street or change its position"</p> <p>Please find attached protective provisions specifically for the benefit of Anglian Water which have previously been shared with Roxhill. We would wish to see included in the wording of the Draft DCO to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. The alternative would be to make it clear in the wording of the Draft DCO that paragraphs 8, 21 and 33 do not apply to Anglian Water's existing assets. In this case the Roxhill would then rely upon the rights for applicants as set out in sections 106 and 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would welcome further discussions with Roxhill to agree the proposed wording of the Draft DCO which is of relevance to Anglian Water prior to the application being submitted.</p> <p>Draft Environmental Statement:Reference is made to assessing the impact of the associated highway proposals on Anglian Water's existing water supply and foul water assets. In the event that there is expected to be an impact on our existing assets we would welcome further discussions on this issue and whether there is a need for mitigation. Similarly reference is made to the disposal of sewage from site welfare facilities to the public sewerage network and that it will be unlikely to be of significance in comparison to the operational phase.</p> <p>In the event that a temporary connection to the water supply and/or public sewerage networks are required a formal application to Anglian Water would be required. We would welcome further discussions about any water and/or wastewater requirements for these facilities. Further details of Anglian Water's pre-planning service are available to view at the following address: <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-planning-service.aspx">http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-planning-service.aspx</a></p> <p>Draft Design and Access Statement: Reference is made to the preparation of a surface water strategy to manage surface water run-off from the site. We welcome the reference made to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems for this purpose. Please see email for Appendix 1 - RECOMMENDED PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS FOR THE BENEFIT OF ANGLIAN WATER</p>	Detailed noted, and formed part of ongoing discussions regarding infrastructure and protective provisions.
OB2 33	Cllr Luke Graystone	Northampton Borough Council	24/11/2017			<p>Emailed comments covering a number of issues: Site Location - concerns that this site is not allocated in the WNJCS, and with other SRFIs at DIRFT and East Midlands Gateway the case and need here is not clear. Rail Capacity - local people do not have confidence that even the minimum of 4 trains per day can be secured given capacity issues on the rail network. Local Roads - with high levels of employment locally the proposals may attract commuting, with significant effects on local roads. Conclusion My residents are extremely concerned about the adverse effect the proposals would have on the local community, in relation to the points raised above and across a whole range of concerns including visual &amp; noise blight, insufficient environmental and air quality mitigation, overly optimistic projections of the growth of the local working age population, and proposed urban sprawl essentially bringing several villages into the Northampton conurbation which are currently separate from it.</p>	Comments and concerns noted - these issues are fully addressed in the final application.
OB2 34	Neville Doe	Historic England	27/11/2017		OB1 03 / OB3 02	<p>At present we are not convinced all of our previous advice has been taken into account - we do not consider that sufficient information has as yet been submitted to provide a clear understanding of the potential impacts on the historic environment as required. We have set out below advice regarding the additional information which we consider will be essential to come to an informed view of the project. It is already evident to us that the proposed development will have a significant environmental impact in EIA terms on the historic environment and that it will cause harmful impacts on a number of designated heritage assets - proportional and refined information is necessary to address these substantial impacts. Historic England Advice At the PEI stage our advice focuses upon how the draft environmental statement (ES) approaches the possible effects of development on the historic environment, particularly designated heritage assets. We will provide you with advice on whether the draft ES provides all the information reasonably required to both assess the environmental effects of the development under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations and enable the consultees and ultimately the Examining Authority to develop an informed view of the scheme.</p> <p>Both general and more specific advice is offered - this includes the need to consider such elements as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The potential impact upon the landscape, especially if a site falls within an area of historic landscape;</li> <li>- Direct impacts on historic/archaeological fabric (buildings, sites or areas), whether statutorily protected or not. All grades of listed buildings should be identified;</li> <li>- Other impacts, particularly the setting of listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas etc, including long views and any specific designed views and vistas within historic designed landscapes.</li> <li>- The potential for buried archaeological remains;</li> <li>- Effects on landscape amenity from public and private land;</li> <li>- Cumulative impacts</li> </ul> <p>The draft ES does not yet adequately address all of the above. We note the inclusion of the updated Built Heritage Statement (BHS) and LVIA. We also note that the LVIA has been informed by a ZTV refined through field evaluation. Maps and other information should be submitted to enable a clear understanding of the approach and reasoning behind the assessment(s). The ZTV is a key piece of baseline information. Detailed advice also offered regarding: Designated Heritage Assets - Significance &amp; Impact, Courteenhall Registered Park and Garden, Roade Aqueduct, and Planning Policy Context.</p> <p>Recommended Next Steps - the proposed development scheme will result in a significant widespread transformation of the existing landscape and geographical character. Further information and assessment is required in order to fully demonstrate the impacts upon designated heritage assets in their shared landscape setting. We recommend that you consider comments and observations that we have provided above in alignment with all the other historic environment consultees and consider in order to address the issues and concerns that we have raised.</p>	The comments about the Stage 2 draft ES, and suggestions about the further work required, are noted, and welcomed. The comments suggested a relatively early and clear view had been reached by Historic England (HE) as to the likely scale and nature of impacts, even ahead of the further work undertaken between Stage 2 in late 2017, and the assessments and ES being finalised. However, the findings of the ES assessments on the built and buried heritage assets do not raise the same issues as those anticipated by HE. A programme of trial trenching was undertaken post Stage 2 consultation to test and verify the Geophysical survey results - the findings are all reported in Chapter 10 and associated Appendices. Further photo viewpoints were added to the assessment in response to concerns about the impacts on the Courteenhall RPG. No significant adverse effects are considered likely.

OB2 35	Peter Baguley	Northampton Borough Council	27/11/2017			<p>I refer to the Stage 2 October 2017 consultation. Planning Committee on 21st November 2017 resolved that the following comments are sent:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site is not allocated for development in the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2014).</li> <li>2. The proposed scheme is in line with the Government's objectives and long term vision for a low carbon sustainable transport system for economic growth and the promotion of a transfer of freight from road to rail. The development would make a valuable contribution towards the economic growth of Northampton and the provision of jobs. Notwithstanding this, a development of such magnitude will inevitably have impacts and appropriate and proportionate mitigation should be sought.</li> <li>3. In considering the impacts of the development proposal (transport, air quality, noise and light pollution) account should be taken of the cumulative impacts alongside existing committed development and allocated sites. In particular the cumulative impacts of allocated Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) at Northampton South SUE (Collingtree), Land South of Brackmills SUE (Hardingstone), Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal (DIRFT) and proposals for Rail Central. Appropriate mitigation should be sought.</li> <li>4. The mitigation measures proposed include a financial contribution towards a larger capacity improvement scheme at the A45 Queen Eleanor Interchange and the M1 Junction 15. Clarification is requested in consultation with the relevant highway authorities, as to how this would fit in with existing planned improvements to these interchanges, particularly in association with the proposed SUE developments at Collingtree and Hardingstone, and the proposed mechanism for securing financial contributions.</li> <li>5. The submitted details indicate that it is the developer's intention that the scheme would deliver a rail terminal in advance of first occupation of any building. The timing of the delivery of the rail terminal and ensuring appropriate rail network capacity is available is vital to ensure appropriate mitigation in respect of highway, noise and air quality impacts and impact on surrounding amenity, and to ensure that the relevant infrastructure is in place for the associated warehousing.</li> <li>6. The development proposals will be required to have regard to Northamptonshire County Council Parking Standards (2016).</li> <li>7. The nearest receptor within Northampton Borough is Collingtree village located to the north of the proposed site beyond the M1. In addition to the existing village, outline consent at the Northampton South SUE was allowed at appeal. The noise impacts of the development proposal both during construction and operation, and the potential for noise deflection from proposed buildings, will therefore need to be considered in relation to these receptors, and the requirement for an appropriate Construction and Environmental Management Plan to ensure any impacts during construction are satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>8. Provision should be made for the early implementation of proposed areas of bunding and landscaping, and subsequent maintenance, to ensure the proposed mitigation for the visual impacts of the development are achieved at an early stage.</li> <li>9. Policy S11 of the JCS requires that major development should contribute to reductions in carbon emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. The development should seek to achieve a minimum rating of at least BREEAM very good standard or equivalent.</li> <li>10. Appropriate measures should be put in place to ensure there is no increased risk of flooding in the area, and appropriate drainage mitigation and ongoing maintenance is in place both during the construction and operational phases of the development.</li> </ol>	<p>Response noted and welcomed - all issues refer to issues which formed part of the ongoing technical work at the time, and which feature in the final Application (in the ES). A cumulative assessment has been undertaken - in transport terms this includes all committed and allocated developments, including all SUEs, DIRFT, etc. Other chapters of the ES also consider the nearest SUEs, as well as the emerging Rail Central scheme. The noise assessment has considered receptors in Collingtree, close to the approved Northampton South SUE, and show negligible noise effects are likely. Close work with partners through the Transport Working Group has helped refine and shape the TA, and Mitigation Works proposed, including the approach to contributions to support a package of works at the Interchange. Parking details are a matter for agreement in due course, but will comply with local standards. Phasing plans confirm the early delivery of the landscaping and earthworks, secured by Requirements in the draft DCO. BREEAM Very Good will be delivered, and a Sustainability Strategy is included in Chapter 2 of the ES.</p>
OB2 36	Jasbir Kaur	Warwickshire County Council	28/11/2017		OB1 09 & OB3 04	<p>The County Council made comments in January 2017 and those comments still stand. However we wish to update you on our progress on our proposals for a new Rugby Park Rail station.</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council is promoting a new station at Rugby on the Northampton Loop of the West Coast Main Line (WCML), known as 'Rugby Parkway' serving the 14,750 new population within the Rugby Sustainable Urban Extension known as Houlton.</p> <p>Since our previous letter, additional work has been carried out with Network Rail on the potential timetable at the new Station. Network Rail is understood to be assessing line speed and headway (the minimum time required between successive trains) enhancements to the Northampton Loop, together with re-modelling of Northampton Station, to offer greater future capacity for passenger and freight services, but with none of these being committed schemes at the time of writing. Warwickshire County Council is aware that along with Northampton Gateway there are other aspirational freight schemes which may affect the Northampton Loop, but that none of these currently have committed rail services or supporting infrastructure schemes. Given the strategic importance of Rugby Parkway to passenger access to the National Rail network for south Warwickshire, and its active stage of development by Warwickshire County Council within rail industry processes, the County Council will work with the Department for Transport, Network Rail and passenger and freight operators to seek to ensure that Rugby Parkway will not preclude any strategic development of freight services on the WCML and, conversely, that freight proposals such as Northampton Gateway will not negatively impact the Rugby Parkway Scheme in terms of paths along the route.</p>	<p>Noted. Plans and aspirations for the Rugby Parkway Station are understood, and the likely rail capacity implications have been considered.</p>
OB2 37	Andy Preston	South Northamptonshire Council	08/12/2017			<p>The Councils response to the statutory consultation with respect to the above development proposal is set out in the following paragraphs. The Development Plan: west Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS), South Northamptonshire Local Plan, (Transport: sustainable modes of Transport, Parking, Rail) Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment, Noise (construction Phase Noise, Construction Vibration, Operational Phase Noise, Rail Vibration, Road Traffic Noise, Noise from RFI terminal on main site) Air Quality, Cultural Heritage, External Lighting, Water &amp; Drainage, Agricultural Land, Wasw &amp; Resources, Ecology &amp; Nature Conservation (Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA/Ramsar, Badgers, bats, Birds, Great Crested Newts &amp; Ponds, Hedgerows and Woodlands, Grassland, Cumulative Effects, Minimising Impacts on and Providing Net Gains in Biodiversity) Economic Growth Impact, Cumulative Impact.</p>	<p>A detailed response is provided in the body of the Consultation Report.</p>
OB2 38	Alison Benson	Quinton Parish Council	30/11/2017			<p>Quinton Parish Council is concerned regarding the above proposals and the lack of real consultation with communities such as Quinton. The Rail Central meetings have been attended by parish councillors and we have been fully informed of proposals, we cannot say this about the Roxhill consultation. Please can you advise what local traffic management plan you have in place for the construction phase? Quinton is blighted by high volumes of traffic on narrow country lanes and we need certainty that this will not be exacerbated by the current proposals.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment has included modelling of the wider network, including and beyond Quinton. The strategy to improve the A508 corridor, and to substantially upgrade Junction 15, reduces rat-running overall, with benefits to a number of villages. With the A508 and Junction 15 improved the local routes are shown by the modelling to be less attractive to through-traffic. The strategy was set out during Stage 2, and some details refined for Stage 3 - it is set out in the final application (ES chapter 12 and the TA).</p>
OB2 39	Kerrie Ginns	Environment Agency	13/02/2018		OB1 02	<p>We would expect that going forward all additional works, such as the A508 Rookery Lane / Ashton Road junction, are included within the environmental statement. As a minimum, all sites that going through the planning process should be accompanied by a preliminary risk assessment.</p> <p>The proposal should assess the need for abstraction licenses during the construction stage.</p> <p>Catchment issues - In 2016 the Wootton Brook was assessed at Moderate in terms of Ecological Status under the Water Framework Directive (WFD), principally failing for Biological quality elements (macrophytes and phytobenthos) and Physico-chemical quality elements (phosphates). Sediment ingress through poor land management has also been identified as part of a walkover survey for River Basin Management Planning on the Wootton Brook. The Environment Agency would not wish to see a deterioration in Ecological Status as a result of the development. Furthermore, we would seek for the developer to propose mitigation measures that see improvements in water quality and biodiversity within the receiving watercourses.</p> <p>There are 3 areas of opportunity:</p> <p>The Courteenhall Brook is approximately 4km long with around 2.4km of the brook running through rural/agricultural land and the 1.6km running through an urban environment. As mentioned, phosphate is an issue for the Wootton Brook catchment so introducing measures that would assist with filtering/capturing phosphates within tributaries that feed the Wootton Brook would make significant steps towards improving this failing element. One solution would be to construct an online pond within the boundary of the development to capture sediment and remove phosphate that has entered the system upstream. A similar arrangement has been constructed in the Courteenhall Brook at Grange Park. This, combined with the surface water management proposed for the development site, would result in water quality improvements and wider biodiversity benefits along 1500m of watercourse.</p> <p>On Courteenhall Brook within Grange Park - there is significant green space between the M1 and the confluence with Wootton Brook. Further investigation could reveal opportunities within this reach that would bring benefits to both Courteenhall brook in term of improved access and amenity for residents of Grange Park, water quality improvements and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>On Wootton Brook between its confluence with Courteenhall Brook and the A45 roadbridge - this section of Wootton Brook is identified within Northampton Green Infrastructure Plan - Urban Brook Corridors component. Some areas of improvement have been identified along this section of Wootton Brook as part of the River Basin Management Planning process.</p>	<p>Comments and references are noted - the Application includes a range of mitigation measures regarding drainage and ecology, with an FRA, Water Framework Directive assessment, and Sustainable Drainage Statement submitted, covering issues of water quality as well as flood-risk.</p>

OB2 40	Iain Long	Fisher German (on behalf of Cadent Gas)	30/01/2018			<p>I note you have a number of interactions with Cadent gas and I need to ensure you have had both C3 and C4 estimates for these interactions. Also, please can you let me have your protective provisions. In respect of existing Cadent infrastructure, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus including compliance with relevant standards for works proposed within close proximity of its apparatus. Cadent Infrastructure is within or in close proximity to the Proposed Order Limits. Please see attached plans highlighting the locations of these Cadent assets. The Cadent apparatus that has been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High or Intermediate pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment</li> <li>• Low or Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipes and associated equipment. (As a result it is highly likely that there are gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity) Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions.</li> </ul> <p>Key Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cadent has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc.</li> </ul> <p>Pipeline Crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at previously agreed locations.</li> <li>• The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.</li> <li>• The type of raft shall be agreed with Cadent prior to installation.</li> <li>• No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the Cadent pipeline without the prior permission of Cadent.</li> <li>• Cadent will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure.</li> <li>• The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to Cadent.</li> </ul> <p>Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the Cadent easement strip.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Cadent representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline.</li> <li>• A Deed of Consent is required for any crossing of the easement</li> </ul> <p>New Service Crossing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New services may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.</li> <li>• A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement</li> <li>• A Cadent representative shall supervise any new service crossing of a pipeline. Any exposed pipeline should be suitably supported and removed prior to backfilling</li> <li>• An exposed pipeline should be suitably supported and removed prior to backfilling</li> <li>• An exposed pipeline should be protected by matting and suitable timber cladding</li> <li>• For pipe construction involving deep excavation (&lt;1.5m) in the vicinity of grey iron mains, the model consultative procedure will apply therefore an integrity assessment must be conducted to confirm if diversion is required</li> <li>• A Deed of Consent is required for any new service crossing the easement.</li> <li>• Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.</li> </ul>	Noted - this formed a number of interactions and dialogue with Cadent Gas representative regarding infrastructure, and protective provisions. The DCO and technical assessments have responded to any relevant issues raised accordingly.
OB2 40A	Iain Long	Fisher German (on behalf of Cadent Gas)	01/12/2017			<p>OB2 40 / OB2 40A/B/C/D &amp; OB2 01 / OB3 27</p> <p>I was wondering if you have been able to review the attached that was sent on the 5th July as I think it would be prudent to set up a meeting with Cadent engineers to ensure we can facilitate any diversions that are required.</p>	See response to OB 40 above.
OB2 40B	Iain Long	Fisher German (on behalf of Cadent Gas)	21/12 2017			<p>OB2 40 / OB2 40A/B/C/D &amp; OB2 01 / OB3 27</p> <p>Dear Sirs, Fisher German LLP have been instructed by Cadent Gas Ltd in respect of the J15 Northampton Gateway. Cadent will have infrastructure affected by your proposals. Please can you confirm if you have already received this asset location information, or if you have requested it. We can provide plans if required. Please can you ensure future correspondence regarding Cadent is issued to my details below at Fisher German, The Estates Office, Norman Court, Ashby De la Zouch, Leics. LE65 2UZ</p>	See response to OB 40 above.
OB2 40C	Iain Long	Fisher German (on behalf of Cadent Gas)	13/2.2018			<p>OB2 40 / OB2 40A/B/C/D &amp; OB2 01 / OB3 27</p> <p>Dear Sirs I note you have a number of interactions with Cadent gas and I need to ensure you have had both C3 and C4 estimates for these interactions. Have you requested this from our engineers? Additional please can you let me have your protective provisions</p>	See response to OB 40 above.
OB2 40D	Iain Long	Fisher German (on behalf of Cadent Gas)				<p>OB2 40 / OB2 40A/B/C/D &amp; OB2 01 / OB3 27</p> <p>Dear Sirs, Please can you let us know who your solicitors are so we can start to agree protective provisions and also if we can have details of your works as we will need to agree any diversions or protections</p>	See response to OB 40 above.
OB2 41	Alastair Inglis S	STOP ROXHILL NORTHAMPTON GATEWAY ACTION GROUP	24/11/2017			<p>1. The Display Boards and Short Explanatory Document are realistically the only sources of information readily accessible for the general public given the complexity of the documentation and the time permitted. We comment on these and the Consultation process. 2. The advance notice of the exhibitions was insufficient. The July newsletter was vague over timing with the dates being announced only days before the first exhibition. The exhibitions were not adequately spaced and some residents were unable to attend due to holidays and work commitments. We consider it inappropriate to condense exhibitions into an 11 day period - they could have been spread over a longer period during the 6 week Consultation period. 3. A huge volume of information was made available together with a short summary. This latter is very selective in the policies quoted and is misleading. A 35 page document is inadequate to précis thousands of pages in the 15 large files. 4. There are documents that have been prepared in a way that is not intelligible to the general public e.g. the Book of Reference which lists hundreds of properties potentially affected by Compulsory Purchase Orders or compensation which is difficult to access by concerned owners. 5. The lack of contact with some residents who will be directly affected by these proposals resulting in unnecessary stress when they discovered that their properties would or may be affected gives us cause for concern at your processes and, in our view, is inadmissible. 6. Display boards at the Exhibitions made statements which rely on reports not yet available and, when completed, may not be supported - e.g. Air quality, Lighting, Noise &amp; vibration, Ecology. The Environment is one of the key areas of government policy but you have failed to produce sufficient information for the general public to be able to assess the impacts of your proposals. 7. We question why you removed the western Bypass route options. Based on the Roade exhibition exit poll data, 87% objected to your proposals and, of those that responded to the potential choice of Bypass route in the event of the scheme being approved, 79% preferred the green route. 8. There were claims made that are unsupported by the documentary evidence; information presented in such a way that made it impossible to make value judgements and quotations from government policies and market studies by independent consultants that were highly selective and misleading. 9. In all the documentation and information we have been able to review so far we have seen no overall benefits for our community and strongly object to this proposal. The above illustrates our concerns at the inadequacy of your consultation. The lack of vital information on environmental issues is of particular concern. In none of the information presented has there been any justification for the need for a SRFI in this location.</p>	The comments and objections are noted, and the key points are covered in the main body of the Consultation Report. The consultation process was undertaken in accordance with the SoCC agreed with SNC and NBC - we understand SNC sought views from some Parish Councils before providing comment to the Applicant about the SoCC. The information provided for consultation was a draft ES - this is by nature a technical document, but the short summary document was intended to aid local residents, and many local people took copies away from the exhibitions. The draft ES was clearly labelled as draft, and was clearly not complete - but was well advanced to begin to form conclusions and judgements about the likely impacts, and this was the case for numerous topics covered by the ES. The purpose of sharing the drafts was to enable people to understand and comment on the emerging conclusions about impacts, and proposed mitigation measures. Many of the conclusions reached at Stage 2 remain valid, and the final ES provides a complete assessment of the likely effects. The Applicant sought views regarding the Bypass route during Stage 1, and via the July newsletter - the results of this consultation were inconclusive, and key local representative bodies chose not to provide a view at all. The bypass design and route has been informed by environmental and technical considerations, with details provided as part of the TA.
OB2 42	Julie Thomas	Borough Council of Wellingborough	22/11/2017			<p>OB3 12</p> <p>I refer to the information submitted and can confirm that this is noted and that the local planning authority has no comment on/objection to make.</p>	No comment/no objection noted.
OB2 43	Rob Sim-Jones	Northamptonshire Highways	04/01/2018			<p>This response represented the combined comments of all relevant sections of Northamptonshire Highways - it is a long letter, summarised here. The Transport Working Group (TWG) has resulted in agreement over the likely traffic to be generated by the proposed development (both light and heavy vehicles). A methodology for distributing the trips on the network is also agreed using the County Council's Strategic Transport Model (the NSTM). The NSTM has been further validated in the area to ensure that it is fit for purpose. Both the baseline and forecast NSTM models have been signed off by the County Council. The developers have assessed the operation of a number of junctions, as presented within their Stage 2 consultation. Initial highway mitigation proposed: Without prejudice to any detailed comments the LHA may make in due course: the principle of improving the M1 junctions is agreed - HGV parking issues re: layby on A45 need thought. Footpaths and crossing points within the improvements need to be fully considered, including Public Footpaths (e.g. KS2/LA13 at J15A) as part of the WCHAR (Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding) Audit. Signage should also be considered given complex layout at J15. The proposal to physically restrict HGV trips exiting the site from turning right on to the A508 is agreed, as is the principle of monitoring this through the provision of Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras (the locating of these on the Highway is still under discussion). The applicant is proposing to restrict the A508 junction with Courteenhall Road (incorrectly labelled in the consultation plans as 'Blisworth Road') to 'left-in, left-out' manoeuvres only, though the provision of a physical island. The principle of this is accepted. However, improvements to Knock Lane could be provided, to include widening. Roade By-Pass: The LHA is supportive of the principle of a Roade By-pass, and the preferred route chosen. The development of the proposals to this stage is comprehensive and appears to comply with all the requirements of DMRB (design speed and modelling appears to be WebTAG compliant). The design allows for future dualling. Detailed suggestions re: technical specification of roundabout and carriageway provided. Internal Layout: The detail will be the subject of further approvals, but the applicant should ensure that parking (cycling, cars, HGV's etc.) is in accordance with adopted Parking. The proposed Lorry Park for on-site HGV's is welcome. Walking and cycling connectivity and Public Rights of Way - welcome the provision currently proposed to the development site for walkers and cyclists. Further provision would be welcome at junction of the Roade Bypass with Blisworth Road/Knock Lane to assist cyclists to cross the bypass. The Rookery Lane/Ashton Road junction of the A508 also requires a facility for cyclists to safely cross. The proposal to create a shared-use facility alongside the A508 running south from junction 15 is currently shown as ending at the junction with the un-named road that leads to Courteenhall and Quinton. I suggest that this facility would be much more useful if it was continued alongside the A508 as far as Roade, thereby enabling easy and safe access by pedal cycle from this and surrounding villages. Revisit footway details along A508. Public Transport The Public Transport Strategy proposed by the developer is yet to be agreed at this stage, and discussion are on-going to ensure compliance with the County Council's adopted Public Transport Strategy. A key part of our rail strategy is an improvement in future passenger services to Northampton. We note that Draft Rail Operations and Rail Capacity Reports have been published as part of the consultation. We consider it important that the rail impacts of the development are included to demonstrate any impact on the rail network from the development. Detailed queries about the draft rail reports provided. The County Council has been involved as a stakeholder in Network Rail's West Coast Capacity Plus Study, and we understand from this that the major constraint on performance of up freight trains is their ability to climb the approximately 1 in 200 gradient from Northampton to Roade following the speed restriction under West Bridge immediately south of Northampton station. While the Draft Rail Capacity Study makes reference to the general availability of paths for freight services it would be useful for more detail to be given of the specific impact of the proposed development. We also note that in the emerging West Coast Capacity Plus Study referred to above, Network Rail have identified a significant future constraint in capacity between Denbigh Hall North Junction and Milton Keynes Central in particular, but also over the entirety of the Northampton Loop, such that increasing freight services over the Loop might require a reduction in the passenger service to Northampton. As many of the items above are subject to on-going work and discussions, the LHA shall comment further at the appropriate stage.</p>	Dialogue had been ongoing with NCC Highways since the inception of the Transport Working Group - the response raises issues covered via that route, and discussed subsequently. Support for the emerging transport strategy, including the J15 improvements and Bypass are noted, and welcome - as is the confirmation that the TA is based on an agreed methodology, with a validated model. Rail issues were the focus of a specific meeting held post Stage 2, and are addressed via the submitted Rail Reports.
OB44	Terry Owen	Landowner/homeowner, Northampton Road, Stoke Bruerne	20/10/2017			<p>Questions raised in writing following discussions held at the Towcester exhibition regarding the detail of the likely boundary of any land acquisitions regarding highways improvements in Stoke Bruerne, and regarding implications for access to the properties on the A508 (Northampton Road).</p>	Plans were provided to Mr Owen to explain in further detail the highways proposals, and land requirements.
OB45	Mr N and Mrs C Murray	Stoke Gap House, Ashton Road, Stoke Bruerne				<p>Questions raised verbally during the exhibition in Roade in October 2017 regarding the proposed works at Rookery Lane - Mrs Murray queried land ownership regarding some of the land included within the potential order limits.</p>	There was a subsequent email exchange (with WSP) - a Section 42 letter was resent, but also explained that the land was unregistered adopted highway - the letter included a copy of the NCC adopted highway plan.