

---Original Message-----

From: Tom McManus [REDACTED]

Sent: 01 November 2018 21:52

To: Northampton Gateway

Subject: Submission.

I strongly object to the Northampton Gateway SRFI proposal for the following reasons.

Considering the already existing site at DIRFT only a few miles away, which has capacity for at least the next ten years, this does not seem to be a strategically appropriate site for another development in an area which already has more of these developments than any other area in the country.

With another development proposal by Ashfield Land, recently re submitted, which will almost join onto the Northampton Gateway proposal, the developers do not seem to have carried out any sort of cumulative impact assessment. Our local road network is running at almost maximum capacity and will not be able to cope with the many thousands of extra trucks and cars necessary to service the site, despite the proposed road changes, such as the roundabout at junction 15 of the M1, an area which already suffers several problems every month. In addition the A45, A43 and A508, our other main routes, are regularly congested to the point that travel is severely restricted whenever a problem, such as a breakdown, occurs. Although an upgrade to the A508 to dual the road as far as the site entrance is proposed I do not believe that this will prevent the inevitable build up of traffic associated with several thousand HGV movements on this section every day. In addition to all of this there will be the inevitable natural increase in traffic as new housing developments are built? There is also the inevitable use of our narrow village roads as a route for workers to get to the site when they have to find an alternative route when the main roads become congested. Whilst there is a 7.5 tonne weight limit, this will not stop cars or even the smaller vans associated with a distribution centre such as this proposal. This pre supposes that the larger vehicles will actually adhere to the law. As I have personally witnessed there are those who do not, in fact we have a damaged lamp post at the end of our road where a large articulated truck attempted to turn round well within the restricted area a few weeks ago and a low bridge on a road which would run alongside this development was struck by a large HGV last year.

My wife and I live in a sheltered housing area which is only a few metres from the proposed site and we think that this proposal would greatly increase the health risk for ourselves and our neighbours. My wife suffers from Pulmonary Fibrosis, a life limiting lung disease, and many of our neighbours suffer from COPD. Some of these people, my wife included, have to take oxygen as part of their treatment and they will inevitably be breathing in toxic dusty air during the building of this development and they will then be subject to increased CO in the toxic air they will have to breathe 24 hours a day from the trucks, cars and trains which will be running day and night. Considering that we chose this location when we were forced to move from our previous home due to my wife's illnesses and that we were allocated a bungalow in this area as a direct result of my wife's deteriorating health we feel extremely upset that we are now likely to living in an even more dangerous environment than if we had stayed where we were. In addition to the air quality issue the noise and light pollution from this site will cause great distress to my wife and others in the sheltered housing area

at a time in their lives when they are surely entitled to expect a little peace and consideration. I also have serious concerns about the ability of the emergency services, in particular the ambulance service, to get to us, as we have had to do several times since we moved here, with the increased traffic in the area. A great deal of emphasis has been made of the increase in employment which the developers suggest will be a benefit to the local area. In fact it is, as I understand it, a requirement of any SRFI. As we have one of the lowest unemployment figures in the country there is no significant benefit for us in this respect. In fact it was reported recently on the national news that employers in Milton Keynes, a short distance away, are having to pay to bring warehouse staff in from as far away as Peterborough because there is a shortage of relevant staff in the area. Bearing this in mind it would seem that far from the stated aim of reducing emissions this would lead to a much greater increase as, in addition to the truck and rail traffic emissions, the increase from normal transport emissions is going to be greater than it is at present. Many studies have been carried out to determine the financial benefit of loading onto trains at ports and transporting the relatively short distance to our area before unloading and delivering once again by road. I believe that the general view is that it will not be economically viable, resulting in this site becoming just a vast road distribution warehouse development. More benefit would be derived from SRFIs being built at the ports, allowing the goods to be delivered to areas further away. We have the support of both our local MPs, Andrea Leadsom and Chris Heaton-Harris, who both support our view that, whilst we all support the government's stated aim of reducing emissions by moving freight from the roads to the rail network, we do not believe that this will be the case if this proposal goes ahead as we believe that it is the right solution but in the wrong place. I hope that you will give serious consideration to my objections.

Tom McManus.

Mac

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
