

From: Alan Hargreaves [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 November 2018 11:30
To: NI Enquiries
Subject: objection to Northampton Gateway

Alan Hargreaves
REF 20010410
Northampton Gateway TRO50006

Alan Hargreaves

Reference 20010410

Northampton Gateway TRO 50006

Written representation

Dear Sirs,

I write to object to the Northampton Gateway proposal for several reasons, to name but a few

1. Network Policy statements are very clear stating that networks should have the capacity connectivity and resilience to support national and local economic activity and facilitate growth and create jobs, to date the applicants have provided no factual or compelling proof that the local Highways and Rail connectivity are either resilient or have the capacity to support this proposal.

>Reduce road congestion

>reduce carbon emissions

Applicants have provided no factual evidence to support that their proposed scheme will result in a reduction of road congestion, or reduce carbon emissions, particularly on one of the busiest stretches of motorway in the country between junctions 14 to 16 on the M1 Motorway, AIR QUALITY ISSUES ARE ALREADY AT EXTREMELY HIGH LEVELS IN THIS AREA. National policy 2.17 stated That the national road network was already under significant pressure as far back as 2010...since this time congestion in this area has only worsened.

3. National Policy was formerly adopted in 2014 in which it acknowledged Policy 2.57 That existing operational SRFIs and other intermodal RFI are situated predominantly in the midlands and the north and Policy 2.58 This means that SRFI capacity needs to be provided at a wide range of locations and that there is a particular challenge in expanding rail and freight interchanges serving London and the south east...since 2014 however SRFIs in the Midlands have actually expanded further with the approval of Drift 3 at Crick just a matter of 18 miles away on the same stretch of West Coast Main line, and East Midlands Gateway, I would contend that this current proposal is not meeting Government objectives and is actually creating a cluster of SRFIs and not achieving the aims of policy i.e. "a wide range of locations"

4. National Policy 4.87 states that an existence of an available and economic local workforce will be an important consideration, Northampton Milton Keynes and Drift at Crick which can all be considered local already have a vast array of road served warehousing and it is acknowledged locally that the key workers, ie warehouse operatives are simply not available, the applicants have provided no fact based information to substantiate that their proposed 5000 workforce can actually be accommodated.

5.The cumulative impacts and interrelationship of this scheme with particularly(but not exclusively) Rail Central,Dirft3,existing Rail passenger services at Northampton station do not appear to have been addressed.

6.Policy 4.86 Acknowledges that in terms of location that SRFIs often may not be considered suitable adjacent to residential areas, this proposal is situated immediately adjacent to the villages of Collingtree,Milton Roade and Blisworth and the potential impacts of noise and light pollution, these issues do not appear to have been adequately and fully addressed.

Many other issues give cause for concern, all Health impacts on the local receptors, Loss of veteran trees and good quality agricultural land.

Alan Hargreaves

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