

-----Original Message-----

From: CHRIS EADS [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 November 2018 17:46
To: Northampton Gateway
Cc: Chris Heaton-Harris MP; andrea.leadson@parliament.uk
Subject: Northampton Gateway Railfreight Interchange (TRO 50006)

Dear Sirs
My reference 20011102

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms against the above mentioned proposed project.

My objections are as follows:

01. Increased pollution from Heavy Goods Vehicles and other traffic in a rural area that is already experiencing high and above action levels of vehicle pollution emanating from the adjacent road networks e.g., the M1 Motorway at junction 15 and the A508/A45 trunk roads.

02. Increased road congestion on the already overpopulated and congested M1 motorway and adjacent trunk roads A508/A45. Any road traffic incident that occurs on these roads (a regular occurrence) results in these and all other routes including minor roads in the area becoming gridlocked. Additional HGV traffic and other vehicles (workforce) needing to enter the site would merely create further and more serious incidents of this type.

03. Light and Noise pollution from the site would have an adverse effect on the adjacent historic rural village settlements, in particular Collingtree and Milton Malsor as well as Roade Blisworth as well as residential areas such as Wootton and Grange Park. There are conservation areas within some of these settlements.

04. There is considerable doubt on my part and amongst the communities affected and from expert opinion whether there is actually a need for a rail freight terminal in this location, given that the nearby Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal is currently operating well below its capacity. In addition there is a view that the existing rail infrastructure would be unable to provide the necessary capacity for such a terminal.

05. There is a strong suspicion within the communities affected that the inclusion of a rail freight terminal element for this proposed development is merely a vehicle to enable large scale warehousing on the site served exclusively by ingress and egress of heavy goods vehicles from the already overcrowded road network. There are I gather examples in other locations in the country where this has occurred and the rail freight element has not come to fruition.

Without the rail freight element any application would be expected to fail as it would not then comply with government policy of removing heavy goods from road to rail.

I would therefore suggest that any warehousing development on this site should only be considered if there is an unequivocal commitment on the developers part to a ring fenced guarantee for the inclusion of a fully functioning rail freight terminal element.

06. The residents of the settlements mentioned above chose to live in rural village locations and not within or on the cusp of a massive industrial site, where noise light and vehicle pollution would become the norm.

07. The planning of these rail freight terminals should be the in the domain of government, not private speculators whose one and only motive is "make a profit and move on". This flawed approach to their proposed locations is never better illustrated than in this particular case as there is another proposed RFT overlapping this site from Ashfield Land (Rail Central) on a massive site between Milton Malsor and Blisworth.

07. Unemployment in this area is very low, so it would be necessary to recruit a workforce from outside the County. Most employees working on these sites would have to travel by car which would have a further significant increased effect of vehicle movements i.e. congestion and pollution.

I trust all of the above will be taken into account before coming to any decision.

Yours faithfully

C.P. Eads

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