



Roade Parish Council wish to strongly object to the proposed Northampton Gateway strategic rail freight interchange.

1. Traffic, Roads and the proposed Roade bypass

1.0 Our villagers are very concerned that the development will exacerbate the traffic congestion around our village. The A508 north and south through the village are heavily congested, and we cannot see how adding 16,000+ vehicle movements a day can improve this in any way, with whatever mitigation the developer proposes.

1.1 We are not satisfied that the proposed access into the site can adequately handle the traffic travelling northbound on the A508, which will be in constant conflict with the traffic seeking to turn right across its path into the site, without causing severe congestion.

1.2 The 16,500 vehicle movements per day (Roxhill's figures) aren't only going to be servicing the needs of Northampton and its immediate area, so where are the savings in terms of vehicle miles travelled.

1.3 We understand that SRFI's are not supposed to be sited immediately adjacent to urban areas due to the high concentrations of air pollution that will result from the vehicles using the site. Little consideration is evident in their application which deals with the emissions from standing/queueing traffic around the area and through the town of Northampton when an incident stops the traffic from flowing. The A45 into Northampton, and across to Wellingborough is regularly at a standstill with the current levels of traffic. 16,500 will cause the whole area to grind to a stop, adversely affecting the health of travellers and residents alike, for which it is impossible to mitigate against.

1.4 What happens to the traffic in the event of a major incident on the M1, as we have had in the past, has not been addressed within the application, our suggestion is that the whole locality will grind to a halt. This would be even more critical when considering the possible cumulative impact of Rail Central.

1.5 Due to the speculative nature of these developments the developer is unable to detail the possible occupants, and hence has no control of the inefficiency inherent in current rail/road distribution models, that see many goods transported from sea ports around the country delivered to the centre of the country, only to be returned by HGV to the conurbations close to where they came into the country, again causing unnecessary congestion and pollution.

1.6 The proposal to prohibit A508 southbound traffic from turning right into Courteenhall Road, and instead have the traffic utilise Knock Lane to Blisworth is absolutely farcical. Knock Lane is very busy and is narrower than Courteenhall Road. Once in Blisworth the village is highly constrained by residents' on-street parking, particularly in the area immediately surrounding the Doctors' surgery, and once again you're increasing the emissions from vehicles by forcing them to use this longer alternative route.

1.7 The proposed Roade bypass is unwanted by most villagers, and we are led to believe that this may not happen until the development is already finished. If we have to have the development it should be conditioned that the bypass be built before any other construction is allowed on site, or it will never be constructed and it will be up to cash strapped local authorities to seek to fund amelioration piecemeal?

1.8 The bypass will also adversely affect the sustainability of the businesses in the village that rely on passing traffic, resulting in the loss of valuable local facilities serving the villagers.



1.9 Whilst some residents through the centre of the village would benefit from having a bypass, it would have a seriously adverse impact on residents close to the proposed route, so where is there any overall material 'benefit' to the village?

1.10 The applicants assertion that HGVs will not be allowed south onto the A508 through our village is highly likely to be unenforceable, who would enforce this and what would be the likely, if any, penalties? This should be borne in mind given that HGVs not emanating from the site would have a perfect right to use the road. How would enforcement be considered if a vehicle from the site goes up to Junction 15 of the M1, around the roundabout and then comes back through our village? The idea is nonsense!

1.11 The proposed weight limits on a number of country lanes are similarly unenforceable and are likely to be ignored.

2. Rail, and Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal

2.0 DIRFT is available nearby, and has capacity up to 2031, and is located only 18 miles from the proposal. The rail interconnection is very little used with most of the inward goods still arriving from abroad by HGV.

2.1 It is patently clear that the number of trains over a certain period is finite, however there does not seem to be any evidence within the application to indicate that Network Rail has agreed that there is sufficient capacity on the Northampton loop to allow all these freight trains to have access into the application site. Is there sufficient capacity to allow this scheme to go ahead without it having an adverse impact on passenger services through the loop? Particularly seeing as how the existing rail freight uses this line to get to DIRFT?

2.2 It should be considered that this adverse effect would be permanent and cumulative with the increase in rail use. There is therefore a limit to future expansion of this and DIRFT, and a high risk that passenger services may be adversely affected, again bringing vehicular traffic onto surrounding roads.

3. Employment and need

3.0 South Northamptonshire has some of the lowest levels of unemployment in the whole country, the proposed development would need to attract large numbers of employees from large distances, exacerbating traffic congestion, and air pollution over a large area as they travel to work 24 hours of the day 365 days a year.

3.1 We do not see not see any joined up thinking in this proposal. If the recruited staff are having to travel anything up to 45 minutes to get to work, this is all further congestion scattered in a wider area unconsidered within this application. And with the inherent fuel costs for employees, mostly being unskilled and low paid, it's likely that the cost of driving to work would make their travel prohibitively expensive. These SRFIs need to be situated where there is a large and locally available suitable employee resource.

3.2 Contrary to guidance provided to applicants it appears that they have failed to produce a 'needs' appraisal prior to identifying this as the most suitable, and sustainable, location for a development such as this. Rather than doing this piece of work the applicant has chosen to use a site that they have had previous involvement with.

3.3 Rail freight capacity should be allocated carefully to the strategically best placed sites around the country to achieve the biggest gain in reducing port to destination road miles, and need to be located near to densely populated areas, or areas with high concentrations of industry to utilise rail so as to minimise the distance that the goods need to travel by road.

3.4 The clustering of the sites around Northampton fails to meet the requirement that the Rail Freight interchanges are 'strategic', i.e. strategically placed around the country to serve local need

Roadé Parish Council

PO Box 847, Northampton, NN7 9AB

Telephone: 01604 861976

E-Mail: clerk@roadeparishcouncil.gov.uk

Website: www.roadeparishcouncil.gov.uk



Parish Clerk:
Fiona Young

and reduce vehicle miles. We have never been presented with any documentation that this 'strategic' rail development has any market here, and as previously applied for, this is just a huge speculative warehouse scheme, like so many others in a twenty mile radius of Northampton.

3.5 The real need from this site is for good quality food. There is also no mention, or consideration, of the food that will need to be additionally imported, probably by HGV, as a direct result of the loss of 520 acres of prime agricultural land. That's about 25 lorry loads of rape seed every year. This needs to be considered as a permanent, and unsustainable loss to the nation, not just for one harvest, but for our children and grandchildren.

4. Two sites

4.0 We are aware of another developer called Rail Central, who are proposing to develop a site at Milton Malsor. We have seen nothing to suggest that the schemes have been properly considered with reference to the other. If they have both completed a detailed needs assessment, how come the two different developers have come up with two adjacent sites, surely one must be better placed than the other? If they are both needed then the cumulative effect on all aspects of the proposals should be rigorously scrutinised.

5. Brownfield sites

5.0 As a village we have seen a large number of houses (500+) on brownfield sites within our Parish, and these have been accepted pragmatically within our community as a good use of the land.

5.1 There are brownfield sites within Northampton that would be better utilised for this type of development. And as is clearly visible there is plenty of existing speculative warehousing within a 5 mile radius of Northampton railway station.

5.2 Having failed in 2014 to get permission for warehousing on this site, this speculative developer is now once again coming forward with an application to build on the greenbelt like land around our villages.

Yours Sincerely



Parish Clerk & RFO
Roadé Parish Council