

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

From: Jamie Wood [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2018 06:54
To: Northampton Gateway
Subject: Northampton Gateway SRFI -TR05006 – Written Representation – 20011341 – 6th November 2018

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to register my objection to the proposed application, for Northampton Gateway SRFI.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:-

- 1) It is my belief, that due to the proximity of currently operating, and already approved developments, that there is no 'strategic' need for this development in this location. It is quite clear in the requirements for siting SRFI's, that they should be spread through the regions, and not all located in close proximity to each other. In my opinion, this region is already suitably served by existing developments, and Northampton Gateway SRFI is nothing more than a glorified warehouse development. There is no guarantee that any required rail paths would be available to serve the development.
- 2) The local road network will not be able to sustain the thousands of extra daily vehicular movements. Local roads are already brought to a standstill whenever there is an incident, either on the M1, A43 or A508. Adding extra vehicles into the already busy roads will compound this. The developers do not appear to have stress tested their traffic modelling, which is absurd, considering the proposed extra traffic volume. My journey to work (on the A508), is already severely impacted whenever there is an incident on the M1 (which seems to happen 2-3 times per week). There also appears to be no plan to stop vehicles using local villages as 'rat runs', in the event of accidents or other incidents on local roads. As there are several listed buildings on the main road through Blisworth, additional traffic could cause severe damage to these properties.
- 3) In an area where air pollution is already very high, it is inconceivable that the amount of extra vehicles proposed would not make this significantly worse. Recent news articles have highlighted the problem of air pollution from the amount of vehicles on our roads. Adding the proposed extra traffic must only make this worse, with the very real possibility of harm to the health of the local community, for which there is no possible mitigation.

- 4) The local communities are rural, and people choose to live here because of this. Any development of this size would change the rural environment, to an industrial environment. Developers must understand, that they cannot continue concreting over the countryside simply for their profit. The loss of farmland and countryside will be incalculable for future generations - where will food be grown, and where will all of the open spaces be? I was born in Blisworth, and have walked the local footpaths for over 45 years. The proposed re-location of centuries old footpaths would turn what is a very pleasant walk, through beautiful countryside, to a considerably longer walk through an industrial landscape. If the developer thinks that this would be an improvement, then quite clearly, they are wrong.
- 5) The proposed development would generate an unacceptable level of both noise, and light pollution. In an area where there is very little street lighting at night, the change to a constant, vast glow produced by such a development, would have a significant impact on the local population, and wildlife. There are also several properties within the proposed development, which would be significantly affected by the amount of noise which would be produced. Local villages would also be affected by this, for which there is no adequate mitigation.
- 6) South Northamptonshire, has a very low unemployment figure, which suggests that the probability of being able to fill any job vacancies with a local labour force is small. Consequently, the labour force would have to travel from further afield, adding considerably to the level of pollution. This would negate the effect of any supposed carbon offsetting from the rail aspect of the development. The developers do not seem to have addressed this. There is also the question of where these workers would park their vehicles. What would be stopping them from parking in local village streets, and walking the final part of the journey to the site?
- 7) The developers do not appear to have considered many other sites. This is a requirement in the Government guidelines.

To summarise, the proposed development does not adhere to Government guidelines, which stipulate that SRFI's should be spread across the regions. Since we already have several in our region, this development is clearly not needed, and should be seen as a speculative warehouse park, which is seeking to bypass local planning regulations by adding an SRFI moniker.

Yours faithfully,
James Wood

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