

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Northampton Gateway](#)
Subject: An application for a non-material change to the Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange
Date: 17 August 2022 15:57:36

Dear Sir/Madam,

This is only a short note. I do not have the patience or expertise to read all the documentation connected to this 'non-material' change to the Gateway plan.

As someone who took a neutral view about the development when it first emerged - the downsides were compensated for because this was to be a road-RAIL interchange - I feel I have to object to this change of plan, albeit one which is said to be 'temporary'.

After 2 years of disruption to my life caused by changes to the M1 Junction 15, work on the A508 and the construction of the Road bypass (close to my house) I think that enough is enough.

This is a multi-million pound scheme which has involved very major roadworks. Was it really beyond the wit of the developers to ensure that the 'rail' section of the works would be completed at the same time as the 'road' section? Surely the prime aim in the construction of a road-rail developer.

Or was the intention of the developers to reach a situation where an initial key demand of the original consent to this development, that -

“A rail terminal capable of handling at least four intermodal trains per day, including 775 metre length trains, **must be constructed and available for use prior to the occupation of any of the warehousing.**”

- could be ignored?

Am I naive or doesn't this matter?

I realise that a 'waiver' appears to have been given in the case of the Leicestershire depot where the same problem seems to have occurred but isn't this a reason why the developers should have got it right this time?

Apparently - in layman's terms - this change will not result in increased road traffic (and its consequences for this village at, for example, the time of M1 closures). Presumably the original consent was allowed because, as a result of the use of the rail terminal, the Gateway would not result in increased traffic. There seems to be a contradiction here.

As well as this there is surely a chance that the rail terminal will be a little-used white elephant, leaving the developers with a lot of

warehouses. Many people in my village suggested that Gateway was just an excuse to build more warehouses - this appeal by the developers suggests that in the long term they might have been right.

For the reasons described in the last 2 paragraphs - a real increase in traffic, albeit occasional, for my nearby village and the danger that this amendment represents an unwelcome compromise with implications for further abuse of public trust in the future - I wish to object to this amendment.

Alex Wood

