

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Northampton Gateway](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Northampton Rail Freight Interchange Non Material change S1 2019 1358
Date: 09 September 2022 12:58:14

Hello

Please may you explain to me the process for decision re the above.

I do not understand why this change would be non material. The original consent order explicitly says that the rail connection -which allows 4+ freight trains a day to this site- must be built prior to the occupation of the sheds. I cannot see that suggesting that sheds are built and occupied prior to the creation of a working rail link can be 'non material' in any way. The change which is suggested challenges the very essence of the project and the explicit recommendation of the Inspector. (See p307 req3 (3) of the Inspector's report)

I want to be able to make an informed response to this proposal which I find really difficult if I am not understanding the process.

I have for 2 days tried to contact the Inspectorate's helpline which, despite its advertised limited hours, was not available. 'Closed' was the term used. Today I was successful and spoke to a helpful man called Ian. He said his only way forward was to email you and request a callback to me direct. I have not received any return phone call. Given the urgency of this, I really am a bit stuck.

Please come back to me
Evelyn Jarvis

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Northampton Gateway](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange 50006
Date: 22 September 2022 11:22:23

To whom it may concern.

I am writing to object to this planning change proposal.

The original application, which received assent, required the completion of railway links prior to occupation of any of the warehousing on the site and specifically prohibited any commercial activity until the rail connection was operational.

I am concerned that this planning change is in contradiction to that decision, which was concluded after an extensive review of all the issues and a lengthy and expensive process. I cannot see what grounds there could possibly be for a change in that decision. Neither do I comprehend why a major shift in the requirements for this site can in any way be deemed 'non-material'. Any change of this magnitude is significant. The planning process, both nationally and locally, will be undermined should this change be accepted. It will set a precedent for changes to future planning decisions. The change proposed also appears to remove the need for any formal process should further changes to capacity of the site etc be sought by the developer. This is unacceptable.

I also want to express my concerns about the apparent shift from a rail freight facility to a general warehouse/lorry/logistic operation, the consequence of which will be to increase the noise, environmental pressure and safety of the residents in my village and the subsequent negative impact on the quality of life in Wootton. The A45 is already full to capacity. There have been no mitigating actions to protect the local residents, of which I am one. The speed limit needs reducing, there needs to be full and robust noise and safety barriers along the A45 and there needs to be in place a noise reduction re-surfacing programme of the road.

I am not a planner. I am not able to forensically look at detailed traffic surveys etc. I can only say that this proposal is not a good one and is driven by commercial interests, not the interests of the public. It is counter to the government's strategic drive to use rail transport and it is environmentally detrimental. Please reject this proposed change.

Yours faithfully,
Evelyn Jarvis

[REDACTED]