

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Northampton Gateway](#)  
**Subject:** Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project – Non-Material Change TR050006  
**Date:** 09 September 2022 17:01:34

---

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to voice my firm opposition to proposed changes requested by the SEGRO to the original development consent order (DCO) granted in October 2019 for Northampton Gateway.

SEGROs proposals are in clear contravention of the national Networks Policy Statement, National Strategy on strategic rail freight interchanges, and the DCO granted to the Northampton Gateway.

When that application was granted, it explicitly stated: A rail terminus able to cope with at least four intermodal trains a day... should be built and made available for use prior to any commercial warehousing being occupied, and it specifically prohibited any commercial activities before a rail link was in operation. This revision will permit operation of up to 80 percent of the facility prior to any rail connection, and then by truck service only, opening the door for a facility that will be operated forever with no rail connection.

Also, I am very opposed to this proposal being treated as a non material amendment. It is plainly a material change, and it must be treated as such, rather than a non-material change, as proposed by SEGRO:

The consequent traffic/noise and pollution would severely affect both local environments and local communities, I live in Blisworth, in a grade 2 listed building adjacent to the road and I am concerned what affect this extra HGV traffic will have on the structure of my building and the many other listed buildings in the village also.

Due to significant changes to uses, and additional storage being built recently to the area, we believe that traffic studies and information provided in 2019 is outdated and wrong, since they assumed that a railwayhead would exist.

We further urge that updated data on traffic, noise/emission pollution should be provided in a request for an amendment from DCO prior to any decisions.

I feel that If SEGRO is allowed this change, it opens the floodgates for other developers to take the same approach: ignoring initial promises, circumventing local planning, and brazenly flouting the policies of national governments.

Kind Regards,

Ian Tack

[REDACTED]

--