

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Northampton Gateway](#); andrea.leadson.mp@parliament.uk; transportsecretary@dft.gov.uk
Subject: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project - Non Material Change TR050006
Date: 13 September 2022 19:03:53

To whom it may concern,

I'm contacting you to raise my concern with the proposed amendment from SEGRO, which contradicts the original plan for the Northampton Gateway. When it was originally planned it stipulated that it should have the capability to handle four intermodal trains per day before any occupation of the sites and no commercial activity until the rail connection was complete.

As a local resident I am worried that without the sufficient rail service into (and out of) the site the overflow pressure will fall onto the roads, roads that will be significantly overrun with vehicles too large (in volume and weight/class) for them. It also seems a logical stretch for the terminal to be used not as a rail link at all but just as standard warehousing.

This point I must stress is not just an example of NIMBYism, nor is it an attempt to block sites such as the NGRFI in my local area. I work in the warehousing industry and am incredibly excited for the development but it's already clear our roads can't handle traffic above normal volume and if constant HGVs were added it would become almost untenable. Having worked at [REDACTED] in Milton Keynes I know the benefit of units in proximity to the motorway (with great transport links) but I also understand the caveat of correct road network/infrastructure that can accommodate sites of this size & nature. This site could be a great and wonderful opportunity for the local area and it would be a shame for it to launch under a cloud if this amendment is granted, many local residents may resent it for many a year and that is not the sort of relationship anyone wants.

The traffic data collected previously is now out of date and doesn't reflect the current situation on our roads, I therefore urge you to request current/renewed/updated traffic & noise data to be provided as part of the DCO amendment request before any decision is made.

One can arguably look at this situation and feel it was always part of the plan; get the permission, know fully well delays will occur and then retrospectively change the nature of the site. As a result I would like to state that I object to this amendment being treated as 'non-material' as, to my eyes, it is definitively material.

It's well known that SEGRO are already advertising the units as fit for use from the end of this year, even though they haven't received confirmation of a go ahead without the sufficient (and previously agreed) rail link. How can they in good conscience advertise and plan these sites to go live if they haven't confirmed they can?

If they are granted this change I believe it would significantly impact my local area but also send a clear message to potential future developers that they can plan one thing but ignore original agreements and change tact further down the line to satisfy their needs. This is perhaps the most worrying outcome of the whole scenario. We know local governments need investment, renovation, innovation, new jobs etc but it should not be to the detriment of business, legislative, government and even moral standards. Businesses should not be able to act with impunity just because they can offer or bring in millions.

I hope you consider this letter as proof that local residents aren't wholly against the

development overall, just backdoor amendments that change the nature of the site. I also hope that as experienced members of government, local and national, you put the needs of constituents, above those of big business.

Please consider the above points with care and attention and I implore you to make the correct decision.

Yours sincerely,
Gabi Murphy

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]