

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Northampton Gateway](#)  
**Cc:** [blisworthparishcouncil@gmail.com](mailto:blisworthparishcouncil@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Northampton Gateway proposed changes  
**Date:** 12 September 2022 20:27:43

---



[REDACTED]

Dear Sir,  
Re. Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project – Non-material Change TR050006

I wish to register my strong objections to the above proposal.

The change to the conditions proposed by SEGRO whereby the site can open prior to the rail link being connected is in no way a “Non-material Change”. The whole basis of the development was to use the rail link to reduce the amount of heavy vehicular traffic on the roads. Without the rail link the whole reason for being there ceases to exist. Should there be no rail link then the site should be closed down as it would no longer comply with the Development Consent Order.

By implementing this proposed change, the development would become a road transport based operation and wouldn't be a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. This would increase the amount of heavy traffic in the area making an already congested junction even worse, together with an unacceptable increase in pollution.

This would also have an impact on the surrounding villages, especially Blisworth which receives excessive extra traffic in the event of the frequent closures on the nearby M1. Since the original application in 2019 there has been a significant increase in traffic in the area which means that traffic and pollutions surveys submitted at that time are now out of date and further research should be carried out for these matters.

There appears to be a trend with developers to apply for approval for a project, listing acceptable reasons, and then subsequently applying for a change to any conditions that are applied. This makes a mockery of the planning system. Should this application be treated as “Non-material” then it opens up the possibility of other similar applications being made. The question that comes to mind is; did SEGRO ever intend to use the rail link or was that proposal merely a ploy to gain approval? They knew full well that having the rail link was a condition so why the change other than for financial gain?

I urge you to oppose this proposal to class the change as Non-material and also to oppose the change.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]