

From: [Carol](#)
To: [Northampton Gateway](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project Non Material Change TR050006
Date: 24 September 2022 15:03:02

Sir,

Re: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project Non Material Change TR050006

I strongly oppose the proposed amendment to the original DCO (granted Oct 2019) requested by SEGRO.

Were this amendment granted, it would mean that 80% of the site would be able to operate with no rail connection, therefore relying purely on road freight rather than the intended rail freight. This potentially then allows it to continue to operate purely as a road freight terminal, permanently, in the future, which is not in compliance with the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the national Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy and the original DCO granted for the Northampton Gateway. When the DCO was granted it clearly stated that 'a rail terminal capable of handling at least four intermodal trains per day Must be constructed and available for use **before the occupation of any warehousing**' and it **specifically prohibited any commercial activity until the rail connection was operational**.

As the amendment is so clearly in breach of the above, I strongly object to the proposal being treated as a 'non-material' amendment, when it is very clearly a **major** change and therefore a 'material' amendment.

To grant this amendment would have a hugely detrimental impact on Blisworth and other surrounding villages and their communities, caused by largely increased HGV traffic, noise, pollution and overall road safety. The villages already suffer high levels of HGV traffic, especially when major road networks (M1, A43, A45) are congested or closed and traffic flows are rerouted through inappropriate village roads. This also brings additional safety concerns for our communities, especially at times of peak pedestrian activity, e.g. during the school day etc.

Our local areas have already seen a large increase in speculative warehousing over the last few years, and as this application is a significant change of use I feel that the traffic surveys and data from 2019 are out of date, and inappropriate, as it assumed there would be a rail head terminal. It would be more relevant for SEGRO to provide current/up to date monitoring and data on traffic/noise/pollution as part of this amendment and urge you to ensure this is requested/updated before any decision on the amendment is considered.

As SEGRO have been actively marketing these units from the beginning of 2022 (with proposed occupation from Q4 2022), it appears this amendment has been requested for purely financial gain, seeking to move from speculative build to a contract build operation. SEGRO were fully aware of the constraints in place when starting the project, and should not be allowed to ignore or change them to the detriment of our local communities. Were this amendment granted it would furthermore allow opportunity for other developers to do the same, by-passing local planning and national government policy.

I strongly oppose the granting of this amendment, and seek your support for our villages and communities in opposing the amendment, to ensure the original DCO is complied with fully.

Yours sincerely,

Carol Clow,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]