

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Northampton Gateway](#)
Subject: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project - Non-Material Change TR050006
Date: 26 September 2022 00:07:00

John Vaughan

[REDACTED]

Dear Sirs

Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project – Non-Material Change TR050006

I have been watching the progress of this proposal for the Northampton Gateway with growing concern and am writing to set down my strong opposition to SEGRO's requested amendment to the original Development Consent Order (the "Order") granted for the Northampton Gateway in October 2019.

The SEGRO proposed amendment appears to be a substantial breach of the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the national Strategic Rail Freight Interchange policy and the Order. When this application was granted, it was on the clear understanding that "the rail terminal ... must be constructed and available for use before the occupation of any of the warehousing" and specifically prohibited any commercial activity until the rail connection was operational.

The amendment now proposed by SEGRO would allow up to 80% of the site to become operational in advance of any rail connection. This would allow the great majority of the site to become operational with only road service – and potentially operating in perpetuity without any rail connection.

It would be extraordinary for such a fundamental change to the consent, and to the potential impact on the local traffic levels and community to be treated as a non-material amendment. It is clearly a material amendment and should be treated as such, not as a non-material amendment as proposed by SEGRO. The increase in

traffic, in noise and in pollution would have a severe impact on both the local environment and local communities such as Blisworth, which already suffers with high levels of HGV traffic, particularly when the strategic road network is congested and traffic is diverted from the M1 through the villages.

Furthermore, there have been significant changes in the local area (including the construction and operation of local warehousing and distribution units) since the traffic surveys and other information provided in 2019, such that it is reasonable to assert that these surveys and information are likely to be out-of-date. They are further invalidated in that they assumed that there would be a rail head terminal, which under SEGRO's proposed amendment may no longer be the case. We further urge you to request updated traffic, noise, emissions and pollution surveys to be completed and the data be provided before any decision is made on the Order amendment request.

The circumstances of this development proposal are disturbing and might reasonably lead to a question of whether SEGRO ever intended to complete the development in its original form. I understand for example that Network Rail have still not confirmed that they would be in a position to support the proposed rail terminal. Without such support, it is, to say the least, surprising that the terminal was included as a key element of the proposal, or seen as credible.

The proposed amendment at least appears to be part of a longer strategy to manipulate the planning system. If so, and if successful, this could establish a precedent for other developers to seek to overturn their original commitments, bypassing local planning and breaching national government policy.

I hope you will oppose this amendment so that the original DCO is complied with in full.

Yours sincerely

John Vaughan