Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022.

Dear Sirs,

## Ref: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project Non Material Change ref. TRO50006.

I would like to register my objection to the above application for proposed changes to the existing DCO order for Northampton RFI. Having read the various application statements it would appear that Segro are using Networks Rails inability to provide firm dates for connections as the reason which prevents them progressing construction of the warehousing.

I would wish to make the following points:-

- Segro have been openly marketing the scheme on their own website and with independent agencies for some considerable time stating 'occupancy available from Q4 2022', clearly Segro know full well this statement is factually incorrect, it is small wonder therefore that they have attracted potential Bespoke Clients.
- Segro commenced work on the road and site infrastructure in December 2020, however works on the rail infrastructure did not start until almost 12 months later.
- Segro have it would seem created the situation they now find themselves in, they were fully aware of the potential issues with rail connectivity from the onset and also aware of the condition in the DCO which prevents them from having any occupancy without final rail connections.
- It appears that the actual reason Segro seek the change is to lessen their own financial risk by building on a Bespoke Contract Build Basis. I question should the financial risk of a huge footsie listed company be a just reason for Government intervention in changing the DCO conditions?
- In closing the planning policy under which this was granted is very clear and states that 'The Initial stages of the development must provide an operational rail network connection' and the condition which Segro seeks to change merely reinforces this. It would appear that Segro's failure to prioritise rail connectivity in the first instance and then embark on premature false advertising and finally their desire to lessen their own financial risk is insufficient reasons to warrant a change to the conditional approval originally granted.

Without rail connectivity this becomes a gigantic warehouse development and should never have been granted planning permission in the first place.

Yours faithfully,



