

From: [John Marshall](#)
To: [Northampton Gateway](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Response to request by Segro for a "non-material change" to the Northampton Gateway Rail Freight interchange Order (DCO 2019 No. 1358)
Date: 25 September 2022 14:38:38

Dear Sirs,

I write to object to the request by Segro Northampton Gateway for what the applicant describes as a 'non-material change' to DCO 2019 No 1358. I have two specific objections. Firstly, my understanding is that the applicant wishes to delete the following requirement from the DMO

P47:

(3) ~~A rail terminal capable of handling at least four intermodal trains per day, including 775 metre length trains, must be constructed and available for use prior to the occupation of any of the warehousing.~~

The requirement for the rail terminal to be constructed and available for use was a specific condition of the consent for the development and the approval explicitly prohibited any commercial activity until the rail connection was operational. It seems to me that the current request by Segro cannot be granted as it is, *de facto* a material change and one that runs contrary to the *rationale* for the government's policy under which the original application was determined and the DMO granted. Indeed, not to do so would undermine the basis of the Planning Inspector's approval and would suggest that rather than this being a 'strategic rail freight interchange' this is in reality a 'speculative road freight interchange'.

Secondly and notwithstanding that, I also wish to object to the request based on the immediate impact it would have on local road traffic. If granted, one inevitable consequence will be an increase in HGV traffic using the A508 south of Roade. This single carriageway road is already the Highways England designated diversion route - north and south-bound - when the M1 is unavailable between junctions 15 and 14 and is also heavily used as an unofficial diversion when traffic reports indicate problems along this 14 mile long stretch. The southern end of the A508 connects with the A5 and A422 at a roundabout, controlled by traffic lights. This roundabout is a recognised bottle neck because like the A508, the A5 is also a diversion route. Despite works to add an extra lane at the traffic lights for the A508 south and whether diverting due to a M1 closure or an accident, anywhere from Junction 18 south or Junction 13 north, traffic on the A5 often tails back for several miles, north and south of the roundabout.

Furthermore, it is important to note that a planning application WNS/2022/174

[REDACTED] has very recently been submitted to West Northants Council for a new industrial park comprising approx 70,000 sq metres to be constructed on greenfield land immediately adjacent to the A5 roundabout on land east of the A508 and north of the A5. If granted (as seems likely as the site is identified for development for employment use in the adopted local plan) the access / egress will utilise the A508, adding significantly to the traffic volume. Indeed the applicant recognises this very issue because to quote from their Design & Access Statement that supports the application;

At the start of the design period, and following rigorous review of the information and constraints associated with the site, a number of points of concern were raised with the layout of the plan. These included:

- The proposed new access to the site is close to the existing roundabout to the A5, and could therefore cause problems with vehicle flow if traffic were to back up/ queue at either the existing roundabout or proposed new site access. One solution would be to further physically separate the two junctions to allow greater 'queuing' length and distance between them.*

I trust that you will reject Segro's request and reaffirm the original DMO.

Yours faithfully,

William John McLaren Marshall
[REDACTED]

