

From: Elaine Reagon [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 September 2022 23:25

To: Northampton Gateway <NorthamptonGateway@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

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

To whom it may concern.

I am appalled that no consideration and due care is taken by our Council and Government to ensure the wellbeing of people who have lived in the surrounding areas for hundreds of years

It's a well known fact that this level of traffic will cause potential accidents, noise and air pollution, which will ultimately lead to an inferior lifestyle. People have invested their life savings to work towards a good, clean environment and it's going to be taken away without consideration.

Does anyone consider the people living in the areas who aren't able to leave, or don't want to as they've lived here for generations?!?!

Is life really all about money because this is certainly not conforming to the original statement on doing it to minimise road freight.

I am appalled and disappointed that this is going to negatively and sadly impact thousands of lives.

We will continue to finger the below cause.

- I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed amendment requested by SEGRO to the original Development Consent Order (DCO) granted in October 2019 for the Northampton Gateway.
- The SEGRO proposal is clearly in breach of the National Policy Statement for National Networks, the national Strategic Rail Freight Interchange policy and the DCO granted for the Northampton Gateway. When this application 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 of the warehousing**' and it **specifically prohibited any commercial activity until the rail connection was operational**.
- This amendment would allow up to 80% of the site to become operational in advance of any rail connection, and therefore road serviced only, opening the door to the site operating in perpetuity without any rail connection.
- We strongly object to the proposal being 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

ensuing increase in traffic/noise and 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.

- Due to the significant change to use and the additional warehouse recently constructed in the area, we consider the traffic surveys and information provided in 2019 to be out-of-date and incorrect as it was assumed there would be a rail head terminal. We further urge you to request updated traffic, noise/emissions pollution data be provided as part of the DCO amendment request before any decision is made.
- We believe that SEGRO is seeking to shift from a speculative build to a contract build operation and is seeking this change entirely for their own financial benefit. They have been actively marketing these units from the start of this year, with proposed occupation from Q4 2022 which is misleading and at odds with the original DCO. SEGRO were fully aware of the constraints to the build when they took on the project.
- [Strongly opposing/seeking your support to oppose] this amendment and ensure that the original DCO is complied with in full. If SEGRO is allowed this amendment this would open the floodgates to other developers to adopt the same approach: ignoring original commitments, bypassing local planning and flagrantly breaching national government policy.

Regards

Elaine Reagon