

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Northampton Gateway](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Project-Non-Material Change TR050006  
**Date:** 19 September 2022 16:29:15

---

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

FAO

Planning Inspectorate

Dame Andrea Leadsome MP

Author details-

Michael Ronald Freeman

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

I am writing to object to the proposed amendment by SEGRO to the original Development Consent Order granted in October 2019 for the Northampton Gateway.

I understand the original plan was for a development to build a Northampton Gateway that conformed to the National Policy Statement for National Networks and the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy. The proposed amendment will be in breach of this.

I was originally quite surprised that planning consent was granted anyway as we already have DIRFT1/2/3 in place at Daventry. As I understand it Freight capacity on the West Coast line is already tight and others are proposing any more freight should have gone to the new HS2 route.

Northampton has already had extensive Warehousing capacity added that are only road serviced and this amendment will cause more traffic, noise and pollution. It is obvious that a traffic/noise/emission pollution survey & report are required asap and certainly before any SEGRO amendments are even considered.

I understand that the amendment is to allow 80% of the site to become operational before any rail connections are installed. This should not be allowed. The development is for a Rail Freight Terminal and that is what must be provided as the first phase before any Warehousing can be used. If not how do we know the rail facility will ever be installed. The cynic in me believes this is the plan by SEGRO all along. How can it be classified as a 'non-material amendment' if the rail infrastructure is not there? It is just more 100% road serviced Warehousing on the Northampton M1 corridor.

The proposed amendments are certain to increase traffic in Blisworth as it is already used as a link to/from the A43 during traffic problems on other trunk routes.

As the Planning Inspectorate I believe based on the above it is your duty to reject the

SEGRO amendment, make them stick to the original plan.

Yours faithfully

M.R.Freeman