



# Preliminary Meeting Note

## Summary of key points discussed and advice given

**Application: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange**

**Reference: TR050006**

**Time and date: 9:30am on Tuesday 9 October 2018**

**Venue: Hilton Northampton, 100 Watering Lane, Northampton NN4 0XW**

*This meeting note is not a full transcript of the Preliminary Meeting. It is a summary of the key points discussed and responses given. An audio recording of the event is available on the National Infrastructure Planning website.*

### Item 1 - Welcome and Introduction

#### The meeting opened at 9:30

**Philip James Asquith (PA)** introduced himself as the Panel lead, welcomed those present and opened the Preliminary Meeting (PM) to consider procedural arrangements for the examination.

**PA** explained his appointment as the lead member of the Panel that comprises the Examining Authority (ExA) of two Inspectors to examine the application by Roxhill (Junction 15) Limited for an order granting development consent for the construction of a nationally significant infrastructure project, namely a strategic rail freight interchange at land to the west of the M1 motorway in the vicinity of J15 and east of the Northampton Loop railway line, Northampton. **PA** emphasised that this examination is solely in relation to the examination of Roxhill, and nothing to do with the Rail Central application which has just been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

**David Brock (DB)** introduced himself as the second panel member of the ExA.

**PA** introduced **Kate Mignano (KM)** as the Case Manager for this application, and the Case Officers **Ewa Sherman (ES)** and **Dean Alford (DA)**, and set out general 'housekeeping' matters and emergency procedures. He stated that a note of the meeting will be produced and an audio recording will be available on the National

Infrastructure pages of the Planning Inspectorate website. He encouraged those not familiar with the website to have a look at it as a very useful tool to finding the documentation relating to the project. He also requested that attendees intending to use social media, reporting filming or recording for themselves, should do so responsibly and with proper consideration for others.

**PA** reminded the attendees of the proposal which comprises several elements: in summary it is to construct and operate:

- An intermodal freight terminal including container storage and HGV parking, rail sidings to serve individual warehouses and the provision of an aggregates facility as part of the intermodal freight terminal, with the capability of also providing a 'rapid rail freight' facility;
- Up to 468,000m<sup>2</sup> (approximately 5 million sq ft) gross internal area of warehousing and ancillary buildings, with additional floorspace provided in the form of mezzanines;
- A secure, dedicated HGV parking area of approximately 120 spaces including driver welfare facilities to meet the needs of HGVs visiting the site or intermodal terminal;
- New road infrastructure, and works to the existing road network, including the provision of a new access and associated works to the A508, a new bypass to the village of Roade, improvements to Junction 15 and to Junction 15A of the M1 motorway, the A45, and other highway improvements at junctions on the local highway network, and related traffic management measures;
- Strategic landscaping and tree planting, including diverted public rights of way; and
- Earthworks and demolition of existing structures on the main site.

**PA** explained that the consent regime established under the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) in principle allows for all of these components to be included within an application for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and for one DCO covering all elements.

**PA** stated that the Examining Authority's role is to examine the application and make a report to the Secretary of State (SoS) for Transport with recommendations. The ExA has up to six months to examine the proposal, three months to consider and produce a report, with the SoS having another three months to make a decision. **PA** explained that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the process that will be followed in

conducting the examination, and that the merits or disadvantages of the scheme could only be considered once the Examination had started.

**PA** stated that the ExA had set out their proposals in the letter of 10 September 2018 (Rule 6 letter), and that the PM is the Interested Parties' opportunity to influence the process that the ExA intend to follow. **PA** asked those who wished to speak to introduce themselves.

**Alexander Booth QC (AB)** introduced himself as a Counsel to the Applicant, with **Morag Thompson (MT)** and **Laura-Beth Hutton (LBH)** (Eversheds Sutherland), also for the Applicant.

**Sharon Nolan (SN)** of Environment Agency.

**Helen Hartshorne (HH)** of Network Rail, **Marnix Elsenaar (ME)** of Addleshaw Goddard LLP, representing Network Rail.

**Paul Minton (PMt)**, chairman of the Northampton Rail Users Group.

**Hereward Phillpott QC (HP)**, **Mark Westmoreland-Smith (MWS)** of Counsel instructed by Osborne Clarke LLP on behalf of Ashfield Land Management Limited.

**Bob Power (BP)** and **Chris Wragg (CW)** on behalf of Northamptonshire County Council.

**Denis Winterbottom (DW)** of South Northamptonshire Council.

**PA** asked others who wished to speak to introduce themselves.

Local residents: **Andrew Bodman (ABo)**, **Andrew Gough (AG)**, **Alastair Inglis (AI)**.

In response to **DB's** question **HP** confirmed that he represents Ashfield Land Management Limited and Gazeley GLP Northampton, two separate parties.

## **Item 2 - Principles of the Examination Process**

For the benefit of those attendees who may not be familiar with the process for the examination of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects **PA** briefly outlined the approach that the ExA will follow. Section 87(1) of the PA2008 says it is for the ExA to decide how to examine the application. However, the PA2008, regulations and government guidance provide a framework within which an Examining Authority must operate.

The Government has set out policy in relation to the type of project the ExA is to examine in the National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN). **PA** emphasised that the role of the ExA is not to consider the merits of the policy, but to consider the merits of the project within the parameters of the national policy statement. PA2008 makes it clear that in taking a decision the SoS '*must decide the application in accordance with any relevant NPS*' subject to certain provisos. Essentially, the provisos are that the application must not breach legal obligations, and that any adverse impact of the proposed development would not outweigh its benefits.

**PA** explained the process is to be inquisitorial and not adversarial, and the role of the ExA is to focus on evidence and justification and not assertion. Whilst it is appropriate at the relevant representation stage for issues of concern to be listed, in submitting written evidence once the examination has started any concerns need to be evidenced.

**PA** emphasised that the process is primarily a written one. The main body of evidence informing judgements and recommendations will come from the written representations made by the Interested Parties, the responses to written representations made by others; Local Impact Reports submitted by local authorities, Statements of Common Ground, and answers to questions that the ExA will pose. The ExA has a responsibility to probe, test and assess the evidence. Representations or responses should set out why the parties support or oppose the application, those parts of the application with which agree or disagree, with reasons for disagreement.

**PA** further explained that whilst the examination process is primarily a written one, there is scope for following types of hearings:

- a) Open Floor Hearing (OFH) – any Interested Party (IP) may request an OFH and if a request is made that may be accommodated. All IPs will, subject to the ExA's powers of control over the conduct of the hearing, have the opportunity to make oral representations about the application. The ExA had already decided to hold an OFH, which was to take place on Wednesday 10 October in the same venue as the PM, starting at 6.30 p.m. The hearing notification and agenda for that hearing was with the Rule 6 letter of 10 September. The ExA also included in the proposed timetable a date reserved for a second OFH later in the Examination.
- b) Issue Specific Hearings (ISHs). The decision on whether to hold ISHs is for the ExA. They are to be held if it is decided it is necessary to ensure adequate

examination of an issue (or to provide an IP with a fair chance to put its case). If any ISHs are held the expectation is that the ExA will ask questions and a specific agenda will be set in advance. There may be a mix of broad and specific question areas. It is not normal to allow cross-examination but the ExA may consider cross-examination if it would be helpful, for example, if there is a dispute between relevant experts on a particular issue. **PA** advised that the letter of 10 September included the hearing notification of an ISH on the draft DCO, to be held after the PM, an agenda and a schedule of issues and questions arising from the draft DCO. **PA** emphasised that this ISH, and any others that the ExA decide to hold, would be held on a without prejudice basis. The holding of such an ISH does not imply that the ExA has reached any judgements or conclusions about whether the DCO should be made. However, there is a need to present to the SoS a DCO which is fit for purpose in the event that the SoS should decide that the proposal is acceptable and that consent should be granted. Parties can participate without prejudicing their position on the application process overall. Therefore, even if parties are opposed to the proposal they would not be compromising their position by engaging in the process and suggesting modifications and amendments to the DCO.

- c) A third form of hearing relates to the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) of land and rights. The Applicant's draft DCO provides for compulsory acquisition. Affected persons have a right to be heard at a CA hearing. The ExA included dates for CA hearings in the examination timetable and a deadline for requests to be heard. If an affected person requests to be heard then a CA hearing will be held.

**PA** further explained that as part of the examination process the ExA will be conducting site inspections which may be both unaccompanied and accompanied. The purpose of these is to see features of the proposal within the context of the evidence put forward.

**PA** confirmed the ExA's intention to carry out an unaccompanied site inspection of the application site from the public footpaths which cross the site, the various road elements of the scheme and the general surroundings on Wednesday 10 October. **PA** stated that there is a date also set aside within the Examination timetable for an Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI).

**PA** stated that during an ASI there would be the opportunity for the attendees to point out features relevant to consideration but not to provide evidence or

submissions. Therefore, it would help to propose and identify relevant features that the ExA should see and explain reasons to support or undermine the case for the development. **PA** reminded parties that there is a deadline in the timetable for notifications of a wish to attend an ASI.

**PA** concluded that this is formally a statutory inquiry and therefore is required to be treated with due regard to its statutory status. **PA** also reminded there is potential to award costs if a party's unreasonable behaviour causes another party to incur wasted expenditure. There is guidance on the Planning Inspectorate website and this includes examples of potentially unreasonable behaviour, including issues such as not submitting evidence on time, withholding evidence or delaying submission for tactical reasons. **PA** requested that parties treat the examination seriously and expeditiously; and the ExA has a duty to ensure that it is fair and open.

### **Item 3 – Assessment of Principal Issues**

**PA** stated the initial assessment of the principal issues around which the examination is likely to focus were set out at Annex B to the letter of 10 September 2018. However, it is not necessarily a comprehensive or exclusive list of all relevant matters but a broad list within which specific matters are likely to be covered. **PA** then referred to the letter of 2 October 2018 submitted by Osborne Clarke LLP on behalf of Rail Central in respect of principal issues but requested that the Applicant speak first.

**AB**, representing the Applicant, wished to make two brief points, the second of them relating to Rail Central's comments. First, **AB** stated that the Applicant was content with the ExA's list of principal issues but wished to add the overarching principal issue of complying with the NPSNN.

**HP**, representing Rail Central, suggested four additional principal issues as per the letter of 2 October 2018. For the purposes of the attendees **PA** asked **HP** to list the issues which he did as follows:

1. Market demand. There are assessments of market demand, one submitted for this application and one for Rail Central. The SoS might consider the overall market demand if there are two applications on adjacent sites. Rail Central considers that there is such demand for both. Hence there might be common ground.
2. Climate. He was concerned as to the adequacy of the Applicant's assessment. Interrelation between two schemes should be considered, something that relates to the NPSNN.

3. Strategic projects and proposals. It is recognised that this is a particular application. Comparative analysis of the merits of two schemes may be necessary. There was no clear statement about cumulative effects and in order to provide assistance to the SoS this may be necessary should there be a need to choose between the schemes. If this is an issue it might be controversial.
4. Operational implications. The ExA will need to be satisfied that both schemes could operate satisfactorily together on the same piece of the network. Rail Central thinks that it would be compatible. Hence the need to put provisions in the DCO.

**PMt** representing Northampton Rail Users Group requested that the term 'Northampton Loop Line' is not used as it appears derogatory and the loop is actually part of the West Coast Main Line. **HP** stated that that was not the intention; it was just shorthand to identify the area.

**AB** for the Applicant stated that Rail Central proposes inclusion of four extra issues which mainly relate to Rail Central seeking to explore how both projects compare, and the Applicant is happy with the ExA's approach to principal issues. But this is an application for Northampton Gateway. The Applicant has already provided some comparative analysis of alternative sites in respect of environmental and compulsory acquisition issues. The governing principle of the Applicant is that the ExA must have all relevant information to consider a comprehensive recommendation for the SoS, so he did not oppose consideration of the issues raised by HP. **AB** did not propose to address each and every one of the matters proposed. But on the third item (comparative analysis of the two schemes) the Applicant submitted some analysis as part of the application in the context of the requirement regarding alternative locations regarding environmental assessment and the compulsory acquisition. It was not necessary for the ExA to conduct the examination to compare two schemes, one of which has not been yet accepted, and this was not a beauty parade.

**DB** asked **HP** to clarify a paragraph in the letter of 2 October 2018 referring to the proposed Roade Bypass, quoting: '*Justification for the transport proposals to meet the traffic generation that is forecast by development of the SRFI would embrace consideration of whether the proposed Roade Bypass is properly to be regarded as Associated Development, applying the Government's associated development principles*'.

**HP** stated that it is possible to a grant development consent order for a NSIP if it satisfies associated development principles, which include consideration of whether it

is an aim in itself or subordinate to the main development; has it been demonstrated that the bypass would be proportionate to the principal development, or whether lesser measures have been considered to arrive at this decision? It was not clear at present and should be flagged up as an issue under Traffic and Transport.

**DB** requested that Ashfield and Gazeley should make any points on this in their written representations.

**ME** on behalf of Network Rail stated that in relation to capacity issues Network Rail is negotiating Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with both the Applicant and Ashfield Land Management Ltd; each of those parties had asked Network Rail to take the view that only one scheme will come forward. He asked the ExA for some guidance for the approach that NR should take in providing information – should it be on the basis of only one scheme coming forward (which could be either) or both?

**AB** stated that the Applicant is exploring SoCG with Network Rail but did not wish to limit considerations which must have regard to the potential applications which can be accepted by the Planning Inspectorate. But he would need to seek clarification and take instructions from the Applicant.

**HP** on behalf of Rail Central stated that with both applications now being submitted there was the necessity to understand overall impact.

**ME** confirmed that each applicant looked at each application in isolation. Network Rail asked whether the SoS in due course would want assessment of the cumulative impacts: Network Rail would be grateful for guidance from the Panel regarding the level of detail required.

**PMt** requested that if there is a comparative analysis to be made, could DIRFT (Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal) be included, as well as other non-warehouse schemes in the area?

**PA** then asked for any other comments or observations.

**AI**, representing Stop Roxhill Northampton Gateway Action Group, suggested that Rugby Parkway should be included as it uses the same line as DIRFT.

**AB** stated that the Applicant's analysis included Rugby Parkway.

There were no further comments regarding the principal issues.

## **Items 4 and 5 - Draft Timetable and Deadlines for submissions**

**PA** referred to Item 4 of the agenda which was the draft timetable for the examination as set out in Annex C of the Rule 6 letter. Following the PM and the consideration of any requests for amendments or additions to the timetable, the ExA will be issuing a firm timetable as part of the Rule 8 letter.

**PA** reminded those present that the 2010 Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules set out some statutory periods that must be allowed in giving notice of specific parts of the examination process, notably the notification of hearings. The draft timetable has adhered to these specific statutory periods. **PA** reiterated that the ExA has a statutory duty to complete the examination within six months following the PM which will be no later than Tuesday 9 April 2019.

**PA** reiterated that the process of examining any NSIP is primarily a written one, and explained that there are a number of documents that are necessary and potentially very useful for the examination. These are as follows: written representations (WRs), including summaries of those that exceed 1500 words, Local Impact Reports (LIRs) prepared by the Local Authorities (LAs) and Statements of Common Ground (SoCG). Annex D to the letter of 10 September listed various SoCG that have been requested. In the draft timetable all these are required on or before noon on Tuesday 6 November, as are comments on the relevant representations already made. All interested parties will have the chance to comment on all these documents by noon on Tuesday 20 November.

**PA** explained that at the heart of the examination are two possible rounds of questions that the ExA will issue, with the first questions included with the Rule 8 letter which would follow shortly after the PM. All interested parties would then have until noon on Tuesday 6 November to respond to these with a deadline for comments on responses of noon on Tuesday 20 November. The ExA proposed that a second round of questions, if required, would be issued by Tuesday 5 February 2019, which would allow the ExA time to reflect on representations, comments and documents that have been provided, and discussion at the likely hearing sessions, which are currently timetabled for 19 and 20 December 2018.

**PA** stated that interested parties would have until noon on Tuesday 26 February to respond to these questions and then would have until noon on Tuesday 19 March to comment on responses. **PA** stated further that, given what the ExA has seen so far from material within the application documents, it is unlikely that it will be necessary

to prepare a Report on the Impact on European Sites (RIES). However, should the ExA decide that this is necessary it will do this by Tuesday 5 February, with comments sought on this by noon on Tuesday 26 February.

In regard to written matters, **AB** stated that the Applicant is in the course of preparing a SoCG with Rail Central and has met with them to work on its content. However, **AB** requested that current Deadline 1 (6 November) for submission is moved to Deadline 3 (30 November) as the Applicant has not yet seen the Rail Central scheme as submitted, not even the electronic version of the documents (though they have been informed one had been sent to them). Much more would be achieved if this SoCG could be submitted later. **AB's** second point referred to the suggestion from **HB** to enter into a tripartite SoCG between Rail Central, Network Rail and Roxhill, and the Applicant would want to resist it at the current time and instead focus on its own project.

**HP** stated that a useful SoCG for Deadline 1 is achievable, even though a further SoCG might be required in due course in order to deal with the cumulative transport model. The initial SoCG could encapsulate many matters by 6 November to assist the ExA and hence there was no reason to delay it. **HP** said that it is inevitable that the SoS might wish to understand the effect of two schemes on the network at the same time. Network Rail is the key voice in that discussion. It therefore seemed sensible that there should be engagement between the three parties. A SoCG would be of assistance to the ExA and SoS.

**ME** for Network Rail said that the more time to prepare this the better; he requested guidance from the ExA as to what information it wished for regarding network capacity, what further work needs to be done, and the validation exercises, and how useful it would be to the ExA as these issues are difficult and complex in terms of dates.

**AB** reiterated that the Applicant has not yet seen the Rail Central application which was submitted to the Inspectorate on 21 September and sent to the Applicant at the end of previous week. The Applicant has to have time to give that application due consideration and therefore Deadline 3 would be appropriate and much more feasible. **AB** for the Applicant stated that in regard to a tripartite SoCG, if required by the ExA, a later deadline would be preferable.

**PA** confirmed that the ExA will consider these matters and will deal with them in the Rule 8 letter.

**ABo** stated that both applications submitted to the Inspectorate would geographically be adjacent to each other and people would be likely to attend events for both. Therefore **ABo** requested that scheduled meetings and hearings do not clash in December 2018 and March 2019.

**AG** referred to final SoCG due for Deadline 6, and requested that the documents are available for members of the public before the second Open Floor Hearing. He was not in favour of delaying a second OFH.

**PA** stated that the application for Rail Central has only just been submitted. If accepted the examination would not commence until probably mid-February 2019 and therefore there would be no potential clashes this calendar year. But the ExA will bear in mind **AG**'s comments and consider the timetable.

### **Item 6 - Hearings and ASI**

**PA** stated that a key document in the examination process is the draft DCO and the ExA is keen that this should be open to scrutiny, comment and development at a number of stages in the examination process. In this regard the ExA has set up the first ISH on the draft DCO on 9 October and with a deadline of 20 November for the Applicant to submit a revised DCO. Responses to a revised DCO are expected by the third examination deadline of 30 November.

**PA** proposed two subsequent ISHs on the draft DCO (20 December 2018 and 13 March 2019), following each of which the Applicant would be expected to provide revised versions. Following the ISH on 20 December and the Applicant's submission of a revised draft, the ExA may publish their own suggested draft DCO or commentary on Tuesday 5 February, with comments invited on this by Tuesday 26 February. The Applicant's final draft DCO should be submitted by Tuesday 19 March.

Following the initial ISH on the draft DCO, the ExA proposed two further blocks of time set aside for hearings on environmental and other matters, the DCO and compulsory acquisition, should the ExA decide these to be necessary, on Wednesday 19 and Thursday 20 December 2018, and Tuesday 12 to Thursday 14 March 2019. Within this second block there is a time slot for the holding of a second Open Floor Hearing if required. The deadline for notification of a wish to make oral representations at an Issue Specific, Compulsory Acquisition or a further Open Floor Hearing is Tuesday 6 November.

**PA** advised that any documents requested at the hearings and written summaries of oral cases put at the hearings should be submitted shortly after the hearings; by Tuesday 6 November in respect of the draft DCO ISH being held on 9 October and the OFH on 10 October; Tuesday 8 January for any December hearings and Tuesday 19 March for any March hearings.

A date of Tuesday 18 December has been allocated for an accompanied site inspection, if required. A notification of a wish to attend the ASI and for suggestions as to sites that parties feel should be visited should be made by Tuesday 6 November.

**PA** invited comments on timetable and site inspection.

**AB** had no further comments regarding the timetable.

**HP** suggested an Issue Specific Hearing to deal with interrelationship between the two applications to understand environmental and technical topics such as cumulative impacts, and any DCO drafting issues, phasing and coordination. The ExA might want to ask questions and Rail Central proposes to appear at each ISH that so far have been scheduled. In the absence of a targeted ISH there might not be enough time for discussion of these issues, or they might get squeezed out. At least one ISH would allow for coordinated understanding across different topics. **HP** discussed attendance at the ISH on 20 December 2018 and 13 March 2019. There is an ISH on 12 March regarding cumulative impacts, and he suggested that the timetable should make it clear when the cumulative impacts ISH will be held so all parties can review and comment on the updated cumulative impact assessment.

**DB** requested **HP** to clarify what interaction issues Rail Central wished to address, and whether Rail Central were asking SoS to make provision for the possible construction of both projects at the same time.

**HP** confirmed this, and stated that both schemes will have impact on junction 15A and both propose different mitigation. Therefore a question arises whether it is appropriate for one scheme to put its mitigation in place, then a second scheme to undo the work and put in its own mitigation. It would need to be reflected in both DCOs, hence a need for coordinated consideration.

**DB** wished to test this position in a situation that the DCO for the Applicant's scheme is granted but not yet constructed, then two years later the Rail Central scheme is proposed. How would the SoS be expected to deal with simultaneous construction impacts in that scenario?

**HP** stated that a DCO is a Statutory Instrument so it can have provisions to override the first DCO. The SoS will deal with two applications arriving at similar times, which is not straightforward to arrive at a solution. The matter requires careful consideration as to what should be the practical solution for the both schemes. **HP** said that was the reason why Rail Central had asked the SoS in its letter to him to give it some thought.

**DB** suggested that under the Rail Central proposal regrading interaction and Junction 15A the Applicant for the NG scheme would require considerable foresight and prescience.

**HP** said it is not easy to come up with the solution but the question remains as to what should be the practical mechanism to ensure that both schemes are not incompatible or that they cause disruption to the network. This will require careful consideration, time and care.

In response to Rail Central's request for at least one ISH on the interrelation between two projects, **AB** stated that the Applicant has not seen the application and this is primarily written process. However, should the ExA require such a hearing the Applicant would not oppose it. **AB** emphasised that Rail Central's application has not yet been accepted by the Inspectorate.

**PMt** supported an ISH due to the complexity of both projects.

**CW** sought clarity as to which ISH would deal with transport and cumulative impact.

**PA** asked for further comments on suggested hearings and the necessity for an ASI as the ExA intend to do USI on 10 October.

**HP** stated the intention to nominate sites for Deadline 1.

## **Item 7 – Procedural decisions**

**PA** advised that the procedural decisions already made by the ExA are set out at Annex E of the letter of 10 September. These relate to several matters, including decisions to hold an early ISH into the draft DCO on 9 October and an OFH on 10 October in the evening.

The ExA has also set deadlines for comments on relevant representations (Tuesday 6 November) bearing in mind that the RRs were published by 13 August so there should have been plenty of time to have read and responded to them, despite the volume (about 850 relevant representations).

The ExA has also set a deadline for the submission of written representations of the same date (6 November) and for any summaries relating to relevant and written representations where these exceed 1500 words. This same date is the deadline by which the ExA should be notified by any statutory parties and certain local authorities if they wish to be considered to be an Interested Party. A similar deadline is set for the submission of LIRs.

**DW** stated that South Northamptonshire Council intends to submit a LIR which could be a combined LIR if the ExA wished.

**Nicky Toon (NT)** advised that Northampton Borough Council will be submitting an LIR.

**PA** stated the ExA requested a series of SoCG between the Applicant and various parties on different topics by 6 November. SoCG should assist in consideration of the issues on which to report, and provide a focus and save time by identifying matters which are not in dispute or need not be the subject of further evidence, and can equally usefully indicate where and why there may be disagreement about the interpretation and relevance of information.

**HP** referred to the earlier exchanges at the PM on SoCG with the Applicant.

**AB** stated that the Applicant is in the process of preparing SoCG and will have a document called a SoCG tracker. **PA** agreed that it would be helpful to the ExA.

**PA** then referred to various documents submitted by the Applicant as a result of advice issued by the Inspectorate following acceptance of the application, and an additional submission by Historic England. These documents are listed in Annex E of the letter of 10 September and have been published on the Northampton Gateway website. The Applicant's documents are primarily updates and clarifications, and the ExA has formally accepted this documentation.

### **Item 8 - Any other matters**

**PA** asked whether the parties wished to discuss any other matters.

**HP** said if the Rail Central application is accepted it is anticipated the examination will commence in early 2019 and some part of the examinations will run in parallel. He stated that he agreed that coordination of the assessment would occur at 'the Secretary of State stage'. Rail Central has written to the SoS regarding some coordination of assessments and sharing of information during this examination. **HP**

advised that relevant material that touches on both schemes will be available to the ExA, which refers to issues relating to the Roxhill application.

**AB** stated that a need for a bespoke approach suggested by Rail Central is not required and neither is there a need for a protocol for exchange of documents. Rail Central is an Interested Person in this examination already.

**PMt** wanted clarification regarding the availability of SoCG.

**HP** stated that discussions will take place in private but SoCG will be public, submitted and available to others.

## **Closure**

As there were no further matters **PA** stated that the ExA will reflect on what was said and plan to issue the Rule 8 letter during the course of the following week. **PA** also stated that the ExA appreciate that the proposed development has resulted in a considerable amount of interest and concern. The ExA hopes to run a thorough and constructive examination and whilst recognising the strong feeling thus far expressed the ExA also intends to ensure that the examination proceeds in a well-mannered, friendly and helpful fashion. **PA** stated that the ExA looks forward to the parties' co-operation and involvement in achieving this.

**PA** reminded that the dDCO ISH was to start at 1.15 that afternoon (9 October) and that the OFH would be also at the same venue, starting at 6.30pm on 10 October.

**PA** thanked those present for their attendance and input and closed the meeting at 11:18.