

IP REF. SP074 - South Northamptonshire Council - PINS Reference TR050006

## SNC Response to Applicants Responses to Written Responses to ExQ1's 20-11-2018 - Roxhill Document 8.7

(submitted by email to [NorthamptonGateway@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:NorthamptonGateway@pins.gsi.gov.uk))    Date – 30 November 2018

### **Application by Roxhill (Junction 15) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange.**

The following is submitted in response to the Applicants Response to Written Responses to ExQ1's 20-11-2018 - Roxhill Document 8.7 to SNC Response (PINS Ref REP1-039)

1. The Applicant's Response (page2) includes reference under the sub-heading 'Rail Central' to an officer report included on the agenda for published the SNC Planning Committee meeting held on 1/11/2018. This officer report is also attached as Appendix 1 to the submitted Roxhill Document 8.7.
2. The Council wishes to make clear to the ExA the decision of the Planning Committee was to require the officer report be amended to reflect the view of the Planning Committee expressed by the committee members at the meetings. The published agenda report thus was not approved and does not therefore represent the view of SNC.
3. An amended report was subsequently approved and this was submitted to the ExA on 6/11/2018 as the Written Representation of South Northamptonshire Council. This document presents the formal view of the SNC with respect to the Northampton Gateway DCO proposal.
4. The Written Representation submitted does not refer to a preference with respect to any proposal for a strategic rail freight terminal. The Council has thus not expressed such a preference. The response submitted by the Applicant in drawing attention to the comment in the agenda officer report has the potential to be misleading with respect to the view expressed by SNC on the proposal.
5. The SNC Written Representation concludes in paragraph 62 :-  
  
"This proposed development has the potential to undermine the adopted WNJCS in terms of both the scale and the distribution of development. The proposal represents a significant increase in employment provision which would lead to increased pressure on housing over and above provision identified in the JCS .The harm that will arise from the contradiction with the Development Plan in terms of the distribution of development and the balance of land uses will not be mitigated through the development proposal. For this reason the Council as the Local Planning Authority is opposed to this proposal"
6. In the response to comments made by the Northampton Rail Users Group, on page 19 the applicant comments :-

“The WR suggests that in ES table 8.19 the Applicant has established significant adverse effects but has made no proposals to mitigate them. This is incorrect. Where potentially significant adverse effects or other adverse impacts have been identified as a result of the Proposed Development, specific appropriate measures have been proposed to avoid, mitigate and minimise them as required by Government Policy as indicated in Table 8.19. The exception are potential significant effects associated with the railway noise maximum noise levels. For this impact, no specific measure is proposed because as set out in paragraph 8.6.11 *“Work is being carried out at a European level to reduce the noise from freight trains and it is likely that by 2043, quieter rolling stock will be in use compared with that assumed for this assessment. Therefore, the potential significant adverse effect would be mitigated by the use of quieter rolling stock.”* Therefore, measures are in place to address all the identified potential significant effects”.

This applicant is thus clearly relying on external agencies to implement measures to resolve the significant adverse noise effect identified rather than proposing mitigation with the proposal. Given this effect is identified to occur in the future identified other measures may emerge to reduce the noise effect however if the anticipated scenario does not unfold, the proposal should include measures now that would be implemented to mitigate this significant effect remain.