



NORTHAMPTON
GATEWAY
STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN
THE APPLICANT, NETWORK RAIL AND RAIL CENTRAL**

DOCUMENT 7.18

The Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange Order 201X

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN
THE APPLICANT, NETWORK RAIL AND RAIL CENTRAL | 30 NOVEMBER 2018

www.northampton-gateway.co.uk

Statement of Common Ground

Relating to the Operational Compatibility of Northampton Gateway and Rail Central

- (1) Roxhill (Junction 15) Limited
- (2) Ashfield Land Management Limited and Gazeley Northampton s.a.r.l.
- (3) Network Rail Infrastructure Limited

This Statement of Common Ground is made on

[●]

Between

- (1) **Roxhill (Junction 15) Limited** referred to as ("**Northampton Gateway**");
- (2) **Ashfield Land Management Limited** and **Gazeley GLP Northampton S.à.r.l.** (together, Ashfield Land Management Limited and Gazeley GLP Northampton S.à.r.l. are referred to as "**Rail Central**");
- (3) **Network Rail Infrastructure Limited** ("**Network Rail**").

1. Background and Scope

- 1.1 Northampton Gateway are the promoters of an application for a SRFI DCO on a site located between the M1 (to the east) and the Northampton Loop Line ("NLL") (to the west). Rail Central are the promoters of an application for a SRFI DCO on land to the west of the NLL, opposite Northampton Gateway.
- 1.2 The Northampton Gateway DCO was accepted for Examination on 15 June 2018. Rail Central resubmitted a DCO application to the Planning Inspectorate on 29 October 2018 which was accepted for Examination on 15 November 2018.
- 1.3 This tripartite Statement of Common Ground has been prepared following the Procedural Decision of the Examining Authority, of the Northampton Gateway application, within their Rule 8 letter of 17 October 2018, for the purposes of addressing the operational compatibility between the Northampton Gateway and Rail Central projects.
- 1.4 It is stated within this Statement of Common Ground that further assessments are required by Network Rail which will further inform the position on operational compatibility. Therefore this Statement of Common is a reflection between the positions of the parties as at Deadline 3.

2. Technical Compatibility

- 2.1 Both Northampton Gateway and Rail Central include similar areas of land belonging to Network Rail within their respective Order Limits.
- 2.2 Rail Central's rail connections will run to their intermodal facility located parallel to the NLL on its western side. Northampton Gateway's rail connections will run to their intermodal facility located parallel to the NLL on its eastern side.
- 2.3 Both the SRFIs connect to the NLL, though from opposite sides and the point at which the crossings converge on the NLL is referred to in this Statement of Common Ground as "the southern connections".

Position of Northampton Gateway

- 2.4 Rail Central, in their Interrelationship Report (Appendix 3 to Written Representations of Rail Central (PINS Ref []), at paragraphs 4.1 to 4.9, provide their views on compatibility of the two schemes. Northampton Gateway, based on an initial view of the application documentation recently submitted by Rail Central, do not agree that the two schemes as shown on the application plans are compatible.
- 2.5 Rail Central have stated in paragraph 3.2.1 of the Interrelationship Report that "Both Projects will be constructing new railway lines at the NLL to connect to their respective intermodal facilities. Configuration of connection points will be determined at detailed design stage in order to facilitate both connections".

- 2.6 However, Northampton Gateway consider that the physical layouts of the network connections shown on the respective rail plans submitted are incompatible with the positioning of the southern connections being in the same location. This is not a conflict which can be left to the detailed stage because the repositioning of the south connections for either scheme would result in the lengthening of the junction which may take a scheme beyond Order limits and have implications on capacity and pathing. This is because entry and exit times will be extended and the amount of wrong direction running will be increased, thereby blocking both the Up and Down Northampton Lines for longer. As at the time of writing Northampton Gateway were not aware of the existence of the drawing referred to in paragraph 2.11.

Position of Rail Central

- 2.7 Recent technical assessment of the respective main line connections onto the NLL (slow lines) indicates that an appropriate design solution can allow both sets of main line connections to be achieved within their respective order limits, without requiring any changes to the main line entry/exit speeds and adding less than 5 seconds of additional "wrong line" working for trains to and from the main line. It is considered that with detailed design the level of wrong line working could be further reduced. A common approach to signalling would allow both schemes to have the opportunity of higher speed entry and exit onto the main lines. Further information on track and signalling design will be provided following review with Network Rail referred to at Section 4 below.

Position of Network Rail

- 2.8 Network Rail has so far assessed the feasibility of the technical design of the SRFI proposals separately, in both cases to 'Grip Stage 2'. Network Rail has not yet undertaken any work to consider the technical compatibility of the two schemes together.
- 2.9 Network Rail understands that for each SRFI scheme to operate satisfactorily together both schemes may have to be redesigned at the southern connections.
- 2.10 In order for Network Rail to give its opinion as to whether the two schemes are compatible from a technical design point of view, in particular in relation to the physical layout and design of the southern connections, Network Rail will need to undertake a full feasibility study to assess the combined effects of the two schemes, at the relevant Applicant's cost, pursuant to a contract with one or both Applicants.
- 2.11 Network Rail received on 27 November 2018 a preliminary drawing from Rail Central, which purports to show how the southern connections could be designed to enable both schemes to come forward simultaneously. Network Rail needs to assess the work that needs to be undertaken before it will be in a position to assess the feasibility of the two schemes coming forward together.

3. Operational Compatibility

Position of Northampton Gateway

- 3.1 Network Rail have advised that they do not have sufficient information to confirm its position on either technical capacity or operational capacity.
- 3.2 Northampton Gateway has provided information with its submitted application (and subsequently to Network Rail in terms of physical access, currently under consideration) which it believes confirms that the Northampton Gateway application is acceptable both in terms of its physical rail access and capacity in terms of train paths (Rail Reports Document 6.7 APP-377). The position on likely available train paths, as outlined in the Rail Reports, demonstrates that there are no capacity constraints in terms of freight paths which would prevent both schemes coming forward. The reference is Appendix 1 (Section 9) and Appendix 3 (Executive Summary) of the Rail Reports. The Applicant does not consider further work is needed to establish this.

- 3.3 Appropriate protective provisions for the benefit of Network Rail have been included in the Northampton Gateway dDCO, as referred to in the SoCG between NR and Northampton Gateway (Document 7.13). Those provisions provide Network Rail with extensive control over any development affecting its assets. Northampton Gateway believes those provisions are adequate to deal with any issues arising from other development affecting the railway occurring at the same time as Northampton Gateway. However, when Northampton Gateway receives the amendments to the protective provisions being sought by Network Rail, as referred to in paragraph 5.1 below, consideration will be given to the appropriateness of such changes and , if necessary, amendments will be included in the dDCO to be provided for Deadline 4.
- 3.4 Northampton Gateway have not been provided with any suggested additional protective provisions by Rail Central. As and when any actual provisions are suggested Northampton Gateway will consider the necessity for, and appropriateness, of those provisions.

Position of Rail Central

- 3.5 Rail Central have made detailed submissions relating to Operational Compatibility of Northampton Gateway within the Written Representation [REP1-029] (paragraphs 7.1 – 7.8). Rail Central submits that in terms of combined results of the work undertaken by Rail Central to date with Network Rail on mainline access and network capability for Rail Central, this has not identified constraints which would otherwise prevent all three SRFI (Northampton Gateway, Rail Central and DIRFT) from being able to operate satisfactorily in the way required by the Planning Act 2008 and NN NPS. Further work is now being undertaken with Network Rail involvement to provide additional information on the availability of main line capacity between London and the North West via the fast and slow lines.
- 3.6 It is considered by Rail Central that the co-ordination of construction of new railway lines to connect to the NLL and the respective Projects' intermodal facilities can be delivered through management by and with Network Rail. This can be secured through the protective provisions for Network Rail's benefit, which should be contained in both Projects DCOs.

Position of Network Rail

Operational compatibility in respect of railway network capacity

- 3.7 Network Rail has not undertaken, and has not received the relevant information, or funding, to enable it to undertake any work to assess the capacity of the railway network to accommodate both schemes.
- 3.8 Elements of each scheme may have to be redesigned to enable the schemes to be constructed and to operate.
- 3.9 In order to be able to assess capacity, Network Rail must first have assessed the technical design and compatibility of the two schemes.
- 3.10 The available paths on the railway network depend upon numerous factors including the speed at which trains can enter and leave the SRFIs: such speeds affect the railway timetable and, therefore, the capacity available on the wider network.
- 3.11 The speed at which trains can enter and leave the SRFIs is partly dependant on the internal configuration of the respective sites and the design of each connection to the railway.
- 3.12 Accordingly, in the absence of a detailed proposal to assess, Network Rail has so far been unable to comment on the capacity of the network to accommodate both schemes.
- 3.13 Network Rail will continue to liaise with the Applicants regarding any designs that they submit for validation.

Technical operational compatibility

- 3.14 In addition, again depending upon the results of the technical assessments referred to at paragraph 2.10 above, Network Rail will need to consider the operational compatibility of the two schemes from a technical point of view.
- 3.15 Network Rail is unable to validate the views expressed by Rail Central at paragraph 2.7, including Rail Central's statement that "an appropriate design solution can allow both sets of main line connections to be achieved within their respective order limits, without requiring any changes to the main line entry/exit speeds". In order to be able to express its views on these matters, further feasibility assessments will need to be undertaken and validated by Network Rail.

4. Network Rail: Further Assessments Required

- 4.1 Once the relevant contracts are in place and Network Rail has had an opportunity to consider the joint scheme currently only proposed by Rail Central, Network Rail will be able to give its opinion on the assessments that it will require to give its view on:
- (a) the compatibility of the two Projects in respect of design and construction, in particular the design of the southern connections;
 - (b) the capacity of the Rail Network to accommodate both Projects; and
 - (c) the operational compatibility of the two Projects.

5. Protective Provisions for the benefit of Network Rail

- 5.1 Network Rail does not agree with the view expressed by Northampton Gateway at paragraph 2.3 above that appropriate protective provisions for the benefit of Network Rail are included in Part 1, Schedule 13 to the dDCO submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-006]. Network Rail has requested various amendments to the Network Rail protective provisions in its Deadline 3 submissions to the ExA. Network Rail considers these amendments to be crucial to the safe operation of the railway network.
- 5.2 Network Rail will also consider whether it needs to request that further protective provisions are included in the DCO once it has had an opportunity to review the effects of the both schemes coming forward.

AGREED BY ALL PARTIES BY NOT YET SIGNED

DATE 30 NOVEMBER 2018

Signed by [*full name of*)
individual signature])
for and on behalf of)
Roxhill (Junction 15) Limited)

Signed by [*full name of*)
individual signature])
for and on behalf of **Ashfield**)
Land Management Limited)

Signed by [*full name of*)
individual signature] for and on)
behalf of **Gazeley GLP**)
Northampton s.a.r.l)

Signed by [*full name of*)
individual signature])
for and on behalf of)
Network Rail)
Infrastructure Limited)

