

Date: 8th January 2019.

To: **Planning Inspectorate/Examining Authority.**

Dear Sirs,

Re: TRO 50006 Application by Roxhill (Junction 15) Ltd. For an order granting Development Consent for Northampton Gateway SRFI.

I attended the ISH 2 on the 19th December 2018 for the above application which covered amongst other things Rail Access and capacity. During that meeting a question was raised by Mr. Andrew Bodman regarding advice provided by PINS on the 21st February 2017, this actually related to a question which I directly raised stating my serious concerns regarding the feasibility practicality and capacity of the Rail Network to accommodate either or both schemes i.e. Northampton Gateway and Rail Central. It should be noted that PINS advice was only published on the Rail Central page of PINS website but should as a matter of course also been posted on the Northampton Gateway page as my question was clearly relevant to and addressed both schemes.

The full transcript of the advice provided is still posted on PINS website and clearly states 'the critical consideration for a developer is to seek to provide an ExA with sufficient information and detail for them to understand and assess the impacts of the scheme, if an ExA was unable to do this there would be a high risk they could not recommend that consent be granted for that scheme. GRIP stage 3 relates to option selection and GRIP 4 relates to single option development. If a developer had not reached a conclusion with Network Rail to GRIP stage 4 this could represent a greater high risk approach as it could complicate the ExAs ability to assess the potential impacts of the scheme.

One of the appointed Inspectors for the ExA during that meeting expressed that he was unaware of what 'GRIP' referred to, I assume therefore that he was also unaware of the advice provided by PINS on 21.2.17. I would wish to seek clarity that: - i). The advice provided by PINS is accurate and still relevant, if this is the case I would wish to seek assurance that the ExA now appointed will familiarise themselves with the GRIP process and ensure that due consideration is given before making final recommendations. GRIP's relevance may be of significant importance once the 'cumulative impacts' ISH is discussed in March this year.

I would also wish to draw attention to a procedural issue and the non-attendance of Network Rail at this ISH2 hearing. Network Rail are a Government Body who ultimately will have the final say on all aspects of Rail Connectivity, capacity and feasibility, and as such I feel their input, involvement and attendance in the process is crucial, particularly when the subject matter is 'Rail Capacity'. Do PINS or ExA have powers to ensure the future attendance of Network Rail when appropriate, as mentioned earlier Rail Connectivity will become of great importance when Cumulative impacts are discussed.

I will also copy this communication to Network Rail, our Local MP's who are actively involved in the process of both these SRFI's, and the Minister of Transport in the hope of receiving an explanation as to why Network Rail did not attend such a crucial meeting.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

A. Hargreaves.

[Redacted signature block]