

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

13 February 2019

Our Ref No's: NGR-AFP032 and NGR-AFP033

The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Planning

For the attention of: Ms. Kate Mignano (sent by e-mail)

**RE: Northampton Gateway Rail Freight Interchange
Document 8.14, Hyde Farm House – Minor Scheme Amendment, Dated 8 January 2019
Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: TR050006-001045**

Dear Ms. Mignano,

We refer to the subject document that was submitted by The Applicant as part of their Deadline 4 submission. We are writing to you as the Owners of Hyde Farm House and referred to in the document as the Landowner.

The objectives of this communication are to:

- A. Provide a summary of our relationship and communications with The Applicant to provide context to our response
- B. Provide our formal response to the subject document
- C. Summarise our position

A History of our Relationship & Communications with The Applicant

Our first contact with The Applicant was in June 2016; The Applicant wished to perform a range of surveys on our property; we allowed all requested access, at no cost to The Applicant, for numerous surveys to be performed at our property during 2016 and 2017.

Summary of Communications in Respect of Land Acquisition and Rights

- i. 14 November 2016, The Applicant shared a plan showing the corridor for “new road infrastructure and improvements including landscaping”. The corridor extended onto our property. The Applicant was evaluating options before confirming what their land acquisition and other requirements were.
- ii. 17 October 2017, The Applicant advised us by e-mail that they did not need to acquire any of our land.
- iii. 19 December 2017, The Applicant changed their position and wrote to us advising that they did require some of our land for the following reasons, please refer to extract from their letter below:

- We are proposing to provide a visual screen and noise barrier, in the form of a landscaped 'bund', alongside the bypass past your property. It is therefore proposed to acquire the corner of your field in order to construct this. Note that in addition to the permanent land take there is a 5m margin that we would require temporarily for construction purposes. This is the area shaded yellow on the enclosed sketch and it would be returned to its current state following completion of the works.
- Your land ownership includes the route of the existing bridleway which we need to divert under the bypass and provide a drainage outfall into the watercourse, as discussed below. The revised land take boundary is the existing tree line alongside the bridleway.

Following this letter, we met with The Applicant to discuss their requirements as outlined above. As requested by the Applicant, we engaged an Agent (Thompson Broadbent, Chartered Surveyors) to act on our behalf to negotiate an Option Agreement to; procure land, obtain temporary access during construction and for drainage rights in to our "large pond".

- iv. September 2018, The Applicant contacted our Agent by telephone, advising that the bypass has been redesigned to avoid the need to acquire any land from us. No other information was volunteered by The Applicant at the time in respect of access rights during construction or drainage rights into our "large pond".

B Our Response to Document 8.14, Dated 8 January 2019

Paragraph 5 states:

"Accordingly, the objective of the proposed change is to address concerns raised by the landowner rather than to address any environmental impacts".

This statement does not reflect our position, as:

- i. We have not commented or communicated any concerns relating to the detailed design of the bund or other details relating to the bridleway or bypass adjacent to our property, either verbally during meetings or in writing to The Applicant.
- ii. If the Applicant's motivation for such design changes were in response to our concerns, there would be documented evidence of such and the Applicant should have communicated back to us that our concerns had been addressed "in a collaborative manner". Please be assured that there has never been any such correspondence.

Paragraph 4 states:

"The impact of the proposed development on Hyde Farm House will be reduced, resulting in a minor benefit over the original proposal"

We do not agree with this statement, as:

- iii. The of the volume of the bund adjacent to our property has been reduced and therefore the functionality of the bund in respect of screening and noise reduction has been diminished. We are at a loss to understand "how the impact has been reduced" and no explanation has been offered by The Applicant. By reducing the volume of the bund, as detailed in this design amendment, the impacts from the proposed bypass have been worsened.

- iv. Hyde Farm House is a Grade II Listed building and we wish to minimise any impacts that the proposed scheme will have on the property.
- v. Paragraph 4 also mentions the environmental impacts; we continue to have concerns regarding the discharge of water from the bypass into our “large pond” for which we have no information. The Applicant has not, thus far, been able to satisfy our concerns regarding the potential risks to us, e.g. water contamination etc. Furthermore, The Applicant does not have any agreement with us that they can use our “large pond” for drainage purposes.

C Summary of Our Position

We feel very aggrieved with the position that we find ourselves in for the following reasons:

- i. The design amendment described in Document 8.14 is not in response to any requests that we have made to The Applicant. It is our view that the sole reason for the design amendment is to potentially reduce the compensation payable to us.
- ii. Drainage; we could be open to risks in respect of pollution of our large pond. At the time of writing, there is no dialogue between us and The Applicant on this matter; a situation that we will proactively endeavour to correct.
- iii. The Applicant still needs to take temporary possession of our land to divert the bridleway. We have requested a meeting to better understand their requirement, but at the time of writing The Applicant has declined to meet.
- iv. We have found The Applicant to be inconsistent and it has been difficult to have a clear understanding of their true objectives, in short, we feel that we have been “messed about”.
- v. We both continue to oppose the scheme in its totality and we object to the design amendment described in Document 8.14, as the impacts on our property have been increased.

Whilst we are not familiar with the precise process that the Planning Inspectorate will follow, we ask you to treat this communication as evidence to be considered in your decision making and to record our objection to the Minor Scheme Amendment described in Document 8.14.

We ask that as part of your recommendations to the Secretary of State, that you to place a “condition” that this design amendment is not approved and the original design is re-instated, should the scheme be approved. The reason for this is to minimise the impacts of the scheme on our property.

Yours sincerely,

Mr D. Nola and Mrs S.E. Nola