

**From:** Alan Hargreaves [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 March 2019 10:12  
**To:** 'Northampton Gateway' <NorthamptonGateway@pins.gsi.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Deadline 6 Cumulative Impact Assessment ISH 4 Tuesday 12th March 2019

Dear Sirs,

I write to confirm questions raised by myself during the morning session of above ISH 4 on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> March, during point 3 on the agenda various parties present namely Mr Brock, Mr Booth Ms Thompson of Eversheds and Mr Gallup, RCs rail consultant made repeated references to a requirement for "4 train paths", which appeared to suggest that is what is required under Government policy, I pointed out that Government Policy NSPNN 4.89 makes no reference to train paths it actually states "As a minimum, a SRFI should be capable of handling four trains per day and, where possible be capable of increasing the number of trains handled....", it was agreed by those present that to handle four trains (i.e. 4 in and 4 out), would create the need for 8 Train paths.

I also raised the question whether NG Doc 7.13a 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019 the unsigned SoCG between NG and NR, required reviewing, those parties present suggested this was not necessary, however. I would wish to elaborate on the reason for questioning a review of this document:-

>Doc 7.13a para 5 reads "there is sufficient capacity for the SRFI to operate up to 4 trains per day", policy clearly requires a minimum (not up to) 8 paths, subsequently in its present format this unsigned agreement would be non-compliant with policy, I believe it is critical that any legal agreement is absolutely clear in its definition.

>Doc 7.13a was also subject to two caveats:-

a) that trains can enter and leave the SRFI at a minimum of 40 mph Q, could the ExA question if this requisite increase in train paths would have any detrimental impact on these entry and exit speed requirements, and can this point be verified by Network Rail

b) the origin and destination of each train movement (path) will not be known until the SRFI is operational ... Q to the ExA this caveat indicates there is no guarantee that the requisite train paths can actually be achieved for even one SRFI let alone the combined cumulative effects of RC, Dirft and all existing services on the NL WCML, how could a recommendation of approval possibly be made with this degree of uncertainty.

It is also clear that the ExA still have several unanswered questions which were addressed to Network Rail at both this meeting and also questions raised at ExQ2.

In closing I would reiterate points made by others in earlier communications to the ExA, that a failure to conduct cumulative assessments (which appears to be the case) indicates non-compliance with regulations, and unless Network Rail or their agent can give clear and unqualified assurance that there will be capacity on the rail network not just the Northampton Loop then our view is that the ExA would not have sufficient factual information on which to make any recommendation for approval.

Alan Hargreaves

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---