

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

27 March 2019

Our Refs: 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, Deadline 7 Submission  
Compulsory Acquisition Hearing, 13 March 2019, Agenda Item 3b), post-hearing written  
submission of oral cases  
Document 8.14, Hyde Farm House – Minor Scheme Amendment, Dated 8 January 2019  
Document 8.23, Applicant’s Responses to other Parties’ Deadline 6 Submissions  
Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: TR050006-001045**

Dear Ms. Mignano,

Please accept this as our Deadline 7 written submission, in response to Document 8.23, page 31 in respect of Document 8.14.

Document 8.14 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”. As previously stated in our response, The Applicant did not consult with us on this design change in any manner. However, Document 8.23 now states that the design amendment is a “more environmentally acceptable” scheme. These two statements contradict each other.

Our view is that the motivation for the design amendment is not to address environmental concerns. At the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing of the 13 March 2019, when asked directly what the motivation for the design amendment was, the Applicant responded “to avoid compulsory acquisition”. This response is on public record and cannot be refuted by the Applicant. We are very disappointed that the Applicant is refusing to acknowledge this statement in Document 8.23.

For the sake of clarity, we wish to re-iterate our statements in our letter of the 25 March 2019, namely:

1. “We wish to protect our home, which has historic value, by ensuring the best possible mitigation measures are put in place. The design change resulted in the height of the bund being reduced from its full height to ground level over an approximate length of 50 metres. By reducing the volume of the bund in this manner, which is significant, the functionality of the bund is reduced. The functionality of the bund is to minimise the impacts of the by-pass, (noise, vibration and visual impacts, not just noise as implied by the Applicant) and therefore this design does not ensure that the best possible mitigation measures are in place.”

Therefore, we are not refuting the removal of permanent compulsory acquisition, we are requesting that the original design i.e. the height of the bund is reinstated as it provides significantly improved mitigation measures.

2. "That a responsible developer has a moral obligation to ensure that any losses experienced by impacted individuals, as a consequence of their actions are suitably compensated in line with common practice for such developments. In taking these actions, the Applicant is blatantly refusing to accept their obligations to severely impacted parties such as ourselves, which is a basic requirement."

Yours sincerely,

Mr D. Nola and Mrs S.E. Nola