

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

31<sup>st</sup> March 2019

By email [NorthamptonGateway@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:NorthamptonGateway@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Dear Sirs,

### **Re Northampton Gateway Deadline 8 Submission**

Having read yet another submission by Rail Central in this examination I feel compelled to write to draw attention to the role that Rail Central has played and to question their motivation. From very early on Rail Central have been claiming that both theirs and Roxhill's proposed SRFIs can co-exist, that both can perform the function of an SRFI and that together they would have limited detrimental impact on the environment and surrounding communities. I would therefore question why Rail Central has chosen to adopt the role of chief protagonist in the examination of a development which, according to them, has little bearing on their own.

Whilst I understand their attempts to ensure that issues such as joint rail connections are catered for in the Roxhill application, there appears little reasoning behind the continued attempts to discredit the Roxhill application on a number of fronts (most recently Roxhill's lack of climate impact assessment). I can only think that they have taken this aggressive stance as they have now come to realise that, actually, successful co-habitation is not even a remote possibility and the only path open to them is to assist in the downfall of their opponent's application. That this is the true nature of their intent became clear when they effectively sabotaged the cumulative impact hearing with their application for deferment on the day preceding the issue specific hearing.

I refer you to advice note 9 "Using the Rochdale envelope" and paragraph 104 of the judgement in that particular case: "the level of information required is: sufficient information to enable the main or the likely significant effects on the environment to be assessed and the mitigation measures to be described." I believe the deliberate actions of Rail Central have resulted in the situation whereby insufficient information is available to enable anyone to fully understand the potential implications. I am of the opinion that this missing information is material to the extent that it precludes a valid judgement being made. I am very much hoping that the Examining Authority is of the same mind.

Yours faithfully

Mark Redding