



National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer
Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: railcentral@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The Rt Hon Andrea Leadsom MP

Your Ref: AL/TG/1906

Our Ref: TR050004

Date: 9 July 2019

Dear Ms Leadsom

Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

Application by Gazeley GLP Northampton s.a.r.l. and Ashfield Land Management Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Rail Central Strategic Rail Freight Interchange

Your letter of 17 June 2019

Thank you for your letter dated 17 June 2019, concerning the issues raised by Mr Redding.

On the first point, there will be a non-statutory consultation on the amendments sought to the Development Consent Order, which relate to a revised package of highways mitigation. Details will be posted on the website and there will be an opportunity for 30 days on which representations can be made. It will be non-statutory and there is no requirement for any public presentations, however, there will be a need for sufficient material to be submitted to justify any requested changes to the original application.

On the second point, the Examining Authority does not have powers under the Planning Act 2008 to impose sanctions on the applicants for missing the milestones or to insist that the applicant withdraw the application. However, it was their intention in setting out a timetable for the proposed further work that this would be a pragmatic way forward within the powers which are available to them, as we are aware of the impact of the continued uncertainty about the proposed changes on the local community. Although they have no powers to bring matters forward more quickly, the community has the opportunity to view the applicant's milestone reports on the website and this provides some transparency on the applicant's work on the proposed changes.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Robert Ranger

Robert Ranger MRTPI
Case Manager

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>





HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

PINS RECEIVED

27 JUN 2019

Mr Rob Ranger
Case Manager
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

17th June 2019

Ref: AL/TG/1906

Dear Mr Ranger,

I write on behalf of my constituent Mr [REDACTED] Redding of [REDACTED] Northampton, [REDACTED] who you will be aware is one of the coordinators of the Stop Rail Central local action group in South Northamptonshire.

As you will see from the enclosed correspondence, Mr Redding has several concerns about the ongoing deferment by Ashfield Land for their Rail Central SRFI application. Particularly, he would be grateful if you could address:

1. that the applicant's consultation will not be open to the public and that, in the absence of any presentation to the public, the material changes will be hidden within reams of information and inaccessible to most (as with previous publications);
2. that there appears to be no sanction or penalty for the missing of deadlines set in the consenting of the deferment. Mr Redding would like to know what is the point of deadlines if they can be missed without sanction?

I look forward to your response.

With best wishes,

[REDACTED]

The Rt Hon. Andrea Leadsom MP
Member of Parliament for South Northamptonshire

[Enc.]

Cc: Mr [REDACTED] Redding

Member of Parliament for South Northamptonshire

GILCHRIST, Tommy

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2019 20:07
To: GILCHRIST, Tommy
Cc: John Exley; Alan Hargreaves
Subject: Fwd: RE: Rail Central Deferment

Tommy,

I know that you are probably very busy at the moment but if you get a spare few minutes would you be able to press PINs, on our behalf, for slightly more definitive answers to the questions below. Our concerns are primarily:

1. that the consultation will not be open to the public and that, in the absence of any presentation to the public, the material changes will be hidden within reams of information and inaccessible to most (as with previous publications)
2. that there appears to be no sanction or penalty for the missing of deadlines set in the consenting of the deferment. What is the point of deadlines if they can be missed without sanction?

Your help would be much appreciated.

Mark.

-----Original message-----

From : [REDACTED]
Date : 18/05/2019 - 11:22 (GMTST)
To : [REDACTED]

maxdarby@darbygroup.co.uk, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], tommy.gilchrist@parliament.uk

Andrew.Gough@northampton.ac.uk

Subject : Fwd: RE: Rail Central Deferment

All,

I have had a response from PINs regarding further consultation with us. For something they have been deliberating for over a month I think it is a lazy answer. Point 3 is key but the answer is far from definitive. Seems RC are at liberty to do what they want with no penalty or come-back. I have copied my original questions below and PINs answers follow. If you think it is worth responding let me know what you think we should say. Not sure whether we will further our cause but I would like clarity on who they have to consult (point 3) as we could well be left out.

1. You have set a number of clear deadlines for the Applicant but, given that they have already missed a number of them, we wonder what sanction there might be if they continue in the same vein. Having seen their (declared and imposed) deadlines come and go over many years, we are concerned that the same may happen again and that the process will be delayed even further. You have already confirmed that you have no powers to require an Applicant to withdraw an application so we are wondering how you will ensure compliance.
2. There appears to be a lack of clarity over the extent of consultation that is required to be carried out. In point 12 of the proposed timetable there is reference to a "Full Consultation". Within the same point it is

stated that *"The consultation exercise will be focused solely on the amendments sought to the DCO application and therefore only concern the revised package of highways mitigation"*. As it is highly likely that the revised mitigation will affect other aspects of the application why is there not a requirement to consult on other potential impacts and adverse effects such as noise/air pollution and visual impact?

3. Within point 12 it also states that the Applicant intends to carry out *"targeted consultation"* with a number of parties (subsequently listed) which clearly excludes members of the community, interested parties and our own representative Action Group. The final paragraph on page 2 refers to consultation with *"all interested parties"* so there appears to be some ambiguity. My understanding of *"full consultation"* is that it be fully inclusive. We therefore request that all of those who are registered as interested parties (in particular) and any other members of the local community are included in this full consultation.

4. In addition, our interpretation of a full consultation is that it should require public exhibitions. There is no mention of these. As you are no doubt aware we have attended two rounds of public exhibitions and have had to read through at least four iterations of the application documents (draft preliminary environmental statement through to, what we thought was, the final DCO submission) which have been far from readily accessible to members of the general public. We believe that the community require an opportunity to question the Applicant and should not be expected to have to interpret and decipher the reams of confusing information that are part and parcel of such applications. The volume and complexity of it is such that ordinary people are prevented from engaging.

5. A number of milestones have been set at which the Applicant must provide the ExA with evidence of progress. We welcome the fact that the evidence will be shared on the Planning Inspectorate web site but would request that full details of the work completed are published at each stage. This will give interested parties more time to digest the changes rather than having to wait until August to receive all the relevant information in one submission. It is appreciated that the consultation period is 56 days but it is at a time when many people will be taking a Summer vacation which limits the time available to properly consider the changes. This puts interested and affected parties at a distinct disadvantage.

6. Having had rather poor experience of navigating the Rail Central web site and significant problems with the email address provided for feedback we trust that the consultation material will also be posted on the PINs web site.

-----Original message-----

From : RailCentral@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Date : 16/05/2019 - 10:52 (GMTST)
To : [REDACTED]
Subject : RE: Rail Central Deferment

Dear Mr Redding,

Thank you for your email. I apologise for the delay in replying to you; we have carefully considered the points you raise, which I have put to the Examining Authority. I will attempt to answer your questions in the order in which they were put to us.

1. The ExA has no powers to enforce compliance with our request for information at the milestones. However, it is going as far as it can within the powers available to ensure compliance with the timetable.
2. A full consultation is one that would fulfil the key principles of chapter 2 of part 5 of the Planning Act 2008. A proportionate approach would be taken, limiting it to the proposed changes to the application, including any mitigation.
3. The ExA will consider the Change Request in the summer to see whether it amounts to a material change and then consultation would be carried out accordingly.
4. The consultation would need to comply with the key principles of the Planning Act 2008 as mentioned above but this does not necessarily include exhibitions.

5. And, 6. The evidence produced at the milestones will be published on PINS' website. It will be for the applicant to organise the consultation process on the proposed changes, to the timetable set out in the decision.

If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours,

Rob.

Robert Ranger MRTPI
Case Manager
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN
Direct Line: 0303 444 5042
Helpline: 0303 444 5000
Email: robert.ranger@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/> (National Infrastructure Planning)

Web: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate (The Planning Inspectorate)

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 May 2019 15:55
To: Rail Central <RailCentral@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: Rail Central Deferment

Dear Sir or Madam,

Could you please confirm whether or not you will be responding to emails during the deferment period. I do not appear to have had confirmation of receipt of the attached or a response.

Your advices would be much appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED] Redding

-----Original message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 26/04/2019 - 13:44 (GMTST)
To: RailCentral@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Cc: denis.winterbottom@southnorthants.gov.uk, tommy.gilchrist@parliament.uk
Subject: Rail Central Deferment

Dear Sir or Madam,

It would be very much appreciated if you could provide responses to the queries raised in the attached letter regarding the process that follows the decision to grant a deferment to Rail Central.

Yours faithfully,