From: Alan Hargreaves <███████████████████
Sent: 27 March 2019 06:59
To: 'Northampton Gateway' <NorthamptonGateway@pins.gsi.gov.uk>
Subject: my submission of 19th March 2019

Dear Sirs,

F.A.O the Examining Authority

I write regarding the submission posted by me on the 19th March 2019,I have just realised that there is an error in para 4 of that submission which relates to wording of the unsigned agreement 7.13a SoCG between Northampton Gateway/Network Rail…..this should have read para 5 of Doc 7.13a presently states "there is sufficient capacity for the train to operate UPTO 4 PATHS PER",I incorrectly referred to 4 trains per day………for clarity policy NSPNN 4.89 has a requirement to handle 4 trains per day, which was agreed in the meeting of the 12th March 20129 equates to 8 paths, thus the Doc 7.13a is non-compliant with policy.

I apologise for the error and trust you will accept this late correction of my submission….if you would prefer that I re draft the corrected submission in full please do let me know.

Alan Hargreaves

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

Dear Sirs,

Northampton Gateway TRO50006 REP4-016

I note the applicants response for the need to progress "Rail Connectivity/feasibility" to GRIP STAGE 3 /4….The applicant states that it is not accepted that GRIP stage 4 is either required or common at this stage, could the applicant advise who dictates this as it was PINS themselves who provided this advice in the first instance,ie are PINS or the applicant correct ? and the applicant further states that completion to GRIP stage 2 is a level at which all major risks would have been identified, I would contend that all" major risks",such as the feasibility and connectivity to support the Cumulative impacts of all competing schemes on this section of the WCML, would only be clearly identified at a much later stage in the GRIP process.

A.Hargreaves

_____