

Northampton Gateway RFI: Comments on the draft Land Plans, Works Plans, Access and Rights of Way Plans and Illustrative Masterplan

These queries relate solely to matters raised by the drafting of the Works Plans and Land Plans and not the merits of the proposal. They are limited by the time available for consideration, and raised without prejudice to the acceptance or otherwise of the eventual application. They are provided to assist the preparation of the next iteration.

Land Plans

Q No.	location	Description of issue	Question/Comment
1.	General	Document numbering	Document numbering of the Land Plans (2.1 and 2.1A – 2.1F) are inconsistent with the Book of Reference introduction, the draft Development Consent Order Article 45(1)(h) and the Explanatory Memorandum Para 4.1(ii). All of which list the Land Plans as (2.1A – 2.1G). Please ensure all plans and all references to plans, are consistent throughout the suite of application documents upon submission of the Application.
2.	Document 2.1 A (Sheet 1 of [6]) Document 2.1 F (Sheet 6 of [6])	Drawing Title	The plans submitted under Regulation 5(2)(i) include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Works Plans (Sheet 1 of [6])” • “Works Plans (Sheet 6 of [6])” The title for each of these plans should be changed to Land Plans.
3.	General	Cut lines	It is difficult to see where the plans overlap with no cut lines. The key plans should show insert boundaries and all plans should show cut lines, to assist the reader.
4.	General	Layout of sheets	For key plans which provide the numbering for the detailed sheets, the normal convention of numbering sheets with the most northerly first and then onwards in sequence should be adopted. Where there are several sheets in an east west line, numbering should proceed from east to west.
5.	General	Legend	The same Legend is reproduced across each sheet of the Land plans, resulting in some definitions that are not used on a particular sheet.
6.	General	Consistency of colour from Legend to land parcels	The colour yellow as indicated in the Legend is a different shade to that shown on the plans.

7.	General	Legend to individual sheets of Land Plans	The categories of land shown are far broader than is suggested by Annex C of the DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (2013 guidance). Because land plans show / reveal people's interests in land the categories should be clear and concise. Nothing should be left 'to be confirmed'.
8.	General	Land marks and road names missing from plans	There are no land marks or road names identified on the plans. As a result, cross-referencing land parcels with the description in the Book of Reference is not possible and is contrary to Annex C of the 2013 guidance
9.	General	Parcel numbers	Parcel numbers across the suite of Land Plans appear to range from 5 to 910 and are in no particular order. We note however, Para 1.3 of the Statement of Reasons. When updating the parcel numbers please ensure numbers run sequentially on each plan.
10.	General	Clear identification of land parcels	Some of the land parcels on the Land Plans are too small to decipher and would benefit from an insert. An example of this can be found on Land Plan 2.1 A (Sheet 1 of [6]) Parcel numbers: 885, 875 and 890.
11.	General	Separation of parcel numbers	Several Parcel numbers have been assigned to more than one parcel of land. Each parcel of land must have an individual parcel number. An example of this is provided on Land Plan 2.1 C (Sheet 3 of [6]). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plots 40, 80 and 525 (identified as land under control of the Undertaker) contain two separate parcels of land each. Plot 90 (new rights to be created) contains two separate parcels of land. Why are the above plots not numbered individually? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plot 595 includes two parcels of land, one of which appears to have been given two plot references, namely 595 and 510. We note there is an insert for these parcels of land on Land Plan 2.1 D (Sheet 4 of [6]). For clarity, it may assist the reader to have the insert on both sheets.
12.	Document 2.1 A (Sheet 1 of [6])	Insert box	A box is identified on the Land Plan which contains land parcels: 20, 5, 7, 10, 15 and 365. The label states: " <i>See insert 1-1 for extents of works no.1 below works no.5</i> " there is no insert on the plan. Are the box, label and insert necessarily required for the Land Plans?

13.	Document 2.1 A (Sheet 1 of [6])	Missing Parcel number	A small parcel of land identified as "Land to be acquired" to the west of parcel number 27 has no parcel number.
14.	Document 2.1 B	Parcel identification	Parcel number 52 appears to be two separate parcels of land. It appears there may be a parcel of land directly to the south of plot 52 unnumbered. Why are these not numbered individually?
15.	Document 2.1 D	Land to be acquired	We note the intention for land to be acquired for the Roade bypass. Is all the land required permanently as indicated on the plan?

Works Plans

Q No.	location	Description of issue	Question/Comment
1.	General	Legend	The same Legend is reproduced across each sheet of the Works plans, resulting in some Works number references that are not relevant to a particular sheet.
2.	General	Limits of Deviation	<p>We note the Legend in relation to Limits of Deviation (LoD) including note 2. If 20 metres is included in the LoD on the plan, is that 20 metres in total or 20m either side (40m). Are the LoD included in the works as drawn on the plan?</p> <p>If so, consider the interrelationships between the plots. Ie works no 4 and 1. What is the effect of several works moving within these LoD?</p> <p>Consider adding the LoD as a separate layer to the works plans to provide a clearer definition of LoD proposed.</p>
3.	General	Lack of detail and size of proposed Works	<p>The detail of the proposed layout is not provided as a separate layer on the works plans. It would be helpful if the proposed layout was visible.</p> <p>Each separate work number could helpfully be broken down to give the reader a clearer understanding of the Works proposed especially in regards to phasing and understanding the individual aspects of each work.</p>
4.	Document 2.2 A	Insert 1-1	<p>The part of Work number 1, below Work number 5 (tunnel under screening bund) should be shown on the main plan to indicate where this work lies in relation to other works.</p> <p>Consider using dashed line marking or hatched shading to show where the tunnel is proposed.</p>
5.	Document 2.2 A	Numbering of Works	Although the Legend identifies which work number corresponds with each colour used on the plan, some Works on the plan itself are labelled with the Work number and others are not, we suggest a consistent approach is used.

Access and Rights of Way Plans

Q No.	location	Description of issue	Question/Comment
1.	General	Document numbering	Document numbering of the Access and Rights of Way plans (2.3 and 2.3A – 2.3E) are inconsistent with the draft Development Consent Order Article 45(1)(h) and the Explanatory Memorandum Para 4.1(iv). Both of which list the Access and Rights of Way plans as (2.3A – 2.3F). Please ensure all plans and all references to plans, are consistent throughout the suite of application documents upon submission of the Application.
2.	General	Legend	The same Legend is reproduced across each sheet of the Access and Rights of Way plans, resulting in some references that are not relevant to a particular sheet.
3.	General	Legend and plans	Existing public right of way stopped up is identified as a dashed orange line on the plans. The DCO describes the extent of stopping up as a dashed red line.
4.	General	Borders	Borders between plot areas (marked in roman numerals) could perhaps be more clearly defined.
5.	Document 2.3B	Inconsistency with DCO	Schedule 6, Article 13 Part 1 of DCO describes a plot marked F shaded purple and plot marked G hatched turquoise. These appear the other way round on the plan
6.	Document 2.3B	Inconsistency in DCO	Schedule 6, Article 13 Part 1 of DCO table refers to Document B where it should read Document 2.3B
7.	Document 2.3C	Inconsistency with DCO	Schedule 6, Article 13 Part 1 of DCO describes a plot marked V hatched turquoise. However on the plan it is not coloured.
8.	Document 2.3D	Inconsistency with DCO	Schedule 6, Article 13 Part 1 of DCO lists 'The private means of access hatched turquoise and marked AF-AD on the access and rights of way plans (Document 2.3D)' and in the row below 'AF-AE'. It is not entirely clear on the plan where the boundaries are for these plots.
9.	Document 2.3E	Inconsistency with DCO	Schedule 6, Article 13 Part 1 of DCO describes a plot marked AT hatched turquoise. However on the plan it is not coloured.
10.	Document 2.3D	Plot identification	Plots AN and AQ appear to merge into one.

Illustrative Masterplan

<i>Q No.</i>	<i>location</i>	<i>Description of issue</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>
1.	Document 2.11		The draft illustrative masterplan appears to show works that are not identified in the draft DCO (for example footpath tunnel under rail relating to the proposed perimeter footpath). Should these be given a specific works number in Schedule 1?
2.	Document 2.11		Some Works as described in the DCO do not match the detail on the Illustrative Masterplan or the Works Plans for instance Works no 2(1)(e) in the DCO contains drainage and attenuation ponds, this is not shown on the plan.