

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: West Midlands Interchange Open Floor Meeting 2pm 27/02/19. Oral contribution from Steve Askew
Date: 28 February 2019 06:36:19

Dear Case Team,

I made an oral contribution during the open floor meeting at 2pm on 27/02/19.

As requested by the inspector, this email is to clarify my point as follows.

My personal view is that a different site with good West Coast Main Line rail access, but crucially also with a dedicated new M6 access junction would be an ideal solution as this would provide all of the National benefits without the local traffic issues. This clearly could not be on the proposed site because as was pointed out during the open floor meeting, there are already too many M6 junctions near to that site.

A simple map search however reveals plenty of locations both north and south of the proposed site which have good West Coast Main line access, and also have the opportunity for a dedicated M6 junction to be built.

During the meeting, the applicant accepted that at an early stage in the process, they looked for a site for which a dedicated junction on to the M6 could be built. He stated that they discontinued this search once Highways England had told them that it was their policy to oppose new dedicated motorway access points.

My question is:

"If the inspector determines that a different site with dedicated access to the M6 may in fact be a better solution than the one proposed, will he say that in his report to the Secretary of State, despite the known policy objection from Highways England."

Regards

Steve Askew

Tel [REDACTED]



Sender notified by
[Mailtrack](#)

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