

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Re: TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange
Date: 28 February 2019 21:33:21

Hi,

Could you please accept the attachments on my Email above sent to you on the 25th of January objecting to the proposed West Midlands Interchange, I was unable to attend yesterdays meeting but hope there was plenty of valid objections raised. I am still of the opinion that the Freight Interchange is being used to enable a huge Warehouse estate to be built on Green Belt Land. If allowed would blight the area causing a huge influx of road traffic to our already over crowded road system.

Martin Bave

On Monday, 28 January 2019, 14:08:40 GMT, West Midlands Interchange <WMIinterchange@pins.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Bave,

Thank you for your email. You are quite correct that this information will need to be submitted to the examination in order to be considered. However, the examination does not begin until 27 February 2019.

I suggest that you submit your letter after 28 February 2019, but before the deadline that will be set for written representations at the beginning of the examination, so that the Examining Authority can take it into account. Please do call me if you have any questions, or if I can be of any further help.

Yours,

Rob.

Robert Ranger

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@pins.gsi.gov.uk

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

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

Twitter: @PINSgov

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

From: martin bave [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2019 15:04
To: West Midlands Interchange
Subject: Re: TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange

Hi,

Thanks for the above information.

I have the impression the meeting is primary for organized parties not for individual affected persons.

Because of this I would like to submit attached copies of documents that I have submitted to object to the above scheme and also copied to my Local M.P.

Please contact me if you have problems opening any of the files.

I would be very interested in your comments and also the results of your meetings.

Many Thanks,

Martin Bave

On Wednesday, 23 January 2019, 11:52:58 GMT, West Midlands Interchange
<WMInterchange@pins.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Sir/ Madam

Planning Act 2008 – Section 88 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 6

Application by Four Ashes Limited for the West Midlands Interchange Strategic Rail Freight Interchange.

Notice of Preliminary Meeting, availability of Relevant Representations and notification of hearings

Your reference: 20015285

Please find below a website link to the Rule 6 letter giving notice of, and the agenda for, the Preliminary Meeting. This letter includes a number of important annexes, including **Annex D** which provides notice of hearings to be held on 27 and 28 February 2019.

<http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR050005-000544>

If this link does not open automatically, please cut and paste it into your browser.

Yours faithfully
West Midlands Interchange Case Team
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

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

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

Twitter: @PINSgov

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

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

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway for the presence of computer viruses.

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

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway for the presence of computer viruses.

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

Introduction.

My name is Martin Bave and I have resided in Coven since 1971. I am a firm believer in the Railways being used to transport freight (it is what they were invented for). One problem living in Coven is the continual projects originating from the West Midlands for improvements that encroach on South Staffordshire's green Belt. Most of which have been contained by the M54. This is something that must not be allowed as we do not wish to become a suburb of Wolverhampton.

Reasons Against.

- 1 The proposal is on Green Field Land (although some is currently being quarried for sand but as in the past should be restored)
- 2 Staffordshire County Council have designated the Staffordshire And Worcester Canal a conservation area.
- 3 The proposed siding would require extensive and expensive earth works due to the main line being for part in a cutting and also close to the canal and factory access and for the East Interchange a bridge over the Canal as well as extending the bridge from the A449.
- 4 The existing Si Group factory is involved with the refining of Hazardous Substances and was originally the Midland Tar Distillers (of which my father was a manager) and was in the top 10 factories most likely to explode in the UK.
- 5 One company the West Midlands has moved to South Staffordshire is Carvers Gas Plant as it was too dangerous to be in Wolverhampton and must be considered when planning any new buildings in the area.
- 6 Local main roads are not suitable for any more traffic. Just before the consultation in Coven the M6 North bound was closed due to an accident all day. The resulting traffic blocked the A5 from Junction 12 to Gaily Island and the A449 from Coven to Penkridge (and maybe beyond) for all day.
- 7 Is your suggestion of creating 6,500 to 8,500 jobs on the site this is another overload of local roads (although it is on a railway line no thought has been given to a passenger station or the re opening of Gailey or Four Ashes).
8. Ours is at the moment a relatively quiet area. The extra road and rail traffic noise will destroy this with the added problem of the site working 24 hours a day.
- 9 Coven is subject to occasional floods during times of heavy rain fall, Most of this is caused by the various overflows from the Staffs and Worcester Canal which passes through your proposed site. Your plans show some attempt to capture excess water but due to the extent of roofs and concreted areas look totally inadequate.
- !0 As you suggest working 24 hours a day and have planned quite high buildings and gantries the light pollution would be excessive.
- 11 The area proposed has a reasonable amount of wild life including Buzzards and Kestrels to my personal observation.

Alternatives.

Why not use brown field sites in the West Midlands which would be closer to industries and existing storage warehousing. Bescot Sidings come to mind as having better rail and road connections. The Railway between Wolverhampton and Birmingham has vast areas of old industrial land which again would serve remaining industry better.

If it has to be in South Staffordshire.

Just to the East of Coven there is the remains of a wartime Royal Ordinance Site at Featherstone. This was connected to the railway by New Road (see attachment). Some of the site has been used for the largest prison in England but quite a lot is unused and South Staffs Council hope to build an industrial site there. With its better and cheaper rail link this could be a viable option.

If it has to be the proposed site.

The only option would be the East of the Canal Terminal but with nothing to the West of the Canal (apart from the rail link) and nothing to the South of Vicarage Road.

This would fit into the existing industrial complex leaving the A449 unaltered Farming land and give residents of Croft Lane the hope of not being surrounded by an industrial complex. The canal would need shielding to retain its conservation value.

I would like to be kept informed via Email on your future plans.

Thanks,
Martin Bave

On Friday, 25 August 2017, 15:47, martin bave [REDACTED] wrote:

Please see below a copy of an email I sent to you after the first stage consultation, as it was later than the close by date and as I received no reply I have resubmitted it as most of my comments are still valid. I have attached a new file which contains the result of survey of existing, planning permission granted and proposed freight interchanges in the surrounding area which shows the claimed desperate need for the Four Ashes site is an over exaggeration.

In addition to the above it has been suggested that the Stoke on Trent area would benefit from such a project to revitalise their economy and employment prospects.

After attending the consultation on the 22nd of July at Coven would like to raise some further comments.

1. On asking how many Lorry and car movements where expected each day was told 12,000 lorries and 6,300 car movements.

Your plan shows very little parking space for all the above vehicles, which has been a proven problem on other Freight Interchange Sites.

In addition you would propose the North bound A449 junction on to Station Road, Four Ashes would be closed. All the above will do nothing to reduce road congestion on the area (already high) as well as making the most direct route from Coven to Cannock some what longer and more expensive.

2. Number of properties to be demolished was quoted as up to 15. You may not be aware but the Government is telling us of a shortage of housing and as your plan shows most are in the way of the proposed parks.

3. Who will want to spend a sunny afternoon in a park surrounded by an industrial site with extensive lorry movements (Cannock Chase a few miles away is a much safer and pleasant option).

4. How many of the 14 huge warehouses have you got interested customer. the answer from your staff was ZERO.

5. There seems to be very little storage area for the estimated 75-100 containers expected each day.

6. What provision are you planning to reduce the Noise and light pollution of your proposed 24 hour operation.

As in my first Email I would make the following suggestions if the unthinkable happens and this is forced upon us :-

Only the Rail Terminal to the West of the Canal as per your latest plan i.e. no warehouses in Zone A1, A2 and A3.


This would have to be well shielded from the A449 buy trees / embankments and a restriction on how high containers will be stacked (Preferably not more than 2 high).

No warehouses to the South of Vicarage Road i.e. no warehouses in Zone A7. The warehouses to the north should be shielded as above.

The above proposal will negate the bribe of both parks as it would remain farm land.

Suitable screening for the Canal Conservation Area.

Yours,
Martin Bave



Your Representation:

1. Why is this using Green Belt Land which South Staffordshire Council have pledged to keep green.
2. Why is there the need for a huge warehouse estate built on Green belt land when the nearby brown field site (the Fetherstone R.O.F. which when built had rail access) has been on the market for over 10 years with no takers(The Sovereign Park). Also the new built 'Wolverhampton 450' warehouse on the Bericote Scheme at Four Ashes is still standing empty. All this points to a lack of interest in South Staffordshire warehousing.
3. Do we really need another Freight interchange in the area. I have done a recent survey of Freight Interchanges already in use (Telford with one train a week). Sites with Planning granted (Cannock Pentilver Container Site). Sites with planning submitted include several to the East of Burton upon Trent. Also the closure of Dudley Freight Terminal due to the lack in use in Birmingham.
4. How will the local roads cope with the enormous load of Lorries (estimated to be around 6,000 per 24 hours) plus the extra cars (An estimated 6.500 to 8,500 people every day mostly by car). The roads are heavily used at the moment and any hint of problems on the M6 (one of the most heavily used sections) causes gridlock in the Coven, Gailey and Penkridge area. Also on roads the proposal to close the A449 north bound access to Station Road Four Ashes are not acceptable as this is the safe and best route from Coven to Cannock. Other Freight Interchange sites in the East Midlands have problems with overnight Lorry parking due to access restriction at the terminals.
5. It is proposed to increase the local Bus service to every 1/2 hour which is an a help but will increase the use of School Lane in Coven which is in need of widening. Also at the last consultation I asked if they had any plans to reopen Gailey Station to reduce the car usage, the answer was no as the line capacity would suffer with an extra stopping point (how will the freight trains get to the interchange during the day) .
6. The planned community parks are a cheep trick by the consortium. Who in there right mind would want to spend time surrounded by noise, pollution and towering warehouses when Cannock Chase is only a few miles away. Plus who would maintain these parks once built (I would suspect the burden would fall on the Local Council to further burden the Tax payers).
7. The noise and light pollution on such a huge site will be enormous (the proposal is an industrial estate area twice the size of Coven). Due to the current use of the railway the bulk of train movements and a lot of lorry movements would be during the night causing excessive noise and light.
8. All in all this is an ill thought plan which will increase the urban sprawl from the West Midlands

The West Midland Interchange

Why Do We need it ?

An Internet survey of Rail Freight Interchanges to the North and East of Birmingham.

Telford International Rail Terminal

Built at a cost of nearly £8 million pounds but only used by 1 train per week to service the Local MOD Unit. It employs 1 person. It was not used by the local industry as was considered to expensive to use. The original operator has canceled his agreement on the site and is now run by D.B.Schenker Rail (UK)

I was unable to find out what the design capacity of this site is.

Further information suggests the site was given planning permission on the assumption of 4 train in and 4 trains out per day (i.e. 8 trains).

Cannock Rail Interchange. Pentalver

Pentalver have a large road based container depot on the site of the old Mid Cannock Colliery and have been given planning permission to make a rail interchange on the site by Cannock Chase Council.

Pentalver is at the moment being taken over by Genesee & Wyoming Inc. who are the owners of the Freightliner rail company. No details on Number of trains it will be able to handle.

I have been informed once the rail link is in place it should reduce the road use by 90 lorries per day.

Burton Rail Terminal (Burton upon Trent)

Run by Maurice Hill Transport Ltd and has storage for up to 1500 containers.

No details on how many trains it can handle but is a working terminal.

East Midlands Intermodal Park, Etwall by the Burnaston A50/A38 crossroads

Goodman & Sheherd is in the process of Getting permission to build an intermodal park on 630 acres of land adjacent to the Toyota Factory. The first stage consultation was completed July 2014. Has applied for Development Consent Order. Subject to approval could be started by 2018. Could handle approx. 12 trains per day.

East Midlands Gateway Rail Reight (Kegworth)

Project by ROXHILL has been granted approval and work will start early 2017.

Capable of trains up to 770m long and up to 16 per day.

Birmingham International Freight Terminal (Birch Coppice Tamworth)

On the site of the former Birch Coppice Colliery.

A working Freight Terminal with at least 7 trains each day.

Kingsbury ?

Could be a freight interchange site or part of the Birch Coppice site (above).

Daw Mill Colliery Site

Harworth Estates have suggested a suitable site for a rail freight interchange in 2015

This is another old colliery site.

Hams Hall International Rail Freight Terminal

Handles over 100.000 Containers by rail each year.

Unable to find number of trains per day.

Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal.

DIRF1 opened 1997 on 430 acres of land.

DIRF2 Completed 2011 on further 130 acres.

DIRF3 Planning approved 2014 on further 400 acres.

This site handles 100 trains per week.

Birmingham Freightliner Terminal (Central Birmingham)

Receives 8 trains per day on a 32 acre site near the city center.

Dudley Freightliner Terminal

Opened in 1967 and by 1982 was the most profitable Freightliner terminals in the UK.

The business was moved to the Birmingham Freightliner site to boost it's low usage in 1986 and the Dudley site was finally closed in 1998.

This survey would suggest there is quite a large amount of container traffic on the railways in the West Midlands (which is good news).

There is at the moment spare capacity, especially at Telford.

Several sites already have planning permission but are yet to be built.

Several sites are proposed but not approved,

Thus the question at the start do we need another Rail Freight Interchange especially one on Green Belt land ?

Also as in the case of Daventry which has expanded once already and has another expansion approved.

If this were to happen at the Four Ashes Site it would be even more devastating for the South Staffordshires Green Belt and all who live around it.

Martin Bave April 2017

Revised June 2017