

From: [REDACTED]
To: [west Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange FAO Paul Singleton
Date: 12 March 2019 11:31:56

Dear Mr Singleton

Following attendance at the Preliminary Meeting 27.02.19 I wish to add some further comments re my opposition to this application.

I am no expert in law, planning, health or environment etc and am sure that relevant points will already have been addressed by those who do have the expertise and experience so will not go over those concerns other than to say the potential negative impacts of this application seem to be grave and avoidable.

I am a local resident who has spent 40 years in education exclusively in inner cities so do however have experience of the effects of national policy - as opposed to detailed national planning on lives, especially the lives of the disadvantaged.

My first concern arises from the NPS document from 24. 2.2 , 24.2.24 and 24. 2.25. which I understand to say there is a need for a national strategy (strongly agree) but that (instead of a national plan according to clear, transparent , agreed factors to determine scope, size and location etc.) will be left to "individual schemes". Every single person I have spoken with about this matter is equally clear - it is NOT NMBYism . If there was a clear plan as I have described and it so happened that there was a need for interchanges of this size, in locations x,y,z... across the countermand the WMI was one of them then fair enough. Unfortunately that is not the case and these vitally important decisions appear to be made by people such as yourself based on the merits of the applications. I am truly not casting aspersions on the skills and integrity of you or any of your fellow decision makers. I am however appalled at the process. In this instance the applicant has the wherewithal to hire a significant team led by a legal expert who has been through this process many times. I cannot help but feel they must be very well equipped to ensure they provide an application that meets the necessary criteria. If an application meets the necessary criteria how can it not be granted?

My next concern is with regards to NPS

24. **2.47** A network of SRFIs is a key element in aiding the transfer of freight from road to rail, supporting sustainable distribution and rail freight growth and meeting the changing needs of the logistics industry, especially the ports and retail sector. SRFIs also play an important role in reducing trip mileage of freight movements on the national and local road networks. The siting of many existing rail freight interchanges in traditional urban locations means that there is no opportunity to expand, that they lack warehousing and they are not conveniently located for the modern logistics and supply chain industry.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->25. <!--[endif]-->**2.56** The Government has concluded that there is a compelling need for an expanded network of SRFIs.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->26. <!--[endif]-->**2.57** Existing operational SRFIs and other intermodal RFIs are situated predominantly in the Midlands and the North. Conversely, in London and the South East, away from the deep-sea ports, most intermodal RFI and rail-connected warehousing is on a small scale and/or poorly located in relation to the main urban areas.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->27. <!--[endif]-->**2.58** This means that SRFI capacity needs to be provided at a wide range of locations, to provide the flexibility needed to match the changing demands of the market, possibly with traffic moving from existing RFI to new larger facilities. There is a particular challenge in expanding rail freight interchanges **servicing** London and the South East.

In other words the WMI is to be a massive warehouse for London and the S.E. Perhaps it should be remembered especially by various governments that the UK does not just mean London.

Also given that this very document points out that there is already a predominance of these structures in the Midlands and the North and yet there are still problems for London and the SE perhaps it should recognise that a different solution should be tried rather than more of the same? ("The **definition of insanity** is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results." ???)

So, to conclude, my apologies! - not a very helpful email for you as it is not evidence based , it is personal but I would add, it is heartfelt. My only hope is that the facts that others better placed than me will put before you will lead you to be able to conclude that this application will "result in adverse impacts of the development outweighing its benefits" something I wish I could have shown but know in my heart is true.

Thanks for your time in reading this

Regards

Janet Taylor

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