

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: TR050005 West Midlands Interchange - Written record of oral submission.
Date: 13 March 2019 18:12:43

Gareth Minton

[REDACTED]

13 March 2019

Dear Mr Singleton,

Following on from my attendance at the preliminary open meeting on the evening of the 27th February, please find below a written record of the key points I made during the meeting. A further written submission covering my other points shall be made in due course.

The points raised in the meeting centred on the following points:

The current road network surrounding the proposed site is inadequate for the volume of traffic expected to be brought to the area by the scheme. Living on Station Drive, it is apparent when any closures or delays are happening on the three major trunk roads surrounding the site, namely the A5, A449 and M6, as Station Drive bears the brunt of the rat-running. At present this is worse around regular peak times. However, the proposal and nature of 24 hour shift work will add a further 3-6 peak periods throughout the day. The current road network barely copes and no significant improvement to infrastructure has been suggested.

I also have significant misgivings regarding the quality of the traffic survey carried out by FAL. On surrounding roads during the survey, tyre strips were laid on surrounding roads such as Vicarage Road, the A5, Lawn Lane in Coven and more besides. I however was extremely concerned to see no sign of survey equipment on Station Drive, which on multiple occasions prior to the survey taking place, I had advised Mr Frost that this road is often the busiest compared to its size in the area. On multiple occasions Mr Frost also experienced the congestion I mentioned. Upon further enquiries I learnt that Station Drive had been allocated a camera to monitor the junction with the A449 for one day only, as opposed to the week plus survey in place with the tyre strips. I therefore see this traffic survey as extremely flawed, and when I questioned as to why it was carried out in this way, I was refused an explanation by Mr Frost on multiple occasions. I would be grateful if, in your role as inspector, you would be able to provide further explanation to the validity of this assessment.

A further point I raised was concerning the provision and use of sustainable transport to get to and from the site. Being a resident of Station Drive for over 25 years of my life, it is clear that the public transport links in the area are poor, but those which do exist are woefully underutilized. This is true for the current Four Ashes industrial estate, and also for the new I54 development. Given the extremely low levels of unemployment in the local area, as well as the continued expansion of the I54, this means that workers will be more likely to drive in from afar, rendering the principal motive of the site as moot.

I also make comment regarding the suggestion made by the representative of FAL who

indicated that the overall plan is to have more SFRI's and therefore reduce the catchment area of each one. Based on these comments, and existing concerns behind the true motive of the incorporation of a rail freight terminal, I am very concerned that, once established, the onus will be on warehousing rather than the rail aspect, which is the reason the application is before PINS.

At all stages the applicant has been unable to offer any guarantees that occupants must use the terminal, indeed with most warehouses 1/4 a mile away, and some warehouses sited 1/2 a mile away from the terminal itself with the only access being via public highways, the use of rail seems to be far from guaranteed. It is widely understood that without the rail aspect, this proposal would have been reviewed at a local level only, subject to the strategy of SSDC, which it would contravene on many counts.

I thank you for your attention and look forward to the next stage of this process.

Kind Regards

Gareth Minton