

**From:** ■  
**To:** [West Midlands Interchange](#)  
**Subject:** TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange  
**Date:** 21 March 2019 14:13:43  
**Importance:** High

---

FAO Mr Singleton

We are again fighting our corner to protect the ever dwindling green areas in Staffordshire.

As I am sure these letter will only be speed read I have highlighted the points which are most important to the local people living in the vicinity of this proposed destruction of **green belt**.

I **strongly object** to the above application and it should be **refused** without further delay when undoubtedly an appeal will be made and we will once more have to go through the process and expense of re evaluation and we will once more all have to write to you presumably in the hope that things can change under the radar. A little like the public meeting in Wolverhampton by the project on a **midweek afternoon** when many are at work and unable to attend.

This West Midlands Interchange Project which as usual is designed not for those who live locally and who ultimately pay the price of the loss of such green space but for the benefit of the **usual suspects who will profit immensely from grants reduced levies taxes etc under the guise of inward investment**.

The hotel built at the Gailey roundabout and the upgrade of the area around the roundabout – and the development further along the A449 towards Wolverhampton indicates an expectation that this project would be rubber stamped. Suddenly we have railings on the corners of the Gailey roundabout after approximately 35 years I can testify to without – I have never seen a pedestrian who is not a roads/water/electricity/gas operative attempt to cross the road there. Perhaps installed to protect any foolish pedestrian from being swept off the pavement by a 44 tonne HGV ? The actual roundabout is currently being dug up.

The severe **health implications** and the **environmental damage** that will be caused by this project and the further **road damage** caused by the vast number of these enormous vehicles is immeasurable and in these uncertain times an unnecessary project. There are already quite enough of these 44 tonne HGV's on our local roads which are in a dreadful condition. Companies are supposed to use logistics to accurately allocate suitable vehicles to delivery routes and clearly they do not even where these vehicles simply **do not fit** the roads one of our own family cars with **two small children** on board was in February badly damaged whilst stationary waiting for a 44 ton tipper truck to thunder by – he didn't even stop – why would he ?? with the best will in the world such vehicles should have restricted access .

The traffic flow on the A5 and the M6 is already chronic and as all locals know one disruption on the M6 and traffic is gridlocked throughout Stafford and Cannock with the knock on effects further afield – we have recently closed a business of J14 as the delays and queues caused by traffic made it impossible for employees to get to work at a regular time and with the “upgrade” of the M6 which is to continue for several more years things can only become worse.

The **air quality** along the A5 in particular can be **visually** observed on what remains of the

indigenous hedging the stems of which have a thick black deposit all over them. Hedging/Tree cover is regularly ripped out without a second thought and we will soon have no toxin removing planting anywhere. This is visible everywhere there is building development and the usual suspects produce a nice powerpoint presentation showing some green and the planning department fall over themselves to accept it in conjunction with a nice Section 106. It is only a matter of time until the first health litigation against councils/companies for wilfully ignoring the risks of declining air quality and release of carbons during these constructions and post establishment of such developments.

It is high time the Section 106 excuse to do the unacceptable is removed from the planning system something is either permitted or not and not adjustable depending on the size of your wallet.

Most developments such as this one provide **no infrastructure to cope, no replacement for the loss of green space which provides environmental health and mental health benefits** for local people **nothing towards the repair and maintenance to the current infrastructure** which will fall again to the local people to endure and **definitively** reduce the public belief that those who govern and administer have accepted any **duty of care towards their residents**. Nothing that will be built here will benefit anyone locally and there are far better sites already developed which would house such warehousing. Obviously such sites have been dismissed as they are more costly with their inherent environmental requirements. **Much easier and cost effective to destroy some nice clean farmland.**

Kind regards

Jannette Bevan