

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [West Midlands Interchange](#)  
**Subject:** TR050005 West Midlenads Interchange  
**Date:** 05 April 2019 09:25:17

---

## **Case Ref No. TRO 50005**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am emailing to further indicate my opposition to the proposed West Midlands Interchange, my original objections submitted last year are still relevant.

In addition the recent announcement that plans have been approved to expand the i54 Business Park, which is only 2-3 miles from the proposed Interchange, initially by 60 acres and create 1,300 jobs make the business case for the interchange even less viable. There are also plans for further i54 expansion by another 40 acres.

The i54 expansion will add to the already increased volume of traffic and pollution (noise, light, vehicle emissions etc) we have experienced in recent years.

We already have a very low unemployment rate in South Staffs and with i54 already creating new jobs and opportunities there is no justification to build on an additional 600 acres of green belt land to create jobs that are not needed in our area.

In addition, warehouse and industrial development is still taking place at Kingswood Lakeside Employment Park in Cannock which, like the i54, is only 2-3 miles from the proposed interchange. This also means there is no requirement for additional development on greenbelt land.

I object to this application because of the above I am more convinced the location is wrong. This is a speculative development proposal for an area that has less than 1% unemployment. There is already developments in the local area that make this proposal unnecessary and a brownfield site in an area that has high unemployment would be far more beneficial.

The low unemployment rate in South Staffs would mean jobs would be taken by people from outside the local area resulting in more commuter traffic from areas such as the West Midlands which will have a negative effect on local roads, air pollution etc. Developments are needed where jobs and investment are needed.

This application is not backed by any of the local authorities or local MP's so they do not deem it necessary for the local area and as such is not in accord with local planning policy.

Best regards,

Richard Smith