

I am the County Councillor for the whole of the area covered by the development in the proposal, the representations I wish to make are mine and not necessarily the views of Staffordshire County Council.

The previous representation I made still stands but wish to expand as follows

I believe that the proposal does not make an adequate case for the need for the development and that examination of alternative sites has not adequately been considered and investigated.

The location of the proposed site at the centre of the national roads network A5, A449, M6, M54 and A460 creates a fundamental issue of substantial increased traffic congestion something that such proposals should aim to reduce not increase. The plans do not include sufficient mitigation and it would be difficult to understand what could be introduced to mitigate against this. There will therefore be a severe impact on traffic congestion locally and regionally.

However if approval is given the following mitigation must in my view be seriously considered.

- There is mitigation in the plan to prevent HGV's using the site to use the A449 between M6 J13 and Gailey roundabout, I would like to see this mitigation extend to prevent HGV's using the A5 between the A41 and Gailey roundabout, although an A road this is narrow in places particularly through the village of Weston – Under - Lizard. If the M6 North is busy traffic uses the A5 and then the A41 toward Liverpool. It is essential that HGV's from the site are not allowed to use the A5 west of Gailey Roundabout and add to the considerable volume of traffic already using this road at peak times.
- This area of South Staffordshire suffers from a large number of HGV's parking overnight in lay byes this causes numerous anti-social behavioural issues for residents and prevents other motorists stopping to take a break or finding somewhere off road in emergencies. It is essential that there is ample parking within the site for drivers to take their required breaks and overnight rest both before and after delivery or collection, so that this issue is not amplified.

Furthermore there has been suggestions that the developer wishes to build a section of warehousing first before starting on the Rail Interchange, I believe that this should be resisted. If the Inspector does believe the case is made for the development and is minded to recommend approval then that needs to not be approval for covering a large section of the green belt in warehousing. Any warehousing should be ancillary to the Rail Interchange and needed for the rail Interchange to operate and not for standalone logistic units that have no need of the Interchange. The position where if permission is given a substantial amount of warehousing is built and the Rail Interchange does not get built is something the developers must not be allowed to do.

Mark Sutton  
County Councillor  
Brewood Division