

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Proposed West Midlands Interchange - TR050005
Date: 02 August 2019 22:54:26

Dear Sirs,

Further to your email of 30th July 2019,

I would like to comment on one particular element of the proposals. This relates to ExQ3.3.1.1 and whether it is reasonable for the developers to build 186,000 sq m of warehousing before the development of the rail terminal, in order to generate sufficient funds and interest in using the rail element of the development.

Alongside this the proposal that it could be up to 6 years before the development of the rail infrastructure.

My understanding is that for a generic warehousing development to be created it should go to the local planning authority for investigation, scrutiny and decision making. The difference with the proposed WMI development and the reason that it circumvented local decision making, was that it was to be regarded as a Strategic Rail Freight Hub and due to the perceived importance of this type of nationally significant infrastructure it should be considered externally from local decision makers, by the Planning Inspectorate.

I consider that the proposed amendment, referred to above, to this part of the plan is a cynical attempt by the developers to circumvent local decision making, by local people, who will be affected by the proposed development. If the rail link is to be allowed to be delayed in time, when it had always been cited as the most important and nationally significant reason for the proposed development then, the decision making process should be removed from the Planning Inspectorate and returned to the local authority. If the developers believe that they can receive authorisation for the delay, then I believe that they will ultimately cite the fact that there is no appetite for a rail link amongst warehouse users or that the development of a rail link is cost prohibitive for them. Under these circumstances the proposed development would no longer meet the strategic aims and would no longer be a nationally significant development or meet the environmental aims cited by the developers.

I wish to object, most vehemently, to the proposed amendment and I would be grateful if you would record my objection.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Deborah Hardman-Wilson

[REDACTED]