

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: West Midlands interchange ex Q3 3.1.1
Date: 04 August 2019 10:23:22

In response to your latest letter requesting further information I wish to thank you highlighting the fact that FAL have no intention of providing a rail link for quite some time after the start of the development. It is my understanding that given that this is greenbelt land the local authority would not have allowed such a proposal to be granted. I strongly urge you to recommend that this is not a suitable site for the proposed infrastructure, especially if there are no plans to utilise rail. I am sure that the local organisation opposing the hub are able to provide you with factual evidence of the number of accidents that have occurred between J11 and 13 over the past few months (and further north on the M6) which has closed the motorway, diverting traffic through local villages. Heavy goods vehicles are making their way through Brewood and roads are covered in potholes not to mention completely unsuitable for HGV traffic. FAL delaying the development of rail infrastructure by 6 years will have a catastrophic impact on our local road network and local villages.

It may be useful for you to know that at one of the original consultations held in Brewood I asked FAL the direct question regarding "how many occupants of the warehouses would be using rail". I was advised that taking occupancy on the site would not be dependent upon them using rail and they could not enforce that any occupants MUST use rail for the transportation of goods. In fact I was advised that if they stipulated that all occupants must use rail then they would not have the same interest. Why, therefore has this strategic development got this far? I stand by previous comments I have made, referring to the vast number of new, yet empty warehouses and brown belt land that could be utilised. Therefore my question to you is "how have FAL been able to get this far in this proposal. It is not unusual to construct some development before infrastructure, BUT NOT IN GREENBELT and if it was an application for warehousing on this land it would have been turned down many years ago. It is my opinion that what the applicant is proposing (rail in 6 years) is unreasonable and not appropriate for the current level of demands on the road infrastructure. There continue to be many sites further afield that tick all of the boxes and have better road networks around.

Kind regards
Dr Vanessa Springthorpe

If the applicant remains unsure that there will be a demand for the rail services then this development should not be allowed. The applicant must be able to demonstrate a significant demand for this development which cannot be accommodated anywhere else.

Some of this DEMAND can be accommodated at Hinckley on the M69 this is another proposed strategic rail freight interchange being submitted to the planning inspectorate, it is only 5 miles from Nuneaton which is in the West Midlands and they are part of the West Midlands Combined Authorities. It is also the same distance to travel to the Hinckley SRFI

from Birmingham Airport international freight terminal as it is to get to Four Ashes, so in my view the Hinckley site is an ALTERNATIVE site that can take some of the West Midlands freight capacity which the applicant is attempting to direct to Four Ashes, the big factor here is the proposed Hinckley SRFI site is NOT IN THE GREEN BELT and is capable of serving the West Midlands region. Bob Cope South Staffs District Councillor