

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Response to TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange
Date: 05 August 2019 12:25:24

20015123

Re question 3 in particular, I do not think that there are reasonable grounds for allowing 186000 square metres of proposed warehousing to be built and occupied prior to the opening of the RT.

The whole premise of this application was how the RT was necessary, would improve/ reduce road transport etc. This last minute change seems merely to confirm the applicants cynical approach to finding a way to get through an application for warehousing. If the RT was as crucial as the applicant originally made it out to be, it is crucial this infrastructure is built first. If the applicant cannot fund the infrastructure without the warehousing surely that raises concerns about the viability of the overall application ?

The original figures put forward for the impact on road transport presumably used modelling of numbers based on the existence of the RT , NOT as would now be needed a set of figures modelling the potential impact of 186,00 sq m of warehousing with the associated heavy duty vehicle increase? Have such figures been provided and what is the likely impact?

If the applicant believes that the warehousing element can function for 6 years without relevant rail infrastructure why is the RT needed? Therefore why include this other than as a smokescreen to tick enough boxes to get the desired warehouses built?

To me the original application has been altered so significantly to a point where rather than being given a few days to respond the whole application should be resubmitted clarifying the true position WHICH WAS NOT AS STATED IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION. It is now a different application and I cannot believe it is legal to make an application then change it so fundamentally and pretend it's the same application? Given the potentially catastrophic impact this development will have on the road network alone let alone on the quality of human and other wildlife in the area this cynical proposal must in all decency be stopped.

As a further comment are there still no concrete figures on whether this would really be used given the lack of usage of other nearby similar facilities?

Regards

Janet Taylor

Sent from my iPad