

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Response to Request for Information ExQ3
Date: 06 August 2019 21:46:21

Your Ref: TR050005

Interested Party Ref: 20013304

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a written response to the questions raised in your Request for Information.

Question i)

I do not believe that such a large volume of warehousing should be constructed before the rail terminal is available. If this much warehousing is developed and then it is discovered that there is in fact no demand for the rail terminal, then we will be left with a warehousing development that never met its objective of creating a rail-road interchange, but which still destroyed the Green Belt.

I am also concerned that such a large volume of warehousing connected only to road will create an additional volume of traffic in the locality, with no infrastructure in place to relieve this.

The whole point of this development being submitted and assessed as an NSIP is that it contained a road-rail interchange. I am concerned that setting such a large development without warehousing will be the first step in the avoidance of building the rail terminal, which will mean that it is not an NSIP at all. Given their concerns and attempts to create a number of get outs, it does appear that the business case for rail-connected warehousing is weaker than the developer has led us to believe.

Question iii)

No, I do not consider that there should be any further flexibility in the delivery timescale beyond that stated in the Rail Requirements, which are already uncertain enough.

Question iv)

No, the current Rail Requirements do not provide enough certainty.

The developer has proposed this as a rail-road interchange to justify it as an NSIP, and yet appears to want a number of get-out clauses to enable it to not have to develop the rail element of it.

Yours faithfully,

Brian Hancher