

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [West Midlands Interchange](#)  
**Subject:** Re: TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange response  
**Date:** 07 August 2019 13:48:16

---

----- Original Message -----

From: "West Midlands Interchange"  
<[WMInterchange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:WMInterchange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
To: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, 30 Jul, 2019 At 13:21  
Subject: TR050005 - West Midlands Interchange

Dear Sir/Madam

20015601

Please find below a website link to a letter requesting further information, in the form of written questions, and setting a deadline for responses.

Whilst most of the questions are directed at the applicant, all parties are welcome to respond.

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR050005/TR050005-001100-Reg%2017%20letter%20July%2030%20-%20FINAL.pdf>

If you do not have access to the internet or are unable to visit public facilities, for example a local library, please contact us at the details below and a member of the Planning Inspectorate's case team will be able to provide you with the relevant details.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Inspectorate's case team if you require any further information.

Yours faithfully

West Midlands Interchange Project Team

Email: [WMInterchange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:WMInterchange@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Telephone: 0303 444 5000

Web: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Dear Sir,

Re. 3.1.1.. (i) I do not agree that there are reasonable grounds for allowing up to 186,000 sq.m. of warehousing to be built and occupied prior to linking up with a rail terminal. If the Applicant does not have funding in place for the Rail Infrastructure, and needs to see what demand there is for its use, it cannot be shown that it is needed in this area at all. There is no guarantee that the rail services will be provided. It is an attempt to establish development rights which would create a precedent for future applications.

3.1.1. (ii) I do not believe that the simplified Requirement 4 would provide certainty as to the delivery of the rail infrastructure, because costs will most certainly rise over the years, and there is no guarantee that funds will be available to complete the project.

3.1.1. (iii) Yes, as a matter of principal.

3.1.1. (iv) No, there is no level of certainty, given that it is located in the Green Belt.

3.1.1. (v) I am concerned that with no rail connection, the completed development would not constitute a SRFI NSIP as defined in s26 of the Planning Act 2008.

3.1.1. (vi) I do not believe that any such amendments would change my opinion expressed in 3.1.1.(V)

Yours sincerely

Joyce Wilson

|

.