Dear Sir

Having reviewed the responses by the applicant. I would like to make the following further observations.

1) The applicant now seem to wish to build the warehouses first to ensure demand for the rail terminal. It has already been proved from the Telford site that th demand is insufficient in fact almost non existent.
The Telford Rail Freight site was advertised with the same vigour as a golden goose bringing wealth and jobs to the community.:

"The terminal, which is the first to the west of the West Midlands conurbation, is a fantastic facility for the borough and the region's economy. It will help to provide a clear economic advantage for businesses in the area, linking Telford and Wrekin quickly and efficiently to destinations in the UK and Europe. The development opportunities around the site are sure to attract new businesses that need access to these main routes, with the benefit of avoiding some of the region's congestion".

It turned out to be more of a 'lame' if not 'dead duck', with one train a week if that passing through. In fact many people have questioned that the Rail Freight was in reality just an excuse to built warehouses on greenbelt land. Had the application have been just for warehouses then it would have been heard at local council level and been dismissed.

Once again we have the same scenario where this applicant is using a Rail Freight that they do not want to build or fund as a method of gaining planning permission for warehouses that would otherwise have not been possible.

They use the excuse that they need to build and let the warehouses to raise funds to build the Rail Freight, while they have on of the 7 richest men in the country backing their project. The emphasis should be on the Rail Freight as without that non of the other promises of £8500 jobs, reducing HGV transport across the country and to the ports will not be possible.

The reality is that if the warehouses are built first then there will will be no Rail Freight, very few jobs as the applicant has already confirmed that most of the warehouses would have full autonomy by the time they are built. Thus with no Rail Freight there will be no reduction in traffic on major roads and ports by using rail rather than roads. In fact there will be more traffic in the local area with no benefit to the local villages.

2) l fail to understand why at various stage 2 meetings the applicant did not provide all of the noise level monitoring details. It was only after they were challenged that the later monitoring figures were produced, one wonders if this would ever have been presented had they not been asked about it.

The applicant maintains that they do not have to take into account reverberated noise, but this will increase noise levels far beyond what they have been predicted as it will create an almost echo effect and this will have a major impact on surrounding properties.

Additionally 6.2 Environmental Statement - Chapter 13 Noise and Vibration Figure 13.2 - Receptor Locations 15/8 2018 shows Figure 13.2: Receptor Locations . This identifies what could reasonably be assumed by its description to be the sites of noise receptors.
However, it now seems to have transpired that when being asked to produce the data from these receptor that no monitoring took place.

Further more the levels shown by the monitor identified as N8 show little difference over the course on the monitoring dates which l find a little strange as the monitor was in fact used on two different sites both identified as N8 and from the actual position of the monitor more discrepancy could have been expected.

3) I would like to think that the Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State will see this for what it really is an application to build warehouses on greenbelt which would have been refused. If there is no Rail Freight

Terminal then the application should surely be refused and the applicant ask to apply for planning permission for the warehouses through the local council. Without the Rail Freight element it is not a project which meets the description of a Nationally Significant Infastructure, it is merely a planning application for warehouses and should be treated as such.

Government policy states:
The main objectives of Government policy for Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges are to:
(a) Reduce road congestion - to deliver goods quickly, efficiently and reliably by rail and help to reduce congestion on our roads;
(b) Reduce carbon emissions – to meet the Government's vision for a greener transport system as part of a low carbon economy;
(c) Support long-term development of efficient rail freight distribution logistics - to ensure a network of SRFI - modern distribution centres linked into both the rail and trunk road system in appropriate locations to serve our major conurbations;
(d) Support growth and create employment – through the transfer of freight from road to rail, where this is practical and economic.

Without the Rail Freight clearly this project does not meet any of the above criteria. If the Rail Freight were built first there may be many local companies who would use it without the need for further warehouses. I believe that the Rail Freight should be built first and run for a given period to prove the need for the additional warehouses. If the applicant genuinely wants to build a Rail Freight terminal and provide the jobs and other national benefits they have stated then there should be no problem. However,k if the real reason was just to get around local planning permission to build warehouses on Greenbelt then I can see why they would be reluctant.

Kind regards

Sue Worrall

Sent from my iPad