

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [West Midlands Interchange](#)  
**Subject:** West Midlands Interchange - TR050005  
**Date:** 25 January 2020 13:26:07

---

## **Application for an order granting development consent for the construction of rail freight interchange and associated development (West Midlands Interchange)**

### **Response to late representation dated 13<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

The applicants representation dated 13<sup>th</sup> December further heightens my concern regarding the proposed development. The application is for a Rail Freight Interchange and as such is why the proposal is being given any consideration by planning authorities.

If the applicant is genuine about their aspiration for the project, I see only two reasons why this development should not include a rail freight interchange from the outset:

1/ The applicant has not been able to fully establish the case for a viable Rail Freight Interchange. In which case such a damaging speculative project should not go ahead until such a demand has been ascertained.

2/ To assist with cashflow. Unfortunately for the applicant the proposal is for a Rail Freight Interchange. If the applicant cannot properly fund the project from the outset, again the project should not go ahead.

For the protection of local residents, the environment and indeed the applicants themselves, approval of this project must be subject to the requirement that a Rail Freight Interchange is developed from the outset. Also that the minimum specification for the RFI is fully adhered to. Anything less could simply be considered as an insurance policy for the applicant at the expense of the environment and quality of life of their neighbours.

There is a lot of scepticism about the true objective of the applicants. Their continued reluctance to unequivocally commit to the Rail Freight Interchange does nothing to reduce this scepticism.

The applicants argument whether it is a requirement or an objective that '*Applications for a proposed SRFI should provide for a number of rail connected or rail accessible buildings for initial take up...*' is irrelevant as they suggest no intention of complying with the statement regardless of whether it is a requirement or an objective.

Regarding the applicants discussion on the meaning of '*initial stage(s)*', there is conversely a strong case for recognising '*initial stage(s)*' as being the installation of infrastructure only (roads, sidings, power, drainage etc). The applicants argument that they consider construction of 25% of the warehouses on site as '*initial stage(s)*' seems completely unacceptable to me. Such an approach would allow 25% of the site to be developed and then the project suspended, this would still be a huge loss of green belt land and damage to the environment. In particular their statement '*occupation of anything more than 25% of the warehousing permitted*' rather than '*constructed*' is dangerous and could lead to a large road only facility that would not have been considered acceptable as a non-strategic development.

To summarise, I wish to note my concerns that a Rail Freight Interchange must be developed as such from the outset and the danger of a road only industrial estate occurring by accident or design must be eliminated.

Dave Holyoake