

From: 
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: West Midlands Interchange : TRO50005 ref 20013234
Date: 25 January 2020 10:12:32

Regarding the above and the recent late application from the applicant:-

I strongly object to this application on several grounds:-

1 . The initial application for this project stated that it was of strategic national importance, and used the manner in which goods would be transported (ie) rail, as a means of taking the decision out of the hands of the local authority and putting it into the hands of the Secretary of State for transport.

They now seem to be attempting to avoid having to connect a rail line to the Network Rail infrastructure , therefore their planning application should ,logically, be rejected.

No rail link means it is not of strategic national importance. Therefore it should be rejected.

2. The original premise of the Strategic Rail Interchange was that it would reduce emissions of carbon dioxide by 70% ,lower particulate emissions by nearly 90% , fifteen times lower nitrogen oxide emissions and ease congestion in the area by reducing HGV journeys.

Therefore if they fail to provide a rail link with the site all of their stated reductions will increase.

They are showing no commitment to a rail link whatsoever.

3. The Government state they believe in tackling climate change and in green sustainability. If this project is allowed to go ahead, Green belt will be destroyed to make way for warehouses.

The applicant is trying to avoid the expense of linking to the rail network which would not be a green thing to do.

4. The important word continually used by the applicant has been :- “rail linked and rail served”. The word rail being predominant.

In my opinion the project application should be rejected as the applicant has shown no commitment to rail whatsoever and has only used the term ,rail, to attempt to push through their planning application.

Yours sincerely, Ann Farr

Sent from my iPad