From:
West Midlands Interchange

Subject: TR050005

Date: 31 January 2020 20:49:44

Ref: 20013170 Dear Sir.

MUST is used when expressing obligation or an unavoidable requirement, whereas **SHOULD** is more of a recommendation, or simply a desirable goal.

The applicant, for the last 3-4 years has committed to and expressed an obligation to build a **strategic RAIL freight interchange**. Why now should the applicant be allowed "relief from sanctions" at this very late stage in the process? Is the applicant backtracking and realised that it simply can't be done? Or is it a case of "We'll by-pass local planning procedures chaps and throw in the rail, then when we're in the final stages we'll change our wording to "should." That way we won't have to commit to including the rail in our road based warehousing development."

The applicant must think we were all born yesterday.

If the obligation/requirement to build the rail is removed, then the development is not a strategic **rail** freight interchange anymore but merely becomes a road based warehousing facility which has been the applicants intention from the outset. **SHOULD** is more of a recommendation, or simply a desirable goal. "Well, we wanted to build the rail but that hasn't happened, never mind." Hundreds of acres of greenbelt wiped out, even more traffic on our already busy and congested road network

(People living in UK towns and cities are 25 times more likely to die from long-term exposure to poisonous air than a car crash, More than one in 19 deaths in Britain are linked to <u>air pollution</u>, according to the <u>Centre for Cities</u> charity, which works with the government to develop urban policies) -*The Independent 28th January 2020*.

to all the residents in South Staffordshire, especially those whom have had to suffer the stress and consequence of having their homes compulsory purchased.

Not FAL and not after this arduous process you've put us all through!

Anita Anderson