Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to express my thoughts as to the letter sent by Eversheds Sutherland on behalf of Four Ashes Limited to request wording changes in relation to the use of land when approving the construction of the West Midlands Interchange, substituting the word "MUST" to "SHOULD".

I, among many others, have raised my objections to this scheme through the appropriate channels to date, but allowing the wording change would fundamentally change the reason the scheme was being assessed by the Strategic Planning Authority, and Four Ashes Limited would not be bound under planning (should it be approved) to construct a rail freight terminal, and indeed only construct a haulage / warehouse development. The reasons Four Ashes Limited have used throughout the process is to reduce the freight haulage on the road, and a better environmental position for the UK as a whole.

Providing Four Ashes Limited with the opportunity NOT to construct a rail terminal, will be contrary to those reasons, and actually increase the freight haulage on Britain's roads, in particular to the Staffordshire / West Midlands area leading to significant environmental and traffic congestion issues for residents and users of the roads in the area.

This development should not be given the go ahead, but they certainly should not be allowed to construct such a huge development with no obligations for rail connections.

Regards,

Chris Roddie

Resident of Penkridge, South Staffordshire