

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: TRO50005
Date: 05 February 2020 13:52:36

Dear Sir,

I understand that the developer submitted a letter via their consultants Evershed Sutherland dated 13th December 2019 in relation to their application for the West Midland Interchange; in the letter they request that the wording in relation to the rail terminal and connections being built should be changed from 'MUST' to 'SHOULD'.

Allowing 'SHOULD' instead of 'MUST' would give the developer licence to cancel the rail terminal effectively giving them consent up build a road based freight terminal on Greenbelt land, in an already highly congested area. Such a site is not needed, there are many other suitable brownfield sites in the area, also with access to a suitable workforce, which this site does not have.

I stress my very strong objection to the amendment of 'MUST' to 'SHOULD'. I have already objected to the construction of the rail terminal and connections, as it will lead to a huge increase in the volume of HGV traffic, as well as commuters travelling to the site to work, in an area that already struggles to cope with existing vehicle congestion during much of the day. In my opinion the freight terminal should not be sited here, but if permission is given it must be built *before* any other construction commences, and failure to construct an *operational* freight connection should absolutely lead to any planning permission being invalidated.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs B Purchase
[REDACTED]