

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Letter to the inquiry by Eversheds Sutherland acting for Four Ashes Ltd, dated 13 December 2019
Date: 06 February 2020 18:07:02

Dear Sirs,

Please note my objections below to the requests in the letter referred to above, in which some clarification in the wording of the legally binding agreements/planning consent for the development is requested by Eversheds Sutherland acting for Four Ashes Ltd.

The developer, Four Ashes Ltd, wishes the wording in relation to the rail terminal and connections being built to read 'SHOULD' rather than 'MUST'. If the change of wording is approved then the requirement to build a rail terminal at the proposed freight hub ceases to be mandatory. In essence, this means that green belt land could be developed entirely for road based freight in totally the wrong location, adding a huge volume of HGV traffic onto the already heavily congested M6 and local roads, with the associated increased traffic problems and pollution. The M6 is over capacity and the Smart Motorway also has major safety issues.

As far as I understand, the only reason this development has been allowed to progress thus far is because it is a 'Strategic Rail Freight Interchange'. Without the rail terminal and connections it is not a strategic development (SRFI) and as such should not be approved. If the word 'MUST' is retained then the freight hub could only be approved if the proposed freight hub is considered to be necessary and includes a strategic rail terminal.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Kemp