

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Objection to the wording change to should from must.
Date: 07 February 2020 22:59:01

Good evening,

As a long standing resident of Penkridge, surrounding area could be changed forever and the environmental impact this proposal would have on the beautiful outlook, we as a nation should respect,

I totally object to the changing of the word from **must** to **should**.

The reason behind my objection, is that if the hub was to succeed in gaining planning permission then there **must** be a rail terminal to ship freight in, after all that was and is its sole purpose. Should does not indicate a **must** and is not a word which has a definitive answer. If the hub is allowed to go ahead on a should basis and no rail freight terminal was to be constructed then more road based traffic would be employed. This would not be acceptable on an environmental front for the future and the local people living in the area. We would suffer from increased congestion which we already do and an increased contamination of our air quality.

I feel that the use of the word should would later on give the owners wiggle room, for them not to build a freight terminal.

So the word **MUST** in the planning document **must** remain.

Regards John McCormack

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.