

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [West Midlands Interchange](#)  
**Subject:** Brief representation regarding proposed amendments.  
**Date:** 09 September 2026 08:06:22

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

My name is Gareth Minton and I am a resident of [REDACTED]. I have been active previously with regards the proposed WMI and took a great interest in the planning process, attending meetings and speaking in hearings before the Planning Inspector.

Firstly, I am incredibly annoyed to not be listed as a Person with Interest in Land and Other Persons Likely to be affected by the Proposed Amendments as per Annex 1 of the developers letter, whilst almost every other property / neighbour on Station Drive has been included and seemingly notified. There is no explanation for this and follows the previous pattern (during the planning phase) of WMI not engaging completely with affected parties, including myself, for matters relating to my property.

As such, following the provision of this information to me by concerned parties, I now only have limited time to engage due to work commitments, which will be insufficient to argue my points fully. I will therefore outline them as below with a view to substantiating them further at a later date, although the core points will remain.

Firstly, there are serious concerns relating to the eventual delivery of the rail terminal. The overall site in itself is not overly conducive to rail supported freight - some warehouses more than half a mile from the proposed terminal, and concerns were raised by almost every party that the terminal itself would be a 'white elephant' - that the terminal was token - to allow the development of what would be essentially a road based distribution centre.

As such, the PI acknowledged that the rail terminal elevated the project to special status and as such, set out a timeline for the delivery of the terminal itself - which includes a maximum number of units / space prior to the work on the terminal being done. This was a short number, to ensure that the developers would not be allowed to just build warehousing before the delivery of the rail.

These proposals appear to want to kick the can down the road and provide more warehousing prior to commencing the rail terminal.

Given the apparent importance of the rail terminal (as outlined by the developers themselves in the planning stage) it seems amiss to now delay that process. Indeed, with the development of further warehousing in advance (and the potential use prior to the full delivery of the rail element), these businesses (of which more will now be allowed) will become accustomed to the road-only processes even further, with a longer wait for the rail element - again demonstrating the true nature of the terminal - a token gesture to plough up and develop over 600 acres of countryside for road-only operations.

The first unit is completely built - sites furthest away from the main roads of the A5 and A449 and also furthest away from the proposed terminal. The next planned developments share this pattern.

Why is construction of units not starting near the rail terminal? If the terminal was correct to this development, it would be one of the first things to be delivered and used by Interested parties. This is plainly not the case and the proposed delay to the delivery of the terminal will further prove this point.

Improvements to the highways network should also not be delayed - although it is not immediately clear to me what those delays will be. For Station Drive there are two elements intended to aid residents:

Turning point for HGV

No right turn from the A449 to Station Drive

Traffic is already unbearable in our small road, with the warehousing already developed sited nearest to our street, with occupiers likely to wish to use our road for access (given the geography of the site). The proposed road delivery must not be affected if it unduly impacts these proposed changes - designed to maintain the traffic levels on Station Drive and not worse them.

The proposal appears to indicate a delay to the delivery of some road elements. As with the rail, this must not be allowed and the developers must maintain their agreed timelines for the development, as agreed in the original planning process.

I wish to be kept informed all further developments relating to this matter at my email address [REDACTED]

Kind regards

Gareth Minton

[REDACTED]