

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Planning ammendments
Date: 09 September 2026 16:12:36

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

I wish to object to the planning amendments applied for by the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange on the following grounds

1. Typical developer move, preserving their cash flow and maximising their profits at the expense of nearby residents and stakeholders in suffering major increases in lorry movements before they deliver the strategic railway connection.
2. This was approved as a 'Strategic Rail Freight Interchange' yet they have no problem delivering increased square footage of warehousing early but are unable to deliver the railway link in the same manner.
3. The 'Strategic Rail Freight Interchange' aptly named as it requires a rail link, the rail link was the most important part of this application and should clearly have priority over delivery of the warehousing or at the very least be delivered in a timely manner in line with their original application and the conditions imposed upon them.
4. The rail link is there to ensure the major movement of goods in and out of this distribution centre delivers what it says a 'Strategic Rail freight interchange' thus keeping lorry movements to a minimum and allowing the goods to go by rail across the country, therefor keeping the overuse of lorries to a minimum and maximising the use of the railway network.
5. The delayed delivery of the rail link will lead to an increase in lorry movements in and out of the interchange due to the earlier delivery of excessive warehouse square footage.
6. The developer has no control over the extra movements of these lorries and besides adding the extra movements to the major surrounding roads will also lead to excessive movements of large vehicles through surrounding villages.
7. The application should be refused and it made clear delivery of the rail connection in line with the original conditions is and was critical to ensuring no excessive nuisance is caused to surrounding residents and stakeholders.
8. The developer is hiding behind financial viability arguments which could have easily been seen when submitting the original planning application and they could have foreseen some of the financial issues they now refer to.

I trust my objections will be read and considered against the backdrop of these unreasonable planning variations by this developer

Kind regards

Andrew Beasley

