

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: FORMAL OBJECTION – Application 26/00671/WMI – West Midlands Interchange
Date: 15 September 2026 17:46:53

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED NON-MATERIAL CHANGES – WEST MIDLANDS INTERCHANGE

I am writing to formally object to the proposed non-material changes to the **West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order 2020**, application reference [26/00671/WMI](#).

My name is **Glyn Rowley** and I live in **Calf Heath**, immediately adjacent to the West Midlands Interchange development.

I fully recognise that the principle of the West Midlands Interchange has already been approved. My objection is therefore **not to the existence of the consented development itself**, but to the proposed changes to the safeguards and sequencing which formed part of that consent.

I believe these changes risk allowing the **road-based logistics operation to substantially outpace the rail infrastructure which was fundamental to the justification for the development in the first place.**

The rail infrastructure should not become an afterthought

The West Midlands Interchange was promoted and approved as a **Strategic Rail Freight Interchange**, rather than simply as another large warehouse and distribution park.

The consented scheme includes an intermodal freight terminal and up to approximately **743,200 square metres of rail-served warehousing**. The site's location and its relationship with the West Coast Main Line are fundamental to the development's strategic purpose.

Indeed, the developer itself describes the rail terminal as being at the heart of the site's transport strategy and states that it will remove HGV movements from the road network.

It therefore seems entirely reasonable to expect the rail infrastructure to be delivered **before a substantial amount of warehouse space becomes operational.**

The proposed amendment concerns me greatly because it would substantially increase the amount of warehouse occupation that could take place before completion of the rail terminal.

The proposed threshold of **186,000 m²** is a very significant amount of warehouse development. This is not a minor administrative alteration. It has the potential to alter the way in which the development operates and, crucially, the balance between rail and road freight.

Impact on Calf Heath and surrounding communities

I live in Calf Heath and have a direct interest in the consequences of this development for the village and surrounding communities.

The WMI site is immediately associated with **Calf Heath, Vicarage Road, Straight Mile and the surrounding local road network**. The development's own transport documentation identifies the site as extending towards Calf Heath Reservoir, Stable Lane, Woodlands Lane, Vicarage Road and Straight Mile.

The concern is therefore very straightforward:

If warehouses become operational substantially ahead of the rail terminal, where does the freight go?

It goes by road.

That inevitably increases the potential for additional HGV movements and associated congestion, noise, air pollution, road-safety issues and deterioration in the amenity of the surrounding communities.

I am particularly concerned that roads around Calf Heath and neighbouring villages could effectively become part of the supporting road network for a major logistics development **before the infrastructure intended to provide the sustainable alternative is operational**.

This would place the consequences of the proposed change directly on residents who had every reasonable expectation that the development would be delivered in accordance with the safeguards and infrastructure commitments associated with the original consent.

The highway infrastructure is equally important

I am also concerned about the proposed changes to the triggers for delivery of highway infrastructure.

The highway improvements and new connections are not optional extras. They are part of the infrastructure required to manage the consequences of a development of this scale.

The original proposals envisaged significant improvements to the local and strategic highway network, including the A5/A449 link and other highway works. The original scheme documentation described the link road as a significant benefit of the

development and noted its importance to the local area.

I therefore object to any change which allows warehouse occupation to progress ahead of the infrastructure required to safely accommodate the resulting traffic.

This is not merely a technical amendment

I appreciate that the applicant has classified these proposals as **non-material changes**.

However, from the perspective of residents, changing the relationship between:

warehouse occupation → rail terminal delivery → highway infrastructure

is potentially very significant.

A change which permits considerably more warehouse space to become operational before the rail terminal is completed has a direct relationship with the volume of road freight generated by the development.

That is precisely the sort of consequence that local residents should be entitled to have properly considered.

It should not be possible to approve a development on the basis that it will ultimately operate as a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange and then, during delivery, progressively relax the sequencing which ensures that the rail infrastructure is delivered alongside the warehouses.

My objection

I therefore strongly request that the Planning Inspectorate:

1. Refuse application [26/00671](#)/WMI in its current form.
2. Retain the existing safeguards linking warehouse occupation to delivery of the rail terminal.
3. Do not allow a substantial increase in warehouse occupation before the rail terminal is operational.
4. Retain appropriate triggers for the delivery of the necessary highway infrastructure.
5. Fully assess the cumulative impact that the proposed changes could have on **Calf Heath and surrounding villages and roads**, rather than considering the amendments in isolation.

I am not opposed to economic development or to the principle of the West Midlands Interchange. What I object to is **changing the rules during the delivery of the development in a way that could result in local communities experiencing the road-traffic consequences before the rail infrastructure intended to mitigate those consequences is available.**

The original consent established a balance between the economic benefits of the development and its environmental, transport and community impacts.

That balance should not now be weakened.

As a resident of Calf Heath, I respectfully ask that my objection is formally recorded against application [26/00671](#)/WMI and given full consideration before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

Glyn Rowley

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]