

From: [REDACTED]
To: [West Midlands Interchange](#)
Subject: Application 26/00671/WMI – Objection from local resident
Date: 17 September 2026 12:55:07

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application 26/00671/WMI – West Midlands Interchange

I am a resident of Great Saredon and wish to formally object to the proposed amendments to the West Midlands Rail Freight Interchange Order.

My concern is not simply with the principle of the West Midlands Interchange, but with the consequences of allowing further warehouse occupation before the rail terminal and associated infrastructure are delivered.

The West Midlands Interchange was approved as a **Strategic Rail Freight Interchange**, with the rail element being a fundamental part of the justification for such a major development. The conditions linking warehouse occupation to the delivery of the rail infrastructure were intended to ensure that the warehouse development did not significantly outpace the infrastructure designed to support it.

I am therefore concerned about the proposal to allow substantially more warehouse space to become operational before the rail terminal is completed.

This is particularly concerning for those of us living in the surrounding rural communities.

As a resident of Great Saredon, I am already experiencing and witnessing increasing problems associated with HGVs and traffic on the local rural road network. HGVs are using inappropriate and unsuitable rural routes, including roads through and around our villages.

There are also ongoing concerns about speeding traffic through the villages. Vehicles are travelling at speeds which are inappropriate for narrow rural roads, bends, junctions and areas where residents, horse riders and pedestrians are present.

The issue is not limited to HGVs. There is increasing traffic generally, placing further pressure on rural roads which were never designed to accommodate significant volumes of heavy commercial traffic.

There have also been incidents and near misses on the surrounding road network, reinforcing residents' concerns about road safety. The combination of HGVs, inappropriate routing, speeding vehicles and increasing traffic creates particular risks on narrow roads with limited visibility and restricted passing opportunities.

I am concerned that allowing additional warehouse occupation before the rail infrastructure and associated highway improvements are delivered could further increase these problems.

The original safeguards were put in place to ensure that the development progressed alongside the infrastructure required to support it. I do not believe

those safeguards should now be weakened in a way which allows the warehouse element to advance significantly ahead of the rail infrastructure.

I ask the Planning Inspectorate to give proper consideration to the **cumulative impact** of additional HGV and vehicle movements on the surrounding villages and rural road network, including:

- the existing use of inappropriate rural routes by HGVs;
- the impact of additional HGV movements on narrow village roads;
- existing concerns about speeding traffic;
- increasing traffic levels on the surrounding rural road network;
- road safety for residents, pedestrians and other road users; and
- the cumulative impact of WMI alongside other development and commercial traffic in the area.

The fact that the rail terminal was a fundamental component of the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange should, in my view, remain central to consideration of these proposed amendments.

I therefore ask that **application 26/00671/WMI is refused, or alternatively that the existing safeguards and infrastructure triggers are retained** so that warehouse development cannot substantially outpace delivery of the rail terminal and necessary highway infrastructure.

I would also ask that the impact on the surrounding rural communities is considered fully, rather than assessing these amendments solely in terms of the WMI site itself.

Yours faithfully,

Emma-Jayne Smith

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Emma-Jayne Smith.