

## Petition template

The following pages provide the template to be used for petitions against the High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill.

A separate template will be made available for petitions against any Additional Provisions deposited by the Government in relation to this Bill. Please note that separate petitions need to be submitted should a petitioner wish to petition against both the Bill and an Additional Provision (i.e. objections cannot be stated on the same petition).

Before completing or submitting your petition, you are advised to read the guidance produced by the Private Bill Office on the petitioning process. All guidance can be found on the [Committee's website](#).

### Content

Your petition should include:

- The names and details of the petitioner/s (and of their nominated representative, if appropriate)
- The petitioners' objections to the Bill
- What the petitioners want to be done to address their objections to the Bill.

You should fill in each of the text boxes in the sections below. The text boxes will expand to accommodate your text.

Your petition should only include text, and not any images. You will have an opportunity to present any photos, maps, diagrams etc in your evidence before the Committee.

The Committee is only able to consider aspects of the project proposed in the Bill which affect people in their private capacity, not fundamental principles involving broader issues such as whether the railway should be constructed at all. You should not, therefore, make political comments, raise general objections to the Bill or raise broad issues of policy in your petition. You should concentrate instead on the specific ways in which the Bill specially and directly affects you or those you represent.

### Submission

You are advised to submit your petition by using the online portal if possible. The portal can be accessed here: <https://committees.parliament.uk/work/6779/petitioning-against-the-high-speed-rail-crewe-manchester-bill/>

Should you wish to submit your petition via email or post, you should fill in the template petition fields on the following pages and send your petition:

- By email – [hs2committee@parliament.uk](mailto:hs2committee@parliament.uk)
- By post – Private Bill Office, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA

## **Payment**

Once you have submitted your petition, you must pay a £20 administration fee. Petitions will not be heard by the Committee without the payment of the fee.

You can pay the required fee by:

- Bank transfer – to sort code 60-70-80 and account number 10022317. Please ensure that you quote your surname as a reference, so that we can identify received payments with received petition.
- Cheque – payable to 'HOC Administration 2' and posted to Private Bill Office, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA.

## House of Commons

# High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill

## 1. Terms and conditions

We need your consent to use your data and to keep you updated on the progress of your petition.

### Your data

Your petition will be published on the UK Parliament's website. Please note this will include your name and address. We will store your data and a copy of your petition in the Private Bill Office and as a record in the Parliamentary Archives.

### Communications

Your data is stored so that you can be invited to have your petition heard by the Committee.

Private Bill Office staff may contact any of the people named in the petition to verify the information provided. Those communications will be stored with the information you have given.

Your petition and communications regarding it may be shared between the Private Bill Offices.

If you have completed this form on behalf of an individual, group of individuals, on organisation or group of organisations, please ensure you have been authorised to do so.

For more information on how we handle your data, please see our [privacy notice](#).

### Consent

I give consent for my information to be used for the purposes set out above.

## 2. Petitioner information

In the box below, give the name and address of each individual, business or organisation submitting the petition.

Cheshire East Council, Westfields, Sandbach, Cheshire, CW11 1HZ.

In the box below, give a description of the petitioners. For example, “We are the owners/tenants of the addresses above”; “My company has offices at the address above”; “Our organisation represents the interests of...”; “We are the parish council of...”.

- i. Cheshire East Council (“the Council”) was created in 2009 by an order, the Cheshire (Structural Changes) Order 2008, made under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- ii. The Council is the local authority for Cheshire East, an administrative area comprising the same area as the former boroughs of Congleton, Crewe and Nantwich, and Macclesfield as well as the corresponding part of the former Cheshire County Council. The Council a unitary authority, having the powers of a non-metropolitan county and district council combined, and derives its powers from the Local Government Act 1972 and numerous enactments passed since then.
- iii. As the local planning authority the Council is responsible for general planning and the preparation of location plans. It is also the local highway, transport, and parking authority and has other powers and duties in relation to activities of public concern including housing, public health, recreation, civic welfare and amenity and the economic well-being of the area. As such, the Council is responsible for the protection of its property, rights, security, and interests and those of the citizens, inhabitants and ratepayers of Cheshire East as a whole.

### **Arrangement of the petition**

- iv. This petition is organised into 8 topic areas: Crewe Hub, Traffic & Transport, Public Rights of Way, Environment and landscape, Ecology, Waste and minerals, Visitor economy, and Miscellaneous matters.
- v. It will be noted that in 17 of its requests the Council seeks a fund to help address the effects of the Proposed Scheme. Rather than provide 17 separate funds, the Council considers it would be preferable if they were organised into 5 funds, namely: Crewe Hub Station Multi-Modal Accessibility, Sustainability and Capacity Fund; Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund; Public Transport Fund; HS2 Green Corridor and Active Travel Fund; and Environment, Landscape and Ecology Enhancement Fund.
- vi. Rather than complete section 3 of the petition, the Council has listed its request, or solution, in this section under each issue.



### 3. Objections to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Bill and why your property or other interests are **directly and specially affected**. Please number each paragraph.

Only objections outlined in this petition can be presented when giving evidence to the Committee. You will not be entitled to be heard by the Committee on new matters not included in your written petition.

#### **Introduction**

1. Cheshire East Council (“the Council”) was created in 2009 by an order, the Cheshire (Structural Changes) Order 2008, made under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
2. The Council is the local authority for Cheshire East, an administrative area comprising the same area as the former boroughs of Congleton, Crewe and Nantwich, and Macclesfield as well as the corresponding part of the former Cheshire County Council. The Council a unitary authority, having the powers of a non-metropolitan county and district council combined, and derives its powers from the Local Government Act 1972 and numerous enactments passed since then.
3. As the local planning authority the Council is responsible for general planning and the preparation of location plans. It is also the local highway, transport, and parking authority and has other powers and duties in relation to activities of public concern including housing, public health, recreation, civic welfare and amenity and the economic well-being of the area. As such, the Council is responsible for the protection of its property, rights, security and interests and those of the citizens, inhabitants and ratepayers of Cheshire East as a whole.

#### **Arrangement of the petition**

4. This petition is organised into 8 topic areas: Crewe Hub, Traffic & Transport, Public Rights of Way, Environment and landscape, Ecology, Waste and minerals, Visitor economy, and Miscellaneous matters.
5. It will be noted that in 17 of its requests the Council seeks a fund to help address the effects of the Proposed Scheme. Rather than provide 17 separate funds, the Council considers it would be preferable if they were organised into 5 funds, namely: Crewe Hub Station Multi-Modal Accessibility, Sustainability and Capacity Fund; Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund; Public Transport Fund; HS2 Green Corridor and Active Travel Fund; and the Environment, Landscape and Ecology Enhancements Fund.
6. Rather than complete section 3 of the petition, the Council has listed its request, or solution, in this section under each issue.

#### **Background**

7. The Council has publicly stated its conditional support for the Integrated Rail Plan, published in Nov 2021, and welcomed Government’s commitment to progress the western leg of HS2 Phase 2b, between Crewe and Manchester, and in the future Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR). This support has always been conditional on

- Crewe serving 5/7 HS2 trains per hour, in each direction, and necessary improvements at Crewe Station to catalyse regeneration – the Crewe Hub.
8. Crewe is the largest but most deprived settlement in Cheshire East. Six out of 13 wards (all in proximity to the Town Centre) are ranked in the top 10% most deprived areas in the UK based on the Indices of Multiple Deprivation.
  9. HS2 Phase 2b and NPR will improve connectivity between towns and cities across the north and, subject to the right investment, could act as a catalyst and stimulus for the Levelling Up agenda. It is imperative that the full benefits are realised as early as possible to support the levelling up of areas that could look to benefit from HS2, such as Crewe and North Wales, by fully exploiting the Bill provisions from Day One. Both HS2 and Levelling Up should not be confined to City Centres and City Regions but should seek to ensure that “no place is left-behind”.
  10. The Council supports the principle of the Bill for a new high-speed railway between Crewe and Manchester, which includes the Crewe Northern Connection and NPR passive provision. This is subject to suitable consultation on route options: the Council does not seek to challenge the expediency of the construction of the railway but asserts that property rights and interests would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form.
  11. The Proposed Scheme will have a significant impact on the Cheshire East landscape, environment and ecology. Maintaining the character, green open space and biodiversity of Cheshire is critical to ensuring Cheshire East continues to offer a high quality of life for its residents, many of whom will be severely and negatively affected by the Proposed Scheme. In this petition, we set out the steps the Promoter needs to take to deliver this.
  12. Cheshire East is significantly affected by the Proposed Scheme with its construction set to cause major and prolonged disruption to the local transport network and to residents and businesses with inadequate mitigation or workable solutions included within these proposals. This petition has been prepared in collaboration with the local communities who know the local landscape and transport network best and are therefore best placed to advise what will, and won't, work in practice. The construction of the Proposed Scheme, to offer quicker and more reliable rail connectivity between cities should not be at the expense of the communities, businesses and landscape in between. This petition offers a balance to ensure the affordability and delivery programme of the Proposed Scheme are not compromised, but neither are the lives and livelihoods of Cheshire East residents.

### **Crewe Hub**

#### **Background**

13. Crewe station is a major junction and interchange on the national rail network and a critical location for the freight industry. The station is currently served by 6 Train Operating Companies and 5 Freight Operating Companies and will also serve HS2 services as part of Phase 2a. It is a key gateway to North Wales and the Midlands and has the potential to be a true rail super-hub for the North West and Wales. For instance, at Crewe Station, the West Coast Main Line (“WCML”) connects with the Crewe to Derby Line, the Crewe to Manchester Line, the North Wales Coast Line, and the Crewe to Mid and South Wales Line. These connections provide access to various destinations, including London, Liverpool,

- Manchester, Birmingham, Cardiff, Edinburgh and Glasgow and major destinations in between.
14. The Council recognises that delivering the full HS2 network would unlock growth and regeneration for Crewe and the many locations it serves. With the right investment in HS2 at Crewe, serving at least 5/7 HS2 trains per hour, in each direction, and direct HS2 services from Crewe to Manchester, Birmingham and London, the Crewe super-hub would act as a critical HS2 hub and spoke station; enabling the HS2 opportunities and benefits to be spread across the North West, North Wales and the North Midlands.
  15. This would unlock critical transport, levelling up and net zero benefits across these regions, which include some of the most deprived areas in the UK. Without fully exploiting opportunities such as the Crewe 'super-hub' and Crewe Northern Connection as early as possible, HS2 is likely to only be an inter-city express route –missing the opportunity to level up places such as Crewe and towns across North Wales.
  16. Crewe has the opportunity to grow. The area to the east of the station, largely in public sector ownership, offers significant brownfield redevelopment potential that could really turn around the fortunes of Crewe. These sites are within 5 minutes' walk of the station and an enhanced HS2 offer for the Crewe Hub could transform these into some of the best-connected development sites in the UK; however, the station currently looks northwards with the main entrance on Nantwich Road bridge, a narrow, congested and unattractive environment for anyone entering or exiting the station.
  17. Reorientating the station to look eastwards, together with an enhanced HS2 offer, would transform these sites into well connected, attractive and affordable mixed use development sites – ripe for investment to unlock new jobs and life chances for the local communities. This in turn will raise employment opportunities, life prospects, living standards and health and wellbeing statistics for Crewe – tackling levelling-up head on.
  18. The Council's current Local Plan Strategy states the following as a Strategic Priority  

"Capitalising on the accessibility of the borough, including improved transport links with the Manchester City Region and Manchester Airport, improved transport infrastructure such as Crewe Railway Station; and maximising the opportunities that may be offered by High Speed 2 Rail Links (HS2)."
  19. Moreover, the Council has recently agreed to review its Local Plan Strategy with HS2 cited as the main reason for commencing this review. The Council would seek to build further on its existing Local Plan to identify and unlock the HS2 growth opportunities around Crewe station within this review. However, as a statutory document, the Local Plan Strategy must be built on evidence and commitments. This petition identifies where the current hybrid Bill proposals do not provide the appropriate commitments and intent to fully embed the Crewe Hub vision, growth and regeneration opportunities into this review.
  20. The Council has been working closely with Network Rail for over 5 years to identify the key interventions and investments needed at Crewe station to enable it to be a 'super-hub':



- Provide the station capacity, facilities and passenger environment to enable 5/7 HS2 trains per hour, in each direction, calling at Crewe Hub station;
  - Provide good quality and compliant access and egress by all transport modes and for people of all abilities; and
  - Reorientate the station with a new main entrance via a Transfer Deck located on the east side of the station to provide more capacity for access/egress and bringing the station closer to the strategic road network.
21. The proposals being brought forward for the Crewe Hub, as planned, will only offer a basic level of capacity and accessibility, but are unlikely to be able to support the passenger growth proposed for HS2, conventional growth and be future proofed for NPR. The cost of these interventions is only a fraction of the cost of HS2 investments at other HS2 hub stations across Phase One and Phase 2b – despite it being the first HS2 hub station in the north, the key gateway for HS2 to the North, Birmingham and Wales and located within an area suffering from some of the country’s most acute deprivation.
22. Network Rail are taking forward a package of works at the station, known as the ‘Core Works’, that will only offer a basic level of passenger capacity to accommodate a Day One scenario at Crewe. However, these investments do not support further HS2 services (and passengers) at Crewe, they are not future proofed for expected growth and are entirely inward looking. The investments focus on the tracks, signalling, platforms and the minimum safety standards at the station. They don’t look to offer an improved passenger experience or environment, as would be expected from such an important HS2 and rail hub. These proposals also do not address the pedestrian congestion directly outside the station entrance or consider how people access or exit the station safely and efficiently, or any consideration of how the station integrates with the wider highway network and public and active travel systems. This, despite Network Rail’s own work identifying the area immediately outside of the Nantwich Road entrance being a significant safety and capacity issue.
23. The Council have been making the case for several years that instead the funds to deliver the station elements of the Core Works package would be far better used as a contribution towards the proposed Transfer Deck (Enhanced Passenger Concourse) to deliver a station that works today and into the future and considers the problem of pedestrian crowding holistically rather than in silos.
24. Since the Council’s petition against the Phase 2a hybrid Bill, it has been working with Network Rail, the Department for Transport, the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Cheshire & Warrington LEP to develop a Crewe Hub vision and associated business cases to present opportunities for a local contribution towards these key interventions for the Crewe Hub. The Council’s investment to date has ensured that the Transfer Deck proposals have been accounted for and ‘future proofed’ in Network Rail’s HS2 ready signalling enhancements at the station.
25. Further local contributions would need to come off the back of developments, with the scale of these linked to the level of services at Crewe Station.
26. The interventions identified within this petition, as with the NPR touchpoints identified within the Bill, would be significantly more expensive and more disruptive

in the future, once HS2 has arrived, so much so that they may never be economically deliverable.

27. The asks set out in this petition present not only the best outcome for HS2, the railway, its passengers, the town of Crewe and the many destinations it serves but also for the UK taxpayer.

### **HS2 services via Crewe Northern Connection**

#### **Issue**

28. The Council has long lobbied for the delivery of the Crewe Northern Connection as part of HS2 Phase 2b to allow HS2 services to re-join the HS2 network north of Crewe to allow for direct HS2 services from Crewe to Manchester and north to Scotland. The Crewe Northern Connection would enable up to 7 northbound and 5 southbound HS2 services an hour from Crewe with direct HS2 services from Crewe to Manchester, Birmingham and London when Phase 2b opens. This is fundamental to the growth, regeneration and levelling up plans for Crewe that the Council has developed in collaboration with Government and HS2 and forms the basis of the Council's significant investment on this proposal to date. Similarly, an enhanced HS2 Phase 2b service solution at Crewe with 5/7 trains per hour is also critical to underpin the growth plans across Cheshire and Warrington, North Staffordshire and Wales as outlined in the work of the Constellation Partnership and Growth Track 360.

#### **Solution**

29. That the Promoter and/or Government provide an assurance that (i) the Crewe Northern Connection will be used when Phase 2b becomes operational, (ii) the Crewe 'super-hub' station will have direct HS2 services to Manchester (via Crewe Northern Connection), Birmingham and London from when Phase 2b becomes fully operational between 2035-2040 and it will not have worse connectivity to Manchester and Scotland than it does pre-HS2, as the current indicative Train Service Specification ("iTSS") shows. Further, the Council requests that the iTSS for Phase 2b is revised in all Do-Something scenarios so that –
- the 2 HS2 trains per hour between Birmingham Curzon Street and Manchester Piccadilly, calling at Manchester Airport, also call at Crewe
  - the 1 HS2 train per hour between London Euston and Scotland, also calls at Crewe station
  - the 1 HS2 train per hour between London Euston and Liverpool/Lancaster continues to call at Crewe
  - the 1 HS2 train per hour between London Euston and Liverpool continues to call at Crewe. However, this train should be double length between London Euston and Crewe, where it splits to serve both Liverpool and Chester.
30. Securing direct HS2 services from Crewe to Manchester, Manchester, Manchester Airport and Birmingham Interchange and retaining services to both Edinburgh and Glasgow via classic compatible services, from day one of Phase 2b opening, is the basis of a 'super-hub'. The iTSS presented in the Department for Transport's report *HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg: Crewe to Manchester, An update on the Strategic Outline Business Case*, with only 2 HS2 trains per hour to London, presents a worse connectivity case for Crewe than exists today,

weakening its 360° rail connectivity, and is likely to see it become a parkway station, only to serve London.

### **Crewe Hub Station – Capacity**

#### **Issue**

31. HS2 Phase 2a contained at Additional Provision 2 (AP2), the following passenger enhancements at Crewe Station:

- Further widening of platform 5 by 1m will be required for a new secondary means of escape footbridge and associated evacuation lift at the southern end of the extended platform 5, 300m south-east of the A534 Nantwich Road.
- This will facilitate evacuation of passengers in an emergency. An additional secondary means of escape footbridge will be required at the northern end of platform 5, 100m north-west of the A534 Nantwich Road.
- The secondary means of escape bridges will be accessed via a set of staircases, with lifts on both platform 5 and platform 6. The bridges will have a height clearance of 8.7m above track level and up to 15.2m above ground level. The southern end of platform 6 will be extended by 6m in length to provide access to the secondary means of escape footbridge and evacuation lift.

32. The Council supports the inclusion of the Crewe North Connection within the hybrid Bill proposals, offering the ability for Crewe to serve 5/7 HS2 trains per hour, in each direction. Consequently, Crewe Hub station will be one of the busiest HS2 hubs on the network; however, the Council has serious concerns about the ability of Crewe station to serve the increased passenger numbers arising from the scheme, both within the station, and in terms of accessibility to it. The Council is further concerned that proposals for Crewe will not address these capacity issues. Failing to invest in key interventions within and outside of the station will have significant negative impacts on HS2 and to the HS2 growth potential of the town. The Council has worked collaboratively with Network Rail over the past 5 years to identify and refine what the critical investments and interventions are for Crewe, with work being undertaken at significant cost to the Council. These interventions are:

- A new enhanced passenger concourse (Transfer Deck) spanning all platforms and located centrally to the proposed 400m HS2 trains. This will provide additional, accessible and inclusive capacity within Crewe station to accommodate HS2 Phase 2b passenger growth and allow for efficient and effective interchange between HS2 trains and the conventional network to ensure the benefits of HS2 are extended across the North West, Midlands and Wales,
- A new, accessible and compliant entrance on Weston Road, directly linked to the new enhanced passenger concourse, to enable the safe access and egress of passengers, of all abilities,
- A sustainable transport access package for the station including east and west pedestrian and cycle access decks alongside Nantwich Road Bridge and a new multi-modal interchange on the north side of Weston Road car park, and

- A new multi-storey car park to accommodate increased parking demand arising from increased passenger numbers caused by the scheme.

33. The Council considers that the Transfer Deck would remove the need for the improvements included in AP2 of the Phase 2a hybrid Bill and as such the costs associated with these improvements should form a contribution towards the costs of delivering the Full Transfer Deck.

#### **Solution**

34. The Council seeks an assurance that the key investments and interventions mentioned above will be fully funded and delivered in advance of the arrival of HS2 Phase 2b services to Crewe, and where possible works delivered in a coherent and coordinated manner with Phase 2a to avoid unnecessary costs, for example, the Phase 2a secondary means of escape footbridges in Phase 2a would not be needed. This funding should form part of the Crewe Hub Station Multi-Modal Accessibility, Sustainability and Capacity Fund, mentioned above.

#### **Crewe Hub Station car parking**

##### **Issue**

35. The Transport Assessment states that the introduction of HS2 services calling at Crewe Station is expected to result in increased passenger demand entering and leaving the station. It is forecast that by 2046, as a result of the Proposed Scheme in combination with Phase One and 2a, passenger demand at Crewe Station will increase by approximately 10%, equivalent to 2,554 additional passengers per day. This is the cumulative impact, of which none has been mitigated under the Phase One or Phase 2a Acts.

36. Car parking for Crewe station is already at capacity with no plans by the station operator to increase car parking provision for the station and existing provision cannot support the increased station demand identified in the Transport Assessment.

37. The Council petitioned against the Phase 2a Bill to seek additional car parking provision to be provided as part of the Phase 2a scheme. This was not supported at the time and this impact remains unmitigated.

38. In addition, since petitioning against the Phase 2a Bill, the Council has prepared and presented business cases to seek Government funding and financing flexibilities to bring forward its Crewe Hub vision. These have also not been supported. This included provision of a new multi-storey car park (MSCP), sized to accommodate the increased demand from Phases One, 2a and forecast demand from Phase 2b.

39. Consequently, the cumulative impact of the Proposed Scheme on car parking demand for Crewe station cannot be mitigated by the Council, as anticipated by the Transport Assessment.

40. Information Paper A3 states –

“Crewe Northern Connection is intended to enable up to an additional 4 trains per hour serving Liverpool and Manchester Airport and Piccadilly High Speed Stations from Crewe Hub”.

41. The potential increase in passenger numbers at Crewe has not been assessed on the above and such modelling would result in additional passengers using Crewe Hub station each day.
42. The Transport Assessment acknowledges “there may be an increase in parking demand and use of drop-off facilities because of the increased passenger numbers using the station. The station owner/operator and the local highways authorities may need to give consideration to measures to address any shortfall in parking.” [ES Volume 5: Transport Assessment Part 4 and Annex A – Report 1 of 2]
43. Based upon the Council’s low growth scenario (pre pandemic) the increase in demand at Crewe Station was predicted to be for an additional 629 parking spaces. This excluded any S2 growth.
44. Considering the HS2 additional trips predicted for Phase 2b only (36 trips), the Council estimates that the total additional parking demand at the station would be for 102 vehicles.
45. This services and passenger demand at Crewe are included in the Cost Benefit predictions for the scheme, yet the improvements required to facilitate these passengers to access the station are not.
46. This is a disproportionate risk allocation, against the interests of the Council, and is not reflective of that proposed by the Promoter in respect of other HS2 stations, where HS2 are funding and delivering new car parking provision. For instance, at Manchester Airport “two multi-storey car parks would be located south-west and south-east of the central concourse providing 3,700 car parking spaces.” Meanwhile, at Manchester Piccadilly, “The Proposed Scheme includes two new multi-storey car parks adjacent to the station accommodating a total of 2029 spaces.”
47. The construction of the scheme (for example the Cowley Way vent shaft) is forecast to significantly increase car parking demand in the station environs, leading to displacement of spaces for use by the railway. Should, as the Council argues, the Transfer Deck be delivered as part of HS2 Phase2B, feasibility designs have demonstrated that up to 50 spaces would be lost permanently from the Weston Road Car Park.
48. In summary, we have a situation where there are predicted increases in car parking demand from background growth, construction impacts and additional demand from Phases 2a and 2b. The Council, as requested by Government, can evidence the significant time and resources expended to bring forward plans to accommodate this growth as part of its Crewe Hub vision – yet to no avail. Unless this car parking demand is accommodated as part of HS2 Phase2B, there is a realistic prospect that the passenger numbers predicted by HS2 for both phases will not be able to access the station, leading to an erosion in the benefits of the scheme.

#### **Solution**

49. Crewe Hub will serve a large geographical area which includes many rural or semi-rural communities. There is a much lower provision of public and alternative transport for Crewe than for either Manchester Airport or Manchester Piccadilly. Owing to this, there is likely to be a higher proportion of passengers accessing



Crewe Station by car. However, there is no provision for additional car parking at Crewe as part of the Proposed Scheme, unlike the other HS2 hubs.

50. The Council would seek an assurance from the Promoter to provide (index-linked) funding to enable the Council to deliver a new MSCP, with a minimum of 500 spaces, to mitigate the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Scheme that can be delivered alongside Network Rail's Core Works programme at Crewe station and in advance of the arrival of HS2 Phase 2a. The Council would be willing to accommodate the MSCP on its own estate, as a local contribution, and construct, operate and maintain the MSCP. This funding would form part of the Crewe Hub Station Multi-Modal Accessibility, Sustainability and Capacity Fund, mentioned above.

**Crewe Hub Station: Accessibility, inclusivity, bus replacement and sustainability**

**Issue**

51. Crewe station today is not fit for purpose and does not meet the standards passengers expect of a modern transport hub. It falls far below the accessibility, inclusivity and sustainability standards expected of a HS2 hub station. Many aspects of the station and entrance/exit points are not compliant with current standards for accessibility, inclusivity and passenger safety. The Proposed Scheme will only worsen these issues and is not currently mitigated.
52. Previous safety evacuations of the station have proven that the station environment outside of Nantwich Road entrance, the only accessible entrance, struggles to accommodate such an event safely due to lack of off-road space outside of Nantwich Road entrance. This will only get more problematic and unsafe with the increased number of passengers using Crewe station as a result of the scheme.
53. In addition, sustainable access to the station is poor with cyclists expected to use the congested highway over Nantwich Road Bridge, pedestrians having to walk on narrow congested footways alongside the highway and buses often having to stop in the highway due to the bus layby also being used as a pick-up and drop off facility. Conflict between vehicular and non-vehicular traffic outside of the station entrance occurs.
54. Accessibility to rail replacement bus services at Crewe station is very poor, only accessible via a temporary scaffolding bridge from Platform 12 or via Nantwich Road Entrance and the Horse Landings. As part of Network Rail's Core Works package, Platform E will be brought back into use, requiring the removal of the temporary scaffolding bridge from Platform 12 to the rail replacement bus services. All passengers accessing rail replacement bus services will therefore need to use the Nantwich Road entrance, Nantwich Road Bridge and the Horse Landings. This is a long walk for any passengers with mobility issues or travelling with heavy luggage. It would also require passengers to walk on a narrow footway alongside a very busy and congested highway. Network Rail has raised concerns about overcrowding outside the Nantwich Road entrance during times when there are planned works or incidents on the network and therefore, there will be a number of rail replacement bus services operating from Crewe.
55. During the construction of the Proposed Scheme, there is forecast to be significant disruption to rail services on routes operating from Crewe, particularly on the West Coast Main Line, and consequently there is anticipated to be a large number of rail replacements services operating from Crewe. As the Nantwich Road Entrance

will be the only access route to rail replacement bus services from Crewe station during the construction of the Proposed Scheme, improvements to the Nantwich Road Bridge are required to provide additional capacity outside the entrance and segregated pedestrian routes over Nantwich Road bridge, to prevent overcrowding and to ensure the safety of passengers.

56. The Council has submitted two bids to the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) to provide an East and West sustainable access package on Nantwich Road. These schemes will improve access to the current location of the replacement bus provision, reduce crowding when accessing these services at Nantwich Road and could offer an additional/alternative and improved location for rail replacement services on Weston Road.

#### **Solution**

57. The Council requests that the Promoter provides an assurance to fund and deliver a sustainable transport access package for the station in advance of Phase 2b services commencing. This should include east and west pedestrian and cycle access decks alongside Nantwich Road Bridge and a new multi-modal interchange on the north side of Weston Road car park. The Promoter should include the land for the Decks within the Hybrid bill to ensure their delivery. In the event the Council is not successful in its bid for funding for LUF, the Promoter should provide the funding to deliver the schemes. This funding would form part of the Crewe Hub Station Multi-Modal Accessibility, Sustainability and Capacity Fund, mentioned above.

#### **HS2 services between Crewe and Manchester Airport**

##### **Issue**

58. The iTSS for HS2 Phase 2b proposes that no services from Crewe call at the Manchester Airport hub, despite Crewe being a critical hub and spoke station serving the North West, North Midlands and Wales. By connecting Crewe directly to the Manchester Airport Hub via HS2 there is huge potential to capture this wider catchment and geography that the Airport serves and encourage a modal shift of long-distance journeys to/from Manchester Airport from road to rail.

##### **Solution**

59. That Council requests that the Promoter provides an assurance that there will be direct HS2 services between Crewe and Manchester Airport when Phase 2b is operational. The Council believes this can easily be achieved by amending the iTSS so that it provides that the 2 HS2 trains per hour between Birmingham Curzon Street and Manchester Piccadilly, calling at Manchester Airport, also call at Crewe.

#### **Direct rail services to Manchester Airport via the Mid-Cheshire Line (MCL)**

##### **Issue**

60. The Mid-Cheshire Line runs close to Manchester Airport but currently there is no provision for services using the MCL to also serve Manchester Airport. By connecting the MCL to the Manchester Airport HS2 Hub there is huge potential to capture more of the Airport's wider catchment and geography through rail and encourage a modal shift of long-distance journeys to/from Manchester Airport from road to rail.

##### **Solution**

61. That Council requests that the Promoter makes provision within the Bill to enable direct access to the Manchester Airport HS2 hub from the MCL. The Council believes this could be achieved by re-routing a short section of the MCL such that it interfaces with the Airport HS2 hub or by the provision of a spur between the MCL and the Airport HS2 Hub.

#### **Northern Powerhouse Rail interfaces: Crewe station**

##### **Issue**

62. Crewe Hub station will be a major interface between HS2, Northern Powerhouse Rail, the conventional rail network and the freight network. It is currently served by 6 Train Operating Companies (TOCs) and 5 Freight Operating Companies (FOCs) with HS2 services set to call at Crewe station between 2029 and 2033. Therefore, any works at or above Crewe station requiring rail possessions are expensive and disruptive. The disruption and cost will only be greater once HS2 Phases 1 and 2a are operational.
63. Information Paper A3 states –
- “The Integrated Rail Plan includes in its “core pipeline” of investment a new NPR high-speed line between Warrington, Manchester and Yorkshire making use of the railway. Although the inclusion of works in the HS2 Crewe to Manchester Bill to make provision for this new NPR line introduces new and different impacts with the HS2 construction phase, it also avoids the potential costs and disruption caused should these interfaces be constructed at a later date when HS2 services are operational.
- Active provision refers to the inclusion of all the necessary works for NPR services to operate on HS2 in future in the HS2 Crewe to Manchester Bill and delivering them in one go as part of a single HS2 construction phase. Generally, the decision has been made to opt for ‘active provision’ where it would not be possible, or would be prohibitively expensive, to adapt HS2 infrastructure in future to accommodate NPR”
64. The Bill includes active provision for the Crewe Northern Connection with Information Paper A3 stating –
- “The inclusion of Crewe Northern Connection would enable high speed services that call at an enhanced Crewe Hub station to then re-join the HS2 main line north of Crewe, as opposed to the using the West Coast Main Line. This would enable enhanced connectivity between Crewe and Manchester via HS2 that would not be possible with Phase 2b alone.
- Crewe Northern Connection is intended to enable up to an additional 4 trains per hour serving Liverpool and Manchester Airport and Piccadilly High Speed Stations from Crewe Hub”
65. The Council fully supports the inclusion of the Crewe Northern Connection in the Bill as this is a critical component of the Council’s Crewe Hub vision with 5/7 HS2 trains per hour calling at Crewe, in each direction. The Council fully supports it being delivered as part of the Phase 2b construction programme as this will mean that there is the ability for direct HS2 services between Crewe and Manchester from 2035 and 2040 and will future proof this part of the network for NPR without additional expense and disruption later.



66. However, the Council believes that current proposals for the Crewe Hub would not enable an additional 4 trains per hour as identified above. The need for investment at Crewe Hub to enable more HS2 services to call at Crewe is also evidenced in Network Rail's 2016 report titled "Crewe Hub: Improving Capacity and Connectivity for our Customers" which states –

"Crewe Station itself has recently been enhanced (with an eastern entrance and car park, ticket barriers and ticket office), but it is unlikely to be able to either accommodate proposed passenger growth or offer the level of associated facilities passengers expect without further investment in the future".

67. The investment needed at Crewe Hub station to provide the capacity and facilities to enable more HS2 (and future NPR) services to call at Crewe includes a new enhanced passenger concourse (Transfer Deck) spanning all platforms with lifts and stairs down to each platform as well as a new and compliant main entrance on Weston Road with direct access onto the new concourse. The investment will also need to provide increased capacity and improved passenger facilities along Nantwich Road Bridge to ensure that passengers can safely access and exit the station via more sustainable modes and also to safely access rail replacement services should there be future works or disruption on the network. Delivering the enhanced passenger concourse and Nantwich Road Bridge Enhancements would require rail possessions at Crewe station which will be significantly more costly and disruptive to deliver once HS2 is operational, consistent with the rationale for the other NPR interfaces provided for within the Bill.

#### **Solution**

68. The Council requests that the Promoter provides an assurance that the following interventions will be funded and delivered in advance of HS2 Phase 2b services being operational:

- A new enhanced passenger concourse (Transfer Deck) spanning all platforms and located centrally to the proposed 400m HS2 trains. This will provide additional, accessible and inclusive capacity within Crewe station to accommodate HS2 Phase 2b passenger growth and enable for efficient and effective interchange between HS2 trains and the conventional network to ensure the benefits of HS2 are extended across the North West, Midlands and Wales
- A new, accessible and compliant entrance on Weston Road, directly linked to the new enhanced passenger concourse, to enable the safe access and egress of passengers, of all abilities
- A sustainable transport access package for the station including east and west pedestrian and cycle access decks alongside Nantwich Road Bridge and a new multi-modal interchange on the north side of Weston Road car park
- A new multi-storey car park to accommodate an increase in parking demand arising from increased passenger numbers caused by the scheme.

#### **Economic development – Crewe Hub perception**

##### **Issue**

69. In current plans, Crewe station has the bare minimum of investment (at most a 10th of that budgeted at other HS2 hubs). It is not reflective of its role as the first northern HS2 hub station and is inconsistent with the Government's levelling up agenda. There is a significant concern that the perception of Crewe to passengers and investors will worsen over time, meaning Crewe and the towns and locations it serves, will miss out on the economic and social opportunities of HS2.

#### **Solution**

70. The Council seeks an assurance that the key investments and interventions mentioned in the Solution to the "Northern Powerhouse Rail interfaces: Crewe station" issue will be fully funded and delivered in advance of the arrival of HS2 Phase 2b services to Crewe.

### **Traffic & Transport**

#### **Construction traffic impacts – assumption of delivery of two major highway schemes**

##### **Issue**

71. The Promoter's Traffic Modelling assumes that two major road schemes which are being brought forward by the Council will be delivered and operational before the Proposed Scheme is constructed.
72. The first is the Middlewich Eastern Bypass, a scheme which will deliver a new single carriageway to the east of Middlewich to alleviate the severe traffic congestion which affects the town centre. The scheme has planning permission but requires the confirmation of a compulsory purchase order and side roads order by the Secretary of State. If the orders are confirmed it is hoped that main works will start in early 2024, with an estimated 28-month construction period.
73. The second is the A500 Dualling scheme which would upgrade the section of the A500 between Meremoor Moss roundabout and M6 junction 16 to dual carriageway standard and provide capacity improvements at the Mere Moss Roundabout. The Transport Assessment states that the daily two way-peak HGV vehicles utilising this section of highway is over 1600 per day.
74. The scheme would address existing congestion issues at peak times, increasing resilience and improving safety, as well as supporting the construction and operation of HS2. The scheme has planning permission, and the Council proposes to make compulsory purchase and side road orders in 2022. These will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for confirmation. If the orders are confirmed, it is hoped that works would start in 2024, with an estimated 24 to 27 month construction period.
75. While the Council's case for each scheme is robust, there is no guarantee that both or either will be confirmed by the Secretary of State. This needs to be considered in the current context of extremely high levels of construction inflation. Moreover, each scheme will be subject to the acceptance of a Final Business Case by the Secretary of State. Again, there is no guarantee that either or both will be accepted. Without one or both schemes in place, the Proposed Scheme's construction impacts across the route will be greater than currently forecast and more mitigation will be required.

76. Even if both schemes are confirmed by the Secretary of State, and the Final Business Case for each is accepted, there is no guarantee that each will be operational before the Proposed Scheme is constructed.

**Solution**

77. The Promoter should undertake further modelling based on neither scheme being delivered. The Council have been requesting this information since early 2021. While this is a worst-case scenario, for the reasons described in the preceding paragraphs, it is not an unrealistic one. The further modelling should then be used as the baseline for mitigation and a supplementary Transport Assessment should be published.
78. The Council further requests that the Promoter engages with it on any additional mitigation and land requirements identified in the supplementary Transport Assessment and, if necessary, these are brought forward in an Additional Provision.

**A54 Middlewich alternative highway mitigation strategy**

**Issue**

79. Taking into consideration the embedded mitigation of the Middlewich Eastern Bypass the Council notes that the residual highway impacts on the A54 through Middlewich remain severe. The peak two-way HGV flow from the Promoter's Transport Assessment is 640 HGVs per day.
80. The Council is of the view that if a Haul Road were to be installed to the south of Middlewich between the A530 and the southern end of the proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass this could mitigate significant levels of harm from construction traffic on the A54 through Middlewich and the B5309 King Street. This would have the potential to remove the need for other mitigation such as at Croxton Lane, Leadsmithy Street and area wide traffic calming of residential streets in the town.
81. Such a proposal could also have legacy benefits for any future proposed Southern Bypass with Middlewich to link up with the committed Clive Green Lane improvements and provide a suitable route to the M6 from the Winsford Industrial Estate, consistent with the Winsford Transport Strategy. Cheshire West and Chester Council is supportive of a haul road being installed.

**Solution**

82. The Promoter should carry out traffic modelling alongside a construction review to understand the likely impacts of this proposal on construction traffic and the potential design choices for such a scheme.

**Phasing of highway closures and utilisation of construction routes**

**Issue**

83. The Council notes that the Transport Assessment has assumed a particular phasing and schedule of road closures / diversions, etc. If there are significant changes to these, the impacts may be markedly different.

**Solution.**

84. The Promoter must undertake the works to the general phasing and schedule as proposed in the Transport Assessment. Any deviation from this should be agreed

with the Council in advance and suitable mitigation measures and community engagement agreed. If necessary, the Bill should be amended to provide for this.

### **Insufficient Highway Junction Mitigation**

#### **Issue**

85. The Council considers the Promoter has not mitigated adequately the construction traffic impacts on key junctions on the Cheshire East network. HS2 acknowledge that the traffic assessment has been undertaken using high level, strategic, models that can mask local impacts. The Council consider this is the case in several areas and without mitigation there will be a detrimental impact at the following junctions –

#### **Hough to Walley's Green area (MA01)**

##### Impact on Savoy Road / Weston Road / A5020

86. The Promoter needs to be aware that there are proposals to traffic calm the B5472 as part of the South Cheshire Garden Village Local Plan Site Allocation. This will have the effect of more traffic being distributed to the above junction, which already suffers from extreme peak hour congestion.

##### A533 London Road/Moss Lane junction, Sandbach

87. The Promoter has identified an impact at this junction; however, the Council considers that the impact identified by the Promoter is understated due to existing on-street car parking issues caused by local businesses.

#### **Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam area (MA02)**

##### A54 Kinderton Street/A54 St Michael's Way/A533 Leadsmithy Street junction, Middlewich

88. The Promoter's Transport Assessment shows that there is an impact at this junction and a modest improvement is proposed. However, the Council has the followings concerns with this assessment –

- the baseline assessment appears to under-report the level of congestion experienced at this location,
- the Council is making changes to the junction to introduce a pedestrian crossing. This will add additional vehicle delay to the baseline situation, and
- the assessment has been undertaken using a strategic traffic model, this has the effect of redistributing traffic onto inappropriate local roads to avoid delays at this junction.

89. The Council considers that a much more significant junction improvement scheme is required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

##### A54 Chester Road/A530 Newton Bank, Middlewich

90. No mitigation is shown here despite the predicted operation of the junction moving from 82% to 104%, and therefore over capacity, as a result of the Proposed Development.

#### **Pickmere to Aqden and Hulseheath area (MA03)**

91. The three junctions below contribute to baseline traffic congestion which in the traffic model is assigning traffic down inappropriate routes. In turn, this has led the

Promoter to identify that an improvement scheme is required at the A50 Gough's Lane junction. This is already a local 'rat run'.

92. The Council is of the view that the Goughs Lane improvement would encourage further additional traffic on this and similar unsuitable roads. The Council would wish to keep as much traffic on the main A road network (the A537 / A50 route) by addressing congestion on these corridors instead.

Brook Street / Hollow Lane, Knutsford

93. The Council has developed a capacity improvement scheme here, but it is partially unfunded. No land is required for the scheme the Council has developed.

A537 / A50 Toft Road

94. This junction is forecast to be affected by additional traffic from the operation of the Proposed Scheme. The Council has developed an improvement scheme, which is partially funded, but third-party land take is required.

A50/Mereside Road junction.

95. No mitigation is shown at this junction, and the Council considers that the impacts identified by the Promoter are underestimated, particularly with regards to the impacts of significant and regular event traffic at Tatton Park. A road safety scheme has been implemented at the junction in recent years, which has had the effect of reducing capacity. It is unclear whether the Transport Assessment takes account of this.

#### **Solution**

96. The Promoter should undertake appropriate scenario and sensitivity testing on each of junctions mentioned above, in consultation with the Council, to ensure that mitigation is appropriate and incorporates both direct and indirect impacts. It is possible that additional mitigation will require the promotion of an Additional Provision.

#### **Land for HS2 agreed Highway Junction Mitigation**

##### **Issue**

97. The Promoter has undertaken an assessment of the construction traffic volumes and routes associated with HS2 Phase 2a and assumed that by 2030 there will be minimal construction traffic movements as a result of HS2 Phase 2a that overlap with the Proposed Scheme. There is a risk that delays to Phase 2a could result in an overlap of activities for both schemes.

98. The Council has agreed with the Promoter that improvements at the following junctions are required to mitigate the effects of construction traffic –

Hough to Walley's Green area (MA01)

- i. Warmingham Road/Groby Road
- ii. Bradfield Road/Parkers Road
- iii. Warmingham Road / Hall Lane
- iv. Bradfield Road/Mablins Lane

Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam area (MA02)

- v. A54 Chester Road/A530 Croxton Lane

Pickmere to Aqden and Hulseheath (MA03)

- vi. A556/B5569/A5033 (Northwich Road) Tabley.
  - vii. A50 Chester Road/A50 Warrington Road/B5569 Chester Road
  - viii. A50 Warrington Road/B5159 West Lane junction
99. The Promoter's own Transport Assessment acknowledges that the construction impacts at the above locations are significant enough to warrant mitigation without which the impacts will include community severance, traffic congestion, public transport delays and wider environmental impacts.

**Solution**

100. The Promoter should, as a matter of urgency, discuss land take plans and detailed designs for the agreed highway junction mitigation with the Council and agree the extent of land which will need to be acquired for the Proposed Scheme. The Council, which has previously raised these concerns with the Promoter, considers it will be necessary for the Promoter to promote an Additional Provision to acquire the additional land needed. This should allow sufficient working space (including compounds) for the safe construction of the proposed improvements.

**Temporary highway junction works made permanent**

**Issue**

101. The Council would wish to ensure that any temporary highway improvements provided as mitigation are designed and constructed as permanent improvements to the highway network to agreed standards; and that following the completion of the construction phase of the scheme the Council can either:
- Require that HS2 remove the highway mitigation scheme and reinstate the road layout to the Council's approval
  - Secure the necessary consents and approvals to enable the permanent retention and adoption of the temporary improvements, under relevant legislation prior to any improvements being removed by the nominated undertaker.

**Solution**

102. The Promoter provides an assurance that it will not restore the temporary mitigation measure to its original use where the Council wishes to make this permanent. The Promoter should work with the Council to identify any junction improvements it wishes to retain after construction and the Bill should include the permanent land take for these junction improvements. For the other improvements, the Promoter should provide an assurance that it will not restore these to their original design and use if the Council wishes to retain these once delivered.

**Appropriateness of Construction Routes**

**Issue**

103. The Council has concerns about the suitability of several local roads across the borough as construction routes, particularly those which will accommodate HGVs. The Promoter seems to have overlooked the fact that these routes are located within rural farming communities and carry a significant proportion of large



agricultural traffic, and are intensively used for certain periods of the year (for example, during harvest). The local roads include –

- Back Lane and Casey Lane
- B5391 Pickmere Lane
- Old Hall Lane (which is very narrow)
- Peacock Lane
- Flittogate Lane
- Budworth Road
- Chapel Lane (where there are already problems because of residents' car parking and narrow footpaths)
- Tabley Hill Lane
- Reddy Lane
- Millington Lane
- Cherry Tree Lane
- Mill Lane / Castle Mill Lane

#### **Solution**

104. The Council seeks the use of alternative construction routes, including one or more of the following –
- utilising rail further to minimise the number of HGVs on the construction routes and/or shortening journeys,
  - the greater use of, and where necessary, provision of haul roads to connect construction compounds and the strategic road network instead of using local roads as construction routes, and
  - the delivery of the trace of the route early in the construction process and for this to be used as a haul route to move the necessary goods and materials.
105. Where this is not possible, the Council requires the Promoter to make provision for the construction routes to be made suitable for the proposed level of HGV movements in advance of construction. This should include road conditioning enhancements, road widening and increased passing places including, where necessary, the provision of additional land to facilitate localised road widening.

#### **Construction Route - Road Safety and Traffic Management measures**

##### **Issue**

106. Many proposed construction routes are local residential roads that normally do not accommodate large volumes of traffic and consequently the Council has significant road safety concerns for other road users, including cyclists and pedestrians. These include –
- Ashley Road
  - Forge Mill Lane/Dragons Lane/Tetton Lane/White Hall Lane junction.

- A530/Brook house lane junction
- Middlewich – Area wide - including Brynlow Drive and Hayhurst Avenue.
- Crewe – Area wide - including Bradfield Road and Sydney Road.

#### **Solution**

107. The Council seeks an index-linked fund to be made available to provide additional road safety measures on key construction routes, such as traffic signals and speed management schemes. This fund should form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned above.

#### **Construction route - maintenance liabilities**

##### **Issue**

108. The Proposed Scheme will result in additional maintenance responsibilities for construction routes, new highway structures and diversions, such as winter maintenance. These will cause a resource and financial burden to the Council. The Bill contains limited provision for these expenses to be reimbursed where the Council can prove an additional financial burden. Maintenance of such routes is, in general, a programmed and planned regime. Reactive, unplanned, and ad hoc maintenance is inevitably more expensive and less reliable than that which is programmed in advance. This mechanism for reimbursement in the Bill does not allow the Council, for instance, to easily programme maintenance of HS2 construction routes which ordinarily fall outside the scope of winter maintenance. Therefore, such maintenance on these routes would likely be reactive.

##### **Solution**

109. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide an appropriately sized, and index-linked, fund made available to the Council to enable it to programme appropriate, adequate and reliable maintenance of the construction routes to the standards required in the Bill such that –

- there is no additional financial burden on the Council,
- costs are controlled for the Promoter, and
- maintenance of the construction routes is reliable and proactive.

This fund should form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned above.

#### **Highway structure impacts**

##### **Issue 1: structures on minor roads**

110. The Council is concerned that several of the structures on the minor roads proposed to be utilised by HGV traffic are in poor condition. Some of these structures have not yet even been assessed to meet capacity loadings. Additionally, at many of these locations, the road narrows to accommodate the structure. In these locations it may be necessary for temporary traffic management measures to be installed for the construction period. Locations include –

- Ashley Road / Birkin Brook
- Mill Lane / River Bollin Bridge
- Cherry Tree Lane / Blackburn's Brook



**Solution**

111. A safety and capacity (both a structural and traffic management) review of structures on HGV routes is required to ensure each route can safely accommodate the proposed levels of construction traffic.

**Issue 2: Automatic advanced Bridge Strike equipment**

112. The A530 in Middlewich is crossed on a very low Bridge by the Shropshire Union Canal.
113. Although there are no proposed HGV construction routes planned to use this section of highway, there are significant HGV movements on the surrounding roads. The Bridge is regularly struck by vehicles who have ignored the warnings, causing damage to the structure and major delays to the road network. The Council is concerned that, given the high volume of vehicles that will be operating in the area, the risk of driver error and a bridge strike is significantly increased.

**Solution**

114. The Promoter should provide funding to the Council to install Automatic Advanced Bridge Strike equipment to deter and prevent HGV drivers from accidentally using this section of the A530. This fund should form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned above.

**Traffic and Transport: detailed design**

115. The Council recognises that under Schedule 5 to the Bill, it will be consulted about the detailed design of new highways constructed under the Bill. But there are a number of important points of principle which the Council considers should be established at this stage in order to remove any uncertainty. The Council will write to HS2 Ltd with a list of these points. They include the request that any new street lighting must be to the specifications required under the Council's county-wide arrangements.

**Solution**

116. Unless a satisfactory response is received from the Promoter to the letter referred to above, it should be required to provide an assurance that it will comply with all the points of principle mentioned above.

**Highways – Air Quality****Issue**

117. The Council has several air quality management areas ("AQMA's") within the borough and is concerned about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on these areas as well as the Proposed Scheme causing other areas at risk into AQMA's.

**Solution**

118. The Council requests that air quality monitoring for current air quality management areas ("AQMA's") should be carried out pre-construction, annually during construction, and post-construction as well as areas which are close to thresholds in order to identify when new AQMA's are created. The Council requests that sufficient mitigation is provided when air quality is compromised by the Promoter's scheme.

**Highways – environmental impacts****Issue**

119. The following roads have been assessed as experiencing a significant increase in HGV movements with resulting noise impacts in dense residential areas. This will be exacerbated from poor surface conditions.

- Sydney Road, Crewe
- Lansdowne Road, Crewe
- Wordsworth Drive,
- Laureston Avenue,
- Limetree Avenue,
- Remer Street
- Shakespeare Drive
- B5076 North Street, Crewe
- B5076 Bradfield Road, Crewe
- Broughton Road, Crewe
- A54 through Middlewich
- A50 through High Legh

**Solution**

120. The Promoter should provide the Council with an index-linked road maintenance fund to improve surface quality improvements on these roads prior to construction. This fund should form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned above.

**Compounds – Highway Impacts**

**Issue**

121. The design of construction compounds must take into account the need for sufficient off-road parking provision and EV charging infrastructure to accommodate staff and visitors or meet the Council's prevailing standards, otherwise highway safety could be compromised. This aspect is not one over which the Council will have control under the detailed planning provisions of the Bill. It appears that in the ES, proposed parking appears not to have been fully taken into account. Although, access by sustainable travel is encouraged, there is an issue that if this is unsuccessful, parking will spread onto local roads.

**Solution**

122. The Promoter should be required to assess the parking requirements associated with planned construction compounds properly, in consultation with the Council with a view to making provision to meet the needs of the contractors within the compounds or elsewhere away from the public highway. The Council requests funding for a Travel Plan Monitoring officer to work with the Contractors to meet their sustainable travel targets.

123. The Promoter is required to provide an assurance that it will meet the Council's prevailing standards and policies for EV charging at the time of construction commencement.

### **Construction traffic efficiency**

#### **Issue**

124. There are several locations across the Council's highway network where there is a material impact from HS2 construction traffic, but this impact falls short of requiring the Promoter to provide direct mitigation. Cumulatively, these impacts will harm the efficiency of the highway network, including for the Promoter's own workforce and supply chain partners.
125. The Council has developed improvements at the following locations that are impacted by HS2, but the improvements are not fully funded by the Council:
- Old Mill Road Sandbach
  - Alvaston Roundabout.
  - Crewe Green Roundabout – Partial signalisation
  - Mill Street /South Street, Nantwich Road, Crewe
  - A534 / A532 / Weston Road – 'Crewe Arms' Roundabout

#### **Solution**

126. The Council seeks an index-linked fund to be made available to undertake improvement schemes at these locations in advance of the HS2 construction traffic. This fund should form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned above.

### **Condition surveys – lorry routes, B roads, and repair**

#### **Issue**

127. The Council will be a Qualifying Authority for the approval of Lorry Routes in connection with the Authorised Works. Whilst many of these routes will be along the main highway network some routes are proposed along B Class classified roads and below. These routes are not likely to fall within the ordinary maintenance programme and will still be subject to lorry traffic that will be extraordinary in terms of its duration volume and frequency. Some of these routes are in country areas and within residential areas and provide local residents with their main access.
128. The repair and maintenance of these smaller roads will place an additional burden on the Council's resources. The extent of the need for additional and/or accelerated repair of these roads and the financial cost would be better informed if the state of condition of these roads was established just prior to works commencing and when the construction works being served by this traffic has reached practical completion. The Bill does make provision for the costs of repair and maintenance arising from traffic being diverted from a higher standard road onto a lower standard one (paragraph 11(1) of Part 1 of Schedule 32 to the Bill). This provision applies to general as well as lorry traffic and enables the Council to seek financial contribution in respect of the additional expense incurred in carrying out repairs to those roads providing the diversion and traffic is caused in consequence of the works (paragraph 11(1)(c)). Several of the proposed construction lorry routes will be on lower classified roads at present there appears to be no way of assisting the Highway Authority with the burden of their maintenance during and immediately after the completion of the Works. This places an unfair burden on the Highway Authority who would otherwise have to pick up all these additional costs.

**Solution**

129. The Promoter provides an assurance that pre and post authorised works Highway Condition surveys will be funded to establish the extent of repairs needed to the B Classified and Lower status roads which carry more than 24 lorry trips a day, in connection with the Authorised Works. The Council also seeks an index linked fund to assist with the repair of these roads, to bring them up to a maintenance level consistent with their Pre Authorised Works state of repair. This fund should form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned above.

**Public transport impacts****Issue**

130. Information Paper E5 (*Roads and public rights of way*) describes the Promoter's approach to maintaining bus routes. It states that the nominated undertaker will identify a diversionary route and temporary bus stops where bus routes are affected by temporary road closures during construction. The nominated undertaker will also work with the local authority and bus operator to develop suitable 'alternative arrangements' for permanent changes to bus routes. In Cheshire East, many of the bus services are marginally viable or currently require a subsidy. It is considered unlikely that these could absorb any financial pressure resulting from the Proposed Development.

**Solution**

131. The Council requests that the Promoter makes available to the Council a discretionary index-linked fund to enable the Council to compensate operators who can demonstrate additional financial burdens as a result of the Proposed Development in order to maintain current services. This fund should form part of the Public Transport Fund mentioned above.

**Walking and cycling improvements - 'Green Corridor'****Issue**

132. The Proposed Scheme will cause significant disruption to many communities in Cheshire East over several years including community severance, increased traffic, and impacts on the local environment. This will affect the daily lives and mental health and wellbeing of residents.
133. Cheshire East communities that will experience significant disruption and/or severance include –
- Ashley Village – Ashley Railhead, Ashley IMB-R and several site compounds
  - High Legh Village – NPR touchpoint
  - Middlewich - High volumes of HGV's and disruption
  - North Crewe – tunnel portal and rolling stock depot
  - Extension of the Crewe Greenway along the A530

**Solution**

134. The Council seeks an appropriately sized, index-linked, fund for the Council to deliver in advance of construction new walking and cycling schemes along the line of route and surrounding environment, in line with the HS2 Green Corridor agenda,

to provide alternative, attractive and sustainable transport alternatives to tackle severance and journey disruption and provide local community and wellbeing benefits to those negatively impacted by the scheme.

135. This fund would be used to focus on areas such as –

- North Crewe, Middlewich and Winsford area (connecting Crewe to the Rolling Stock depot)
- Bollin Valley Great North Way to connect the Trans Pennine Trail to Macclesfield travelling through Little Bollington, Tatton Park, Mobberley, around Manchester Airport, Styal, Wilmslow and into Macclesfield – which has a number of interfaces with the proposed route and infrastructure, including along Millington FP7 to Hope Cottage and where HS2 crosses and severs Ashley Road
- Improvements to the towpath of the Middlewich Branch Shropshire Union Canal from Middlewich to Clive Green Lane

136. This fund should form part of the HS2 Green Corridor and Active Travel Fund mentioned above.

### **Walking and cycling standards**

#### **Issue**

137. The Bill provides for several junction mitigation schemes, local diversions and other schemes that will provide walking and cycling facilities.

#### **Solution**

#### **Walking and Cycling Improvements – sustainable access**

138. The following roads would benefit from additional pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities to mitigate some of the severance impacts from the additional traffic arising from the Proposed Development –

- Sydney Road – a new cycleway could also be delivered on the approach to Crewe Green Roundabout.
- Parkers Road – a new cycleway could also be delivered to improve sustainable access to Crewe Tunnel North Main Compound.
- B5076 Bradfield Road.
- A530 Greenway scheme to Leighton – this corridor is a key route to Leighton Hospital which as well as a key health care service is also a major local employer. The Council has been working with the Hospital and others to extend the Cycleway ‘Greenway’. This scheme, a major sustainable access improvement, is well developed and runs from the junction of the A532 and the A530 to the Hospital. The Council has secured some, but not all, of the funding required to deliver this key link. It would be extremely advantageous if this could be completed prior to the Proposed Development’s traffic impacts being experienced on the A530. This scheme could also improve sustainable access to the Moss Lane Satellite compound. As such, a contribution towards its completion is requested.
- Completion of A556 Active Travel network from Chester Road to Bowdon Roundabout – the Council has developed options in which this could be achieved which would benefit many of the Northern access routes.

- East to West NCN Route Middlewich, this will re-route cyclists from the A54 to the NCN route
- St Michaels Way, Middlewich –improved crossing points are needed. The existing underpass is unappealing and so there is an opportunity to improve the underpass or install an at grade crossing point. This road is intensively used by construction traffic.

#### **Solution**

139. In addition, the Council seeks an assurance that these facilities will be designed to the appropriate standards including the Department for Transport's document *Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20)*.

#### **Public rights of way ("PROW")**

#### **Issue 1 – standards and specifications for PROW furniture**

140. Standards and specifications have not been detailed for PROW furniture (e.g. gates), widths, surfacing, underpass headroom, underpass lighting, overbridge specification, gradients and signage.

#### **Solution 1**

141. The Council seeks an assurance that any new PROW furniture will conform with the Council's Policy on structures on Public Rights of Way, British Standard design BS 5709:2006, British Horse Society advice and the "least restrictive access" principle.

#### **Issue 2 – standards and specifications for PROW**

142. Standards and specifications for such matters as surfacing, widths, marshalling, temporary closures, and traffic volumes have not yet been provided for PROW affected by construction traffic.

#### **Solution 2**

143. In the first instance, the Council seeks an assurance this information will be provided by the Promoter as soon as possible and that the Promoter will then commit to work with the Council to ensure appropriate mitigation is provided once the Council has had the opportunity to properly consider the information and identify any required mitigation.

#### **Issue 3 – severance**

144. The construction of the Proposed Development will sever a residential area of Crewe on Groby Road from the adjacent countryside access network, which includes a "walking for health" route.

#### **Solution 3**

145. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide an off-road pedestrian route along Groby Road between Sydney Road/Remer Street junction and Crewe Footpath No. 6

#### **Issue 4 - Bridleway 6 at Wimboldsley**

#### **Solution 4**

The Council requests that the Promoter considers an improvement to the Bridleway 6 connection with Sutton Lane, which would provide an active travel route with community benefits linking Middlewich to Wimboldsley including the school. It would also provide a



sustainable connection for construction works travelling to the Rolling Stock Depot from Middlewich. The Council is aware that Cheshire West & Chester Council seeks the same commitment.

### **Environment & Landscape**

#### **Insufficient landscape mitigation and visual screening**

##### **Issue**

146. There are numerous highways or access improvements proposed. Construction zones overlie many hedgerows or mature trees. The Environmental Statement states that such vegetation may be cleared. Many of these access arrangements have no corresponding mitigation plans for the replacement of vegetation and the cumulative effect of vegetation loss could be significant, and detrimental to landscape character.
147. The proposed route and associated works will also give rise to severance of the landscape and wildlife corridors along the courses of the Dane, Smoker Brook and Weaver Valley. (The Weaver Valley also falls within the administrative area of Cheshire West and Chester Council). It is acknowledged that mitigation proposals include measures such as woodland habitat creation to replace woodland lost from Leonard's and Smoker Wood, Belt Wood, Bongs Wood and along Waterless/Arley Brook to provide connectivity between habitats
148. There are places where substantial track side tree planting will be appropriate to mitigate impacts. However, in other places it would be more appropriate to strengthen adjacent landscaping, ensuring views out from the trains while mitigating for the impact created in the surrounding countryside. There are a few places where such planting has been achieved more than 100m from the edge of the Proposed Development.

##### **Solution**

149. As with HS2 Phase 2a, the Council seeks a landscape fund to support offsite planting by adjacent landowners. This will have a greater benefit for landscape mitigation without placing the HS2 route behind a relatively narrow 'green wall'. The fund could be administered by the Council or the Mersey Forest. Strengthening the wider landscape would reduce the overall visual impact and landscape character harm, further mitigating the harm identified and accepted by the Promoter. This fund would form part of the Environment, Landscape and Ecology Enhancements Fund mentioned above.
150. Seek, as well as 5-year establishment, that longer-term management and monitoring be secured so that mitigation measures are sustainable.
151. Given the number of trees of local provenance that are proposed to be planted across the scheme, the Council seeks an assurance that measures are in place to meet this commitment and satisfy future demand.

#### **Scale of operations in Ashley area**

##### **Issue**

152. Ashley village and the surrounding area will be significantly affected by the Proposed Scheme both during construction and through operation with several large and intrusive infrastructure elements proposed within the village and surrounding areas. These include –

- Ashley Railhead
- Ashley IBM-R
- Ashely Embankment
- Passive provision for NPR/HS2 (Liverpool to Manchester) junction

153. These infrastructure proposals will have a significant and negative effect on the landscape and visual character of the area and negatively impact the residents and visitors in this area.

154. The Council acknowledges that some of this infrastructure is only proposed during construction or for a finite period. However, the lengthy construction period of HS2 means that even the temporary measures will be in place for several years. This will have lasting negative impacts on the character and attractiveness of the area, and on its residents, that may extend for decades beyond the construction period.

#### **Solution**

155. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter considers options to reduce the visual and landscape impacts of the scheme in the area in and around Ashley, including considering relocating the Ashley Railhead and/or Ashley IMB-R, lowering local embankments, moving more of the infrastructure into cuttings, and providing enhanced visual screening against all the infrastructure outlined above.

#### **Contamination**

##### **Issue**

156. The Council has a regulatory obligation under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to address contaminated land in its area. The Council has a prioritised list of potentially contaminated sites in accordance with its Contaminated Land Strategy, and must ensure that these sites or impacts from these sites are not worsened as part of any known works. As such, as part of the Proposed Development, the Council would expect appropriate assessments to be provided detailing how the Promoter's works may impact these known potentially contaminated sites so that this information can feed into the Council's Part 2A work. If this information is not provided, the Promoter is at risk of being designated as an 'appropriate person' under Part 2A with respect to liabilities that may arise, should any of these sites be determined as Contaminated Land by Cheshire East Council.

157. The Council has reviewed the following documents in the context of land contamination in order to review the assessments undertaken by HS2 –

- Volume 1: Introduction and methodology (document M14), HS2, 2022;
- Volume 2: Community Area reports MA01: Hough to Walley's Green (document M16), HS2, 2022;
- Volume 2: Community Area reports MA02: Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam (document M16), HS2, 2022;
- Volume 2: Community Area reports MA03: Pickmere to Agden and Hulseheath (document M16), HS2, 2022;
- Volume 2: Community Area reports MA06: Hulseheath to Manchester Airport (document M16), HS2, 2022;



- Volume 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Scope and Methodology Report, Appendix CT-001-00001 (documents M93, M94 and M95), HS2, 2022;
  - Document E18: Land quality (contamination), HS2, 2022;
  - Volume 5: Appendix LQ-001-0MA01 (document M214), HS2, 2022;
  - Volume 5: Appendix LQ-001-0MA02 (document M215), HS2, 2022;
  - Volume 5: Appendix LQ-001-0MA03 (document M216), HS2, 2022;
  - Volume 5: Appendix LQ-001-0MA06 (document M219), HS2, 2022;
  - Volume 5: Map Book, Land Quality (LQ-01) (document M232), HS2, 2022;
  - Background information and data, Land quality, BID LQ-002-0MA01 (document M223), HS2 2022;
  - Background information and data, Land quality, BID LQ-002-0MA02 (document M224), HS2 2022;
  - Background information and data, Land quality, BID LQ-002-0MA03 (document M225), HS2 2022; and
  - Background information and data, Land quality, BID LQ-002-0MA06 (document M228), HS2 2022.
158. No supporting information has been provided in any of the documents above to justify the omission of identified potential sources of contamination from progressing to stages C and D of the assessments (i.e. High-Risk Potential Sites).
159. Stages C and D of the assessments comprise a further detailed risk assessment stage which includes a Conceptual Site Model, which is a standard land contamination risk assessment taking into account sources of contamination, pathways by which contamination can migrate, and receptors which are entities that could be adversely affected by a contaminant. As a result of this information not being provided, the Council is unable to review the Promoter's reasoning or properly consider its assessment. The Council requested this information from the Promoter on 2 March, 21 June and 8 July 2022 and no satisfactory response has yet been received.
160. From the Council's perspective, the proposed tunnel has the potential to sterilise sites that the Council has prioritised for further inspection under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, if future restrictions are placed on excavations/works overlying the tunnel. Further information on this aspect should be provided, as this will guide our future comments on the land contamination proposals.

**Solution**

161. The Council seeks further information to enable it to properly review the findings of the work undertaken so far.
162. Any information on future restrictions proposed by the Promoter over the tunnelled area should be provided to the Council so that it can provide comprehensive comments on the proposals.

**Heritage concerns**

**Issue**

163. The Proposed Development will have either a moderate or major adverse impact on several listed buildings during construction and operation. The Council's main concerns are around the significant impacts to Mere Court Hotel and Ovenback Cottage, where the interventions proposed are so significant that their viability as homes and business is questioned. The Council is also concerned by the Proposed Development's effects on Winterbottom Farm and by the proposal to demolish certain non-designated heritage assets.
164. Some of these impacts have been underestimated and lack of necessary 3D visuals to show exactly what their new setting will look like. For instance, the impact on Ovenback Cottage, a grade II listed building asset (asset MA03-0058) is described as "moderate medium adverse"; however, the Council's expert's professional opinion is that it is likely to be more severe and in two cases the buildings rendered uninhabitable. There has been little cross-discipline work to establish exactly what the impacts will be and whether mitigation measures will actually make the impacts much greater than considered to date.
165. The significant effects identified are for the following –
- 1.Mere Court Hotel
166. Temporary: The hotel and sections of the landscaped gardens are surrounded by mature trees and planting that prevents views of the agricultural land beyond. The trees give the gardens a peaceful, discrete, and enclosed character. The setting was designed to complement the building, and therefore positively contributes to how the heritage value of the asset is understood and appreciated. The presence of noise and movement from machinery during construction of the A50 Warrington Road overbridge and Hoo Green North cutting within the asset's setting will temporarily alter the peaceful, enclosed and discrete character of the asset. This will reduce the legibility of the design intention and function of the asset and its gardens, constituting a medium impact and resulting in a moderate adverse significant effect.
167. Permanent: The asset will be affected by the presence of A50 Warrington Road overbridge and Hoo Green North cutting. Sections of the asset's gardens will be removed by the Proposed Development, including a raised terrace of mature tree planting, the orchard, former rose garden, former tennis court and a section of the small lake. The removal of these features will result in the loss of elements of the landscaped garden which were deliberately designed to complement the building. The designed landscape positively contributes to how the heritage value of the asset is understood and appreciated. This will constitute a high impact and result in a major adverse significant effect.
- 2.Ovenback Cottage
168. The use of construction machinery associated with the construction of High Legh cutting and High Legh cutting retaining wall within the two fields on the north side of Agden Lane will increase noise and activity within the setting of the asset. This additional noise and construction activity will alter the experience of the asset and disrupt the legibility of the association between the former bakery and the rural hamlet it once served. The building is timber framed and vulnerable to damage from the effects of construction of the Proposed Scheme, something which is not mentioned in the Promoter's documents. The two large agricultural fields to the north of the asset form part of its setting and positively contribute to understanding

the historic interest of the asset as a cottage and former bakery serving a rural community. High Legh cutting and High Legh cutting retaining wall will be constructed within the fields on the north side of Agden Lane, removing these fields from the setting of the asset. This will change how it can be appreciated as a rural cottage and former bakery within the surrounding farmland, constituting a medium adverse impact and resulting in a moderate adverse significant effect.

### 3. Winterbottom Farm

169. Winterbottom Farmhouse (MA03\_0040) is Grade II listed and is of moderate heritage value. It is located adjacent to the land required for the construction of the Proposed Development within fields which form part of the farm's landholding. These fields form the setting of the asset and aid in the ready appreciation of the historic function of the asset as a farmhouse, making a positive contribution to the asset's heritage value. The temporary presence of construction plant within agricultural land to the north of the asset during construction of Hoo Green South embankment No. 2 will adversely impact how the historic interest of the asset is appreciated and understood. Utility diversions adjacent to the asset will contribute to the impact on its heritage value but will not increase the scale of this impact. This will constitute a medium impact and result in a moderate adverse significant effect. These fields form part of the setting of the asset and aid in the ready appreciation of the historic function of the asset as a farmhouse, making a positive contribution to the asset's heritage value. The presence of the Proposed Development within the asset's setting will adversely impact how the historic interest of the asset is appreciated and understood. This will constitute a medium impact and result in a moderate adverse significant effect.
170. The mitigation required or whether there are other options is unknown, but it is clear, there will be significant immediate and long-term implications for the use/heritage value of these designated heritage assets. With the exception of Mere Court and Ovenback Cottage, the majority of the buildings listed are not as severely impacted in the Borough but will suffer considerable blight from all phases of HS2.

### 4. Non designated heritage assets

171. The non-designated heritage assets which are to be demolished are –
- Bowden View Farm (MA03\_0101)
  - Holly House Farm, Warrington Road (MA03\_0091)
  - Barn and Range at Heyrose Farm (MA03\_0085)
  - Barrhill and Waterless Brook Cottage (MA03\_0084)
  - Flittogate Farm (MA03\_0081)

### **Solution**

172. The Council seeks an assurance that it will receive appropriate ongoing management and support for the listed buildings mentioned above to ensure their future and positive optimum future use.
173. While the effect on non-designated heritage assets is less significant than those on heritage assets, the non-designated heritage assets are also protected by national policy. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will work with the Council to (i) ensure each asset is properly recorded by the Promoter before

demolition and (ii) ensure the Promoter will properly manage each asset until it is demolished.

174. Due to the limited scope of the assessment, it is unclear how many other buildings may require mitigation because of the construction or operation of the line. No images have been prepared of key areas where setting is likely to be affected to a greater degree. Where there is an adverse impact in terms of landscape, the Council seeks confirmation whether these have been cross referenced with nearby listed buildings to investigate if any setting impacts, or those which might occur through noise and vibration.

#### **Validation of operational noise levels**

##### **Issue**

175. It is important that noise levels associated with the operation of the railway are in accordance with those suggested by the Promoter in the relevant information papers and in the Environmental Statement. It is essential that measures are put in place to ensure that validation is undertaken to ensure that the noise levels are as expected and that if they exceed the expected levels, then corrective measures, such as further mitigation, are implemented.

##### **Solution**

176. The Council seeks an assurance that the steps described above will be taken.

#### **The Crewe Tunnel exit**

##### **Issue**

177. The exit of the tunnel, under the Bill scheme, is close to properties which will be affected by the noise of the trains and the noise of air as it forced in and out of the tunnel by train movements.
178. The Council notes that one of the amendments, amendment AP1-001-001, proposed by Additional Provision 1 ("AP1") is the extension of the tunnel by approximately 620m, emerging to the north of Parkers Road. The Supplementary Environmental Statement which accompanies AP1 shows the properties will experience a reduction in the operational noise levels as a result of the proposed amendment.

##### **Solution**

179. Had the Promoter not brought forward AP1, the Council would have requested an Additional Provision to realign the Crewe Northern Tunnel exit so that the portal is located further away from local properties.
180. The Council is satisfied with the proposed amendment mentioned above and supports the inclusion of this part of AP1 within the Bill scheme.

#### **NPR touchpoints – passive provision**

##### **Issue**

181. The Bill includes passive provision for two HS2/NPR junctions as follows:
- London to Liverpool NPR/HS2 junction at High Legh
  - Liverpool to Manchester NPR/HS2 junction at Rostherne, near Ashley

182. While the Council supports the principles of NPR, it firmly believes that any route options for scheme such as NPR and HS2 should be adequately consulted on with the public prior to any decisions being made on the route. NPR is a scheme that is not yet committed and to date no consultation on possible route options for the scheme have been undertaken.
183. The Council acknowledges the benefits of including passive provision for NPR/HS2 junctions within the construction programme for HS2 Phase 2b. However, this should not be done at the expense of fair and unbiased consultation on route options.

#### **Solution**

184. The Promoter provides an assurance that appropriate, adequate and sufficient consultation on NPR route options has been undertaken and conclusions reported and accepted by the Secretary of State for Transport before any route options are determined.

#### **Ecology**

##### **Issue 1 – Lesser Silver Diving Beetle and Mud snail**

185. The Promoter's survey [Ecology and Biodiversity BID EC-007-00001\_part 2.] is inadequate. A minimum 1:1 pond replacement is proposed; however, this is inadequate for these species. The changes in land use brought about by the Proposed Development will affect the Lesser Silver Diving Beetle. The cessation of grazing will mainly affect the Lesser Silver Diving Beetle species even if ponds are retained.

#### **Solution**

186. The Council seeks an assurance for more compensatory pond and ditch provision north of Crewe. The ponds should be purpose designed and managed for these species. A pond replacement ratio of 4:1 should be provided. Such a replacement ratio has been agreed recently for the Council's Middlewich Eastern bypass scheme.

##### **Issue 2 – Borrow pits proposed to be restored to agricultural use**

187. The restoration to agriculture of borrow pits misses an opportunity to deliver additional compensatory habitat. Borrow pits provide an opportunity to create aquatic/wetland habitats that might not be possible elsewhere along the line of route. This is consistent with Council policy; for instance, Policy 23 of the Cheshire Replacement Minerals Local Plan states that on restoration schemes should make a positive contribution to the nature conservation and physical environmental resources of the area.

#### **Solution**

188. The Council seeks an assurance that borrow pits will be restored to nature conservation after use.

##### **Issue 3 – cray fish**

189. Paragraph 15.4.44 of Water recourse and Flood Risk chapter of the MA01 community area report identifies a temporary moderate adverse effect on Basford Brook. Table 30 of the MA01 report identifies Basford Brook as being a low sensitivity receptor. Basford Brook Local Wildlife Site was selected for designation as it supports one of three remaining populations of White Clawed Crayfish in

Cheshire. This species is very sensitive to changes in water quality. The potential significant adverse impacts of the proposed scheme on white clawed crayfish does not appear to have been fully considered as part of the Environmental Statement ecology chapter.

#### **Solution**

190. The Council seeks a full and detailed assessment of the impacts of HS2 on the Basford Brook LWS and its associated native white clawed crayfish population. Avoidance, mitigation and compensation for these impacts is required.

#### **Issue 4 – connectivity**

191. There is some acknowledgement in the ES about the loss of connectivity along water courses (paragraph 7.4.55 MA06, paragraph 7.4.23 MA01, paragraph 7.4.21) which the Promoter acknowledges is significant at the district borough scale. The Promoter describes mitigating this through the provision of culverts and the like.
192. There is no assessment of the fragmentary impacts of the scheme overall.
193. While there is some assessment of the fragmentary effects of the Proposed Development on water courses, the residual effects of this are not clear.

#### **Solution**

194. The Promoter should undertake an assessment of the fragmentary effects of the Proposed Development on wildlife and provide appropriate compensation which could include the enhancement or creation of wildlife corridors away from the scheme.

#### **Issue 5 – Overall loss of habitat and priority habitat in particular**

195. In total 87ha of priority habitat would be lost (paragraph 6.4.14 Volume 3 route wide effects). This will be replaced by 240ha of habitat creation (with some additional landscape planting also proposed) (paragraph 6.4.15). A broad-brush metric assessment of these figures, and this shows a loss of -60.91%). Overall losses of habitat difficult to assess as the contribution made by landscape planting is not quantified in the ES and the route wide approach to compensation means it is difficult to assess the level of compensation provided locally.

#### **Solution**

196. The Council seeks an assurance that an increased level of compensatory habitat will be provided on site; alternatively, a commuted sum should be provided to enable the Council and partners to deliver an increased level of compensation elsewhere. The commuted sum would form part of the Environment, Landscape and Ecology Enhancements Fund mentioned above.

### **Waste & minerals**

#### **Issue 1**

197. The Council is concerned by the predicted 67% reduction of inert waste landfill capacity in the North West Region [Volume 3 Route Wide Effects – section 15 Waste and Material Resources Reference, table 57]. This is likely to adversely affect the ability of the Council and all waste planning authorities in the North West to manage their waste arisings over the Plan period (The Council's plan period in the emerging Minerals and Waste Plan is 2021-2041).



198. The Council's Waste Needs Assessment identifies that beyond 2020 there is a predicted shortfall of 149,356 tonnes per annum of inert waste management capacity in the borough and a peak cumulative requirement for 1.9mt for inert waste deposit to land to 2030, and that such shortfall will need to be managed by export to other facilities in the region where there is sufficient sub-regional capacity. The loss of 67% of that capacity will clearly compromise the ability of the Council and the other North West authorities to plan for inert waste management requirements. The Council intends to write in more detail to the Promoter about its concerns in respect of Waste and Minerals.

#### **Solution 1**

199. The Council requests that the Promoter revisits its plans and identifies opportunities for potential increased re-use rather than disposal to landfill.
200. The Council also requests that the Promoter considers alternative methods of treatment or disposal in more detail.
201. The Council requests that this should be reassessed as major adverse and identified as causing a significant effect given the extent of landfill capacity that will be lost across the whole of the North West. This would affect a number of planning authorities and such impact will extend beyond those authorities with sections of the route spanning their boundaries.

With a 'major adverse' impact identified, the Promoter would then need to identify alternatives to avoid the impact or identify mitigation to reduce the impact.

#### **Issue 2**

202. The loss of 4.56 million tonnes of inert waste landfill capacity (which comprises the 67% overall reduction in the North West) is described in the Environmental Statement as being of "low importance". By the significance criteria, the impact is assessed as minor adverse, which is not considered to constitute a significant effect.

#### **Solution 2**

203. Owing to the strategic implications of this loss on the Council and all North West authorities, the Council considers the impact of this loss should be reassessed.

#### **Issue 3**

204. The Environmental Statement states there are other options open to waste planning authorities for managing inert waste arisings such as for use as fill in site restoration. The Council does not consider this a realistic option for managing any significant quantity of waste arisings in its area as there are not enough sites, nor is the Council aware of any sites likely to come forward that would provide any significant capacity for inert waste deposit. The ES states there is sufficient inert waste landfill capacity in West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humber regions which would mitigate any loss of North West capacity. There is no evidence that the waste planning authorities in these regions have been approached to ascertain whether this is a feasible option. In any event, the Council would be concerned with the sustainability and climate change impacts of utilising these facilities.

#### **Solution 3**

Again, the Council requests that the Promoter reassesses the impact of this loss.

### Visitor economy

#### Tatton Park and Cheshire Showground

##### **Issue**

205. The Proposed Scheme will have significant impacts on both Tatton Park and Cheshire Showground. This will include the accessibility of both sites during construction and, in the case of Cheshire Showground, will see Proposed Development acquire land within the Showground's control.
206. Cheshire Showground hosts a number of events throughout the year, including the annual Cheshire Show. Similarly, Tatton Park has an extensive events list which includes the annual Royal Horticultural Society Tatton Park Flower Show. Events at Tatton Park and Cheshire Showground can each attract tens of thousands of visitors each year, from across the UK and beyond.
207. These events are hugely important showcase events for Cheshire East and make substantial contributions to the Borough's visitor economy. These events rely on the visitors, exhibitors and event organisers returning each year. Both Tatton Park and Cheshire Showground are wishing to grow these events year on year by attracting more people to visit and exhibit at these events. The Council fully supports these ambitions.
208. The impacts of the Proposed Development on these visitor attractions and key events are far more pronounced than the scheme reflects. Whilst most of the direct impacts to the attractions and events will be during construction, which themselves are not appropriately mitigated, the indirect impact of the Proposed Development on the reputation and financial viability of the Cheshire Showground, Tatton Park and the events they each hold throughout the year, will be felt for years later.
209. The impacts during construction, particularly on the access and egress from the Showground and Tatton Park will deter visitors from attending. Lower visitor numbers will make the events less attractive and profitable for exhibitors – and they won't return the following year. Fewer visitors and fewer exhibitors will present a key risk that the event organisers will seek to find new venues to host such events. Getting such events back to Cheshire Showground and Tatton Park, or Cheshire East at all, will be almost impossible for many years; indeed, they might never return.

##### **Solution**

210. The Promoter will need to work closely with the Council, Cheshire Showground and the National Trust to develop appropriate, robust and sufficient mitigation packages to enable the visitor attractions to remain as accessible as today and to enable the key events held at these venues to not only survive but prosper. The Council supports the petitions of both National Trust and Cheshire Showground.

#### Cheshire Showground impacts

##### **Issue 1 – access to the Showground**

211. The Proposed Development will affect the access to Cheshire Showground. This is caused by the proposed construction routes and volumes on local roads and the location of the Pickmere Lane Satellite Compound and permanent severance by the rail line.

##### **Solution**



212. That the Promoter provides new or alternative access routes into the site in combination with a safety improvement at the Flittogate Lane/ A556 junction.

**Issue 2 – one-way traffic management system**

213. A one-way traffic management system is operated during the Cheshire Show days to enable safe access and exit from the site. This would not be possible with the Proposed Development and there are significant traffic management and safety concerns with operating the Show.

**Solution**

214. That the Promoter provides an additional underpass underneath the route of the Proposed Development, together with associated highway works, so that a one-way system can continue to be operated to ensure the safe access and exit of visitors.

**Issue 3 – significant land take from the Showground**

215. The Proposed Development will require significant land take from the Showground, both during construction, and some permanently. This will affect the Showground's ability to operate as it does today and compromises its ability to expand.

**Solution**

216. The Promoter should work with Cheshire Showground and neighbouring landowners to look at options for moving the associated works slightly with the aim of reducing or removing the amount of land required from the Showground.

**Tatton Park Impacts**

**Issue 1 – access**

217. Ashley Road is a construction route that is expected to see high volumes of construction traffic and HGVs for several years during construction to access the compounds and satellite compounds in the Ashley area. The Rostherne Drive entrance is the main entry and exit point to Tatton Park and the only entrance which is wide enough for two vehicles to comfortably pass in each direction, and the only access route suitable for deliveries by lorry and for coaches. The entrance gives onto Ashley Road, and visitors arrive along Ashley Road from the east and the west. It is also the only suitable entrance and route to handle most of the traffic entries and exits during large events at Tatton Park.
218. The continuous use of Ashley Road is essential for the day-to-day operation of Tatton Park, in terms of access for visitors to the property and its grounds and to the many large events hosted there.
219. The Proposed Development will have significant detrimental impacts on the ability to safely and effectively manage and maintain Tatton Park and on its ability to successfully host the large events that it does today and that attract many people to Cheshire East.

**Solution**

220. The Promoter should engage and consult with National Trust and Cheshire East on the proposed construction programmes and traffic management plans for the area around Tatton Park and an assurance should be provided to National Trust

that the construction programme will accommodate the requirements for Tatton Park for their pivotal events.

### **Issue 2 – road closures and traffic management measures**

221. There are concerns about the possible road closures and traffic management measures along Ashley Road and the surrounding highway network that would impact the continuous vehicular movement along the route and the efficient access to Tatton Park from the strategic road network.

#### **Solution**

222. The Promoter provides an assurance that interference with access to and from Tatton Park will be further mitigated during the full construction period and avoided altogether during particularly busy periods, for example when events are being held at Tatton Park. The assurances should provide for:

- Avoiding, or at least minimising the duration of any temporary closures of Ashley Road during tie in works for its diversion or for any other reason;
- Avoiding, or at least minimising the duration of any traffic regulation measures which would prevent or restrict the passage of traffic along Ashley Road and other local roads which are used to give access to Tatton Park;
- Giving sufficient notice to the National Trust of any temporary closures of, or traffic restrictions on, Ashley Road and other local roads as mentioned above so that the Trust can make contingency arrangements; and
- Avoiding temporary closures of or traffic restrictions on Ashley Road and other local roads as mentioned above when any major events are taking place at Tatton Park, of which the Trust has notified the nominated undertaker.

### **Issue 3 – structural integrity of Tatton Park perimeter wall**

223. The Council has concerns on the future structural integrity of the perimeter wall at Tatton Registered Park and Garden, close to Ashley Road, and feels this may be compromised by the impacts of vibrations from the proposed construction traffic using Ashley Road.

#### **Solution**

224. The Promoter should carry out, or fund, pre-construction and post-construction condition surveys of the perimeter wall at Tatton Registered Park and Garden and provide an assurance that they will fund any remedial work required as a result of any damage caused by the Promoter's construction traffic.

### **Miscellaneous matters**

#### **Engagement Team**

##### **Issue**

225. The Proposed Development will be the most significant to have taken place in Cheshire since the construction of the railways in the nineteenth century. It is essential that the Cheshire local authorities and the Promoter establish and maintain an excellent working relationship throughout the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

##### **Solution**

226. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide funding for a full-time Engagement Team who will be the direct point of contact between the Promoter and the Council and Cheshire West & Chester Council.
227. This role is in addition to the request for a Travel Plan Monitoring Officer, made elsewhere in this petition.

### **Yellow Park open space**

#### **Issue**

228. Yellow Park in Crewe is an area of informal open space between the West Coast Main Line and the B5067 Middlewich Street which will be affected by the construction of Middlewich Street vent shaft. An area comprising 55% (0.66ha) of the open space will be required for Middlewich Street vent shaft satellite compound. Of the 0.66ha required for Middlewich Street vent shaft satellite compound, 0.22ha of land will be permanently required from Yellow Park at the western end of Ridgway Street, Audley Street West and Mellor Street.
229. The Sherbourne estate, just north of the open space, is one of the most deprived areas in the country. The open space is regularly used by children and young people, particularly to play football. The reduction in size of the open space will clearly negatively affect the ability of the children and young people to play in this area.

#### **Solution**

230. It is essential that the effects on users of the open space (which the Promoter acknowledges as “significant”) is mitigated. The Council requests an assurance that the Promoter provides replacement land for the open space which will be acquired under the Bill.

### **Water management**

#### **Issue**

231. In its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, the Council recognises that the Phase 2b route has significant implications for water management catchment as the route cuts directly across the natural catchment. This impact will need to be reviewed throughout the construction phase of the project and as part of the work of the Phase 2b Water Management group. Where necessary and appropriate, suitable flood mitigation measures will need to be put in place to satisfy the regulatory requirements of both the Environment Agency (for statutory main rivers) and the Council for all other sources of flood risk, including ordinary watercourses and ground water/hydrogeology.

#### **Solution**

232. The Council seeks an assurance that where a negative impact in water management catchments is evident, mitigation measures must be implemented in accordance with latest Government guidance and criteria to ensure flooding and flood risk impacts on people and property/infrastructure are minimised and at no cost to the Council. Where appropriate, collaborative projects will be supported where evidence suggest this would be mutually beneficial and where partnership funding arrangements are in place.

233. The assurance should provide that a working liaison group is maintained for the duration of the construction period and for the first 10 years of operation and appropriate resources are made available to fund it.
234. The Council also wishes to discuss the provision of an appropriate budget to deliver wider community benefits.

### **Drainage and flooding**

#### **Issue 1: local drainage and flood defences**

235. The Proposed Scheme and the associated construction works will have an impact local drainage and flood defences and the Council is concerned that these impacts have not been adequately assessed or mitigated.

#### **Solution**

236. In areas where the Authorised Works sever drainage systems and ditches, the Council seeks an assurance that suitable alternative provision will be made to ensure that there is no consequential adverse effect in relation to drainage and flooding.
237. As part of this, the any additional maintenance liability arising as a result of the construction and operation of the works in respect of flooding, waterlogging or poor drainage must be the responsibility of the Promoter during construction and for a period of up to 50 years after the scheme becomes operational.
238. Winter conditions, or the results of periods of heavy rain, must also be considered during assessment of whether flood prevention works are required, and if so what type. In this assessment, the Promoter should consider recent weather trends and flooding events as opposed to historical assessment methodologies (i.e. 1 in 100-year events) and appropriate mitigation must be provided.
239. The Promoter must also consult the Lead Local Flood Authority on the assumptions used in flood assessments and on any mitigation. The assurance must also provide that the assessments and mitigation measures are either undertaken or reviewed by an independent assessor. It is possible that certain mitigation will require the promotion of an Addition Provision to secure, say, additional land.

#### **Issue 2: surface water flooding**

240. The Council is concerned that the increased risk of surface water flooding arising from the construction and operation of the works authorised by the Bill has been inadequately assessed and has the potential to have significant adverse impacts. Some of the areas in which development will take place have experienced flooding recently and the construction impacts, particularly the changes to landscape from the excavation and deposit of material, are likely to exacerbate the existing problems.
241. The Council is concerned that the Promoter has not (i) carried out a proper assessment of the risks of surface water flooding or the implications on ground water contamination arising from the HS2 proposals in Cheshire East or (ii) considered the recent trends and frequency of flooding events in these areas.

#### **Solution**

242. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will consult the Lead Local Flood Authority on the assumptions used in each flood assessment and the

proposed mitigation. The Promoter must also provide an assurance that the assessments and mitigation measures are either undertaken or reviewed by an independent assessor. It is possible that certain mitigation might require the promotion of an Addition Provision to secure, say, additional land. The assurance should also provide that discharge rates are monitored pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to ensure no new flooding has been caused downstream as a result of the construction of the Proposed Scheme and that mitigation is provided if post-construction monitoring shows that discharge rates have increased. These measures should be agreed with relevant stakeholders and local authorities in advance of implementation.

### **Issue 3: inadequacy of flooding and water contamination measures**

243. The Council considers that the Proposed Scheme makes no provision to safeguard the borough, including its roads, green spaces and residential areas from flooding and ground water contamination and the provisions necessary for their protection have not been provided.

#### **Solution**

244. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter consults with the Lead Local Flood Authority on the assumptions used in each flood assessment and the proposed mitigation. The assurance should state that assessments and mitigation measures are either undertaken or reviewed by an independent assessor. It is possible that certain mitigation might require the promotion of an Addition Provision to secure, say, additional land.

#### **Issue**

245. The Council considers that a number of significant earthworks to be carried out during the construction phase will present a risk of silt pollution to local watercourses.

#### **Solution**

246. That Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter brings forward appropriate solutions that would ensure that all site run off is captured and adequately treated.

247. The assurance should also provide that discharge rates are monitored pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to ensure no new flooding has been caused downstream as a result of the construction of the Proposed Scheme and that mitigation measures is provided if post-construction monitoring shows that discharge rates have increased. These measures should be agreed with relevant stakeholders and local authorities in advance of implementation.

### **Recovery of costs by the Council for dealing with queries**

#### **Issue**

248. During the proceedings on the Phase One and 2a Bills, local authorities made a case for the recovery of their costs in dealing with enquires from the public about the scheme. The Promoter said it was unnecessary. The Council is aware that in areas where construction activity has started in earnest on Phase One, a great officer time has been spent dealing with enquiries from residents affected by the scheme. It appears that residents are more likely to approach a local authority than the Promoter or any of its agents. This comes at a cost to the local authority.

#### **Solution**

249. The Council requests that Promoter provides an assurance to pay the reasonable costs of the Council in dealing with enquiries from the public once construction starts.

**Extension of time for granting approval and providing consents**

**Issue**

250. Under the Bill, the Council will have 28 days to grant certain consents and provide certain approvals. The Council considers it will be able to accommodate this deadline if the Council has received advance notice of around 6 months for any application. If this not provided, the Council considers that it will require 72 days to determine any consent or approval.

**Solution**

251. The Council requests that the Bill is amended to provide for this.



#### **4. What do you want to be done in response?**

In the box below, tell us what you think should be done in response to your objections to the Bill. You do not have to complete this box if you do not want to.

You can include this information in your response to the section 'Objections to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

Please see the "Objections to the Bill" section above and the solutions included in it.

## 5. Petitioner details

Organisation/group name (if relevant)

CHESTER EAST COUNCIL

First name(s)

HAYLEY

Last name

KIRKHAM

Address line 1

WESTFIELDS

Address line 2

SANDBACH

Post code

CW11 1HZ

County

Email

[Hayley.Kirkham@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:Hayley.Kirkham@cheshireeast.gov.uk)

Phone (landline or mobile)

07811 677352

Who should be contacted about this petition?

- Individual above
- Another contact (for example, Roll A Agent or other representative)

If another contact, complete the 'Main contact's details' section below.

## 6. Main contact's details

**First name(s)**

EMYR

**Last name**

THOMAS

**Address line 1**

SHARPE PRITCHARD LLP

**Address line 2**

ELM YARD, 3-16 ELM STREET, LONDON

**Post code**

WC1X 0BJ

**County**

**Email**

[ethomas@sharpepritchard.co.uk](mailto:ethomas@sharpepritchard.co.uk)

**Phone (landline or mobile)**

07584706583

## 7. Next steps

Once you have completed your petition template, please save it.

After doing so, please visit the Committee's webpage on the link below and follow the instructions to submit your petition through the dedicated online portal.

<https://committees.parliament.uk/work/6779/petitioning-against-the-high-speed-rail-crewe-manchester-bill/>

Alternatively, you can email your petition to [hs2committee@parliament.uk](mailto:hs2committee@parliament.uk) or submit your petition by post to: Private Bill Office, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA.

Please pay the £20 administration fee within 2 working days of submitting your petition. Payment should be made by bank transfer (sort code 60-70-80 and account number 10022317, **quoting your surname as a reference**) or cheque payable to "HOC Administration 2". Cheques should be posted to Private Bill Office, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA.

Once your petition has been received and accepted, it will be sent to the Bill's promoter (HS2 Ltd, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport) and published online on the Committee's website. Copies of petitions submitted in hard copy (i.e. delivered by post or in person) will also be kept in the Private Bill Office and then as a record in the Parliamentary Archives.

Petitions sent to the Bill's promoter will include all personal information provided by the petitioner/s. Petitions published online will include only the name and address of the petitioner/s. More detailed personal information, provided in Sections 5 and 6, will be removed before publication.