



GREATER MANCHESTER LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP

DATE: Wednesday, 15 June 2022

TIME: 4.00pm - 5.30pm

PLACE: The Tootal Buildings - Broadhurst House , 1st Floor, 56
Oxford Street, Manchester, M1 6EU

AGENDA

Item	Pages
5. HS2 Bill Update Simon Warburton	1 - 10

Agenda Contact Officer:

Lee Teasdale

Governance and Scrutiny

Greater Manchester Combined Authority

Lee.Teasdale@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

GM LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

SUBJECT: High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Bill and GM Rail Priorities

DATE: Wednesday 15 June 2022

FROM: Transport for Greater Manchester

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To inform the GM LEP of GM's concerns (GMCA, TfGM and GM Partners) regarding the Government's proposals for HS2 to Manchester, as set out in the High Speed Rail (Crewe-Manchester Bill ("the Bill")), the intention of GMCA, TfGM and affected GM Partners to petition against elements of the Bill, and the relationship between these concerns and GM's wider priorities for rail in the city-region.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The GM LEP Board is requested to:

1. Note the intention for GMCA, TfGM and GM Partners to petition against elements of the High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill.
2. Note the elements of the Bill which are of concern to GMCA, TfGM and other GM Partners.
3. Note associated concerns regarding the wider agenda for rail; and
4. Consider a public intervention by the LEP at the appropriate time which highlights to Government the importance of all rail services and infrastructure including HS2 to the GM business community as critical economic infrastructure.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Simon Warburton simon.warburton@tfgm.com

Martin Lax martin.lax@tfgm.com

Liz Goldsby liz.goldsby@tfgm.com

Equalities Impact, Carbon and Sustainability Assessment:

N/A

Risk Management:

N/A

Legal Considerations:

N/A

Financial Consequences – Revenue:

N/A

Financial Consequences – Capital:

N/A

Number of attachments to the report:0

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

N/A

1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1 HS2 is the Government's scheme to implement a new high-speed north – south railway network, from Manchester to London via Birmingham and Crewe. This is a major national infrastructure proposal that would be progressed over several decades and is being taken forward in several phases. Phase 1, which is under construction will connect London with Birmingham and the West Midlands by around 2030. Phase 2a, which gained Royal Assent in 2021, will extend the route from the West Midlands to Crewe. The Phase 2b Western Leg will connect Crewe to Manchester by around 2040.
- 1.2 The Bill was deposited in Parliament by the Department for Transport (DfT) on 24th January 2022 and provides for the HS2 Phase 2b “Western Leg”, between Crewe and Manchester. The Bill as deposited includes provision for new high-speed rail stations (providing for HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail services) at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport, along with a tunnelled section of railway that will connect the respective stations and new high-speed infrastructure (the ‘Golborne Link’) to connect HS2 services to the West Coast Mainline just before Wigan North Western. However, on 6 June 2022 the Government, via a Written Ministerial Statement, confirmed its intention to remove the Golborne Link from the Bill after Second Reading in the House of Commons. The Government stated that alternative connections to the West Coast Mainline would be considered, but did not set out the details or timing of this.
- 1.3 The Bill also covers some provision of other related infrastructure, including new highways layouts and changes to car parking and Metrolink infrastructure being modified at the two stations.
- 1.4 Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) is a proposal to deliver a high-speed rail network between Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Newcastle, Sheffield and Hull. The Government's preferred outline plans for NPR are included in the Integrated Rail Plan (IRP) which was published at the end of 2021 (the IRP does not include proposals from Manchester to Sheffield and Hull as originally intended and as backed by Northern Leaders and Transport for the North). The Bill does not cover the whole of the proposed NPR scheme, but rather elements to enable its future delivery.
- 1.5 HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) have the potential to be crucial to the future prosperity of Greater Manchester and the North, acting as a catalyst for regeneration, jobs, homes and economic growth. More broadly, it is critical to GM's success as a city-region that both future high speed rail (HS2 and NPR) and ‘classic’ rail are designed to actively support the long-term needs of GM's people and places and attract the necessary level of sustained, long-term, investment required to deliver the quality of infrastructure (including stations) and services required to grow patronage, improve customer satisfaction, shift passengers and freight from road to rail, underpin the efficient and sustainable functioning of GM's economy and, in so doing, contribute to the success of the wider North of England and UK Plc.
- 1.6 Therefore, as well as seeking to secure the best-possible form of HS2 for GM by improving the scheme as currently proposed (detailed below), it is necessary in

parallel to also engage with Government and Industry to continue to promote GM's long-standing priorities for the classic network, including:

- i. Making sure GM's stations are accessible to all
- ii. Ensuring GM's major stations in the urban centre benefit from the investment needed to ensure they are fit for the 21st Century and support rather than hinder the sustainable growth of the economy
- iii. Putting in place the programme of improvements to fundamentally correct the long-standing lack of rail capacity and reliability in the GM network including: new platforms 15 and 16 at Piccadilly; re-signalling along the Castlefield Corridor; Oxford Road Station re-modelling; infrastructure investment in South Manchester and Stockport.

1.7 Given GM's Bee Network plan for an integrated multi-modal transport network, it is also critical that national rail policy supports this vision, including by:

- i. Pursuing opportunities with Great British Rail for a greater local say over how the rail network is designed and delivered, including so that rail fares and ticketing can be aligned with the Bee Network's policy for a single multi-modal ticket product with a spending cap.
- ii. Ensuring HS2 stations are properly integrated into the Bee Network, with bus, Metrolink, cycling and walking all properly accommodated for in the Government's plans.
- iii. Ensuring stations meet minimum 'Bee Network' standards so no-one is excluded from accessing public transport.

1.8 The Government's intention to develop HS2 was initially confirmed by the publication of the Strategic Case for HS2 in October 2013. GMCA confirmed its strong support in principle for the scheme at that time. This included setting out a framework for engagement with DfT and HS2 Ltd to secure a HS2 solution that is fit for purpose.

1.9 Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) has been working closely with GM partners (GMCA, Manchester City Council, Trafford Council, Wigan Council and Manchester Airport Group) with regards to HS2 Phase 2b. TfGM has also liaised with Tameside, Salford, Cheshire East and agencies including National Highways.

1.10 Despite long-running and detailed discussions with HS2 Ltd and DfT prior to Bill deposit, many of GMCA and TfGM's concerns remain unresolved. It was therefore considered necessary for GMCA and TfGM to both oppose the Bill through the Parliamentary process to ensure Greater Manchester's concerns are considered prior to the Bill obtaining Royal Assent. Many of these concerns are shared by one or more of the GM partners, who have also resolved to petition against the Bill, and TfGM is working with the GM Partners to coordinate their response to the Bill.

1.11 On Friday 25th March the GMCA agreed to provide Delegated Authority for the Chief Executive for GMCA and TfGM in consultation with the Mayor of Greater Manchester to take all such steps as may be incidental, necessary or expedient in connection with GMCA and TfGM's opposition to the Bill, including all steps required

for petitions to be submitted, maintained and if considered appropriate modified or withdrawn (in whole or in part) in the event that any petition points have been resolved satisfactorily with HS2 Ltd and/or DfT in respect of the Bill, and to negotiate and/or seek assurances, undertakings and/or agreements to the Bill as well as to appear at any Select Committee considering the Bill.

2. Hybrid Bill for HS2 Phase 2b - Crewe to Manchester

2.1 The Bill includes powers to:

- i. build and maintain HS2 and its associated works
- ii. compulsorily acquire interests in the land required
- iii. sever the existing Ashton line of the Metrolink to enable the construction of HS2's Piccadilly station
- iv. make consequential changes to the Metrolink network, including the provision of a turnback at New Islington, new track and infrastructure for expanded and relocated facilities at Piccadilly and passive provision (an overbridge, but not a stop or new track) at the HS2 Airport station.

3. Hybrid Bill process

3.1 The principal stages of the Bill are as follows:

- i. The deposit of the Bill and formal "first reading" on 24 January triggered a period for representations on the formal Environmental Statement (ES) which sets out the environmental impacts of HS2 Phase 2b. This consultation closed on 31 March 2022. GM partners all submitted a response.
- ii. An Independent Assessor has produced a Report on the Environmental Statement Consultation. This Report was published on 6 June. Second reading in the House of Commons cannot take place any sooner than two weeks after this date. GM partners are currently awaiting the formal announcement for the date of the second reading, but the Minister recently advised the House that the Government is aiming for second reading to take place between late June and early July.
- iii. The second reading in the House of Commons will approve the principle of the Bill and the railway scheme and set out the timetable for petitions against the Bill to be heard (see below). Thereafter, the Bill proceeds to a Select Committee which would present the first opportunity for petitioners to seek amendments to the Bill. The Select Committee stage is likely to take around 18 months.
- iv. The Bill is then re-committed to a Public Bill committee of the House of Commons followed by Report stage and Third Reading; and

- v. The Bill is then sent to the House of Lords where a similar process is repeated. When both Houses have approved a hybrid Bill, it receives Royal Assent.

4. Opposing the Bill ('Petitioning')

- 4.1 'Petitioning' against a hybrid bill is the method to oppose the Bill and propose changes to it. The petitioning process will be essential for seeking to secure the required changes to the hybrid Bill and enable negotiations with DfT / HS2 Ltd to mitigate the impact of the delivery of the proposals within GM.
- 4.2 A petition is a summary of objections to specific items of a Bill, to be heard before a Select Committee of MPs. TfGM and GM Partners have instructed Parliamentary Agents and Leading Counsel to act on their behalf in advising on negotiations with the DfT, preparation of any petition and appearance at Select Committee.
- 4.3 The petitioning period follows the second reading and encompasses several activities, running in parallel. These include:
 - i. Preparation of written petitions from GMCA and TfGM that sets out their concerns with specific items within the Bill, and where possible proposes alternative solutions.
 - ii. Negotiations with HS2, DfT, and other parties as necessary to progress GMCA and TfGM's concerns.
 - iii. Attendance at Select Committee.
 - iv. Discussions associated with progressing and resolving GMCA and TfGM's opposition to the Bill.
 - v. If necessary, compromising or withdrawing petition points following amendments to the hybrid Bill and / or receipt of satisfactory undertakings from or agreements with DfT and/or HS2.

5. Core concerns with the hybrid Bill proposals

- 5.1 Notwithstanding GMCA, TfGM's and GM Partners' overall support for the principle of HS2, there remain several issues within or omitted from the hybrid Bill. As a result, GMCA and TfGM, along with the GM Partners, will need to pursue securing the necessary provisions within the Bill and such assurances, undertakings or agreements from HS2 as are considered appropriate.
- 5.2 TfGM and the GM partners continue to work with HS2 Ltd and representatives from DfT to pursue the necessary provisions and agreements. However, if agreement cannot be reached on specific matters it will be necessary to petition the Bill, and approval to TfGM and GMCA to do so has been granted by GMCA.

5.3 At this stage, it is anticipated that the key issues summarised below are likely to be included in the GMCA and TfGM petitions:

HS2 NPR Piccadilly Station

- i. The design of Manchester Piccadilly station as a surface, turn back station, as opposed to an underground, through station, which could provide greater capacity, reliability, resilience, futureproofing and passenger experience and result in a reduced land take.
- ii. TfGM and GM partners do not support the proposal to retain Gateway House. This would prevent the delivery of the proposed plaza and Boulevard, potentially complicate Metrolink delivery and significantly reduces connectivity within the overall station, with the city centre and development areas.
- iii. Integration with the Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF). The current design of both the station, and supporting infrastructure, contradict significant aspects of the SRF, taking considerable development land, creating severance and compromising the environment.
- iv. The level (number of parking spaces) of car parking proposed at Manchester Piccadilly, which is too high and not in line with the requirement for the station to be a city centre public transport hub, unnecessarily encourages car travel. The proposed location also takes up prime development land.
- v. There is a need for a multi-modal interchange which provides adequate cycling, bus and coach parking facilities.
- vi. The extent of the highways infrastructure proposed at Pin Mill Brow, is overly large, would unduly encourage car travel and increase pollution, sever areas of the city, and does not make sufficient allowance for active travel. The proposed tram train extension to Metrolink also needs to be safeguarded.
- vii. The provisions for Metrolink at Piccadilly are inadequate. TfGM welcomes the inclusion of powers to construct, maintain, replace, renew and operate the new Metrolink alignment and facilities at Piccadilly. However, these need to include the delivery of the Piccadilly Central stop as part of the main scheme.
- viii. The hybrid Bill also includes inadequate provisions to mitigate the impact of construction of the high-speed station and associated infrastructure on the existing Metrolink operations. The Bill includes provision for a turnback facility at New Islington to replace Metrolink's existing Sheffield Street turnback, which is to facilitate HS2's construction access, instead of TfGM's preferred option at Velopark. HS2 are also proposing the full closure of the Metrolink Ashton Line with a replacement bus service for the entirety of the line for a period of circa 2 years. This is not acceptable. Therefore, the hybrid Bill should be amended to make provision for the following:

- A temporary replacement turnback at Velopark, not New Islington. It should be noted that additional vehicles are also required to maintain existing operations (this applies to both turnback options).
- A depot facility at Ashton Moss to enable a tram shuttle service to operate between Ashton and New Islington instead of the full closure of the Ashton Line.
- Additional works to mitigate the impact on Metrolink services during intermediary single line running periods and during construction of the new alignment across London Road.
- The removal of Gateway House, as set out above, to reduce risk to HS2 Ltd.

HS2 NPR Airport Station

- ix. The hybrid Bill proposals conflict with the existing statutory powers for Metrolink to deliver the proposed Western leg of the Airport Metrolink line. The Bill does not include any additional powers to connect the proposed Airport HS2/NPR station to the Metrolink network, providing only powers for a bridge over the station, with no tram stop or track. This is unacceptable to GM partners, as is the resultant 'highways only' strategy.
- x. The hybrid Bill does not include powers for a turnout to the immediate west of the proposed Metrolink tram stop at the high-speed station to allow for a future tram-train route to the south-west. This tram-train proposal forms part of GM's Transport Strategy 2040 and fits with the HS2/NPR Growth Strategy wider connectivity initiative.
- xi. The high-speed station forecourt is raised by approximately 5m above the level previously proposed. This is known as the change from 'deep cutting' to 'shallow cutting'. This has resulted in the Metrolink tram stop and approach viaducts being similarly raised to a significant height above existing ground level, leading to an increase in construction cost, embodied carbon, and environmental impacts.
- xii. There is an inappropriate design for highways access to Manchester Airport station, particularly at Junction 6 of the M56, which does not take into account future demand from NPR services, planned development and Airport growth, and the unacceptable impacts on the local highways network.
- xiii. The level of construction traffic proposed by road is too high, and there need to be measures to enable materials to be supplied and removed using rail to the site at the high-speed station at Manchester Airport.
- xiv. The scale of car parking provision at the proposed high-speed station at Manchester Airport station needs to be agreed with GM partners.

Golborne Link and other issues

- xv. As above, on 6 June the Government announced its intention to remove the Golborne Link from the Bill after second reading. It is understood that this is likely to be implemented by way of a Government 'instruction' at Second Reading which would be subject to a vote of the House of Commons. The instruction would require the Select Committee to amend the hybrid bill, removing the provisions relating to the Golborne Link. The 6 June announcement explained that the Golborne Link was being removed from the Bill so that alternatives could be considered which would improve connectivity to Scotland while also delivering value for taxpayers. It is understood that alternatives may include a) a different location for the link between HS2 and WCML, for example south of Preston, and b) some upgrades to the WCML without building a separate link.
- xvi. However, at the time of writing, it is not known exactly what alternative proposals will be considered or over what period of time the assessment of alternatives will take place. Nor is it known whether any cost-saving derived from selecting a less expensive option would be re-invested back into the HS2 scheme (the Ministerial Statement simply says that the alternative option must be delivered within the £96bn cap for the Integrated Rail Plan). The 6 June announcement therefore brings with it considerable uncertainty over how capacity and connectivity on the WCML will be delivered. Until the final preferred option comes to light (which may still be the original Golborne link proposal or something similar), there will be no plan for connecting HS2 services to Scotland or for addressing the existing bottleneck on the WCML north of Crewe.
- xvii. Construction and operation of the Golborne Link has been supported by GMCA as the best option for connecting HS2 services to the West Coast Main Line while also having the potential to transform rail connectivity for Wigan and surrounding areas, supporting significant investment into the area and enabling public realm improvements.
- xviii. However, the Golborne Link would also have a significant negative impact on communities, particularly in Trafford, in terms of noise, landscape, visual and heritage and GM Partners would have been using the petitioning process to seek better mitigation for those areas.
- xix. Elsewhere on the route between Manchester Airport and Piccadilly stations, the proposed location of the ventilation shaft and headhouse on the Fallowfield Road Retail Park on Birchfields Road, and the need to provide adequate flood storage required for the proposed Palatine Road ventilation shaft.
- xx. TfGM has concerns regarding the number and extent of West Coast Mainline route suspensions to construct the proposals.
- xxi. The Code of Construction Practice will require tighter limits to manage elements such as noise, dust and vibration impacts from the scheme.

5.4 Other items may also emerge as the review work of the Bill and Environmental Statement documentation progresses.

6. Timeframes

6.1 The formal petitioning period follows the second reading of the Bill. The House of Commons Select Committee is likely to run from Autumn 2022 until possibly the end of 2023. This process is broken down into (approximate timings only):

- i. A petitioning period commences and runs for at least 25 days from the date of second reading, during which time written petitions setting out the concerns of the GM Partners, proposing alternative solutions where appropriate, will be prepared and submitted to the House of Commons.
- ii. The Select Committee will consider all petitions and will set the programme and order for hearing each petitioner. It is anticipated that GMCA and TfGM will need to appear at the Select Committee on more than one occasion, subject to how the programme is set up (sessions commencing late Summer/Autumn 2022 and running through to end 2023).
- iii. If there is agreement by the House of Commons to the provisions of the Bill it will be sent to the House of Lords to go through a similar process, at which point a further paper will be submitted to GMCA to seek applicable authority and delegation to continue to promote GMCA and TfGM's interests in the appropriate way.
- iv. The Government has indicated it is aiming to reach Royal Assent before the end of 2024; this would require the Bill to be passed over into the next Parliament following the next General Election.

7. Recommendations

7.1 The recommendations are per the front page of this report.