

1. Petitioner information

In the box below, give the name and address of each individual, business or organisation submitting the petition. Please note that addresses here will be provided to the Bill's promoter, but will be redacted in the version of the petition published on the Parliamentary Website.

Jeff Smith MP
Manchester

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 am the Member of Parliament for Manchester Withington constituency. An element of works under the HS2 Phase 2b Bill and AP2 fall within my constituency, specifically those related to the proposed ventilation shafts at The Hollies (originally proposed at Withington Golf Club in the Hybrid Bill) and at Wilmslow Road; and a section of the tunnel between the Manchester Airport and Manchester Piccadilly High Speed stations. My constituents and I will be directly and specially affected by the Bill as a result of the design, construction and operation of HS2 Phase 2b, and by the Additional Provision 2 (AP2) proposals.

2. Objections to the Second Additional Provision to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Second Additional Provision 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.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. I support the proposals to construct a new high speed railway between Crewe and Manchester. High Speed 2, if properly designed and efficiently implemented, will help to address the challenges facing the UK and provide improved rail capacity and connectivity with my constituency and Manchester as a whole, which will offer a catalyst for economic growth and regeneration. I wish to see this progress as quickly as possible with minimum detrimental impact on my constituents and Manchester residents.
- 1.2. I submitted a petition in response to the original Bill, outlining my concerns regarding the development of the station at Piccadilly. The AP2 proposals do not address those concerns and my original comments on this aspect of the Bill still stand.
- 1.3. In relation to my constituency, I welcome that HS2 proposes to move the Palatine Road vent shaft from its originally proposed site at Withington Golf Club. However, the new proposed site at The Hollies creates a number of problems outlined below, and I therefore do not support the new proposal for the vent shaft site.
- 1.4. I therefore cannot support some parts of the Bill in its current form, including those parts of the AP2 proposals outlined below, and wish the concerns outlined to be addressed.
- 1.5. I support the petitions of Manchester City Council, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) in respect of comments that relate to my constituency, and the petitions of local residents groups in Manchester Withington affected by the AP2 proposals

2. Wilmslow Road Ventilation Shaft

- 2.1. The change in the ventilation system at the Wilmslow Road vent shaft has resulted in a significant increase in the height of the headhouse from 7.3m to 12.7m. I share concerns that the height of the headhouse is likely to be overbearing in this location, given the very close proximity to residential properties, with the structure being taller than most neighbouring properties. This would have significant adverse visual impacts on local residents and users of the Christie hospital.
- 2.2. I share concerns about the tight construction area for the vent shaft structure and the proximity of the site to local residents. HS2 should provide further clarity on how the shaft and headhouse will be managed within the construction boundary, in order to minimise the impact on local people.
- 2.3. The impact on residents of the adjacent properties in terms of noise, dust and visual disamenity during the construction and operational phases will be significant

3. The Hollies Ventilation Shaft

- 3.1. I welcome the relocation of the proposed vent shaft away from Withington Golf Course, which is in the River Mersey flood basin, but the failure of HS2 to engage with stakeholders including Manchester City Council and LTE (the former owners of the Fielden Park campus) has resulted in a choice of new proposed site which causes very significant problems. I believe there needs to be a full reappraisal of the potential sites identified within the Sift 2.5 report, along with others suggested by local residents.
- 3.2. Size of vent shaft. The proposed 50m shaft is, I understand, bigger than any others constructed by HS2 so far, and the construction of a shaft of this size will cause excessive disturbance and blight for local residents. It has been suggested that the size of the shaft could be reduced if 2 tunnel boring machines (TBMs) were used. I am aware that Manchester City Council believe that there are feasible alternative technical solutions to the size, design and function of this ventilation shaft (i.e the large elliptical design), which could reduce the construction impact, potentially reduce cost, and enable the structure to be constructed on a smaller site. HS2 have stated that the vent shaft will in reality probably be smaller than the 50m stated, which may mean that other potential sites for the shaft are feasible.
- 3.3. **Impact on Islamic Schools campus:** The Manchester Islamic Education Trust will be operating new schools on the Fielden Park campus from September 2023, having invested around £15m in buying and

- refurbishing the site and buildings. 700-750 pupils will be receiving their education on the site. The proposed site – in particular the use of the proposed access road during the construction phase - will make this campus unviable. It is unacceptable that the education of the pupils at the campus will be so jeopardised by the proposal.
- 3.4. Regarding the access road to the proposed site at The Hollies; The initial sift 2.5 Report of possible sites for the vent shaft proposed an access road from Palatine Road. Subsequently the sift 3.0 report proposed the access road to be from Barlow Moor Road. There appears to be no explanation given for why the proposed route of the access road changed at this point. The proposed access route for construction and operation causes very significant problems.
- 3.5. The construction of an access road with access and egress onto Barlow Moor Road - and the consequent use of the Fielden Park campus car park - will cause additional problems for local businesses and community facilities, particularly Didsbury Mosque which uses the car park at busy times such as Friday prayers, Ramadan and Eid. I believe the use of the campus car park, play areas and potential demolition of buildings make this access route unfeasible.
- 3.6. **Impact on local residents.** The construction of the access road and vent shaft will cause adverse impacts on residents of the nearby properties at Mersey Meadows, The Hollies, Mersey Road among others. These properties will be subject to noise and construction dust, exacerbated by the south westerly prevailing westerly winds. The noise, visual, air and light pollution will impact for approximately six years. Measures proposed to mitigate this are unclear, but it is clear that full mitigation is impossible.
- 3.7. There would also be a visual impact during the operational phase of the vent shaft, due to the size and raised elevation of the headhouse structure.
- 3.8. Traffic issues. The use of an access road onto Barlow Moor Road will exacerbate the already problematic traffic congestion in this location. It will impact local residents and community facilities, and may potentially impact the viability of the Bright Horizons Day Nursery and Moor Allerton Preparatory School. I am informed that the traffic modelling for HS2 in Manchester is now out of date, having been conducted in 2017.
- 3.9. Flood risk. The proposed site is in the River Mersey flood plain. Modelling indicates the construction of the shaft here will result in increased flood risk for areas around the wider area of the site, including Riverside Court, Beeches Mews and Palatine Road. The impacts on local residents have not been fully set out.

3.10. The environmental statement notes that no replacement flood plain storage has been identified for the storage lost, and opportunities are minimal. HS2 construction assumptions are that construction sites should be raised to a level of at least a 1 in 100 year return period flood event, but the same report notes that the the return period for Storm Christoph and Storm Franklin – recent flood events which impacted the flood plain – are currently unknown. These kinds of climate events will be more likely as a result of climate change.

3.11. The vent shaft is proposed in a flood zone area 3(b) which actively floods and is water logged for large parts of the year. In the view of Manchester City Council HS2 has not met the relevant tests within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (the sequential and exception tests) in selecting this site. Consequently, the flood risk concerns raised in MCC’s Petition at paragraphs 1.17 and 4.52 still stand, and have been worsened due to the impact and lack of mitigation proposed.

3.12. Impacts on public amenity. The loss of a local wildlife area will result in detrimental impacts on local ecology and habitats, and on local residents from the removal of a well-used community green space. I am aware that Manchester City Council are responding to the consultation on the environmental statement, and I would ask that their concerns on these issues are noted and addressed. The closure of public footpaths will impact local walkers

3. 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 Second Additional Provision 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 section 3 'Objections to the Second Additional Provision to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

4.

4.1. Wilmslow Road vent shaft

4.1.1. I request HS2 to undertake to work with Manchester City Council to agree a design for the headhouse that is sympathetic to the local environment. This should minimise the visual impact, including consideration of increasing the footprint of the headhouse below, rather than above ground, as is being suggested for the Birchfield Road ventilation shaft, ideally, reducing the above ground dimensions of the headhouse back to the original hybrid Bill dimensions

4.1.2. I request HS2 to give an undertaking to work with Manchester City Council to agree and deliver appropriate mitigation for the revised headhouse structure on residents, businesses and hospital users, both during construction and operation, including a robust management plan for constructing in a constrained area, in very close proximity to residential properties.

5. The Hollies Vent Shaft

5.1. I request HS2 to relocate the proposed site for The Hollies vent shaft. HS2 should undertake a full reappraisal of potential sites, including those in the Sift 2.5 report and others suggested by residents. HS2 should agree with Manchester City Council an alternative to both the site proposed in the Bill and that proposed in AP2, in order to remove the substantial impacts from both.

5.2. I request consideration of an alternative design for the vent shaft, which could allow the use of a smaller site, reducing construction impact. Consideration should be given to using two TBMs to construct the tunnel instead of four.

5.3. I request that HS2 seek any amendments to the Bill required to accommodate the relocation of the vent shaft.

- 5.4. In the event of HS2 not agreeing to move the proposed site of the Hollies vent shaft, I request the following in order to limit the detrimental impact on residents and the local area:
- 5.5. **Access road.** An alternative access road that does not pass through the Fielden Park campus and does not require access/egress onto Barlow Moor Road.
- 5.6. HS2 to work with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency (EA) to provide robust mitigation which ensures that the scheme does not increase the risk of flooding anywhere in the locality or downstream, backed up by thorough modelling and verification (including demonstration of compliance with NPPF) shared with Manchester City Council and the EA.
- 5.7. HS2 to demonstrate that they have undertaken full flood modelling with the Environment Agency, who need to confirm that they are happy with proposals for flood mitigation before the Bill is passed.
- 5.8. A commitment to flood mitigation measures for any and all residential and commercial properties likely to be affected.
- 5.9. HS2 to agree with Manchester City Council and local residents additional robust mitigations against the adverse noise, visual, pollution and congestion impacts caused by the construction and operation of the vent shaft and headhouse.
- 5.10. HS2 to carry out detailed ecology surveys to assess the impact of loss of the local habitat area and agree with Manchester City Council appropriate mitigations, including re-provision of community green space.
- 5.11. HS2 to provide an alternative means of keeping (FFP139) footpaths along the river Mersey open for walking and cycling during construction.
- 5.12. HS2 and Manchester City Council should clarify whether the land at The Hollies has been left in trust to the young people of Manchester, and if this is confirmed the aspiration should be for part of the land to be brought back into use as recreational space.