



## 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.

Manchester City Council  
 P.O. Box 532 Town Hall  
 Manchester  
 M60 2LA  
 (care of BDB Pitmans LLP, Parliamentary Agents, One Bartholomew Close, London EC1A 7BL)

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...".

1. The Petitioner is Manchester City Council ("MCC"), a local government authority for Manchester, a city and metropolitan borough in Greater Manchester. Manchester was incorporated in 1838 as the Corporation of Manchester and achieved city status in 1853. The Council was reconstituted as a metropolitan borough in 1974.
2. MCC is a local planning authority and is, therefore, responsible for general planning and preparation of local plans. It is also the local highway authority and the education 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 wellbeing of the area. As such, the Petitioner is responsible for the protection of its property, rights, security and interests and those of the citizens, inhabitants and ratepayers of Manchester as a whole.
3. MCC also owns or has an interest in land that is subject to compulsory acquisition or use under Additional Provision 2.
4. MCC petitioned against the Bill under reference number HS2 – 121, referred to in this petition as the "Bill Petition".
5. MCC and its rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by Additional Provision 2 ("AP2"), to which MCC objects for the reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.



## 2. Objections to the Second Additional Provision

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.

## 1 **Introduction and summary**

- 1.1 MCC remains supportive, in principle, of the proposals to construct a new High-Speed railway between Crewe and Manchester ("Phase 2b") as promoted by HS2 Ltd.
- 1.2 However, MCC is unable to support the Bill in its current form, or as proposed to be amended by AP2, and objects to AP2 for the reasons, among others, set out below.
- 1.3 Unless stated otherwise, MCC stands by the issues and asks set out in the Bill Petition. AP2 has not satisfactorily addressed all of MCC's concerns and in a number of instances exacerbates them. Rather than repeat the asks in the Bill Petition where they still stand a cross reference is made to the relevant paragraphs. This petition only references those changes proposed in AP2.
- 1.4 MCC supports the petitions of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority ("GMCA"), Transport for Greater Manchester ("TfGM"), Trafford Council, the Mayfield Partnership and Manchester Airport Group ("MAG") against AP2.
- 1.5 MCC remains hopeful that a large number of its concerns will be met by agreement with the Promoter but is concerned that no binding commitments have yet been agreed with the Promoter. Despite regular requests by MCC, many of the details that are needed to inform such an agreement have not yet been supplied by the Promoter.
- 1.6 Communication and collaboration with the Promoter is seen as key to MCC particularly with regards to the proposed works and the programme for those works which remain a concern.
- 1.7 Rather than complete section 4 of the petition template, MCC has listed its requests in this section under each objection.

## 2 **Problems with the Piccadilly High-Speed Station and surrounding public realm**

- 2.1 The proposed changes in AP2 do not fully address the deficiencies identified in the petition to the Bill submitted by MCC (the Bill Petition). The Bill proposals for Piccadilly High-Speed Station continue to fail to provide an appropriate gateway to the city; fail to properly connect into the surrounding areas; fail to fully integrate with sustainable transport modes; and fail to maximise the economic benefits of High-Speed Rail.
- 2.2 Impact of retention of Gateway House (GWH) on public realm and the risk to delivery of the Manchester Tram Works

- 2.2.1 Issues caused by the retention of GWH remain as set out in paragraphs 2.24 – 2.31, 2.79 and 2.94 of the Bill Petition.
- 2.2.2 Whilst the inclusion in the supplementary Environmental Statement (ES) for AP2 includes an assessment of the demolition of GWH, which is welcome, MCC has concerns that AP2 only considers that GWH will be removed as a 'worst case scenario'. Therefore, there is no commitment to remove the building and to deliver an entrance plaza befitting as a gateway into the city and capable of accommodating a significant numbers of station users. In the event that the Promoter do deem it to be required, AP2 proposes that the building is demolished only down to the level of the ramp, which would impede the ability to deliver a high quality entrance plaza.
- 2.2.3 The risks remain to the delivery of the Manchester Tram Works with the retention of GWH, as the assessment does not go far enough to assess the building foundations as well as the above ground structure.
- 2.2.4 In addition, during construction of the High-Speed station, the ability to access the train catering facility will still be required. This will be contained within a facility on the existing Network Rail deck with access to it assumed to be via the ramp at the rear of GWH. This ramp is also the service area for GWH and a busy pedestrian walking route to/ from the Network Rail (NR) station. Maintaining this route during construction may frustrate the ability to demolish GWH.
- 2.2.5 The risk to the Manchester Tram Works relates to the Victorian brick foundation structure of GWH, which would not be removed. AP2, therefore, still fails to address our overarching concern that GWH needs to be removed to avoid conflict between the proposed Metrolink Tram Works and GWH foundations and sub-structure. A failure to remove GWH foundations also frustrates the ability to deliver supporting features including an appropriate gateway entrance Plaza and reduces the ability to optimise the overall station design for example by relocating the Network Rail loading bay.
- 2.2.6 Further, MCC understands that the Promoter proposes allowing access to the rear of GWH for Network Rail Deliveries and construction activities which further complicates the removal of GWH, and conflicts with access for pedestrians to Piccadilly station, and results in significant construction traffic along Ducie Street. Ducie Street has been closed to general traffic since 2021 from London Road with an active travel modal filter being installed by MCC between 2020-2022 to allow pedestrians to safely cross the street and access Piccadilly station, as this is the main thoroughfare to the station. AP2 appears to assume that this road is still open to vehicle use which is incorrect and vehicle use should not be permitted down it.

2.2.7 MCC also understands that the Promoter proposes moving Network Rail's loading bay during construction with the temporary location unclear but assumed to be via Store Street. This may further complicate the removal of GWH, adversely impact the construction of Metrolink realignment, and the additional traffic in this area may impact Metrolink operation.

**Request:**

2.2.8 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to demolish GWH in its entirety, including the foundations and substructure, and to provide a supplementary ES which includes an assessment of the effects of its full removal, including the foundations and sub-structure.

2.2.9 MCC repeats its requests at paragraph 2.32 (a) – (b) of the Bill Petition.

2.2.10 MCC requests that Ducie Street remains closed to road traffic to and from London Road throughout construction and operation of HS2, in order to ensure that the active travel routes can be maintained.

2.2.11 MCC requests that an undertaking is given to maintain both service and pedestrian access to the station and facilities during HS2 construction in a manner that does not frustrate the removal of GWH.

## 2.3 **Impacts on the proposed Boulevard**

2.3.1 The Boulevard proposal in the Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) is in the same location as New Sheffield Street proposed in the Bill (Work No. 2/36). The proposals in AP2 for New Sheffield Street are broadly welcome and go some way to address the concerns set out in the Bill Petition, which mainly arise from the reduced width of the Boulevard as assumed in the 2018 SRF, as a result of the increased footprint (from 4 to 6 platforms) of the combined HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) station. However, the proposals in AP2 do not go far enough.

2.3.2 Of specific concern is that within the AP2 design, taxis continue to be routed and placed along the Boulevard and the number of taxis proposed in this location has actually increased. The inclusion of taxis conflicts with the Council's central aspiration for the Boulevard, as a high quality, largely traffic free, public realm connector, which prioritises pedestrians and cyclists, and also drives commercial value in Piccadilly Central. The proposed narrowing of the Boulevard since the 2018 SRF, to accommodate the station layout in the Bill, now means that the Boulevard vision cannot be delivered with the presence of taxis.

- 2.3.3 MCC has serious concerns that the active travel proposals shown along the Boulevard are not fit for purpose, do not support the proposals within the Piccadilly SRF, and do not recognise the purpose of the Boulevard as a connector in providing access to the wider city centre and east part of the city, not just the High-Speed station. In particular, MCC believe that the current footpaths designs are too narrow, and the two-way cycle lane ends abruptly at both ends, which places a safety risk on cyclists. Therefore, the approach to active travel is still not aligned with the routing strategy developed by MCC and TfGM and shared with the Promoter on 16 May 2023.
- 2.3.4 MCC also has concerns over the loss of connection from St Andrews Square to the Boulevard which it considers will force access to the eastern loading bay along Helmet Street, routing un-necessary traffic through the SRF area.
- 2.3.5 MCC has concerns over emergency vehicle access requirements to and from the High-Speed station and Piccadilly Metrolink stop now that Chapeltown Street and St Andrews Street are proposed to be stopped up under AP2. Specifically, the current access arrangements under AP2 could create challenging traffic volumes around the station. negatively impacting emergency service response times.
- 2.3.6 MCC has concerns that the AP2 design proposals have not considered cyclists and persons of reduced mobility, specifically where roads have been stopped up and that the level differences have not been thought through.
- 2.3.7 MCC has concerns over the one-way proposal for Store Street and Adair Street as set out in AP2 and how this will impact on deliveries for businesses on Store Street as they will be forced to use the Boulevard. This would further detract from the environment and purpose of the Boulevard.
- Request:**
- 2.3.8 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders such as GMCA and TfGM to develop and agree the design of the Boulevard, and for an alternative arrangement for taxi movement to be relocated away from the Boulevard (and Fairfield Street at the existing entrance to the Network Rail Station), in line with the request at 2.23(e) of the Bill Petition.
- 2.3.9 MCC further requests that the Promoter be required to work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders such as GMCA and TfGM to agree traffic routing and access arrangements on streets surrounding the Boulevard to prevent unnecessary traffic being routed through the SRF area and onto the Boulevard itself.

2.3.10 Further, MCC requests that emergency service vehicle routing should be identified and agreed with the relevant services.

2.3.11 MCC request that the Promoter work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders to agree active travel and accessibility needs, between the station and the SRF including for the newly stopped up roads in AP2.

#### 2.4 **Parking, Multi-Modal Hub (MMH), Taxis, Buses and Coaches**

2.4.1 The AP2 design still prioritises private car use over public transport and active travel. This is particularly inappropriate given the city centre location of Piccadilly. Despite the GM Partners sharing a solution with the Promoter on 24 May 2023 that prioritises public transport, minimises car parking, improves the function of the Multi-Modal Hub, and adequately addresses the need for accessible parking; this has not been taken into consideration in AP2.

2.4.2 Whilst the relocation of one of the car parks (Car Park 2) away from the Boulevard, is welcomed, it is now proposed to be placed into the Multi-Modal Hub. This removes the space set aside for bus and coach facilities in their entirety from within the Multi-Modal Hub. This is not acceptable to MCC; the Multi-Modal Hub should prioritise public transport, not private car parking.

2.4.3 The AP2 proposals also still retains a multi storey car park on the Boulevard (Car Park 1) which directly impacts and inhibits the delivery of the Portugal Street East SRF, including a planned new city centre park.

2.4.4 Should the car park not be relocated, access to this car park needs to be clarified, and should not be permitted via the Boulevard which is envisaged as an active travel priority space by the Council.

2.4.5 MCC are also concerned, based on the dimensions given, that Car Park 2 has not been designed to Network Rail's latest car park guidance given its size and number of spaces. Car Park 1 also sits on a smaller footprint in AP2 and has a similar number of spaces than in the Bill so may also not be designed to Network Rail's most up to date car park guidance. Consequently, when the Promoter comes to construct the Car Parks, there is a risk that they will be larger than currently proposed.

2.4.6 Under AP2, accessible parking spaces currently situated to the North of the Network Rail Piccadilly Station are proposed to be permanently located into the Fairfield Street Short Stay car park, displacing all non-blue badge parking. HS2 Ltd has also verbally confirmed that 5% of the spaces in Car Park 1, situated on The Boulevard, and 5% of the

spaces Car Park 2, situated in the area in the Bill had originally reserved for Bus/Coach station, will be blue badge spaces. The location at Fairfield Street is not acceptable, as it conflicts with the aspirations of MCC, and stakeholders such as TfGM and GMCA for a southern entrance and arrival plaza into the existing Network Rail station. It also frustrates a new route proposed through the undercroft to the High-Speed station, to offer improved access and environment to passengers arriving from the south, and to other city development areas, such as Mayfield and ID Manchester.

- 2.4.7 Further, it is not clear whether there is sufficient land identified to provide the number of accessible parking spaces the Promoter is proposing, and this raise concerns that an already insufficient number of spaces will be reduced further to ensure compliance with current space standards. Car Park 1 is also not suitable for 5% blue badge parking for reasons described in the Strategic Environmental Statement (SES) 2 and AP2 ES. The suitability of Car Park 2 for blue badge spaces has not been stated in AP2 and allocating, only 5% of blue badge spaces as share of the car parking provision does not align with Department for Transport (DfT) guidance. BS8300 4.2.1.4.
- 2.4.8 These changes would worsen the impact of the original Bill as the relocation of Car Park 2 now prevents the delivery of a bus and coach station in the Multi-Modal Hub and the use of Fairfield Street for taxi pick up would detract from active travel and sustainable travel modes in the area.
- 2.4.9 Additional taxi ranks have also been added to the Boulevard which does not align with the GM Partners aspirations for the area as it has unacceptable impacts on the Council's aspirations for the Boulevard, as set out above.

**Request:**

- 2.4.10 Requests set out in the Bill Petition at paragraphs 2.39-2.40 and 2.45.
- 2.4.11 MCC also request that the overall car parking provision is reduced to that needed for operational needs and that the car park is moved further away from the station, to the opposite side of Helmet Street, as this land isn't as suitable for a bus/coach station. Having car parking closer to the station than buses goes against the active travel hierarchy.

**2.5 Cycle stores**

- 2.5.1 AP2 proposals refer to two new cycle stores (in addition to the two proposed in the Bill) but still delivering the same number (523) of cycle racks. Whilst MCC welcomes the provision of cycle stores to encourage active travel the number of racks proposed remains the same as in the



original Bill and is not sufficient. Further, MCC considers that the proposed locations around the station are not in the right places and none of the cycle parking facilities align with MCC's aspirations.

2.5.2 Specific concerns include:

- (a) The cycle parking proposed on the Piccadilly approach ramp, with the retention of GWH, would impact on pedestrian movements and create conflict between these modes.
- (b) The cycle parking proposed within the station, opposite Store Street, may have an impact on the proposed Metrolink substation and the proposed Metrolink axial fan plant room. Further design integration is required to ensure the proposals are compatible.
- (c) The cycle parking proposed at the Multi-Modal Hub needs to be considered and integrated with MCC's and GM's preferred solution of bus/coach station facilities (waiting area, ticket office etc) as they are also needed in this area.
- (d) The cycle parking proposed in the eastern thoroughfare is inadequate and may impact pedestrian movements through this area.

**Request:**

2.5.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders such as GMCA and TfGM to agree appropriate locations for cycle parking at Piccadilly.

2.5.4 Requests set out in the Bill Petition at paragraph 2.23(f) are repeated.

2.6 **North block relocation impact on eastern entrance**

2.6.1 AP2 amends the design of the North Block and catering facility. The new design reconfigures the proposed building structure so that it sits at surface level and incorporates the catering facility. Whilst the AP2 design would enable the removal of the Relay Room, which was a concern raised in the Bill Petition, its design under AP2 has further impacts on the future development of an eastern entrance. The design of the structure at ground level effectively severs access to the joint Network Rail and HS2 concourse from the east. As previously petitioned, safeguarding the ability to provide an improved eastern entrance is critical to future connectivity from the east of the station, the SRF areas and the Multi-Modal Hub.

2.6.2 In addition, having had sight of proposed designs from HS2, MCC have concerns about the vehicle access arrangements to the loading bay for the catering facility. The first is that there may be safety implications

related to vehicles having to make reversing manoeuvres from the loading bay in close proximity to the Mayfield thoroughfare. The second is that the access arrangements to the loading bay may frustrate the development / reduce the capacity of a future bus/coach station apron in the MMH.

**Request:**

2.6.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to:

- (a) give an undertaking to work with Network Rail, MCC and TfGM to agree a design for a relocated North block building that safeguards the possible future construction of an attractive, efficient and legible eastern entrance into the existing Piccadilly station and includes the provision of access to the Network Rail link bridge at the eastern end of the station as part of Phase 2b;
- (b) promote any necessary amendments to the Bill and supporting documents to give effect to the agreed design; and
- (c) implement the agreed design as part of Phase 2b.

2.6.4 MCC also requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that the design for vehicular access to and from the Catering Facility from Travis Street for vehicles does not impact pedestrian safety or delivery driver safety and does not frustrate the ability to have a bus/coach station in the location currently proposed for Taxis and Public (car) drop off.

**2.7 Network Rail Ramp**

2.7.1 Under AP2 the access proposals to the Network Rail ramp have been revised to remove vehicles from travelling through key development plots within the Mayfield area. The design proposals have also been amended to include parking at the top of the ramp. Whilst we welcome the fact that access will no longer be routed through the central part of Mayfield, there remain a number of areas of concern:

- (a) Work Nos. 2/34A and 2/34B are described as an access road which will use Chapelfield Road, Temperance Street (part of) and Hoyle Street and the Bill proposes to stop up these roads, thereby removing public access. This will frustrate the delivery of the access strategy for Mayfield as set out in the Mayfield SRF. This is completely unacceptable.
- (b) Egress from the ramp under AP2 continues to rely on using the edge of Mayfield along Temperance Street, which will be lined with residential properties (not warehouses as currently) and Hoyle Street. This negatively impacts on the overall

environment of the development, will impact the tranquillity of the neighbourhood with vehicle movements 24 hours a day, and conflicts with the proposals in the Mayfield SRF for a low traffic area.

- (c) The base of the ramp is too close to the junction of Fairfield Street / Mancunian Way to facilitate an all-movements junction from Fairfield Street to the ramp. This means that to access the ramp vehicles must approach from the west along Fairfield Street to turn right into a realigned Chapelfield Road. There are concerns this will result in inappropriate traffic routing through the Piccadilly SRF and the dedicated right turn lane will be confusing for general road users. However, the addition of parking at the top of the ramp prevents the ramp from being moved further west to avoid these impacts on the junction.
- (d) There are concerns that the addition of parking bays on Hoyle Street could make vehicle manoeuvrability difficult and unsafe which in combination with the stopping up of Hoyle Street frustrate the provision of high-quality facilities for active travel.

**Request:**

- 2.7.2 MCC repeats its requests at paragraph 2.63-2.64 of the Bill Petition.

### 3 **Metrolink at Piccadilly**

3.1 MCC is concerned that the AP2 construction programme suggests that the replacement for Sheffield Street turnback is delayed by a year. This is a concern as the main HS2 Piccadilly compound is proposed to be in use and major construction works underway before the turnback is replaced. MCC & TfGM are concerned there will be unacceptable and unmitigated impacts on the operation of the Metrolink network.

3.2 Whilst MCC and TfGM welcomes the correction in relation to the width of the box structure for the Metrolink sub-surface tram stop they remain concerned that the width (52m) is incorrect and is insufficient to accommodate the four escalators needed to cope with predicted passenger demand.

**Request:**

3.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to:

- 3.3.1 work with MCC to agree to a construction programme that gives rise to no additional impacts on Metrolink operations; and

- 3.3.2 give an undertaking to work with MCC and TfGM to establish a correct minimum width and to update the Bill documents to the agreed minimum width and to then construct in accordance with that agreed minimum width.

#### 4 **Metrolink fire escape**

- 4.1 AP2 indicates a new attenuation tank, expanded public realm and highway changes adjacent to a proposed Metrolink fire escape on the corner of a development plot (which is currently a surface car park) along the Boulevard, alongside the existing Metrolink lines leading towards New Islington. MCC are concerned that the design and location of the fire escape, proposed highway changes and attenuation tank could now add unnecessary constraints to a highly desirable future development plot along the Boulevard. Further, MCC has concerns about the impact on the planned public realm area which directly links from the Boulevard to the Portugal Street East development. Further, MCC believe that reasonable modifications could be made to these proposals to ensure these undesirable impacts are avoided, or at least, minimised by the Promoter.

##### **Request:**

- 4.2 MCC requests that the Promoter works with MCC and TfGM to agree the final location, design and access arrangement for the Metrolink fire escape and associated highway changes including any SuDs proposals, so that these proposals collectively do not negatively impact on the planned public realm and Portugal Street East development, or the ability of the adjacent development site to come forward without undue constraints.

#### 5 **Utilities: Travis Street sewer diversion and Store Street sub stations**

- 5.1 AP2 moves the access to enable the required sewer diversion from within a development site (which is part of the East Village Central SRF Area) into the junction on Great Ancoats Street. Whilst this move is positive in that it enables the redevelopment plans on a key regeneration site, MCC are concerned to ensure that traffic disruption is carefully managed.
- 5.2 AP2 proposes locating a number of sub stations on land off Store Street outside of the footprint of the High-Speed Station. MCC are concerned that the location of the proposed sub stations would adversely impact the development potential of the nearby land in this area, along the Boulevard. In addition, the proposed realignment of Store Street included in AP2 impacts on the Metrolink proposals.
- 5.3 MCC has a growing concern, exacerbated by the utilities information in AP2, that there are substantial, and increasing, diversions of utilities and watercourse assets in the Piccadilly area resulting from the Scheme. MCC are concerned that

the currently proposed diversion routes may not all be physically possible, due to the size of the affected highways, and the fact that further surveys still need to be undertaken by the Promoter, meaning that the full extent and scale of underground asset diversions is not yet known. This may lead to the Promoter proposing and implementing diversion routes that are difficult and expensive for the current or future asset owners to maintain and keep operational, due to their constrained nature (i.e. too many diversions being proposed down narrow or heavily constrained routes through the city).

**Request:**

- 5.4 MCC requests that the Promoter works with the Local Highways Authority to agree a robust traffic management plan that minimises disruption to Great Ancoats Street, and the surrounding local highway network, during the Travis Street sewer diversion works. MCC would also request an undertaking for a design of the sewer relocation to be agreed with MCC, GM Partners and other utility companies to ensure the future maintenance practicalities.
- 5.5 MCC repeats its requests at 2.96 and 2.97 of the MCC Petition.
- 5.6 MCC requests that the Promoter works with MCC to identify and agree alternative locations be found for the sub stations.
- 5.7 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work with MCC and TfGM to agree a mitigation strategy for any impacts on Metrolink delivery and operations from the realignment of Store Street.
- 5.8 MCC requests the Promoter be required to fully survey existing underground assets at and around the new High-Speed Station at Piccadilly and develop a full diversion implementation and maintenance plan, in consultation and agreement with statutory utilities and the local highway authority.

**6 Pin Mill Brow junction**

- 6.1 The AP2 proposals offer various changes to the design of the gyratory junction at Pin Mill Brow that are not supported by MCC. The AP2 proposals continue to offer a deficient design for Pin Mill Brow causing adverse impacts on the community in this area and beyond. Specifically, the revised design takes additional land, which sits within the centre of the gyratory. This sterilises more land that cannot be developed having significant adverse effects on the future regeneration proposals of this area.
- 6.2 The junction design does not fit with the proposals within the City Centre Transport Strategy and GM2040 to improve permeability for pedestrians and cyclists and enable further growth of active travel. The highway design appears incomplete and provides unclear and complicated routes across the road. Whilst it is accepted that the precise detail will follow later, MCC does not consider

there to be sufficient land within the Bill limits in this location to deliver sufficient and safe active travel provisions around Pin Mill Brow.

- 6.3 TfGM and MCC are developing an alternative proposal for Pin Mill Brow, which it is hoped could be used as part of a collaborative approach to agreeing a revised solution, which provides better permeability for users of the area, and better aligns with local and national policy objectives.

**Request:**

- 6.4 MCC repeats its requests in paragraph 2.54 of the Bill Petition.

**7 Tram-Train Safeguarding**

- 7.1 An alignment for the proposed tram-train services to Glossop and Marple (as referenced in the Integrated Rail Plan) to the east of Manchester Piccadilly has been shared with the Promoter, yet they continue to not be taken into consideration. The proposed realignment at Pin Mill Brow of A635 Mancunian Way northbound to the west and the movement of Helmet Street to the east now prevents the tram-train route climbing high enough to clear the Pin Mill Brow Gyratory once it has passed Helmet St at ground level. The changes in AP2 would completely prevent the ability of TfGM to deliver tram train in this location.

- 7.2 Further, concerns have been raised with the Promoter over the location of the proposed Midland Street Autotransformer Station (ATS) and whilst this has been moved under AP2 to a location supported by MCC, a new smaller substation has been located on the original site of the ATS. AP2 also includes proposals for the permanent re-alignment of Rondin Road. Whilst there may be some access benefits from this, it further impacts on the proposal for delivery of tram-train by infringing on the route identified for tram-train in this location, as set out in the Bill Petition and raised in discussions with the Promoter. The location of the substation also takes potential development land in the area. Whilst the moving of the ATS is positive, the inclusion of the substation and the Rondin road realignment (see below) mean that the Bill continues to frustrate the ability to deliver the tram-train extension and the 2040 Transport Strategy, likely adding delay, complexity and costs, as well as impacting on future regeneration. The retention of Midland Street as an access road for the substation also creates another unacceptable highway interface for the tram train alignment.

**Request:**

- 7.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to relocate the new proposed substation from its current location to avoid an impact on the route identified for tram-train route and future re-development.
- 7.4 MCC repeats its requests in paragraph 2.91 and 2.92 of the Bill Petition.

## 8 **Rondin Road realignment**

8.1 Notwithstanding the impact on the deliverability of tram-train, whilst the permanent realignment of Rondin Road in AP2 may provide a more coherent access arrangement, the design of the four-arm signalised junction proposed in AP2 raises concerns over the vehicle flow capacity, and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The crossing points appear to be inadequate and fail to meet latest guidance. MCC are also concerned that local access for businesses could be unduly impacted unless construction is programmed efficiently.

### **Request:**

8.2 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders such as TfGM to design a suitable junction layout at Rondin Road which prioritises pedestrians and active travel. MCC also requests that the Promoter commits to delivering a delivery programme which seeks to minimise local access restrictions.

## 9 **Impacts at Ardwick from Spoil Storage**

9.1 Additional land is proposed to be taken under AP2 to accommodate land for spoil storage at Ardwick. The Promoter is also now proposing to remove spoil at night, 7 days per week. AP2 also indicates that additional volumes of excavated material will be removed by road. MCC is concerned that the use of this additional land, the impacts resulting from the removal of spoil at night, and the associated lorry movements will have a substantial adverse impact on the local area, specifically noise, visual impact, light pollution, air pollution, and disruption for local residents, and congestion on the local roads. It is essential that more appropriate methods of moving spoil and construction materials such as a railhead or conveyor are adopted (as they have been by the Promoter on earlier phases of HS2). MCC does not support the removal of spoil by HGV and as much material as possible should be removed by rail.

### **Request:**

9.2 MCC requests that the Promoter should be required to give an undertaking to:

- (a) Prioritise the removal of spoil by train where it cannot be reused locally for either HS2 works or to support local development and investigate the use of alternative methods for the movement of spoil and construction materials to reduce the impact on the local highway network;
- (b) Find solutions to move construction materials by train during daytime hours as far as possible. If it is essential to remove rail during the night, then timings and additional mitigation should

be agreed with MCC, to avoid unnecessary disturbance to residents;

- (c) Further to (a) & (b) above, which seek to minimise impacts to residents, work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders such as GMCA and TfGM to identify, agree and deliver sufficient mitigation for local residents to address the increased visual, noise, air, vibration and light pollution from the proposed works.
- (d) Utilise internal haul routes between the compounds permeating the viaduct, which potentially severs the area, for inter-spoil compound vehicle movements, and minimise the impact on local roads and local residents.
- (e) Minimise land take for additional spoil storage identified in AP2
- (f) Commit to returning land for development to MCC as soon as it is no longer required for construction and agreeing its future use with MCC.

## 10 **Greening at Ardwick**

10.1 A "greening" area is indicated in AP2 near the existing Ardwick station, to replace grassland lost elsewhere. MCC view this to be in the wrong location. Whilst a small part of the land could be inappropriate for redevelopment, the larger parcel of land could potentially be used for redevelopment, as part of the wider regeneration of East Manchester, leading out from Piccadilly station. MCC also feel that this area would not be appropriate for use as stand-alone public realm, as people would not have a reason to go to the area without wider development taking place. This runs the risk of producing an un-maintained area, providing a poor environment, and potentially attracting anti-social behaviour.

### **Request:**

10.2 MCC request that the Promoter gives an undertaking to work with MCC to either identify and agree an alternative location for the greening area, or to agree a contribution to enable greening to be carried out by another undertaker as part of redevelopment elsewhere, and to return the area identified in AP2 to MCC for redevelopment.

## 11 **NPR viaduct**

11.1 AP2 includes the addition of a single-track viaduct as part of the NPR Manchester to Leeds Junction. Notwithstanding the position in the Bill petition that Manchester Piccadilly Station should be an underground station (that would remove the need for the viaduct), we believe that this viaduct should be



constructed at the same time as the main HS2 works, in order to avoid sterilising the land for a lengthy period, extending construction impacts and causing long term blight.

**Request:**

- 11.2 MCC request that the Promoter gives an undertaking that the NPR viaduct identified in AP2 will be constructed at the same time as the main HS2 works and to work with MCC to identify and provide appropriate mitigation both during and following construction, including adequate screening.

**12 Fairfield St Lay-by**

- 12.1 MCC is concerned that the introduction in AP2 of a new bus lay-by on Fairfield Street and a new bus stop adjacent to the Multi-Modal Hub will cause further traffic congestion and impact on the quality of the local environment around the Mayfield development, and the route from the station to Mayfield. In particular, the impacts of queuing buses and lack of clarity over bus routing proposals in the location is a concern. MCC's position with regards to any permanent or temporary changes to bus stops required as a result of the Bill remain as set out in paragraph 4.21 of the Bill Petition. Furthermore, the land proposed for the layby is owned by the Mayfield Partnership (in which both MCC and TFGM are partners) and will be an important part of the activation of the Mayfield development onto Fairfield Street, as set out in the Mayfield SRF.

- 12.2 MCC also believes that highways should be prioritised for sustainable travel uses rather than for ancillary purposes, such as loading and lay-by areas.

- 12.3 MCC is also concerned that two additional bus stops, one in each direction, does not make up for the loss of the passive provision in the Bill in the Multi-Modal Hub (due to the new location for Car Park 2).

- 12.4 MCC is concerned that, although AP2 proposals contain text relating to provision for rail replacement buses, which is welcomed, the exact location is unknown and is not identified on maps.

**Request:**

- 12.5 MCC further requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders including GMCA and TfGM to agree an alternative solution for the proposed bus lay by, if one is required, which avoids taking land owned by the Mayfield Partnership, or otherwise impacting on the Mayfield development.
- 12.6 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work with MCC and other relevant stakeholders including GMCA and TfGM to ensure that any alterations to the highway in the Piccadilly area prioritise sustainable travel (i.e. public transport and active travel) rather than ancillary uses such as laybys.

- 12.7 MCC request that the Promoter work with MCC and other Stakeholders to agree a suitable location for Rail Replacement buses to pick up, drop off and queue.
- 12.8 MCC repeats its requests at paragraphs 4.22 of the Bill Petition in light of the proposed changes in AP2.

### 13 **Temperance Street Land Take**

- 13.1 The Promoter's AP2 proposals to acquire land at Temperance Street, either side of the Mancunian Way, are inconsistent with the delivery of a primary substation located on the land at Temperance Street within Plot AP2-1399. Though the Promoter's reasoning for acquiring this land are unclear, the proposals impinge the Mayfield Partnership's ability to meet the requirement to deliver a critical piece of energy infrastructure. The substation referred to is intended not solely to serve the Mayfield site, but also a significant proportion of Manchester city centre at a sustainable and accessible location.
- 13.2 MCC and the Mayfield Partnership have engaged with Electricity North West and negotiations have commenced to deliver the critical infrastructure at this location to ensure the supply meets the envisaged energy requirements of the Mayfield site and beyond which will result in significant cost and delivery implications if the infrastructure cannot be delivered.
- 13.3 In addition, major utility works are envisaged to be undertaken at Temperance Street which will serve Mayfield's site – both residential and commercial development within the site. Interference with such envisaged works at Temperance Street will fundamentally impinge the delivery of the Mayfield project and will detrimentally impact the timings for such delivery.

#### **Request:**

- 13.4 MCC requests that the Promoter urgently provide further clarity around the need to acquire land at Temperance Street, and work with MCC and the Mayfield Partnership to provide an alternative solution to acquiring this site, which is currently earmarked for essential infrastructure to serve the Mayfield site and Manchester city centre.

### 14 **River Medlock Impacts**

- 14.1 The AP2 proposals make provision for changes to drainage design to two underground attenuation tanks instead of one due to the provision for the Multi-Modal Hub.
- 14.2 The first tank will be located at Travis Street, and will discharge the combined sewer beneath Fairfield Street, and the second tank will be located 8m south of the relocated Car Park 1. It will attenuate flows from Manchester Piccadilly High-

Speed station and discharge to an existing combined sewer beneath Fairfield Street.

- 14.3 Given the proximity to the Mayfield site, and in particular the proximity to the Government-funded Mayfield Park, and the River Medlock, attenuation and drainage amendments as a result of the design changes referred to are of concern to MCC and the Mayfield Partnership, in respect of both drainage and environmental damage issues. Any such design changes should also prevent, or if that is not possible clearly minimise or mitigate, any potential adverse environmental impacts, to both the Park and more widely.

**Request:**

- 14.4 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to agree with MCC sufficient environmental mitigation in respect of the AP2 design amendments to prevent adverse environmental impacts at the River Medlock and the Park.

**15 Relocation and re-configuration of Junction 6 of the M56**

- 15.1 Whilst MCC recognises that the AP2 M56 Junction 6 design includes NPR traffic demand, and also results in the need to only realign the motorway once rather than twice as with the Bill design, we have a number of concerns with the proposed relocation and reconfiguration of Junction 6 of the M56 in AP2. Of particular concern is the effect that this will have on inhabitants of Ringway Parish, specifically in relation to the extent of land take and the visual and noise impacts. MCC are further concerned about the limited mitigation proposed on the side of what is an extremely large highways junction, which will effectively make Ringway unviable as a residential area. MCC believe the design of the junction and associated infrastructure, such as the portal building, have not been designed to minimise their visual and noise impacts in the locality.
- 15.2 The AP2 junction layout also requires land which is owned by "Manchester Airports Group" (MAG), and potentially encroaches into an area that is part of the Terminal 2 aircraft apron. This is part of the Airport's secure area and is subject to national aviation security requirements and controls. This would be unacceptable from an airport operational and DfT Aviation Security perspective, and MCC supports MAG's petition on this matter.
- 15.3 The revised design will also lead to additional spoil and materials needing to be moved on the local and strategic road network which will increase congestion and the adverse effects predicted (see also section 17 below).
- 15.4 MCC remains concerned that the Promoter has failed to take into account the demand related to the developments included within the 'Places for Everyone' (Pfe) and concerns set out in para 3.25 of the Bill Petition remain despite the revised design

15.5 It is unclear from the SES2 and AP2 ES which version of the NPR scheme has been used in the transport modelling and design of M56 J6 and access to the Airport High-Speed station. MCC is concerned that this might not reflect what is eventually delivered, rendering the HS2 proposal access proposal to the Airport station inappropriate.

**Request:**

15.6 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to provide appropriate mitigation to local residents who are impacted. Given the severe impact of the changes, this should be over and above the standard schemes proposed by the Bill.

15.7 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with the relevant highway authorities, TfGM and GM Partners to deliver a High-Speed station access design that accounts for demand from PFE allocation sites and to make the necessary amendments to the Bill to deliver this.

15.8 MCC & GM partners also request that HS2 review and amend its HS2 Phase 2b design proposals in the Manchester Airport High-Speed station area if a different NPR proposal from what is assumed in its HS2 Phase 2b transport assessment model is progressed and bring forward any necessary changes to the airport access proposals as part of any future NPR Bill.

15.9 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with MAG to avoid any land take within the Airport's secure boundary and impacting the safe and efficient operation of the Airport.

15.10 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with MCC regarding the design of the junction and associated infrastructure to ensure any adverse noise and visual impacts are appropriately mitigated against and be required to prepare an education and skills plan to provide employment and relevant training opportunities for local employees and affected businesses.

15.11 MCC repeats its requests at paragraphs 3.30 and 3.43 (a) & (b) of the Bill Petition.

**16 Thorley Lane / Runger Lane Junction**

16.1 Whilst the Promoter has updated its assessment since the submission of the Bill to address that Runger Lane will not be a dual carriageway before the Project commences construction, MCC remains concerned that under AP2 the Promoter's proposals continue to assume that Runger Lane will be upgraded by MAG, from a single to a dual carriageway in 2038 in the operational phase of HS2. MAG's obligations to dual Thorley Lane / Runger Lane are solely to provide capacity for the operation of the Airport and are not currently committed

developments. Only once passenger numbers reach a certain level will this dualling be carried out. It cannot, therefore, be assumed that Runger Lane will be a dual carriageway by 2038, or that it will be available for HS2 construction traffic. This presents a risk in terms of inadequate junction design and inappropriate mitigation.

- 16.2 In addition, MCC is concerned that changes to the Thorley Lane/Runger Lane junction provide junction capacity, but not link capacity either on Runger Lane (towards Junction 6), on Thorley Lane (over the M56 towards the HS2 station), or on Thorley Lane towards Enterprise Way.

**Request:**

- 16.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work with MCC and other partners including TfGM, GMCA and MAG and the relevant authorities to identify and deliver appropriate mitigation for any significant adverse traffic, or other effect caused by the HS2 proposal in the instance that Runger Lane is not a dual carriageway by 2038, as assumed.
- 16.4 MCC requests that the Promoter agrees this mitigation with the stakeholders mentioned above and promote any amendments to the Bill and supporting documents that may be necessary to deliver this mitigation in the event it is required.
- 16.5 MCC repeats its request in 3.45 of the Bill Petition.

**17 Significant Adverse Road Congestion During Construction – Airport Area**

- 17.1 The AP2 design will lead to additional spoil and materials movement on the local road network that access the strategic road network at junction 6 of the M56. This will lead to an increase in congestion at nearby road junctions and the adverse traffic related severance effects along road links.
- 17.1 Paragraph 7.3.24 of the SES AP2 ES MA06 Community Area Report describes the assessment of impacts on traffic during the construction phase, but the SES2 AP2 ES does not present details of the impacts, nor does it present information on mitigation measures to be implemented on these routes aside from high level measures noted in the CoCP.
- 17.2 As noted in the Bill Petition, the addition of significant numbers of HGV and other construction vehicles on the wider local road network in the Airport area during the planned construction period of circa 10 years will worsen congestion in this area, reduce the attractiveness of Manchester Airport and surrounding area with negative impacts on the local economy, amenity and environment. It will also adversely impact on freight journeys using the roads around Manchester Airport. It is therefore now more essential that more appropriate

methods of moving spoil and construction materials in the Manchester Airport area are adopted.

- 17.3 The highways modelling used in SES2 / AP2 ES assumes the Rainbow Works would not have been delivered before construction of Phase 2b highway works commences and that the road between Manchester Airport's Terminal 2 and M56 J6 would be used as a construction route. The road between Manchester Airport's Terminal 2 and M56 J6 is not appropriate for construction traffic in its current state even with proposed AP2 modifications at the Runger Lane/Avro Way and Runger Lane/Thorley Lane junctions. This evidenced by HS2's SES and AP2 ES transport assessment which still predicts significant adverse traffic effects along the road between Manchester Airport's Terminal 2 and M56 J6 during construction. These include traffic congestion and delays to vehicle occupants, traffic severance on non-motorised users and public transport delay.
- 17.4 With the Manchester tunnel south portal, Airport high speed station site and M56 J6 being a continuous construction area, the use of a haul route through the Airport station site connecting the tunnel site and M56 J6 would help reduce construction traffic movements on the local highway network and serve to avoid the majority of the predicted significant adverse construction environmental effects.
- 17.5 With the increased construction vehicle movements associated with spoil and material movement the case for a conveyor and railhead system connecting to the mid-Cheshire line / Ashley railhead should be explored further.
- 17.6 **Request:**
- 17.7 MCC repeats its request in paragraphs 3.43 of its petition against the main HS2 Phase 2b Bill.

## 18 **Footpaths and Active Travel**

- 18.1 New design of M56, J6 leads to major adverse effects during construction on a number of footpaths with no viable alternatives offered for users. Examples of the affected footpaths are Ringway 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 as well as the Sunbank Lane and Hasty Lane underpass. This needs to be addressed. Whilst further active travel provisions are being proposed as part of the highways access to the station, MCC feel that the provisions are still not sufficient for the numbers of people anticipated to access the station by foot or cycle.
- 18.2 The AP2 proposals fail to provide a high quality, direct connection from the east of the M56 to Manchester Airport High-Speed Station due to lack of cycling infrastructure on the eastern station access road that aligns with current good practice design guidance. As designed, cyclists from the east will need to cross via the Hasty Lane underpass, traverse the ramp up to road level then continue to the western station access road to access the station via that route –

substantially longer than using the eastern road. In addition, the A538 route under the motorway requires active travel provision.

18.3 MCC is still concerned that the proposals for active travel infrastructure are ill defined, lack clarity and therefore do not provide confidence the station will be appropriately connected into the wider surrounding area and enable journeys to be made by cycling and walking.

18.4 Greater Manchester's Right Mix Vision is for at least 50% of all journeys with GM to be made by active travel and public transport by 2040 and aspires to be carbon neutral by 2038. Appropriate active mode connectivity is essential at the Airport station to support the achievement of this vision. In Greater Manchester it is also recognised that high quality off-road routes are essential for the growth in active travel journeys.

18.5 MCC supports TfGM's AP2 Petition in respect of facilitating the Greater Bollin Trail - a proposed high-quality active travel route across Cheshire and Greater Manchester.

18.6 Delivery of sections of this proposed cycle route which coincides with construction areas and routes, or are near the HS2 scheme, presents HS2 Ltd. with an opportunity to mitigate its adverse impacts of severance.

**Request:**

18.7 MCC request that the Promoter works with MCC and other partners, including TfGM, GMCA and MAG, to further develop and agree sufficient active travel provision to the Manchester Airport High-Speed station.

18.8 MCC repeats its requests at paragraphs 3.36 (a) and (b) of the Bill Petition. MCC supports the requests in paragraphs 19.5.7-19.5.8 of TfGM's AP2 Petition in relation to the Greater Bollin Trail.

**19 Highway impacts around the Airport**

19.1 There are a further 83 junctions in the Airport area where serious adverse effects are predicted in AP2. There are 164 adversely effected links are predicted from AP2. There are additional construction routes proposed, which will impact the local highways network. MCC also has concerns about the impact on the operation of Manchester Airport, resulting from the use of Enterprise Way as a construction route, and the increase in construction traffic on roads within the airport campus, and the issues raised in 3.41 of the Bill Petition remain.

19.2 Given that the GIS data files which underpin the AP2 proposals were only provided by the Promoter a week before the petition deadline (despite MCC,

Trafford Council and TfGM requesting access on a number of occasions), MCC have not been able to undertake a full assessment of the impacts on the road network.

- 19.3 Further sections of Enterprise Way, along with World Way and Airport Spur, have been brought into the Bill Limits as major construction routes. Mitigation will be needed for the increase in traffic on MCC's local highways network resulting from the temporary closure of these roads, which will further increase the impacts on the Local Highways Authority's existing network.

**Request:**

- 19.4 MCC repeats its request at paragraph 3.43 (b) of the Bill Petition.
- 19.5 MCC request that the Promoter give an undertaking not to close Enterprise Way, World Way and Airport Spur, except with the consent of the Local Highways Authority.

**20 Sunbank Lane and Impacts on Global Logistics**

- 20.1 AP2 proposes to significantly realign the overbridge crossing the new M56 alignment. Sunbank Lane will be permanently closed to road vehicles to the east of Yewtree House to accommodate the M56 junction 6 Wilmslow Road link road and the M56 junction 6 westbound exit slip road, with access to properties retained on the southern side of the HS2 route. MCC has concerns regarding the impacts of these proposals on local residents and businesses in the immediate vicinity of the area. MCC is also concerned with the proximity of the M56 Junction 6 slip road to the Global Logistics Hub and the removal of the lorry park in AP2, and the consequent impact on the Amazon warehouse and the Hut Group, specifically in relation to the risk of loss of local employment. The removal of the lorry park could also result in a significant negative impact on the local road network, with lorries waiting on surrounding roads during loading/unloading of deliveries.

- 20.2 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with MCC to mitigate the impact on the Global Logistics Hub and ensure that there is no loss of local employment. This should include an alternative lorry parking facility to avoid impacts on both the businesses and the local road network.

**Request:**

- 20.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with MCC, GM Partners and MAG to mitigate the impact on the Global Logistics Hub and ensure that there is no loss of local employment. This should include an alternative lorry parking facility to avoid impacts on both the businesses and the local road network.



20.4 MCC requests that the Promoter gives an undertaking to work with MCC to agree and deliver appropriate mitigation to residents arising from the changes to Sunbank Lane, including appropriate active travel connections as set out in Section 17.

## 21 **Connection of Metrolink to Manchester Airport High-Speed Station**

21.1 MCC welcomes the inclusion of the connection of Metrolink to Manchester Airport High-Speed Station in AP2, but further clarity on the proposed programme is needed for these works to ensure that Metrolink Western leg can be delivered into service as soon as practicable.

21.2 MCC reaffirms that it desires for Metrolink to be operational no later than the first day of operation of HS2 services but operations may commence in advance of that date (running through but not stopping at Manchester Airport HS2 Station) if TfGM is in a position to do so.

21.3 To facilitate the forward programming of the Metrolink extension, it will be necessary for GM Partners to understand the detailed dependencies during the design, construction and testing/commissioning phases of HS2; GM Partners would welcome further detailed discussion and information sharing between both parties.

21.4 MCC welcomes the inclusion of Work No. 2/18F to provide access in the vicinity of Keepers Cottage but notes its concern that the proposed design for the relocation of the access to Keepers Cottage may not be feasible due to the topography of the site. MCC is therefore concerned that the AP2 limits are not wide enough to enable the necessary realignment of the entrance to the driveway of Keepers Cottage.

### **Request:**

21.5 MCC repeats its request at 3.17 & 3.18 of its Bill petition.

21.6 MCC requests that the Bill limits be extended to ensure adequate realignment of the driveway to Keeper's cottage to ensure continued and appropriate access.

21.7 MCC additionally requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking that they will agree with MCC and other GM Partners an integrated delivery strategy that will enable Metrolink to be delivered into service as early as is practicable, possibly in advance of High-Speed operations and no later than day one of High-Speed operations. This integrated delivery strategy shall encompass the agreement of delivery responsibilities, ensure that the necessary worksites and access for Metrolink construction are provided in a timely manner and that interfaces between elements of the programme are managed to mitigate risk.

## 22 **Metro/Tram-Train from Manchester Airport to the west and southwest**

22.1 MCC notes that Work No 2/16A provides for a junction to the immediate west of the proposed tram stop to enable a future Metro/tram-train link route to the southwest. This is welcome. However, MCC is concerned that design solutions for a route to the south-west (particularly those running north of the M56) are now constrained due to the amended design in AP2 for M56 Junction 6.

22.2 The ability for GM Partners to deliver a link to the south-west is essential to support GM's 2040 Transport Strategy which will also serve to ensure that the benefits of HS2 are widely disseminated across Greater Manchester and beyond. The amendments to the design of M56 Junction 6 introduce new constraints to the identified route options which may impact GM's ability to deliver a solution which delivers the 2040 Strategy objectives whilst representing optimum value for money.

### **Request:**

22.3 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work collaboratively with MCC and other relevant parties including TfGM, National Highways and Trafford Council to agree and make provision for a future South-West Metro/tram-train alignment within the design of M56 Junction 6 which minimises the cost and complexity impacts of the M56 Junction 6 design on a future south-west Metro/tram-train route.

## 23 **Car Parking at Manchester High-Speed Airport Station**

23.1 The AP2 revised scheme proposes to increase the number of car parking spaces at the proposed Manchester Airport High-Speed station. MCC is concerned that within the design for AP2 the Promoter includes this additional car parking spaces (noting the correction to the Bill numbers given on page 31 of the SES and AP2 ES MA06 Community Area Report, Table 2) on the roof areas of the car parks at the Manchester Airport station, increasing the number of spaces from 3, (corrected figure) to 3,992. Such an increase is out of line with Greater Manchester's 2040 Transport Strategy and its aspirations to reduce car travel in favour of other modes of transport.

23.2 MCC also support the concerns expressed and remedies requested by Trafford Council, in terms of the design and visual impact of the car parks, in Section 8.2.16 – 8.2.22 of their petition.

### **Request:**

23.3 MCC repeats its requests at paragraph 3.38 (a) and (b) of the Bill Petition.

23.4 Car and cycle parking provision should be agreed with MCC and the local highways authorities.

**24 Sunbank Wood and Cotteril Clough**

24.1 MCC are concerned about the fact that the AP2 proposals would directly and indirectly impact areas of Special Biological Importance (SBI), particularly the loss of approximately 0.41 hectares of ancient woodland. HS2 Ltd have indicated additional ecological mitigation in the wider area on their current plans.

**Request:**

24.2 MCC requests that the Promoter be required to give an undertaking to work with MCC to ensure any adverse impacts on Manchester's blue and green infrastructure are avoided, where possible, or minimised and mitigated.

**25 Palatine Road Ventilation Shaft move to the Hollies site**

25.1 MCC welcomes the relocation of the Palatine Road ventilation shaft away from the site on Withington Golf Course Club House (Palatine Road) proposed in the Bill. Unfortunately, however, the Promoter did not properly engage with MCC and other local stakeholders in the selection of an alternative site and has chosen a new site that causes multiple concerns. A further concern is also raised by the tunnel realignment associated with the ventilation shaft relocation. MCC strongly opposes the alternative site and vent shaft design proposed by the Promoter, known as the Hollies Vent Shaft site for the following reasons:

25.1.1 It is detrimental to the viability of a planned school due to open in September (Manchester Islamic Educational Trust Campus – the only Islamic girls' school in Manchester), due to the construction and operational impacts of the scheme, principally due to the access route proposed through the school's site onto Barlow Moor Road and the loss of the car park.

25.1.2 The substantial adverse impacts caused during construction and operation, including loss of car parking facilities, would be detrimental to the viability of a number of local businesses and community facilities in the immediate area, including the Bright Horizons Day Nursery, Didsbury Mosque (which uses the car park) and Moor Allerton Preparatory School.

25.1.3 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 our view the Promoter 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 the Bill Petition at paragraphs 1.17 and 4.52 still stand, and have been worsened due to the impact and lack of mitigation proposed.

- 25.1.4 It would result in substantial adverse construction impacts including noise, visual and air and light pollution for a period of approximately 6 years, both on closely adjacent properties on Mersey Road, Mersey Meadows, The Hollies and the Rookery Gardens, and also on hundreds of residential properties in the wider West Didsbury and Northenden areas. There would also be a significant visual impact during operation, due to the size and raised elevation of the headhouse structure and during any emergency event there would be significant disruption experienced in this location.
- 25.1.5 MCC believe that there are feasible alternative technical solutions to the large size, design and function of this ventilation shaft, which could reduce the construction impact, potentially reduce cost and spoil, and enable the structure to be constructed on a smaller alternative site.
- 25.1.6 The proposed access arrangements would cause significant congestion on Barlow Moor Road, which already experiences high levels of traffic, providing further disruption and access issues for local residents, businesses and community facilities. Any alternative access routes into the site would result in congestion and disruption for other communities, e.g. Northenden.
- 25.1.7 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. MCC considers that there has been insufficient assessment of the adverse impact of the loss of this habitat area caused by the vent shaft.
- 25.1.8 Closure of public footpaths and cycleways displacing pedestrian and cyclists.
- 25.1.9 Due to the tunnel realignment, concerns have been raised by local residents regarding the impact on their property and ability to implement more eco-friendly local heating solutions such as ground sourced heat pumps which would be prejudiced by the new tunnel alignment. In-line with this, MCC support an efficient system of individual assessments of subsoil.

**Request:**

- 25.2 MCC requests that the Promoter reconsiders the location of the Hollies ventilation shaft site and agrees with MCC an alternative to *both* the site proposed in the Bill and that proposed in AP2, in order to remove the substantial impacts set out above. This should include consideration of an alternative design for the ventilation shaft, which could allow the use of a smaller site, as well as reducing construction impact. MCC further requests that the Promoter seeks any amendments to the Bill required to accommodate the relocation of the vent shaft.

25.3 Should the Promoter not agree to move the vent shaft and thereby commit local residents, community facilities, businesses and habitats to the serious and detrimental impacts which would be caused by the proposed Hollies Vent Shaft, MCC requests that the Promoter at least provides an undertaking to minimise the impacts in the following ways:

25.3.1 Reconsider the proposed construction and operational access road for the Hollies site, so as to remove any direct impacts on the viability of several significant community facilities and businesses along Barlow Moor Road such as the planned school and Didsbury Mosque, and works with MCC to agree and deliver robust mitigation for the impacts of a revised access route.

25.3.2 Propose, and agree with MCC, additional robust mitigations against the adverse noise, visual, pollution and congestion impacts caused by the construction of the vent shaft.

25.3.3 Propose, and agree with MCC, additional design and mitigation measures to minimise the visual and noise impacts of the permanent headhouse structure.

25.3.4 Work with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LFA) 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 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) shared with MCC and the EA.

25.3.5 Carry out detailed ecology surveys to assess the impact of loss of the local habitat area and agree with MCC appropriate mitigations, including re-provision of community green space.

25.3.6 Provide an alternative means of keeping footpath FFP139 along the river Mersey open for walking and cycling during construction.

## 26 **Birchfields Road Ventilation Shaft**

26.1 The realignment of the Manchester tunnel, to accommodate the relocation of the Palatine Road ventilation shaft in AP2, could have provided an opportunity to relocate the ventilation shaft proposed at Birchfield Road. However, the location of the Birchfield Road ventilation shaft remains unchanged by AP2, except for a very small move in its exact position on the site, and our Bill Petition points in paragraphs 1.17, 4.44- 4.50 stand.

26.2 In addition, MCC have concerns about the increased size and visual appearance of the ATS included in AP2. The ATS takes up significantly more land in the area, leaving no space available for returning the park & stride facility upon completion, which results in the permanent loss of a vital community facility.

From the photo montage, the ATS and headhouse do not appear adequately screened, given a reliance on trees to block the structures. It also appears that the construction access would be the same as the road access to the shopping centre, leading to safety concerns for the public.

**Request:**

- 26.3 MCC repeats its requests at paragraphs 4.51 (a) and (b) of the Bill Petition.
- 26.4 MCC also requests that the Promoter works with MCC to agree the designs for the headhouse and autotransformer station, that are in keeping with the local surroundings, provide adequate screening, minimises the impact to the primary school and pupils during perturbation scenarios at the site and enables the park and stride facility to be retained.

**27 Wilmslow Road Ventilation Shaft**

- 27.1 MCC recognises the rationale not to change the structure from a vertical headhouse to a horizontal headhouse, in order to avoid the need to demolish nearby properties. However, the change in the ventilation system requires a significant increase in the height of the headhouse from 7.3m to 12.7m. The height of the headhouse is particularly sensitive in this location, given the very close proximity to residential properties, with the structure being taller than most neighbouring properties. This would have considerable adverse visual impacts on local residents and users of the Christie Hospital.
- 27.2 MCC are also concerned with the tight construction area for the increased ventilation shaft structure and the proximity of the site to local residents. Further assurance is required on how the redesigned shaft and headhouse will be managed within the construction boundary, in order to minimise the impact on local people.

**Request:**

- 27.3 MCC requests that the Promoter:
- 27.3.1 Gives an undertaking to work with MCC 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 at least back to the original hybrid Bill dimensions.
- 27.3.2 Gives an undertaking to work with MCC 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.

## 28 **Out of Date Highways Modelling**

28.1 The modelling utilised by HS2 for analysis of highway impacts in the Greater Manchester area is based upon TfGM's 2017 GSM. Whilst it is noted that this model underwent updates as part of the SES2 and AP2 ES development, it is still fundamentally a model based on 2017 data that is now 6-years old and pre-dates changes to traffic patterns arising after COVID. As also noted under other petitioning items this outdated model and future year forecasts also fail to adequately consider demand associated with Places for Everyone, changes made to the road network since 2017 and regional policies such as the 2040 Transport Vision. As such the model utilised for AP2 is not sufficiently accurate for further development of highway mitigation proposals during either construction or operational phases of HS2.

### **Request:**

28.2 HS2 provide an undertaking to work with GM Partners and National Highways to update the traffic modelling at the detailed design stage to a more appropriate baseline and use it to optimise the design of highway mitigations to address the significant adverse effects of the scheme on road users.

## 29 **Route-wide Highways**

### 29.1 Impact of Highway Diversions and Closures

29.1.1 The AP2 revised scheme proposes to close additional roads during its construction phases over and above those noted in the main Bill. MCC is still concerned about the number of roads to be closed, especially in Manchester city centre and the Airport area, and the resultant impact on residential properties and the ability of businesses to function. MCC is also concerned about the general management of road closures, diversionary routes and more importantly how these road closures will be managed in the case of emergencies.

29.1.2 The proposed works to construct AP2-006-014 are expected to require a series of highway closures, including temporary closures of the M56 around the existing Junction 6, notably the westbound slip road for up to 3 months. This will have a potential effect on businesses and operations at the World Freight Terminal, Global Logistics Hub, and the wider Manchester Airport site.

### **Request:**

29.1.3 MCC repeats its request at paragraph 4.13 of the petition against the main HS2 Phase 2b hybrid Bill.

29.1.4 MCC also requests that road closures mentioned above are kept to a minimum with engagement and agreement on the extent and the management of closures undertaken with the GM Partners.

### 30 **Inappropriate Construction Routes**

30.1 Paragraph 3.44 of the Bill Petition notes MCC's concern that several roads identified by the Promoter in the main ES as construction routes were unsuitable for the reasons stated. MCC are further concerned about the additional construction routes identified within SES2 AP2 ES which are considered unsuitable. Examples of these additional construction routes where MCC has concerns are:

- (a) Chapel Lane
- (b) Longsides Road
- (c) High Elm Road
- (d) Bennett street
- (e) Wigley Street
- (f) Anthony Close

**Request:**

30.2 Bennett Street, Wigley Street, Anthony Close, Chapel Lane, High Elm Road, Longside Road, Sunbank Lane overbridge should be removed as proposed construction traffic routes and HS2 should utilise the route through the Olympic Freight Terminal.

### 31 **Environmental Issues**

31.1 MCC remain strongly concerned that the environmental impacts as reported in the ES and AP2 ES and SES2 are under-estimated or mis-represented in several respects. As previously raised in MCC's Bill Petition, and again for AP2, in many instances, no mitigation was or is now offered, or what little mitigation is referenced, is left to the draft CoCP. The term, 'reasonably practicable' has been used frequently throughout the CoCP but it is not clear who will decide what is 'reasonably practicable'. This is inadequate.

**Request:**

31.2 MCC reiterates its request for the Promoter to work with MCC to provide appropriate commitments or agreements to satisfy all the environmental concerns of MCC as set out in its original Bill Petition and as set out above. For brevity, MCC has not exhaustively referenced these concerns in its original Bill Petition and also points towards the forthcoming MCC AP2 ES and SES



consultation response (shortly to be submitted by MCC), which will provide more specific detail with regards to the many environmental concerns MCC has with AP2.

## 32 **Waste**

32.1 AP2 ES indicates that there is an anticipated increase of 11% in the quantity of excavated material, demolition material and construction waste than reported for the AP1 revised scheme. However, this is offset against the assumption that 35% of excavated material, demolition material and construction waste would be diverted from landfill. As such, in comparison to the main ES, there is a projected 17% decrease in the volume of waste which is being sent to landfill as a result to changes in AP2. Whilst this reduction is welcomed MCC remains concerned that the surplus excavated material for off-site disposal will represent an equivalent 62% reduction in North West's inert waste landfill capacity.

32.2 There is no proposed mitigation against this significant reduction in capacity with the assessment putting the onus on local authorities noting in AP2 ES and SES2 Volume 3: Route-wide Effects report Para 20.2.22 that "*Waste planning authorities have a statutory responsibility to make provision for sufficient waste infrastructure capacity, and it is therefore likely that the respective authorities will continue to plan for new inert waste landfill sites and/or to identify other suitable placement locations to enable continued capacity to be available as landfill void space is occupied*". Further Schedule 32 as proposed to be inserted by AP2 potentially exacerbates this problem by enabling the promoter to close existing landfill sites within the Bill limits.

32.3 The current GM Joint Waste Development Plan, (2012), covers the plan period 2012 to 2027 and does not account for HS2's waste disposal requirement. Allocation of landfill sites through Local Plans and approval of planning applications for landfill sites is a difficult and time-consuming process. Producing a new joint waste plan or include sites within existing plans could take about 6 years. As this process is yet to commence, 2029/2030 is the earliest possible time for a new Joint Waste Development Plan. HS2 have assumed that the generation of surplus excavated material will take place primarily over a four-year period (2028 – 2032) during the construction of the AP2 revised scheme. MCC is concerned that this may also result in a situation where there is insufficient capacity to dispose of waste generated in GM's Waste Plan period (particularly given the complexities involved in allocating or obtaining planning permission for landfill sites).

### **Request:**

32.4 MCC requests that the Promoter should be required to give an undertaking to:

32.4.1 engage with MCC and the relevant Waste Local Planning Authorities on several waste matters including HS2's utilisation of spare planned for

landfill capacity and HS2 landfill needs so that these may be catered for in Greater Manchester's next Joint Waste Development Plan.

- 32.4.2 produce and agree with MCC and other relevant stakeholders a detailed and robust strategy, including monitoring, for Waste Management of the Proposed Scheme during operation
- 32.4.3 not exercise its powers under Schedule 32 until this engagement has taken place.

### 33 **Impacts on Bus Services within Greater Manchester**

- 33.1.1 AP2 will have greater adverse impacts on bus journey times during construction compared with the original Bill proposals. AP2 causes a significant worsening on bus journey times once HS2 is operational on two sections of route; City Centre to A6010 via A6 Stockport Road (routes 192 and X92) and City Centre via A6010 via A57 Hyde Road (routes 201, 202, 203, 205) during the PM peak.
- 33.1.2 It is a further concern to MCC that when bus stops are temporarily closed due to traffic management measures during construction the impacts of doing so are not adequately considered and some assessments of journey time on route sections do not seem to accord with the traffic management measures proposed.
- 33.1.3 Whilst there has been some change to the significant adverse residual effects on delays to public transport, all of the bus routes identified in the original ES continue to experience unacceptable and unmitigated adverse effects at some point during construction or operation of HS2.

**Request:**

- 33.1.4 MCC repeats its request in paragraphs 4.22 of the Bill Petition.



**6. 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. 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 Second Additional Provision' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

7. MCC seeks binding commitments from the Promoter and/or amendments to the current proposals in the Bill and supporting documents in respect of the matters set out above.