

Petition template – First Additional Provision

The following pages provide the template to be used for petitions against the First Additional Provision to the High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill. The First Additional Provision will sometimes be referred to as 'AP1'.

A separate [template](#) and [submission portal](#) is used for petitions against the Bill itself. Please note that separate petitions need to be submitted should a petitioner wish to petition against both the Bill and an Additional Provision (i.e. objections cannot be stated on the same petition).

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

Content

Your petition should include:

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

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

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

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

Submission

You are advised to submit your petition by using the online portal if possible. The portal can be accessed here: <https://committees.parliament.uk/work/6816/petitioning-against-the-first-additional-provision/>

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

- By email – hs2committee@parliament.uk
- By post – Private Bill Office, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA

Payment

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

You are not required to pay the fee if you have already petitioned against the Bill and paid the £20 fee when submitting that petition.

You can pay the required fee by:

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

House of Commons

High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill – First Additional Provision

1. Terms and conditions

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

Your data

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

Communications

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

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

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

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

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

Consent

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

2. Petitioner information

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

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

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

- i. This petition sets out Cheshire East Council's (“**the Council**”) comments on, and concerns with the proposed amendments included in Additional Provision 1 (“**AP1**”) as far as they effect its administrative area. It also includes the Council's proposals for addressing its concerns.
- ii. This petition is organised by geographical area, namely Hough and Walley's Green (MA01), Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam (MA02), and Pickmere to Agden and Hulseheath (MA03).

3. Objections to the First Additional Provision to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the First 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.

Hough and Walley's Green (MA01)

Proposed amendment 1: realignment and extension of the Crewe tunnel, to lower the height of the proposed alignment between the Middlewich Street ventilation shaft and the Crewe tunnel northern portal.

Issue: Crewe tunnel

1. The Council notes that proposed amendment AP1-001-001 in AP1 provides for the extension of the Crewe tunnel by approximately 620m, emerging to the north of Parkers Road.
2. The Council further notes that the Supplementary Environmental Statement shows that, as a result of this proposal, there will be a reduction in the operational noise levels at Parkers Road.
3. The Council welcomes this proposed change in principle; however, the Council has concerns that there remains a significant adverse in-combination effect on the amenity of the residents of approximately 250 properties in the vicinity of Broughton Road, Coppenhall.

Solution

4. The Council requests that the Promoter (i) provides additional noise mitigation to protect the residents of the properties mentioned above and (ii) seeks to reduce the negative effects on air quality on the residential communities within the vicinity of the Crewe North tunnel portal.

Issue: Middlewich Street vent shaft

5. The Council has no additional concerns about the changes proposed to the Middlewich Street vent shaft. However, the Council remains concerned about the green open space that will be lost as a result of it. This area is one of the few areas of green space accessible to residents of Middlewich Street and the surrounding roads and estates. The AP1 changes will change the design of the ventilation shaft from a circular design to a rectangular design but this change does not provide appropriate compensatory mitigation for the lost green space.

Solution

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

Issue: Sandbach Flashes Site of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI")

7. The Council is concerned about the residual permanent adverse effect on hydrology at Sandbach Flashes Site of Special Scientific Interest. Whilst the Council recognises the proposed change is a precautionary measure within AP1, it is a cause of concern for the Council.

Solution

8. The Council requests that the Promoter includes the worst-case mitigation strategy within the AP1.

Issue: landscape

9. Under AP1, during construction, owing to the additional land permanently required for the realignment and extension of the Crewe tunnel, the effect on the view east from Bleasdale Road and north from Thornfields will increase to major adverse from moderate adverse reported in the main Environmental Statement. There will be a new likely residual significant construction effect at the view north west from the White Lion public house, Coppenhall Moss. The effect will increase to moderate adverse (significant) from minor adverse reported in the main ES, which was not significant.
10. The realignment and extension of Crewe tunnel (AP1-001-001) will also give rise to new likely major adverse residual significant construction effects to the view north-east from Parkers Road and the view west from Footpath Crewe 30/1, Kent's Lane. At operation, the realignment and extension of Crewe tunnel (AP1-001-001) will also give rise to new likely residual significant operational visual effects, at year 15 operation, for the view north-east from Parkers Road – the effect will be major adverse, and the view west from Footpath Crewe 30/1, Kent's Lane – the effect will be moderate adverse. The realignment of the tunnels will also result in the additional loss of approximately 350m of hedgerow.

Solution

11. The Council requests that the Promoter seeks further opportunities to reduce these impacts through both offsite and onsite screening with mounding and planting as appropriate. Opportunities for the integration of the tunnel realignment and the additional loss of hedgerow, through landscape planting, should be sought in the vicinity of the portal and surrounding landscape.

Proposed amendment 2: changes to the routing of the power supply to the Crewe tunnel.

Issue: Effects on bus network

12. The Council recognises the need for the Promoter to amend the routing of the power supply to the Crewe Tunnel given that Pym's Lane is now a private road. The Council would also support the re-routing to avoid traffic management issues on the A530 and any impacts that would have on access to Leighton Hospital.
13. However, the Council is concerned about the impacts on the bus network using the A532 during the works and the potential for community isolation which could arise as a result.

Solution

14. The Council requests that the Promoter takes all reasonable steps to minimise impacts on the bus network during works.

Issue: Traffic Management

15. The Council notes there will be a major impact on the A532 West Avenue/Victoria Avenue as a result of the proposed change.

Solution

16. The Council requests that the Promoter provides funding to the Council to help address traffic and severance issues on the route. This funding would form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund mentioned in the Council's petition against the Bill.
17. The Council notes that shuttle working on A532 West Street/Coppenhall Lane is proposed and requests more details on these proposals and the impacts on the A530 Marshfield Bank Roundabout if blocking back may occur.

Issue: landscape

18. During construction, the provision of a power supply to Crewe tunnel (AP1-001-002) will give rise to a new likely residual significant moderate adverse construction effect for views west from Halton Drive which is a new viewpoint in an area that would be unaffected by the original scheme.

Solution

19. The Council requests that the Promoter seeks further opportunities to reduce these effects through both offsite and onsite screening with mounding and planting as appropriate.

Proposed amendment 4: modifications to the junction of Warmingham Road and Groby Road, including carriageway widening to provide new turning lanes, to increase junction safety and reduce the potential impacts of construction traffic.

20. The Council supports this change in principle but would like the proposed junction improvement to be retained permanently. The Council has concerns that the junction improvement will result in a different health effect on Oakfield Lodge School, which may reduce the beneficial wellbeing effects associated with educational attainment. The noise and visual effect is expected to last for approximately 1 year and 7 months but the effect on the education and welfare of the students could endure for many years longer.

Solution

21. The Council requests that Promoter provides an assurance that the improvements to this junction will be retained permanently. The Promoter should consult with the Council on the detailed junction design to ensure there is sufficient land secured in the Bill to provide a permanent improvement.
22. The Promoter should consider how it can mitigate some of the impacts on Oakfield Lodge School. Including the provision of additional noise mitigation and visual screening or provide an assurance that works in this area will be kept to a minimum during school hours.

Issue: landscape

23. During construction, modifications to Warmingham Road and Groby Road junction (AP1-001-004) will give rise to new likely residual significant construction effects at the following new viewpoints, which are in an area where there will be changes from the original scheme:

- the view north-west from Groby Road viewpoint – the effect will be moderate adverse; and
- the view east from Footpath Crewe 28/1 viewpoint – the effect will be moderate adverse.

Solution

24. The Council requests that the Promoter seeks further opportunities to reduce these effects through both offsite and onsite screening with mounding and planting as appropriate.

Traffic and Transport – Other**Issue: A51 Nantwich Bypass junction impacts**

25. The Council has raised the issue of the safe operation of these roundabouts in its petition against the Bill. The Council note that, as a result of AP1, there will be more significant impacts at the following roundabouts:
- A500 Shavington Bypass/A51 Newcastle Road/A51 Nantwich Bypass/Cheerbrook Road/Newcastle Road (Cheerbrook Roundabout),
 - A51 Nantwich Bypass / Crewe Road, and
 - A51 / A530 'Alvaston' Roundabout.
26. The Council has partially unfunded improvement schemes proposed for these locations.

Solution

27. The Council requests that the Promoter (i) contributes financially to the delivery of these schemes, with a view to them being completed in advance of the AP1 works commencing and (ii) works with the Council to mitigate some of the effects identified in the AP1 Transport Assessment. These steps would benefit the Promoter since they would improve the movement of HS2 construction vehicles at the roundabouts mentioned above.

Issue: A534 Nantwich Road/A5019 Mill Street/B5071 South Street

28. The Council notes that the impact of AP1 at this junction is assessed as 'major adverse'. This is a key junction on the Crewe Highway network, affecting the function of the town centre access route (via Mill Street) and access to Crewe Station. The Council has a partially unfunded improvement scheme for this location.

Solution

29. The Council requests that the Promoter (i) makes a financial contribution towards the delivery of this scheme, with a view to it being completed before the AP1 works commence and (ii) works with the Council to mitigate some of the effects identified in the AP1 Transport Assessment.

Issue: the A500

30. The Council has, in its petition against the Bill, stated that the Council's A500 dualling scheme is not fully committed and its delivery cannot be assumed in advance of the AP1 construction works. The A500 dualling scheme, and its associated improvement at Meremoor Moss Roundabout, is coded into the traffic modelling and relied on for the AP1 revised scheme. Consequently, the assessment and provision of mitigation on the local highway network is based on the assumption that these improvements

are in place. This underestimates the potential impacts on the local network of the AP1 works and so, as with the original Bill, inadequate mitigation is provided.

Solution

31. The Council requests the impact at this roundabout is assessed on the worst-case assessment; being that the Council's A500 improvements are not delivered.
32. Further, the Council requests that the Promoter works with it to develop appropriate improvements at this roundabout to mitigate the effects of the AP1 revised scheme which will not inhibit the future delivery of the A500 dualling scheme. The Promoter should provide an assurance that it will deliver any revised mitigation, including seeking any additional powers via a further Additional Provision, should the A500 dualling scheme not be fully committed and programmed to be delivered in advance of the AP1 construction works.

Issue: David Whitby Way

33. The Council has concerns that the impacts of construction traffic on the following roundabouts on David Whitby Way are not representative of the true 'on ground' situation –
 - A500 Shavington Bypass/A5020 David Whitby Way
 - A532 Weston Road/A5020 University Way/A5020 David Whitby Way/B5472 Weston Road/Savoy Road

Solution

34. The Council requests the impact at these roundabouts is assessed on the worst-case assessment; being that the Council's A500 improvements are not delivered.
35. Further, the Council requests that the Promoter works with it to develop appropriate improvements at these roundabouts to mitigate the effects of the AP1 proposals on the worst-case scenario. The Promoter should also provide an assurance that it will deliver any revised mitigation, including seeking any additional powers via a further Additional Provision, should the A500 dualling scheme not be fully committed and programmed to be delivered in advance of the AP1 construction works.

Issue: B5076 Bradfield Road/Parkers Road

36. The Council notes that an improvement scheme has been agreed in principle with the Promoter at this location and requests that this improvement is provided for in AP1 works as well.

Issue: A530 Middlewich Road/B5076 Flowers Lane/Eardswick Lane

37. The Council notes that the assessment shows a significant impact at this junction, however, the Council is currently delivering its North West Crewe Package which includes interventions to address capacity issues at here. It is uncertain from the AP1 documents whether these improvements, which will be completed in advance of the construction of the AP1 revised scheme, have been included in the traffic modelling.

Solution

38. The Council requests that the Promoter confirms whether the modelling scheme has been assessed at this location and whether the Council's improvement scheme, which is currently in construction, has been assumed to be in place in the base assessment.

Issue: A534/A533 Old Mill Road A534 Congleton Road/A534 Old Mill Road/Congleton Road

39. The AP1 assessment shows a far greater impact at these junctions than that proposed in the Bill. Previously, the Council requested a contribution for it to complete an improvement scheme at the Old Mill Junction.

Solution

40. The Council seeks an index-linked fund made available to the Council to implement an improvement scheme at the Old Mill Junction in advance of construction, but now requests that the fund also cover the implementation of an improvement scheme at the A534 Old Mill Road roundabout. This fund would form part of the Construction Route Management, Maintenance and Road Safety Fund, mentioned in the petition against the Bill.

Issue: A533 London Road/B5079 Station Road

41. The Council notes that an additional impact is assessed here as a result of the AP1 proposals.

Solution

42. The Council requests that the Promoter funds traffic calming measures on this route, which should be delivered in advance of the AP1 works commencing.
43. The Council also requests that the Promoter funds and delivers replacement car parking in the vicinity of this junction to enable parking restrictions to be enforced closer to the junction. This will improve continuous traffic flow through this junction during construction.

Issue: access to Crewe Station

44. The Council is concerned about the proposal to implement shuttle working and utilise the service road on Weston Road as an alternative carriageway. This will not operate well in practice as the service road is used for HGV parking and also as the access road to the businesses located on it. The cumulative impact of this proposal and the net loss of HGV car parking off Cowley Way for the construction of the Cowley Way vent shat are likely to provide significant effects on the primary access to Crewe Station from the strategic road network, via Weston Road.
45. The Council, as part of its Crewe Hub Vision, developed an access strategy which included the permanent widening of the northern section of Weston Road; including the section adjacent to the service road. This scheme would provide a far better solution for Weston Road during the construction of the AP1 works.

Solution

46. The Council requests that the Promoter engages with it to review these proposals and provide an assurance that the Council's access strategy will be delivered instead of the current proposals for Weston Road.
47. The Council also requests that this scheme would be retained permanently to provide legacy benefits to Crewe and ensure that the highway access to Crewe Hub station can support more HS2 services calling at Crewe.
48. The Crewe Hub access package also includes a revision to the Crewe Arms Roundabout. The Council notes that the impact of the AP1 scheme is greater than the Bill scheme. The Council requests that the Promoter undertakes the Crewe Arms

Roundabout works. As above, delivering these improvements to mitigate the impacts at the junction would deliver legacy benefits to the town and Crewe Hub station.

Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam (MA02)

Proposed amendment 4: Additional land permanently required for the provision of a shared use cycle and pedestrian path at Clive Green Lane

49. The Council would support this amendment.

Proposed amendment 7: Additional land required for modifications to the A54 Chester Road/A530 Croxton Lane junction

Issue 1: queuing at roundabout

50. The proposed changes include modifications to the existing junction arrangement, consisting of changing from a mini roundabout to a junction with traffic signals, carriageway widening to enable the formation of a right-turn lane on A530 Newton Bank Road, and a left turn lane on A54 Chester Road.

51. The Council notes that the revised assessment for the signalisation of this junction appears to provide for more queuing than the existing roundabout operation.

Solution

52. The Council requests that a review is undertaken to examine if an enlarged and updated roundabout would provide a better solution.

Issue 2: landscape

53. During construction, modifications to the A54 Chester Road/A530 Croxton Lane junction (AP1-002-007) will give rise to a new likely residual significant construction effect in an area which was not affected by the original scheme for views north-west from A54 Chester Road, Middlewich. The level of effect will be moderate adverse.

54. At Clive Green Lane and the Smoker Brook viaduct, there will also be the additional loss of approximately 350m of hedgerow and unspecified veteran trees.

Solution

55. The Council requests that the Promoter seeks further opportunities to reduce these impacts through both offsite and onsite screening with mounding and planting as appropriate. These should not only seek to reduce visual impact further but serve to integrate the junction into the surrounding landscape. Additional hedgerow and tree planting to compensate for the loss of hedgerows and veteran trees is also sought.

Proposed amendment 8: Additional land required for the provision of temporary traffic signals around the M6 junction 18

Issue

56. The Council wishes to understand why temporary modifications are proposed at this National Highways Road when the Promoter's transport assessment concludes there is no construction impact on this junction, and shows that the junction will continue to operate adequately.

57. The temporary traffic signals proposed on the A54 Middlewich Road (west) do not appear to be mitigation that is required by the Transport Assessment. The Council is concerned that this proposal is unnecessary for the AP1 works and will serve only to add to the anticipated high levels of driver frustration from delays along the A54 corridor.

Solution

58. The Council requests that the Promoter provides an assurance that it will not deliver the signals unless it can provide the results of an assessment that demonstrates the operational impacts of AP1 at this junction. Should the assessment demonstrate impacts, then the Promoter should consult with the Council on appropriate mitigation measures.

Proposed amendment 9: Additional land permanently required for the widening of the A54 Middlewich Road and Chester Road junction

Issue 1: alternative solution

59. This amendment will result in a combined negative effect on residents and the community that was not present in the original scheme. Of particular concern is the proposed loss of mature trees neighbouring the junction. These provide a positive landscape and green amenity for the nearby communities and natural screening from the traffic at this junction. While the proposal is temporary, the effects of the loss of mature trees and natural screening will be prolonged. The proposal appears to be removing existing landscape mitigation, and noise and visual screening. This is of particular concern as it is not a HS2 construction route.
60. It appears that the amendment has been developed to address concerns from National Highways, but without any consultation with the Council, the local highway authority who manage the network. The Council is concerned as to why this has been included in AP1 given the junction is remote from the National Highways network and has no prospect of impacting the operation of the strategic highway network that National Highways manages.
61. It is proposed within the AP1 revised scheme that the carriageway will be widened to enable the formation of a right-turn lane on the A54 Middlewich Road approach, with no change in journey length. On completion of the construction phase of the AP1 revised scheme, the junction will be reverted to its existing layout.
62. Despite the concerns mentioned above, the Council is supportive of the principle of a capacity and safety improvement scheme at this junction which would reduce blocking back delays from vehicles trying to turn right along Chester Road, which is the principal route in this area.

Solution

63. The Council requests that the Promoter explores, in consultation with the Council, alternatives to the solution proposed to reduce the impacts on local residents and the surrounding landscape. Alternative options for this junction that should be assessed include a change in priority at the junction or a mini roundabout. Any improvements here, if acceptable to the Council, should be made on a permanent basis.
64. Furthermore, if an acceptable alternative solution can be found, the Council seeks an assurance that the AP1 amendments, if incorporated into the Bill, will not be carried out.

Issue 2: landscape

65. Modifications to the A54 Middlewich Road and Chester Road junction (AP1-002-009) will give rise to a new likely significant residual construction effect at the view west from the B5308 Middlewich Road. Effects will be moderate adverse (significant).

Solution

The Council requests that the Promoter seeks further opportunities to reduce these impacts through both offsite and onsite screening with mounding and planting as appropriate. These should not only seek to reduce visual impact further but serve to integrate the junction into the surrounding landscape.

A54 Chester Road – additional junction mitigation

66. There are no assessments of the other ‘pinch points’ in the parish of Holmes Chapel which are likely to experience increases in traffic movement. The Council would have expected the following to be assessed:

- The junction of the A54 Chester Road / Station Road and the A50 that travels north/south, and
- The narrow carriageway width on the A54 Chester Road from the junction with Middlewich Road and the junction with the A50.
- In any event, the increased traffic movement will sever communities on the A54.

Solution

67. The Council request that the effects of AP1 at these junctions is properly assessed and that the Promoter provides additional funding to the Council to provide for additional crossing facilities on the A54 to help address the severance.

Traffic and Transport - Other

Issue: Middlewich Eastern Bypass

68. The Council considers that an assessment of the impact of AP1 proposals, made on a worst-case assessment and reflecting the current situation that the Middlewich Eastern Bypass is uncommitted, should be undertaken.

Solution

69. The Council requests that the Promoter undertakes a Transport Assessment scenario / sensitivity test which assumes that the Middlewich Eastern Bypass is not delivered ahead of the construction of the AP1 works and that any additional mitigation, including any additional land, required in this scenario is provided within the scheme.

Issue: A54 Kinderton Street/A54 St Michael's Way/A533 Leadsmithy Street Minor adverse

70. No improvements are planned here as part of the AP1 revised scheme and the AP1 assessment appears to show that the impact at the junction is less than the original scheme.

71. The Council notes that the junction has been assessed on a future baseline that does not include the Council's committed highway improvement to provide a signalled crossing phase at the junction. The Council is also concerned that the traffic modelling appears to suggest that less traffic will use the junction in 2028 with the proposed AP1 scheme than against a future ‘no scheme’ baseline. This suggests that traffic will re-route to unsuitable roads, a concern already raised by the Council in its petition against the Bill.

Solution

72. The Council strongly disagrees with the Promoter's Transport Assessment and requests that the Promoter (i) re-assesses, following consultation with the Council on the content of the reassessment and (ii) provides a junction improvement scheme at this location.

Issue: A556 Chester Road/B5569 Plumley Moor Road

73. The Council notes that there will be an increased impact at this junction as a result of AP1.

Solution

74. The Council requests that the Promoter explores options to provide capacity improvements at this junction.

Issue: Traffic Management

75. The AP1 revised scheme notes that there will be the need for temporary traffic management and shuttle working on the A54 Middlewich Road / Chester Road / St Michael's Way / Kinderton Street / Holmes Chapel Road during utility works.
76. The Council has significant concerns about the impact of this on the operation of the gyratory. It is not possible to accurately 'model' the impact of these delays.

Solution

77. The Council requests that the Promoter investigates alternative construction routes to mitigate this impact.

Pickmere to Agden and Hulseheath (MA03)

Issue: Design change – removal of Golborne Link spur

78. The Council has concerns that the Golborne Link spur has been removed from the AP1 revised scheme without an alternative solution brought forward to address the capacity issues on the West Coast Main Line (WCML), north of Crewe. We understand that it is the Government's intention to bring forward an alternative solution that delivers better connectivity to Scotland and that it is deliverable within the overall budget envelope of the Integrated Rail Plan.
79. Since no alternative options have been published or communicated and AP1 includes a passive provision 'stub' at Hoo Green, for a future Golborne Link, this suggests that either the Golborne Link will still be progressed, albeit delayed under other powers, or there will be highly visual redundant infrastructure, the 'stub' in the borough.

Solution

80. The Council requests that the Promoter provides an assurance that –
- a solution to the capacity issues on the West Coast Main Line, that the Golborne Link solution addressed, will be delivered under the Bill scheme;
 - consultation is undertaken on alternative options to address capacity issues on the WCML, and a preferred option selected in advance of the AP1 works commencing;
 - should an alternative option, not connecting to the HS2 line at Hoo Green, be progressed, the Promoter will not deliver the proposed spur.

Proposed amendment 1: Additional land permanently required to improve visibility on the approach to Flittogate Lane junction

81. The Council's objections in its Bill petition regarding Flittogate Lane remain.
82. The Bill provides for the diversion of Flittogate Lane, 260m to the north of its existing alignment for 491m. A new three-arm priority controlled (give way) T- junction would be formed at the connection with the B5391 Pickmere Lane realignment. Flittogate Lane would cross under the HS2 route beneath Arley Brook viaduct, increasing journey length by 372m. The existing Flittogate Lane would be closed where it crosses the HS2 route.
83. The proposed amendment would improve visibility for accessing Flittogate Lane from Pickmere Lane (southbound).
84. The Council supports this amendment.

Proposed amendment 2: Additional land permanently required to modify HS2 access near Heyrose Farm

85. The Council supports this amendment.

Traffic and Transport – Other

86. The AP1 revised scheme transport addendum shows a greater impact on a number of construction routes across the borough than in the original Bill. The Council has concerns about a number of additional junctions on the route as a result of the revised assessment. The Council considers the Promoter has not mitigated adequately the construction traffic impacts on key junctions on the Cheshire East network. The Promoter acknowledges that the Traffic Assessment has been undertaken using high level, strategic, models that can mask local impacts. The Council consider this is the case in several areas and without mitigation there will be a detrimental impact at the following junctions:

- A537 Brook Street/B5085 Hollow Lane/Lilybrook Drive
- A50 Holmes Chapel Road/B5081
- A50 Holmes Chapel Road/B5081 Middlewich Road
- A50 Warrington Road/B5159 West Lane (East and West)
- A56 Higher Lane/B5159 Burford Lane/B5159 High Legh Road
- A50 Warrington Road/A50 Chester Road/B5569 Chester Road (south)
- A556 Chester Road / A5033

Solution

87. The Promoter should undertake appropriate scenario and sensitivity testing on each of junctions mentioned above, in consultation with the Council, to ensure that mitigation is appropriate and incorporates both direct and indirect impacts. It is possible that additional mitigation will require the promotion of an Additional Provision.
88. The Council also requests that Promoter provides an assurance that it will not restore the temporary mitigation measure to its original use where the Council wishes to make this permanent. The Promoter should work with the Council to identify any junction improvements it wishes to retain after construction and the Bill should include the permanent land take for these junction improvements. For the other

improvements, the Promoter should provide an assurance that it will not restore these to their original design and use if the Council wishes to retain these once delivered.

Ashley Road

89. The Council notes that the AP1 Transport Assessment now shows a Major Adverse effect on Ashley Road. This shows a larger impact than reported in the original Transport Assessment which reported a Moderate Adverse effect. The Council wishes to confirm that the objections raised in the Council's petition against the original Bill are even more critical as a result of the AP1 revised scheme.

Landscape

90. The realignment and extension of Smoker Brook viaduct (AP1-002-012) in the Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam area (MA03) will give rise to a different likely residual significant construction effect for the view east from Footpath Pickmere 5/1 and Providence Farm. The level of the effect will slightly increase but remain major adverse.

Solution

91. The Council requests that the Promoter seeks further opportunities to reduce these impacts through both offsite and onsite screening with mounding and planting as appropriate. Whilst it is acknowledged that mitigation proposals include measures such as woodland habitat creation to replace woodland lost from Leonard's and Smoker Wood, Belt Wood, Bongs Wood and along Waterless/Arley Brook to provide connectivity between habitats, more mitigation in the form of habitat connectivity is necessary and would be welcomed.

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

In the box below, tell us what you think should be done in response to your objections to the First 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 the section 'Objections to the First Additional Provision to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

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

5. Petitioner details

Organisation/group name (if relevant)

Cheshire East Council

First name(s)

Hayley

Last name

Kirkham

Address line 1

Westfields, Sandbach

Address line 2

Post code

CW11 1HZ

County

Email

Hayley.Kirkham@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Phone (landline or mobile)

Who should be contacted about this petition?

☐ Individual above

☒ Another contact (for example, Roll A Agent or other representative)

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

6. Main contact's details

First name(s)

Emyr

Last name

Thomas

Address line 1

Sharpe Pritchard LLP

Address line 2

Elm Yard, Elm Street

Post code

WC1X 0BJ

County

Email

ethomas@sharpepritchard.co.uk

Phone (landline or mobile)

07584706583

7. Next steps

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

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

<https://committees.parliament.uk/work/6816/petitioning-against-the-first-additional-provision/>

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

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

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

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