

# Highways and Transport Committee

## Agenda

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Thursday, 24th November, 2022</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>10.30 am</b>
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>The Capesthorne Room - Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA</b>

---

The agenda is divided into 2 parts. Part 1 is taken in the presence of the public and press. Part 2 items will be considered in the absence of the public and press for the reasons indicated on the agenda and at the top of each report.

It should be noted that Part 1 items of Cheshire East Council decision making meetings are audio recorded and the recordings will be uploaded to the Council's website.

### **PART 1 – MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS PRESENT**

1. **Apologies for Absence**

To note any apologies for absence from Members.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

To provide an opportunity for Members and Officers to declare any disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests in any item on the agenda.

3. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** (Pages 3 - 10)

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022.

4. **Public Speaking/Open Session**

In accordance with paragraph 2.24 of the Council's Committee Procedure Rules and Appendix on Public Speaking, set out in the [Constitution](#), a total period of 15 minutes is allocated for members of the public to put questions to the committee on any matter relating to this agenda. Each member of the public will be allowed up to two minutes to speak, and the Chair will have discretion to vary this where they consider it appropriate.

Members of the public wishing to speak are required to provide notice of this at least three clear working days in advance of the meeting.

5. **Engine Idling - Options Report** (Pages 11 - 28)

To consider a report which reviews options that could be implemented to help reduce instances of engine idling.

6. **Bus Support Criteria** (Pages 29 - 52)

To consider a report which outlines the proposed approach to reviewing the Council's bus support criteria.

7. **HS2 Programme Update** (Pages 53 - 134)

To consider an update report on the HS2 programme.

8. **Financial Review 2022/23** (Pages 135 - 168)

To receive and note the report of the Finance Sub-Committee, and specifically the recommendations of that committee in so far as they relate to the Highways and Transport Committee.

9. **Work Programme** (Pages 169 - 172)

To consider the Work Programme and determine any required amendments.

**THERE ARE NO PART 2 ITEMS**

**Membership:** Councillors S Akers Smith, M Benson, C Browne (Chair), L Braithwaite, B Burkhill, L Crane (Vice-Chair), H Faddes, A Gage, L Gilbert, C Naismith, M Sewart, D Stockton and P Williams

**CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the **Highways and Transport Committee**  
held on Thursday, 22nd September, 2022 in the The Capesthorne Room -  
Town Hall, Macclesfield SK10 1EA

**PRESENT**

Councillor C Browne (Chair)  
Councillor L Crane (Vice-Chair)

Councillors S Akers Smith, M Benson, L Braithwaite, B Burkhill, H Faddes,  
A Gage, L Gilbert, M Sewart, D Stockton, P Williams and B Puddicombe (for  
Cllr Naismith)

**Other Members present**

Councillors J Clowes, T Dean, J P Findlow and M Goldsmith

**Officers in attendance**

Tom Moody, Director of Highways and Infrastructure  
Tom Shuttleworth, Interim Head of Highways  
Chris Hindle, Head of Infrastructure  
Richard Hibbert, Head of Strategic Transport and Parking  
Mandy Withington, Principal Lawyer  
Samantha Oakden, Principal Accountant  
Paul Mountford, Democratic Services

**Apologies**

Councillor C Naismith

The Chair welcomed Paul Mountford who was replacing Sarah Baxter as the Democratic Services support officer for the Committee.

**20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor P Williams declared that he had made public comments in relation to the previous version of the speed management strategy but that this would not prejudice his consideration of the revised strategy on the agenda.

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor S Akers Smith declared that she knew many of the speakers on the speed management strategy as she had met them through her role as Cycling and Walking Champion.

In the interests of openness and transparency, Councillor M Sewart declared that he had been a member of the task and finish group on flooding and flood risk management, whose report was to be considered later in the meeting.

## 21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

### RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2022 be approved as a correct record.

## 22 PUBLIC SPEAKING/OPEN SESSION

Mrs Jan Jennings referred to the speed of traffic and heavy vehicles using the A51 in the vicinity of Peter Destapleigh Way, Nantwich and the inadequate signage and narrow pavements at this location, which was impacting the lives of local residents. She called for a reduction in the 40 mph speed limit along this length of the A51.

The Chair responded that if the proposed speed management strategy due to be considered later in the meeting was approved, Mrs Jennings' request for a speed limit reduction could be considered within the strategy criteria.

Mr Nick Cheetham asked for consideration of the proposed speed management strategy to be deferred as he felt that the logic of the report was flawed and that the report did not adequately reflect the feedback from public consultation, particularly as regards 20 mph zones.

Mr David Mayers also asked for consideration of the proposed speed management strategy to be deferred as the report did not adequately address the need for 20 mph speed limits in residential and shopping areas of towns.

Mr Frank Mathers requested consideration by the Council of a reduction in the 40 mph speed limit on the A54 Holmes Chapel Road at Brereton Heath and Somerford, between the Davenport Methodist Church and the Somerford Equestrian Centre.

The Chair advised that if the speed management policy was approved later in the meeting, Mr Mathers would be able to take forward his request for consideration against that policy.

Councillor Ruth Thompson, Macclesfield Town Council, asked that the Committee defer consideration of the speed management strategy so that further consideration could be given to 20 mph areas. She said that there was evidence to show that 20 mph areas reduced accidents and injuries whilst achieving financial savings.

**23 SPEED MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, VEHICLE RESTRAINT SYSTEM STRATEGY AND SKID RESISTANCE STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report recommending the adoption of the Cheshire East Speed Management Strategy, the Cheshire East Vehicle Restraint System Strategy and the Cheshire East Skid Resistance Strategy.

The Chair read out the written comments of Councillor R Bailey who had been unable to attend the meeting as a visiting member. Councillor Bailey asked the Committee to seek assurance that the speed management strategy took into account the needs of rural parishes and enabled support for speed indication devices (SIDs) and a uniform approach to speed management across the Borough.

Councillor J Clowes attended as a visiting member and, at the invitation of the Chair, spoke on behalf of residents of Hough and Shavington who were seeking a reduction in the speed limit on Newcastle Road to 30 mph to ensure the safety of children and elderly residents crossing the road. Councillor Clowes submitted a petition to the Democratic Services Officer as the petitions scheme did not allow the Committee itself to accept a petition under 5,000 signatures.

Councillor M Goldsmith attended as a visiting member and, at the invitation of the Chair, spoke in support of the speed management strategy.

It was moved and seconded that the recommendations in the report be approved subject to the addition of the following words to recommendation 3.5 on the basis that this would give members oversight and greater understanding of the scheme prioritisation process within the speed management strategy:

*'The Director of Highways shall nominate a named position to have direct point of contact for member submission of speed assessment requests and authority over their subsequent prioritisation. A bi-monthly list of the current prioritisation and any scheme(s) coming forward will be circulated to all committee members.'*

The Chair emphasised that the three strategies were living documents capable of being reviewed by the Committee at a future date. He welcomed the fact that the prioritisation matrix within the speed management strategy gave greater weight to local concerns.

**RESOLVED (unanimously)**

That the Committee

1. approves that the Cheshire East Speed Management Strategy be adopted as policy and subsequently implemented operationally;

2. approves that the Vehicle Restraint Systems: Installation, Inspection and Maintenance Strategy be adopted as policy and subsequently implemented operationally;
3. approves that the Cheshire East Skid Resistance Strategy be adopted as policy and subsequently implemented operationally;
4. delegates authority to the Director of Highways and Infrastructure to make technical amendments to the Cheshire East Speed Management Strategy, the Vehicle Restraint Systems: Installation, Inspection and Maintenance Strategy and the Cheshire East Skid Resistance Strategy as required and to update the Highways and Transport Committee on any significant changes at a future meeting;
5. delegates authority to the Director of Highways and Infrastructure to amend/further develop the scheme prioritisation process for the Speed Management Strategy as required and to consider the need for changes to future investment programmes to reflect this process, any proposed changes to investment programmes to be reported to the Committee as part of the annual investment programme cycle. In addition, the Director of Highways and Infrastructure shall nominate a named position to have direct point of contact for member submission of speed assessment requests and authority over their subsequent prioritisation. A bi-monthly list of the current prioritisation and any scheme(s) coming forward will be circulated to all members of the Committee; and
6. approves the use of Speed Indication Devices (SIDs) on the highway network in accordance with the approach as set out in the Speed Management Strategy.

#### 24 **NOTICE OF MOTION: 'SAFER SCHOOL STREETS'**

The Committee considered a report in response to the Notice to Motion on Safer School Streets. The Motion was as follows:

*'That Council creates a process that allows a Safer School Street to be created for all schools, where supported by those schools, which will provide a safer environment and enable children to walk and cycle to school safely.'*

Councillor L Anderson attended the meeting as seconder of the Notice of Motion and spoke in its support.

Councillor S Akers Smith as proposer of the Notice of Motion, also spoke in its support.

In response to members' questions regarding school street schemes, officers clarified that:

- The reference to 'any class of traffic' within the road traffic legislation included cyclists.
- The road closures would be financed from within the Safe Travel to School budget, enhanced with developer contributions where available.
- The scheme would be enforced by trained volunteers, supported by suitable technological/engineering measures.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Committee endorses the proposed response to the Notice of Motion as set out in the report, which will be made available on the Council's highways webpage.

### **25 IT'S NOT JUST WATER**

The Committee considered a report highlighting the findings of the former Environment and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Working Group on flooding and flood risk management.

Councillor J P Findlow attended the meeting as Chair of the working group and presented the group's report, its findings and recommendations. Councillor T Dean also attended as a member of the working group and, at the Chair's invitation, spoke on the matter.

Members noted that some of the recommendations within the working group's report required additional funding which was not within the current budgetary framework. A further report to the Committee would therefore be required on which recommendations could be progressed in line with the MTFS.

### **RESOLVED (unanimously)**

That the Committee

1. receives from the Task and Finish Group the report 'It's Not Just Water' as contained at Appendix A, relating to the important issue of effective flood risk management;
2. notes the recommendations of the report;
3. notes that some of the recommendations within the report 'It's Not Just Water' have financial implications that are not covered by the current MTFS;
4. notes that the proposals contained within the report require additional funding which is not within the current budgetary framework; and
5. invites the Executive Director Place to present a further report to a future meeting on what recommendations can be progressed in line with the MTFS.

(At this point, the meeting was adjourned for a five minute break.)

## 26 REVIEW OF HIGHWAYS WARD MEMBER BUDGET SCHEME

The Committee considered a report proposing a policy for a revised ward member budget scheme.

Councillor J Clowes attended as a visiting member and, at the invitation of the Chair, commented that members of single member wards were not able to pool their resources with others to provide something substantial for their local community. She sought an assurance that funding could be carried forward to future years.

The Chair confirmed that the scheme provided that funding could be carried forward within the four-year period of operation in order to fund larger projects. He went on to advise, however, that if a significant number of members carried their funding forward to the final year (year 4), this could present capacity issues and some form of prioritisation would be necessary. Members could also use the funding as match-funding for any projects that parish councils wished to bring forward.

The new administration process would specifically offer the opportunity for Members to discuss their proposals with officers at an early stage. This would prevent wasted time and effort submitting applications to the scheme which were then rejected on the basis of non-policy compliance or being unaffordable.

The Chair welcomed the uplift in funding of £6,500 per member per year which, he said, would give individual members a greater level of influence over what work could be undertaken in their wards.

### **RESOLVED (unanimously)**

That the Committee

1. approves that the following proposals be adopted as the new policy in relation to the ward member budget scheme:
  - (a) the annual budget per member be increased to £6,500 per annum;
  - (b) the revisions to how the scheme is administered, as set out under Section 8.1 of the report, be implemented; and
  - (c) the revised scheme operate for a fixed 4 year period with delivery commencing in April 2023; and
2. approves the re-allocation of a maximum of £255k underspend from the initial 2 year allocation to the ward budget scheme to those initiatives as listed under paragraph 9.2.8 of the report.

## 27 WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered its work programme for 2022/23.

Officers reported the following changes to the work programme since its circulation with the agenda:

- The item 'Greenway Crossing of the River Dane' was to be rescheduled from November to January.
- A report on 'Bus Service Support Criteria' was now scheduled for November.
- An officer report on 'It's Not Just Water' would be scheduled for January.

Councillor L Crane highlighted that the consultation had now commenced on Idling Vehicle Engines which was due to be reported to the November meeting.

### **RESOLVED**

That subject to the amendments and additional items reported at the meeting, the work programme be noted.

## 28 MINUTES OF SUB-COMMITTEES

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Public Rights of Way Sub-Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2022 be received.

## 29 REPORTING OF OFFICER DELEGATED DECISIONS

There were no officer delegated decisions to report.

The meeting commenced at 10.30 am and concluded at 12.43 pm

Councillor C Browne (Chair)

This page is intentionally left blank



*Working for a brighter future together*

## **Highways and Transport Committee**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	24 November 2022
<b>Report Title:</b>	Engine Idling - Options Report
<b>Report of:</b>	Tom Moody, Director of Infrastructure and Highways
<b>Report Reference No:</b>	HT/53/22-23
<b>Ward(s) Affected:</b>	All

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1. The current Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) contains an action to educate and, where possible, enforce requirements to switch off idling engines to help improve air quality. The report reviews options that could be implemented to help reduce instances of engine idling, including whether legislation should be adopted.
- 1.2. The Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002 allow councils to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) against drivers who leave their engine idling and refuse to turn off their engines when asked to do so by an Officer. The legislation applies to all vehicles on public roads, including buses, taxis, and private vehicles. It does not apply to vehicles that are:
  - 1.2.1. Stationary at traffic lights or because of congestion;
  - 1.2.2. Broken down and under test or repair;
  - 1.2.3. Needed to refrigerate fresh goods or run a compactor on a refuse vehicle; or
  - 1.2.4. In any other situations deemed acceptable (e.g., defrosting a windscreen or cooling the inside of a vehicle down on a hot day for a few minutes).
- 1.3. The need to reduce air pollution is identified as a key priority within the council's Environment Strategy (2020 – 2024), the Corporate Plan (2021 –

2025), our Air Quality Strategy (2018) and the Carbon Neutral Action Plan (2020 – 2025).

## **2. Executive Summary**

- 2.1.** In response to a resolution at Committee on 22 March 2022, a working group of officers from strategic transport, parking services, air quality, licensing and public health was formed to develop an evidence-based feasibility report to understand issues and identify options in relation to the matter of engine idling. A copy of the feasibility report is included as Appendix A.
- 2.2.** The report identified and assessed options that the council could implement to try and change behaviours and reduce instances of engine idling, while making the most efficient use of council resources. Results from a survey completed by Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) in September 2022 shows that less idling is occurring outside schools when compared with 2020. It has also demonstrated that idling could be more prevalent in winter, when drivers keep engines running to help retain heat within their vehicles (see 1.2.4 above).
- 2.3.** The number of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) has reduced across the Borough, suggesting that campaigns are effective and progressively changing driver behaviours. Additionally, funding is available from central government to support promotion/education campaigns, which means that these campaigns can continue in the future.

## **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1.** The Committee is recommended to
  - 3.1.1.** Continue internal and external promotional / educational public information campaigns in accordance with the findings of the Feasibility Study (Appendix A).
  - 3.1.2.** Set aside the opportunity to adopt additional legislative powers under the Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002, at this time.
  - 3.1.3.** Note that air quality across the whole Borough is reported annually, in accordance with the Council's statutory responsibilities and that, should evidence indicate a need, the opportunity for engine idling fixed penalties can be reviewed as part of that process.

## **4. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1.** Overall, Cheshire East has good air quality and it is improving. The number of AQMAs has reduced from 18 to 12. This suggests that the current promotion/ education campaigns are effective; contributing to reduced health inequalities across the Borough, and reducing the impact on the environment, which are key priorities within the Corporate Plan.

- 4.2. Results from the 2022 survey suggest that the promotion/ education campaigns run by the council over the past two years have helped to change behaviours, with less idling occurring outside schools. It has also demonstrated that idling could be more prevalent in winter, when drivers keep engines running to help retain heat within their vehicles.
- 4.3. Continuing promotion/ education campaigns demonstrates to the public and businesses that the council is taking the matter seriously by raising awareness and providing training to staff, contractors, and supply chain partners. It will also help to continue the work that the council has done to date in educating drivers on the adverse impacts of engine idling on the environment and their vehicles.
- 4.4. Adopting legislative powers may adversely impact the level of engagement from the public and businesses with council-led promotion/ education campaigns. Additionally, it could contradict the messaging of past and current campaigns, which aim to educate people on the issues of engine idling in the borough and better publicise current idling issues across the borough.
- 4.5. Funding is available from central government to support promotion/ education campaigns, which means that they can continue in the future.

**5. Other Options Considered**

- 5.1. The alternative options that were considered are appraised in the table below.

Option	Impact	Risk
<p><b>Stop Campaigns</b></p> <p>The council would stop running promotion/ education campaigns and would also not adopt the legislation.</p>	<p>This option would mean that measure GN12/2020 in the approved AQAP could not be delivered and limit the impetus and opportunities to engage with the public and businesses on the issue of air pollution and engine idling.</p> <p>The Council would also lack the legislative powers to deal effectively with idling engines and any complaints that may arise.</p>	<p>Air quality worsens outside local hotspots such as schools due to unnecessary vehicle idling.</p>

Option	Impact	Risk
<p><b>Adopt Legislation Only</b></p> <p>The council would adopt the legislation but cease all promotion/ education campaigns.</p>	<p>This option provides the Council with the legal powers to effectively deal with idling engines and any complaints that may arise.</p>	<p>Extra resources would be needed for enforcement alongside training.</p> <p>Due to the confrontational nature of issuing FPNs, enforcement officers may choose not to issue them, particularly in hostile environments.</p>
<p><b>Adopt Legislation and Continue Promotion/ Education Campaigns</b></p> <p>The council would adopt the legislation and continue promotion/ education campaigns.</p>	<p>This option provides the council with the legal powers to effectively deal with idling engines and any complaints that may arise.</p> <p>It also enables the Council to continue engaging with the public and businesses over air quality.</p>	<p>The public and businesses do not engage as well with the promotion/ education campaigns.</p> <p>Due to the confrontational nature of issuing FPNs, enforcement officers may choose not to issue them, particularly in hostile environments.</p>

## 6. Background

- 6.1.** Air pollution can cause both short- and long-term effects on health and contribute to climate change. Under the Environment Act 1995, the council has a duty to review and assess air quality across the borough to check concentrations against a set of health-based objectives for specific air pollutants.
- 6.2.** Air quality across most of the borough is good and seven AQMAs were revoked in 2021. 12 AQMA's that have demonstrated a breach of the annual mean concentration for nitrogen dioxide (40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) remain across the borough and are included within the Cheshire East AQAP. These AQMAs have been declared largely because of emissions from road traffic.
- 6.3.** The council currently raises awareness of air quality issues through its 'Show the Air you Care' webpage. This explains how air pollution is caused and ways that everyone can contribute to improving air quality. This

includes information on what engine idling is, how it worsens air quality and potential issues of idling in modern vehicles. There are plans for more campaigns to be launched in the near future following receipt of funding from Defra.

## **7. Consultation and Engagement**

- 7.1. No external or public consultation or engagement has been completed. Relevant council services have been engaged with the working group that prepared the Feasibility Study.

## **8. Implications**

### **8.1. Legal**

- 8.1.1. Were the Council to decide to adopt the powers under the Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002 they would, before enforcement could commence, first need to apply to the Secretary of State to become a designated local authority in accordance with Part 2 of the Regulations and authorise officers to enforce the Regulations in accordance with Part 3.
- 8.1.2. In the absence of adoption the Council would not have any direct legal powers to prevent vehicles idling.
- 8.1.3. The recommendation does not propose to adopt the Regulations, maintaining the status quo, there are no new legal implications associated with this recommendation.

### **8.2. Finance**

- 8.2.1. The recommendation proposes that current promotion/ education campaigns continue, which are accounted for within the existing Regulatory Services and Health budget and through funding by Defra.
- 8.2.2. If legislation was introduced, this is likely to require additional financial support/ resources for, including but not limited to: adoption and training/ recruiting CEOs and notice processing officers.

### **8.3. Policy**

- 8.3.1. The recommendation is consistent with the councils Corporate Plan, Air Quality Strategy, AQAP and Carbon Neutral Action Plan. Therefore, there are no policy implications.

### **8.4. Equality**

- 8.4.1. There are no equality implications, as the recommendation proposes that the council continues to adopt the same approach, with promotion/ education campaigns taking place across the borough.

- 8.4.2. AQMAs are monitored continuously for pollutants and specific interventions to improve air quality within each area are contained within the AQAP.

**8.5. Human Resources**

- 8.5.1. There are no human resources implications.

**8.6. Risk Management**

- 8.6.1. There will be a small proportion of drivers who will continue to idle while stationary and the council will be unable to issue FPNs to repeat offenders.
- 8.6.2. Council employees, contractors and supply chain partners need to complete their training and lead by example when representing the council and turn off their engines when stationary (unless there is a need to keep vehicles on). Failure to do so could potentially damage the reputation and reduce the credibility of the council's promotion/ education campaigns.

**8.7. Rural Communities**

- 8.7.1. There are no specific implications for rural communities.

**8.8. Children and Young People/Cared for Children**

- 8.8.1. The recommendation proposes to continue promotion/ education campaigns, which includes visiting schools to educate teachers and children about ways they can improve air quality.

**8.9. Public Health**

- 8.9.1. The recommendation proposes to continue promotion/ education campaigns that encourages changes in behaviours amongst drivers. Through changing behaviours, this will help to improve air quality and lead to a reduction of pollutants from vehicular traffic. The implementation of the AQAP also aims to improve public health.

**8.10. Climate Change**

- 8.10.1. The council has already launched an eco-driving course for all council staff who drive for work. This outlines techniques that drivers can use to reduce emissions generated by the existing council and grey fleet, as well as educate drivers about issues of vehicle idling. This course is also available to contractors and the wider supply chain who deliver services on behalf of the council.
- 8.10.2. In response to ongoing promotion/ education campaigns, some schools across the borough are starting to invest in, and deploy, no parking/ stopping signs around the school entrances to encourage parents to park further away and walk their children to the school

entrance, which reduces the volume of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matters being emitted in the vicinity of schools.

<b>Access to Information</b>	
Contact Officer:	Richard Hibbert, Head of Strategic Transport and Parking <a href="mailto:Richard.hibbert@cheshireeast.gov.uk">Richard.hibbert@cheshireeast.gov.uk</a> 07866 157324
Appendices:	Appendix A - Idling Vehicle Engines Options Review v1
Background Papers:	There are no background papers appended to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## ENGINE IDLING – FEASIBILITY REPORT FOR CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

### Purpose

In March 2022, the Council's Highways and Transport Committee requested that options to help reduce instances of engine idling were reviewed, including whether additional provisions in legislation should be adopted.

A small working group comprising officers from strategic transport, parking services, air quality, licensing and public health was formed to develop an evidence-based report to understand existing air quality issues, lessons learnt from other councils who have adopted and currently enforce the legislation, and to identify options that the council could implement to tackle engine idling.

### Background

Air pollution can cause short- and long-term effects on health and contribute to climate change. The need to reduce air pollution is identified as a key priority within the Council's Environment Strategy (2020 – 2024), Corporate Plan (2021 – 2025, *a council which empowers and cares about people and a thriving and sustainable place*), Air Quality Strategy (2018) and Carbon Neutral Action Plan (2020 – 2025).

Under the Environment Act 1995, the council has a duty to review and assess air quality across the borough to check concentrations against a set of health-based objectives for specific air pollutants. Air quality across most of the borough is good and seven Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's) were revoked in 2021. However, 12 AQMA's remain across the borough that have demonstrated a breach of the annual mean concentration for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) (40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>)<sup>1</sup>, which are mostly associated with vehicular traffic. Interventions for each area are included within the Cheshire East Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP).

The AQAP contains an action to educate and, where possible, enforce requirements to switch off idling engines to help improve air quality. Progress is currently being made on the launch of an anti-idling campaign because unnecessary idling increases fuel use and emissions of pollutants.

### Engine Idling Legislation

The Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002 allows councils to issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) against drivers who leave their engine idling and refuse to turn off their engines once asked by an Officer. The legislation applies to all vehicles on public roads, including buses, taxis, and private vehicles. It does not apply to vehicles that are:

- Stationary at traffic lights or because of congestion;
- Broken down and under test or repair;
- Need to refrigerate fresh goods or run a compactor on a refuse vehicle; or
- Any other situations deemed acceptable (e.g., defrosting a windscreen or cooling the inside of a vehicle down on a hot day for a few minutes).

Over 30 local authorities have adopted anti-idling enforcement legislation, including Cheshire West & Chester Council, in a bid to improve air quality. AirQualityNews submitted freedom of information

---

<sup>1</sup> Air Quality Management Area Maps (Cheshire East, 2022). URL: [https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/business/environmental\\_health/local\\_air\\_quality/aqma\\_area\\_maps.aspx](https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/business/environmental_health/local_air_quality/aqma_area_maps.aspx). Last accessed 26 August 2022.

requests to Reading, Camden, Westminster, Southwark, and Norwich Councils to ask how many FPNs they issued during 2018<sup>2</sup>. Reading, Camden, and Norwich issued no FPNs, while Southwark Council issued nine and Westminster, 20. It has raised questions over how effective council strategies are when it comes to enforcing vehicle idling.

## Baseline

To date, the council has chosen to educate drivers about the importance of switching off engines, rather than adopting legislation that could allow enforcement to be undertaken. Education has been primarily focused on known hotspots for engine idling, including schools.

Throughout the year, the council's Air Quality Awareness Group<sup>3</sup> plan and execute various activities for national and international awareness campaigns.

## Schools

### 2020 Engine Idling Survey

Due to direct approaches made by schools and parents, Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) recorded the number of idling vehicles whilst undertaking routine school patrols during a seven-week period in January and February 2020. Given the time of year, this provided a robust worst-case scenario.

49 idling cases were recorded (an average of seven cases per week). There were also a few locations where vehicle idling was recorded on more than one occasion.

### 2022 Engine Idling Survey

To supplement the 2020 survey, a 'snap survey' was completed by CEOs as part of routine school patrols between Wednesday 07 September and Friday 16 September 2022. Of the 18 schools that were patrolled, idling cases were only observed at eight schools (with 15 cases in total across the survey period). This is lower than 2020, which is likely to be a combination of the time of year (September is much warmer) and the promotion/ education campaigns run over the past two years. This latest data also provides an opportunity to provide more focused promotion/ education campaigns going forward.

## Buses

Currently, 99% of commercial and subsidised bus services are operated by vehicles to a Euro 4 or Euro 5 specification (30% and 69% respectively)<sup>4</sup>. Across the borough, approximately 70% of bus services receive funding support/ subsidy from the council. Where services are subsidised, such as for some public routes and home to school transport, the council can specify the maximum age of a vehicle and minimum euro standards as part of contract procurement.

The remaining 30% of services operate on a fully commercial basis (i.e., no subsidy/ support from the council), which reduces the influence that the council has on the age of the vehicles used to provide those services.

---

<sup>2</sup> Exclusive: Idling enforcement branded 'not fit for purpose' as just a handful of fines issued during 2018, (AirQualityNews, 2018). URL: [Exclusive: Idling enforcement branded 'not fit for purpose' as just a handful of fines issued during 2018 - AirQualityNews](#). Last accessed 01 September 2022.

<sup>3</sup> The Steering Group comprises officers from Air Quality, Public Health, Communications and Media, Parking Services, Highways and Strategic Infrastructure, Children and Families and Health Protection

<sup>4</sup> 1% operate with Euro 3 specifications.

## Taxis

Taxis include Hackney Carriages as well as Private Hire Vehicles. The council will adopt its new Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy from 01 November 2022, running for five years. This will mandate:

- Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles to be manufactured to a Euro 5 or higher specification from 01 November 2022. The council will not issue or renew licenses for older vehicles from this date. From 01 November 2024, this will mandate Euro 6 or higher specifications; and
- For Private Hire Vehicles, no vehicle shall be more than four years old when granted an initial license and no vehicle more than eight years old will be relicensed.

Prior to being granted a license, all vehicles are tested by the council at depots in either Middlewich or Macclesfield. Vehicles are licensed annually, to ensure that each vehicle meets the appropriate emissions standards. Licensed vehicles are tested every six months once they reach their fifth anniversary.

Taxi drivers are required to renew their license every three years from the date of issue. They must comply with the licensing policy and code of conduct. Currently, the code of conduct does not require drivers to switch off engines; however, this will be a requirement within the new Joint Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's License Conditions that that will be adopted from 01 November 2022.

## Current Projects

The council raises awareness through its 'Show the Air you Care' webpage<sup>5</sup>. This explains how air pollution is caused and ways that everyone can contribute to improving air quality. This includes information on what engine idling is, how it worsens air quality and potential issues of idling in modern vehicles.

The Air Quality team were successful in their grant application to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) in March 2022 to run an awareness campaign focusing on vehicle idling and domestic solid fuel burning. With this funding, it is hoped to develop campaigns that are continuous rather than adhoc, which should improve their effectiveness. The grant will be spent on facilitating communication methods, including:

- Visuals/ posters/ leaflets/ press releases;
- Radio campaigns – utilising four local radio stations to reach different demographics;
- Online:
  - On our awareness webpage;
  - A dedicated page for idling and domestic burning; and
  - Social media platforms.
- Schools Toolkit around vehicle idling;
- Advertising on pay and display parking tickets; and
- Installation of anti-idling signage around the borough, focusing on schools, taxi ranks and recreational areas.

---

<sup>5</sup> Show the Air You Care (Cheshire East Council, 2022). URL: [Air quality awareness \(cheshireeast.gov.uk\)](https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/air-quality-awareness). Last accessed 01 September 2022.

## Schools

Air Quality officers have produced an education package for schools to raise awareness within Key Stage 2 year groups. They are visiting schools around the borough (on a request basis) to educate them on what they can do to help improve air quality around their school. On the same webpage, there are also links to other important information and toolkits, such as the Sustainable Modes of Travel to Schools (SMOTS) strategy and to Modeshift STARS, which aim to increase the number of trips made to school by sustainable and active modes of transport.

Some schools across the borough are starting to invest in, and deploy, no parking/ stopping signs around their respective entrances. Static cameras are also being trialled at some schools where there are persistent parking issues to help CEOs with enforcement during the start and end of the school day. Both initiatives support, and reinforces, the messages within the councils' campaign and encourages parents to park further away and walk their children to the school entrance.

## Taxis

Due to reports/ concerns about idling at taxi ranks across the borough, diffusion tubes monitoring NO<sub>2</sub> were installed during 2020 on three taxi ranks at railway stations in Wilmslow, Macclesfield, and Crewe. Data is available for 2020 and 2021 and shows that the highest annual mean concentration of NO<sub>2</sub> occurred at Crewe Railway Station (27.8 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) during 2021, while levels of 20.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> were recorded at Wilmslow and Macclesfield Railway Stations. All three sites have higher concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> than 2020, but this is likely to be associated with increases in traffic following national lockdowns.

## Future Opportunities

Following a review of the baseline, this section outlines future opportunities for the council that could help future anti-idling campaigns, while reducing emissions from its current fleets' operations.

### A More Co-ordinated Approach

There are several projects across the council that directly/ indirectly help to improve air quality and tackle engine idling. While the AQAP demonstrates there is some cross working between different services within the council (e.g., Air Quality and Highways Officers meet every six weeks to discuss air quality issues and how the Local Transport Plan funding should be allocated), this approach could be co-ordinated through the existing Programme Management Office (PMO) to maximise benefits from projects. This also extends to the private sector partners, who are continuously developing innovative solutions and bringing them to the market.

Continuing to expand existing working relationships between designers and planners and making them aware of where air quality issues exist may help to influence the design during early stages of scheme development.

## Buses

Although the council was unsuccessful with its Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) funding bid, an Enhanced Partnership has operated since May 2022, which applies to all commercial and subsidised bus services. A key element of this Partnership is to develop an action plan within 12 months of the commencement date (by May 2023), which will include a requirement for the existing bus fleet to be retrofitted to Euro 6 standards. This Partnership provides a framework to encourage bus operators

to use lower emission vehicles<sup>6</sup> and to share best practise (e.g., driving techniques and turning off engines at layover areas/ bus stations).

## Taxis

With the new licensing policy being adopted from 01 November 2022, and with some protection rights for existing licence-holders, any changes will come into effect gradually over the course of the policy period. However, monitoring data for 2022<sup>7</sup> shows small increases in NO<sub>2</sub> at the taxi ranks outside Wilmslow, Macclesfield and Crewe Railway Stations when compared with 2021. Therefore, the council should continue monitoring these sites so that appropriate interventions can be put in place if needed.

## Awareness Campaigns

### Internal

The AQAP states that an eco-driving course has been developed for all council staff who drive for work. This outlines techniques that drivers can use to reduce emissions generated by their vehicles, which will help to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions from the existing council and grey fleet. This course is also available to contractors and the wider supply chain who deliver services on behalf of the council.

It is important for staff representing the council to set an example on the public network to demonstrate that the council is leading the way. Going forward, all staff should be required to complete a refresher training course, which will capture any changes/ development in technology. The council could also consider extending the training to family members of employees, contractors, and the wider supply chain to improve driving efficiency across the borough and to support promotion/ education campaigns.

### External

The council should continue working closely with schools to educate children about the impact that engine idling has on the environment. The council should also consider whether more emphasis can be placed on the effectiveness of School Travel Plans.

Anti-idling signage could be considered, using Defra grant funding, with a focus on schools, taxi ranks and recreational areas. This signage would need to be located appropriately/ sensitively to minimise street clutter.

The council could consider working with neighbouring local authorities (e.g., Cheshire West and Chester Council) to promote, and educate on, the negative impacts of vehicle idling and myth busting campaigns. This would allow resources to be shared and potentially increase the reach of promotion and education campaigns.

---

<sup>6</sup> Includes monitoring future opportunities to acquire funding from central government to help with the transition of the existing bus fleet to lower emission vehicles. An application for funding to ZEBRA or an equivalent funding source should be considered in the future, if eligible.

<sup>7</sup> Diffusion Tubes (NOx) and Air Quality Management Areas (Cheshire East Council, 2022). URL: <https://opendata-cheshireeast.opendata.arcgis.com/maps/58a0da9395064b16a8ff52be80c3e5af/explore>. Last accessed 06 September 2022.

## Potential Options

Following liaison with the working group, and a review of baseline conditions and current projects, the potential options that the council could consider are summarised in the table below, alongside their benefits and disbenefits.

Option	Benefits	Disbenefits
<p>1</p> <p><b>“Do Nothing”</b></p> <p>The council would continue running promotion/ education campaigns but would not adopt the legislation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivery of one of the measures in the approved AQAP.</li> <li>• Educates the Council’s fleet, employees using their own cars for Council business and contractors.</li> <li>• No extra finance or resource implications involved with adopting the legislation.</li> <li>• Potential opportunities to collaborate with neighbouring local authorities and delivery partners, which could increase the reach of campaigns.</li> <li>• Highlights the adverse impacts on the environment of unnecessary vehicle idling.</li> <li>• On-going community engagement through campaign work to encourage behavioural change.</li> <li>• Targeted patrols and campaigns could be run outside schools, taxi ranks, construction sites and other relevant areas to try and change behaviour.</li> <li>• Use of social media, schools bulletin, website, local press, etc to deliver the campaign.</li> <li>• No need for new FPNs to be printed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Messaging needs to be clear for council employees, contractors, and supply chain. Potential for adverse social media if council/ contractor/ supply chain vehicles are seen idling (e.g., during a lunch break).</li> <li>• Resourcing required to plan and implement the campaigns.</li> <li>• Cost implications associated with the design and production of leaflets and posters etc, although central government funding is available to help prepare and run campaigns.</li> <li>• The council would lack the legislative powers to effectively deal with idling engines and any complaints that may arise.</li> </ul>
<p>2</p> <p><b>“Stop Campaigns”</b></p> <p>The council would stop running promotion/</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No extra finance or resource implications for adopting legislation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council would lack the legislative powers to effectively deal with idling engines and any complaints that may arise.</li> </ul>

Option	Benefits	Disbenefits
<p>education campaigns and would also not adopt the legislation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removes costs associated with running the promotion/ education campaigns (e.g., production of leaflets).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limits the impetus and opportunities to engage with the public and businesses on the issue of air pollution.</li> <li>Would not deliver measure GN12/2020 in the approved AQAP.</li> </ul>
<p>3  <b>“Adopt Legislation Only”</b>  The council would adopt the legislation but cease all promotion/ education campaigns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides the council with the legal powers to effectively deal with idling engines and any complaints that may arise.</li> <li>Removes costs associated with running the promotion/ education campaigns (e.g., production of leaflets).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signs needed to help enforce the legislation. More street clutter and cost.</li> <li>Cost of training CEOs who would carry out enforcement.</li> <li>Extra resources needed for enforcement.</li> <li>The method for issuing FPNs is very confrontational, and CEOs may face additional abuse because of enforcing this legalisation.</li> <li>Potential for a reduction in engagement from the public and businesses with council-led promotion/ education campaigns.</li> <li>Could be seen as a ‘money making’ exercise for the council.</li> <li>More resources required within notice processing team due to challenges arising from FPNs and chasing unpaid fines etc.</li> </ul>
<p>4  <b>“Adopt Legislation and Continue Promotion/ Education Campaigns”</b>  The council would adopt the legislation and continue promotion/ education campaigns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery of one of the measures in the approved AQAP.</li> <li>Potential to combine media campaigns with day(s) of action utilising the FPN only for those not turning off the engine when asked.</li> <li>See benefits for Options 1 and 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Disbenefits for Options 1 and 3.</li> </ul>

## Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this review is to identify options that help to change behaviours and reduce instances of engine idling, while making the most efficient use of resources. The borough generally has good air quality, and it is improving, as shown by the number of AQMAs reducing from 18 to 12.

Results from the 2022 survey suggest that the promotion/ education campaigns ran by the council over the past two years have started to change behaviours, with less idling occurring outside schools. It has also demonstrated that idling could be more prevalent in winter, when drivers keep engines running to help retain heat within their vehicles.

Issuing FPNs is very confrontational for CEOs, as they must ask drivers to turn their engine off and only issue an FPN if the driver refuses to do so. This confrontational approach is likely to be a reason why other local authorities that have adopted the legislation issue so few each year.

Additionally, legislation is considered as a last resort when promotion and education campaigns are ineffective. As the number of AQMAs has reduced (and are linked with emissions from vehicular traffic), this suggests that these campaigns are effective and gradually changing driver behaviours. Developments in technology and more efficient vehicles are also helping to reduce emissions from vehicular traffic. Funding is also available from central government to support promotion/ education campaigns, which means that campaigns can continue in the future.

It is recommended that Option 1, “Do Nothing” (the council would continue running promotion/ education campaigns but would not adopt the legislation), is implemented. Continuing promotion/ education campaigns demonstrates to the public and businesses that the council is taking the matter seriously by raising awareness and providing training to staff, contractors, and supply chain partners. It also will help to continue the work that the council has done to date in educating drivers on the adverse impacts of engine idling on the environment and their vehicles.

This page is intentionally left blank



*Working for a brighter future together*

## **Highways and Transport Committee**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	24 November 2022
<b>Report Title:</b>	Bus Support Criteria
<b>Report of:</b>	Tom Moody, Director of Highways and Infrastructure
<b>Report Reference No:</b>	HT/66/22-23
<b>Ward(s) Affected:</b>	All

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1.** The bus network in Cheshire East plays a key role in providing access to jobs and services and connecting people and places. Local bus services support the delivery of the Council's strategic priorities for economic growth, environmental sustainability, social inclusion and health and wellbeing.
- 1.2.** The Council currently prioritises revenue expenditure to support bus services using a set of criteria adopted in August 2011. There is a need to update the criteria to reflect current corporate priorities, policy objectives in the Local Transport Plan (LTP), the needs of local communities and the challenges facing the bus industry following the Covid-19 pandemic.
- 1.3.** This report outlines the proposed approach to reviewing the Council's bus support criteria, providing an up-to-date framework to guide future expenditure on those local bus services that are financially supported by the Council.

### **2. Executive Summary**

- 2.1.** It is over 11 years since the current bus support criteria were adopted. In that time, the travel needs of local communities have changed, the bus industry has changed significantly, and new transport policy/strategy has been published both nationally and locally. There is a need to reflect these changes in the Council's bus support criteria so that the framework for decision-making is current and in line with the Council's corporate priorities to be open, fair and green.

**2.2.** Appendix 1 sets out the current criteria which were adopted in August 2011. The existing set of 10 criteria are framed around three objectives –

- 1) Local Transport Plan (LTP) priority themes,
- 2) Accessibility and
- 3) Financial considerations.

These objectives are weighted 35%, 40% and 25% respectively i.e accessibility is weighted highest at 40%. The proposed consultation will seek stakeholder views on whether this balance of weightings is appropriate or in need of adjustment.

**2.3.** A detailed review of the current criteria has found that they remain relevant for prioritising expenditure on local bus services. In addition, it is recommended that 3 new criteria be added to the current framework so that it reliably takes account of prevailing opportunities and challenges for the local bus network.

**2.4.** The 3 new criteria, which are intended to complement the existing metrics, are as follows:

- **Decarbonisation** – Following the publication of the DfT Transport Decarbonisation Plan in July 2021 and in line with the Council's Environment Strategy, the aim is to build into the criteria consideration of carbon emissions of bus services based on the type of engines they use EV/Hydrogen, Euro 6, 5 or 4 vehicles.
- **Areas of Deprivation** – are particularly reliant on local buses to meet travel needs. For this metric, the percentage of route length that is in the top 25% most deprived areas (based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation) will be used to score each bus service. This metric ensures that the social value of bus services is considered.
- **Patronage Recovery Post Covid** – Recovery post-covid is still ongoing and continues to significantly impact the viability of many bus services across the borough. Fare paying patronage, on average, has returned to around 80% of pre-covid levels, although there is significant variation between bus routes. Concessionary travel - which is approximately half of total patronage for many services - remains at around 60% of pre-pandemic levels. These metrics allow the Council to assess services based on their rate of recovery across all ticket types and users.

**2.5** It is proposed to simplify the wording of the three key objectives to avoid technical language and focus on the strategic outcomes that the bus network is expected to support, namely;

- 1) supporting the economy and environmental sustainability,

- 2) improving access and social inclusion and
- 3) bus service performance.

Appendix 2 illustrates the proposed new criteria with the changes / additions highlighted in red.

- 2.6** It is proposed to undertake public and stakeholder consultation on the revised criteria in the New Year. To ensure that the review process is open and transparent, the Council will need to make clear that the consultation is on the criteria and setting a framework to guide future decision-making. It will be important to stress that no changes to bus services are proposed as part of the work to review the bus support criteria.

### **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1.** That the Highways and Transport Committee:
- 3.1.1. Approve the approach to updating the Council's local bus support criteria.
  - 3.1.2. Agree the need to introduce additional criteria on decarbonisation, deprivation and patronage recovery post Covid, as proposed in the report, as a basis for consultation.
  - 3.1.3. Approve the proposal to carry out a period of public consultation and stakeholder engagement on the bus support criteria in line with section 7.

### **4. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1.** The proposed criteria enable existing and any potential future contracts to be tested using a fair, transparent and accountable process to manage contracts within budget constraints, provide maximum value for money and support wider strategic priorities in the Council.
- 4.2.** With the imminent withdrawal of Covid bus recovery funding at the end of March 2023, there is considerable uncertainty affecting both supported and commercial bus services in Cheshire East. It is therefore important to have a robust framework in place to prioritise expenditure.
- 4.3.** This decision-making framework relates to the Council's provision of fixed route scheduled bus services to enhance the network that can be provided commercially. Any consideration of the role of flexible, demand responsive transport, such FlexiLink and Go-Too is the subject of a further report to Committee.
- 4.4.** In July 2021, the Department for Transport (DfT) published the Transport Decarbonisation Plan setting out plans to decarbonise the entire transport system in the UK. The DfT are also set to release new LTP guidance for consultation this autumn placing decarbonisation at the centre of future transport planning. In Cheshire East, the Council have committed to becoming carbon neutral in its own operations by 2025 and in January 2022

a further pledge was made to become a carbon neutral borough by 2045. The emission standard of vehicles used to deliver particular services has been included as a new criterion. Services will be scored based on whether they use EV/Hydrogen, Euro 6, 5 or 4 vehicles.

- 4.5. The proposal to incorporate the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) recognises that areas of deprivation typically rely on bus services for access to facilities and amenities, therefore this metric ensures that the social value of bus services is considered, particularly in the context of the general rise in cost of living.
- 4.6. A significant challenge for the bus industry is the current patronage levels compared to pre-Covid levels in 2019. While fare paying patronage on average has returned to around 80% of pre-covid levels, concessionary travel (which constitutes half of total passengers for many services) still remains at around 60%. The lower levels of patronage are affecting the viability of services going forward.

**5. Other Options Considered**

- 5.1. The alternative option is to do nothing and continue with the existing scoring criteria which was developed in 2011. However, the criteria would not fully reflect corporate priorities, strategic transport framework and the significant challenges to the bus industry following the Covid-19 pandemic. The needs of local communities have changed in terms of the way people work, commute and socialise, so it is important that the scoring criteria reflects a changing bus network.

Option	Impact	Risk
Do Nothing	The support criteria will be outdated.	The criteria will not reflect the demands of the current bus network and the changing need of local people.

**6. Background**

- 6.1. In 2019, 70% of bus services in Cheshire East were supported by the Council and approximately 30% were operated commercially i.e. with no financial support from the Council. The local bus network in Cheshire East is facing a number of challenges due to a long-term structural decline in patronage, compounded by recent loss of ridership during the Covid-19 pandemic. The bus industry has also faced cost increases associated with fuel and driver wage rates.

- 6.2.** Since the outbreak of Covid-19, the government has been supporting the industry through the Bus Recovery Grant (BRG) and Local Transport Fund (LTF) – both are due to end in March 2023. In addition, concessionary travel reimbursement to operators has continued to be paid at pre-Covid levels, rather than actual patronage figures. As the additional funding ends, it is uncertain what this might mean for the bus industry nationally and locally.
- 6.3.** These circumstances are not unique to Cheshire East and the Council are working in partnership with bus operators to stabilise and improve the network over time. In July 2022, the Committee agreed to the establishing of an Enhanced Partnership for buses and the inaugural meeting is due to take place in autumn 2022. The partnership provides a mechanism to work in collaboration with the bus industry in Cheshire East.

## **7. Consultation and Engagement**

- 7.1.** A period of public consultation and stakeholder engagement is proposed to ensure the criteria reflects the views of the bus industry, service users and wider stakeholder and public opinion. The consultation is planned to be launched in January 2023 for 6 weeks. A Consultation Plan is being developed in conjunction with the Council's Research & Consultation Team.
- 7.2.** It is important for the Council to be open and transparent on the purpose of the consultation, which is to review the proposed criteria as a framework for decision making going forward. It will be important to make clear that the consultation will not propose any direct changes to existing bus services in the borough.
- 7.3.** The Council will engage with bus operators by means of the Enhanced Partnership Board and Forum. Within the Forum, all bus operators who operate within the Cheshire East Enhanced Partnership Plan and Scheme area will be invited and entitled to participate, ensuring that the whole industry have an opportunity to input to the consultation.

## **8. Implications**

### **8.1. Legal**

- 8.1.1.** In developing and implementing the revised bus service support criteria, the Council must have regard to the transport needs of all of the residents in the borough, which may include disabled persons, persons who are elderly or have mobility problems and mothers with young children. Development of plans will need to be in accordance with statutory and legal requirements for public consultation and stakeholder engagement and Equalities Impact Assessment.

## 8.2. Finance

8.2.1. The Council has an annual revenue budget of £1.969m to support local bus services in Cheshire East. The proposals in this report do not propose any changes to the Council's supported bus budget.

8.2.2. In response to the Covid-19 pandemic, the Department for Transport (DfT) have allocated additional grant funding to support the bus sector during the recovery period. The Local Transport Fund (LTF) supports the provision of local authority supported bus services, which are not commercially viable but considered socially necessary.

8.2.3. The table below indicates the DfT grant funding allocations for 2022/23.

2022/23	£
DfT LTF Grant (6 April – 4 October 2022)	£383,682
DfT LTF Grant (5 October – 31 December 2022)	£191,341
DfT LTF Grant (1 January – 31 March 2023)	To be confirmed

8.2.4. The review of the support criteria has been undertaken by Council staff in the Strategic Transport & Parking Service and therefore funded through existing staffing budgets. The costs of the public consultation and stakeholder engagement will be funded through the transport policy budget.

## 8.3. Policy

8.3.1. Cheshire East's Corporate Plan recognises the importance of the bus network in supporting key strategic objectives such as reducing air pollution, achieving carbon neutrality, enabling housing and employment growth, improving quality of place, and protecting the environment.

8.3.2. The Local Transport Plan (2019-2024) outlines the role transport will play in supporting the long-term goals to improve the economy, protect the environment and make attractive places to live, work and play. The proposed bus support criteria reflect this framework, to deliver social, economic and environmental improvements.

8.3.3. Cheshire East's Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) sets out the ambition for the bus network to improve the speed, reliability and quality of public transport, to encourage more residents to choose bus, make fewer car journeys and contribute to carbon reduction targets.

#### **8.4. Equality**

- 8.4.1. The Council will ensure the equality implications of the proposed changes are fully evaluated through an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA). A draft EqIA is appended to this report (see Appendix 3).
- 8.4.2. The Council has held early engagement with protected equality groups, including people with disabilities and mobility problems. Discussions have been held and engagement will continue with Cheshire Centre for Independent Living and Cheshire Eye Society.

#### **8.5. Human Resources**

- 8.5.1. There are no direct implications for Human Resources.

#### **8.6. Risk Management**

- 8.6.1. There are risks associated with not having a suitable set of criteria in place – continuing with the 2011 criteria would mean we are not considering the current challenges and priorities for the bus network.
- 8.6.2. In terms of governance and corporate oversight, a Project Board has been established including colleagues from key enabling services, namely legal, finance, research & consultation and communications. This will ensure that the process of updated the bus support criteria is robust.

#### **8.7. Rural Communities**

- 8.7.1. The Corporate Plan outlines targets to reduce areas of the borough not served by public transport. The Council has already demonstrated a commitment to this through its successful bid for DfT funding as part of the Rural Mobility Fund, subsequent operation of the Go-too service and continued delivery of the boroughwide FlexiLink service.
- 8.7.2. The Corporate Plan also identifies the desire for thriving and active rural communities by 2025. The importance of local buses for rural communities has been reflected within the scoring criteria ensuring that bus services remain accessible for those who need them most. Accessibility indicators are included within the support criteria to ensure areas with no reasonable travel alternatives score highly.

#### **8.8. Children and Young People/Cared for Children**

- 8.8.1. The Corporate Plan outlines the significant pressures in Children's Services, particularly placements for looked after children and services for children with special educational needs, including home to school transport. A significant number of school children across the borough use buses to access educational establishments, therefore access to education has been included as a journey purpose in the criteria.

## 8.9. Public Health

- 8.9.1. There are pockets of deprivation in Cheshire East related to income, health and life chances. Bus services enable a greater proportion of residents to access important services such as health care facilities. The continued delivery of these services therefore helps to address the Corporate Plan target to reduce health inequalities across the borough. Access to health care facilities is included as a journey purpose that each service is scored against and IMD are used to prioritise services based on their ability to serve highly deprived areas.

## 8.10. Climate Change

- 8.10.1. Cheshire East Council have committed to be carbon neutral by 2025 and to influence carbon reduction across the borough in order to become a carbon neutral borough by 2045 – the decarbonisation of the transport network is a key component of this programme of work. The scoring criteria considers the emission standards of vehicles in operation with EV/Hydrogen and Euro 6 vehicles looked at more favourably.

<b>Access to Information</b>	
Contact Officer:	Richard Hibbert, Head of Transport Strategy <a href="mailto:Richard.hibbert@cheshireeast.gov.uk">Richard.hibbert@cheshireeast.gov.uk</a> 07866 157324
Appendices:	1 – Current Bus Support Criteria (August 2011) 2 – Proposed Bus Support Criteria (November 2022) 3 – Draft Equality Impact Assessment
Background Papers:	N/A

## Appendix 1 – Current Bus Support Criteria, August 2011

Criteria			
Objective	Criteria	Scoring	
<b>LTP Priority Themes</b> Weighting 35%	Business growth - journey purpose (max. score of 10)	Employment	5
		Education / training	4
		Health / medical / welfare	4
		Shopping / personal business	2
		Leisure (social / recreation)	1
	Sustainable economic growth	The route serves a significant (>1000 trips) travel to work area	4
		The route serves a moderate (500-1000 trips) travel to work area	2
		The route serves a low (<500 trips) travel to work area	0
	Impact on carbon emissions	The route directly serves an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and/or congestion hotspot	4
		The route passes nearby an AQMA and/or congestion hotspot	2
		No AQMA or congestion hotspots are served by the route	0
<b>Accessibility</b> Weighting 40%	Integration - transport interchange	More than 1 interchange point or major interchange point on route	4
		One interchange point on route	2
		No interchange points on route	0
	Accessibility - travel alternative	No reasonable alternative	5
		Alternative within 2 hours during daytime within no more than 800 metres	4
		Alternative within 2 hours during daytime at same location	3
		Alternative within 1 hour during daytime within no more than 800 metres	2
		Alternative within 1 hour during daytime at same location	1
	Access for older & disabled people	More than 50% passenger journeys by concessionaires	5
		Between 33% and 50% passenger journeys by concessionaires	3
		Less than 33% passenger journeys by concessionaires	1
		No passenger journeys by concessionaires	0
	<b>Financial Considerations</b> Weighting 25%	Cost per passenger	Subsidy per passenger is no more than £1
Subsidy per passenger is more than £1, but no more than £2.50			4
Subsidy per passenger is more than £2.50, but no more than £5			3
Subsidy per passenger is more than £5 but no more than £10			2
Subsidy per passenger is more than £10			1
Funding options / alternatives		Potential for external funding contributions	4
		Potential for sharing of internal resources (e.g. cross-departmental)	2
		No funding / resource alternatives	0
Service Usage		More than 100,000 passenger journeys per annum	5
		More than 25,000 but not more than 99,999 passenger journeys per annum	4
		More than 10,000 but not more than 24,999 passenger journeys per annum	3
		More than 5,000 but not more than 9,999 passenger journeys per annum	2
		Up to 4,999 passenger journeys per annum	1
Patronage trends commercial potential		Passenger numbers increasing	4
		Passenger numbers stable	2
	Passenger numbers decreasing	0	

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 2 – Proposed Bus Support Criteria, November 2022

Objective	Criteria	Scoring	Points	
<b>Supporting the economy &amp; environmental sustainability</b>	Business growth - journey purpose	Employment	5	
		Education / training	4	
		Health / medical / welfare	3	
		Shopping / personal business	2	
		Leisure (social / recreation)	1	
	Sustainable economic growth	The route serves a significant (>1000 trips) travel to work area	4	
		The route serves a moderate (500-1000 trips) travel to work area	2	
		The route serves a low (<500 trips) travel to work area	0	
	Impact on carbon emissions	The route directly serves an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and/or congestion hotspot	4	
		The route passes nearby an AQMA and/or congestion hotspot	2	
		No AQMA or congestion hotspots are served by the route	0	
	Contribution to carbon emissions based on vehicle type and age	EV and Hydrogen	4	
		Euro 6	3	
Euro 5		2		
Euro 4		1		
<b>Improving access &amp; social inclusion</b>	Integration - transport interchange	More than 1 interchange point or major interchange point on route	4	
		One interchange point on route	2	
		No interchange points on route	0	
	Accessibility - travel choice	No reasonable alternative	5	
		Alternative within 2 hours during daytime within no more than 800 metres	4	
		Alternative within 2 hours during daytime at same location	3	
		Alternative within 1 hour during daytime within no more than 800 metres	2	
		Alternative within 1 hour during daytime at same location	1	
	Areas of deprivation	Over 50% of the route length serves an area within 25% most deprived in the borough	4	
		Under 50% of the route length serves an area within 25% most deprived in the borough	2	
		The route does not serve an area within the 25% most deprived in the borough	0	
	<b>Bus service performance</b>	Cost per passenger	Subsidy per passenger is no more than £1	5
			Subsidy per passenger is more than £1, but no more than £2.50	4
Subsidy per passenger is more than £2.50, but no more than £5			3	
Subsidy per passenger is more than £5 but no more than £10			2	
Subsidy per passenger is more than £10			1	
Alternative / external funding options		Potential for external funding contributions	4	
		Potential for sharing of internal resources (e.g. cross-departmental)	2	
		No funding / resource alternatives	0	
Service usage		More than 20,000 passenger journeys per annum	5	
		More than 15,000 but not more than 20,000 passenger journeys per annum	4	
		More than 10,000 but not more than 15,000 passenger journeys per annum	3	
		More than 5,000 but not more than 10,000 passenger journeys per annum	2	
		Up to 5,000 passenger journeys per annum	1	
Patronage trends - commercial potential		Passenger numbers increasing	4	
		Passenger numbers stable	2	
		Passenger numbers decreasing	0	
Fare paying patronage recovery post-covid (compared to 2019)		80-100%	4	
		60-80%	3	
		40-60%	2	
	20-40%	1		
Concessionary patronage recovery post-covid (compared to 2019)	80-100%	4		
	60-80%	3		
	40-60%	2		
	20-40%	1		

This page is intentionally left blank

# EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**TITLE: Cheshire East Enhanced Partnership and Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP)**

## VERSION CONTROL

<b>Date</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Description of Changes</b>
03.11.2022	2	Chris Taylor	N/A

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026

**CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL - EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Stage 1 Description: Fact finding (about your policy / service /

<b>Department</b>	<i>Place</i>		<b>Lead officer responsible for assessment</b>		<i>Chris Taylor</i>	
<b>Service</b>	<i>Strategic Infrastructure</i>		<b>Other members of team undertaking assessment</b>		<i>Jenny Marston Richard Hibbert</i>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>03.11.2022</b>		<b>Version</b>		<b>2</b>	
<b>Type of document (mark as appropriate)</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Service</b>
<b>Is this a new/ existing/ revision of an existing document (please mark as appropriate)</b>	<b>New</b>		<b>Existing</b>		<b>Revision</b>	
<p>Title and subject of the impact assessment (include a brief description of the aims, outcomes, operational issues as appropriate and how it fits in with the wider aims of the organisation)</p> <p>Please attach a copy of the strategy/ plan/ function/ policy/ procedure/ service</p>	<p>Bus Support Criteria for Prioritisation of Services</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Significant challenges have been posed to the bus industry in recent years on a national level. Following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic bus services within Cheshire East have witnessed a sharp decrease in patronage which remains lower than pre-pandemic.</p> <p>For the bus industry, there is continued uncertainty surrounding passenger and revenue recovery, coupled with cost increases associated with fuel and driver wage rates. These uncertainties alongside slow patronage recovery have further undermined the viability of the current network.</p> <p>Due to these challenges, the Department for Transport (DfT) have provided the Bus Recovery Grant (BRG) for operators and the Local Transport Fund (LTF) for Local Transport Authorities to aid the delivery of the existing bus network. Both are due to cease in March 2023.</p> <p>As BRG/LTF funding comes to a close and concessionary reimbursement aligns with actual patronage (rather than 2019 values) commercial operators will begin to evaluate the viability of their commercial services. At the moment it is uncertain what this might mean for the bus industry nationally and locally. This could lead to commercial services</p>					

being withdrawn and supported contracts being handed back. For this reason the DfT has proposed that Local Transport Authorities should conduct detailed Bus Network Reviews, to understand services that are at risk and the support that would be required to provide a sustainable public transport network.

At the moment within Cheshire East, around 70% of services are supported by the council which costs £2.3m per annum.

In accordance with the Government’s guidance on Network Reviews issued in April 2022, analysis has been conducted with operators to help identify which services within Cheshire East are deemed to be commercial, marginal or non-viable after the cessation of the BRG and LTF funding support. Conducting this network review is a condition of gaining access to the next phase of the BRG/LTF funding.

As services adapt to changing funding arrangements, there is a need to prioritise services. Cheshire East utilises a set of criteria which are used to score and prioritise bus services based on their ability to meet LTP priority themes, accessibility requirements for users and financial considerations.

The current criteria are summarised below:

- LTP Priority Themes: Including business growth (journey purpose), sustainable economic growth and impact on carbon emissions.
- Accessibility: Including transport interchange and travel choice
- Financial Considerations: Including cost per passenger, funding options/alternatives, service usage and patronage trends (commercial potential).

This set of criteria was developed in 2011 and used as a reference case in 2017 during the bus service review to reflect the key themes and aspirations contained within the LTP.

The bus network and industry within Cheshire East has witnessed significant challenges and changes since the adoption of this support criteria in 2011. For this reason, a refresh has been proposed in order to ensure services are scored based on relevant criteria as of 2022.

The new criteria includes the following additions which are being presented for consideration:

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026**

	<p>Decarbonisation – Cheshire East Council aims to be carbon neutral in its own operations by 2025, as outlined within the council’s Environment Strategy (2020-2024). Cheshire East made a further pledge in January 2022 to be a carbon neutral borough by 2045. With these targets in place, there is a need to ensure bus services contribute to their attainment. The emission standard of vehicles being used has been suggested as a new criterion, here services will be scored based on whether EV/Hydrogen, Euro 6, 5 or 4 vehicles are in operation.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) – For this metric, the percentage of route length that sits within the top 25% most deprived areas will be used to score each bus service. Areas of deprivation typically rely on bus services for access to facilities and amenities, therefore this metric ensures that the social value of bus services is considered during decision making.</p> <p>Fare Paying and Concessionary Patronage Recovery post-covid (compared to 2019) – Recovery post-covid is still ongoing and significantly impacting the viability of bus services across the borough. While fare paying patronage on average has returned to around 80% of pre-covid levels, concessionary travel (which constitutes half of total passengers for many services) still remains at around 60%. These metrics therefore score services based on their rate of recovery for all ticket types.</p>
<p>Who are the main stakeholders and have they been engaged with? (e.g. general public, employees, Councillors, partners, specific audiences, residents)</p>	<p>New criteria have been added to better represent the current bus network and its duties to serve the people of Cheshire East. In particular, the support criteria have been expanded to consider indices of multiple deprivation (IMD). This provides a measure of relative deprivation for small areas based on seven distinct domains of deprivation: income, employment, education, health, crime, barriers to housing and services and living environment. IMD has been introduced to limit the impact of bus service alterations on vulnerable groups. Conversations with vulnerable groups will be conducted to ensure impacts on those with protected characteristics are minimised.</p> <p>Consultation and engagement with bus user groups, and other key stakeholders will take place to discuss the proposed criteria and take account of any comments. Early conversations are to be held in November-December 2022 with full consultation taking place during January 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The general public (including residents and visitors to the Borough);</li> <li>• Cheshire East Council stakeholders;</li> <li>• Public transport operators;</li> <li>• Local businesses/organisations;</li> <li>• Schools and education establishments;</li> <li>• Neighbouring local authorities;</li> </ul>

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governmental bodies (e.g. Local Enterprise Partnership);</li> <li>• Statutory transport bodies (e.g. Department for Transport and Transport for the North).</li> <li>• Partner organisations</li> <li>• Town and Parish Councils;</li> <li>• Umbrella organisations for people with specialist transport needs; such as:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Space4Autism</li> <li>* Disability Information Bureau (DIB)</li> <li>* Cheshire Centre for Independent living</li> <li>* Cheshire Eye Society</li> <li>* Deafness Support Network</li> <li>* ADCA Medical Transport Service</li> <li>* Congleton Disabled Club</li> <li>* Care4CE</li> <li>* Leonard Cheshire Disability</li> <li>* The Stroke Association</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Transport interest groups; Such as:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crewe &amp; District Bus Users Group</li> <li>• Transition Wilmslow</li> <li>• Active Travel Congleton</li> <li>• Travel Cheshire</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Environmental groups;</li> <li>• MPs</li> </ul>
<p>What consultation method(s) did you use?</p>	<p>Early conversations are to be held with key stakeholders (vulnerable groups and bus operators). Once these conversations have been held, discussions will be recorded within future iterations of this EqIA.</p> <p>It is important for the council to be open and transparent on the purpose of this engagement/consultation, which is to review the proposed criteria as a framework for decision making going forward. The consultation will need to clearly describe why the criteria are suitable for forming a framework that guides decision making. It is noted that the consultation will not propose any direct changes to the network.</p>

Stage 2 Initial Screening

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026**

Who is affected and what evidence have you considered to arrive at this analysis? (This may or may not include the stakeholders listed above)	There will not be a direct impact on bus services as a result of this revised support criteria. The future of the bus industry within Cheshire East remains uncertain, this criteria will be used as a tool to help manage future changes to the network. The criteria itself will not have an impact on the public or bus operators. Application of this criteria will require additional Equality Impact Assessments to be conducted.		
Who is intended to benefit and how?	There will be no direct benefits associated with having this set of criteria in place. The criteria will serve as a tool for assessing the future bus network as it continues to evolve using more up to date and relevant criteria.		
Could there be a different impact or outcome for some groups?	No		
Does it include making decisions based on individual characteristics, needs or circumstances?	No		
Are relations between different groups or communities likely to be affected? (e.g. will it favour one particular group or deny opportunities for others?)	No		
<b>Is there any specific targeted action to promote equality? Is there a history of unequal outcomes (do you have enough evidence to prove otherwise)?</b>	There is no specific targeted action to promote equality other than to ensure that the importance of the challenges faced and the absence of strategic guidance on the matter recognise the need for CEC to develop a strategic approach to bus passenger transport		
<b>Is there an actual or potential negative impact on these specific characteristics? (Please tick)</b>			
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Marriage & civil partnership
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Pregnancy & maternity
Gender reassignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Race
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Religion & belief
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Sex
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	Sexual orientation
What evidence do you have to support your findings? (quantitative and qualitative) Please provide additional information that you wish to include as appendices to this document, i.e., graphs, tables, charts	Consultation/ involvement carried out		

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026

The outlined criteria will not lead to any direct changes to the bus network within Cheshire East. This is simply a scoring mechanism to evaluate bus services operating within the borough.		No
<b>Age</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage.</b> However, there may be positive or adverse impact on older and younger people who tend as groups to use public transport more than other age groups. Nationally the proportion of trips made by bus is highest amongst those aged between 17 and 20. Young people also face barriers to transport, include the availability and cost of public transport, particularly to further and higher education. Bus use is higher for those aged 60 and over than those in middle aged groups. This will be considered in future EqlAs following application of the criteria.	
<b>Disability</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage.</b> However positive or adverse impacts are possible depending on how the criteria is implemented. Key challenges faced by disabled people on the transport system include being able to access accurate and relevant travel information both before and during the journey, being able to access public transport interchanges, especially at night when these may be poorly lit, being able to access public transport vehicles and concerns regarding safety and comfort on the public transport network. This will be considered in future EqlAs following application of the criteria.	
<b>Gender reassignment</b> /	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage.</b> However it is widely accepted that gendered abuse and sexual harassment are particularly associated with public transport with concerns around personal safety when travelling. This will be considered in future EqlAs following application of the criteria.	
<b>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage.</b>	
<b>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage,</b> however a lack of adequate public transport provision creates further barriers to accessing medical establishments providing essential maternity services. This will be considered in future EqlAs following application of the criteria.	
<b>Race</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage</b> however it is important to recognise that Bus Services are aimed at all potential users regardless of ethnicity. Consideration also needs to be given to how fears and risks of violence associated with public transport disproportionately affect people from ethnic minorities. This will be considered in future EqlAs following application of the criteria.	
<b>Religion &amp; belief</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage</b> however, consideration needs to be given to how fears and risks of violence associated with public transport disproportionately affect people because of their religion or religious beliefs. This	

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026**

	will be considered in future EqIAs following application of the criteria.			
<b>Sex</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage</b> however, it is widely recognised that women are very often constrained by several barriers that shape how they travel. Women are also more likely to travel by bus and less likely to travel by rail than men. This will be considered in future EqIAs following application of the criteria.			
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	<b>No particular negative impacts have been identified at this stage</b> however, it is crucial to consider how fears and risks of violence associated with public transport proportionately affects people from the LGBT community. This will be considered in future EqIAs following application of the criteria.			
<b>Proceed to full impact assessment? (Please tick)</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>Date: 03/11/2022</b>	
/				

**If yes, please proceed to Stage 3. If no, please publish the initial screening as part of the suite of documents relating to this issue**

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026

Stage 3 Identifying impacts and evidence

This section identifies if there are impacts on equality, diversity and cohesion, what evidence there is to support the conclusion and what further action is needed

Protected characteristics	<p>Is the policy (function etc....) likely to have an adverse impact on any of the groups?</p> <p>Please include evidence (qualitative &amp; quantitative) and consultations</p> <p>List what negative impacts were recorded in Stage 1 (Initial Assessment).</p>	<p>Are there any positive impacts of the policy (function etc....) on any of the groups?</p> <p>Please include evidence (qualitative &amp; quantitative) and consultations</p> <p>List what positive impacts were recorded in Stage 1 (Initial Assessment).</p>	<p>Please rate the impact taking into account any measures already in place to reduce the impacts identified</p> <p><b>High:</b> Significant potential impact; history of complaints; no mitigating measures in place; need for consultation</p> <p><b>Medium:</b> Some potential impact; some mitigating measures in place, lack of evidence to show effectiveness of measures</p> <p><b>Low:</b> Little/no identified impacts; heavily legislation-led; limited public facing aspect</p>	<p>Further action (only an outline needs to be included here. A full action plan can be included at Section 4)</p> <p>Once you have assessed the impact of a policy/service, it is important to identify options and alternatives to reduce or eliminate any negative impact. Options considered could be adapting the policy or service, changing the way in which it is implemented or introducing balancing measures to reduce any negative impact. When considering each option you should think about how it will reduce any negative impact, how it might impact on other groups and how it might impact on relationships between groups and overall issues around community cohesion. You should clearly demonstrate how you have considered various options and the impact of these. You must have a detailed rationale behind decisions and a justification for those alternatives that have not been accepted.</p>
Age				
Disability				
Gender reassignment				
Marriage & civil partnership				
Pregnancy and				

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026

maternity				
Race				
Religion & belief				
Sex				
Sexual orientation				
<p><b>Is this change due to be carried out wholly or partly by other providers? If yes, please indicate how you have ensured that the partner organisation complies with equality legislation (e.g. tendering, awards process, contract, monitoring and performance measures)</b></p>				

**EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 0026**

**Stage 4 Review and Conclusion**

**Summary: provide a brief overview including impact, changes, improvement, any gaps in evidence and additional data that is needed**

Acceptance of the proposed criteria for bus service support prioritisation will be determined as a result of Committee review and detailed consultation. The Council will continue to work with specific groups and focus groups to monitor the impact of all future alterations. At this stage there will not be a direct impact on bus services as a result of this revised support criteria. The future of the bus industry within Cheshire East remains uncertain, this criteria will be used as a tool to help manage future changes to the network. The criteria itself will not have an impact on the public or bus operators. Application of this criteria will require additional Equality Impact Assessments to be conducted.

<b>Specific actions to be taken to reduce, justify or remove any adverse impacts</b>	<b>How will this be monitored?</b>	<b>Officer responsible</b>	<b>Target date</b>
Review consultation findings following the close of the consultation period	Results of consultation	Chris Taylor & Jenny Marston	March 2023
Undertake future consultation to further determine the impacts on groups identified as having a significant impact	Through stakeholder engagement.	Chris Taylor & Jenny Marston	TBC following application of criteria.
<b>When will this assessment be reviewed?</b>	This will be reviewed at following acceptance of the criteria and during future application of the criteria.		
<b>Are there any additional assessments that need to be undertaken in relation to this assessment?</b>	Yes, when the criteria is required and applied to existing services for prioritisation.		
<b>Lead officer sign off</b>	Jenny Marston	<b>Date</b>	03/11/2022
<b>Head of service sign off</b>	Richard Hibbert	<b>Date</b>	03/11/2022

This page is intentionally left blank



*Working for a brighter future together*

## **Highways and Transport Committee**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	24 November 2022
<b>Report Title:</b>	HS2 Programme Update
<b>Report of:</b>	Jayne Traverse, Executive Director of Place
<b>Report Reference No:</b>	HT/68/22-23
<b>Ward(s) Affected:</b>	All Wards

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1. This report provides Committee with a copy of the Council's petitions against the HS2 Phase 2b hybrid bill (High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Bill) and the first additional provision to the Bill (AP1).
- 1.2. The report outlines the steps the Council is taking to prepare for the Select Committee hearings.
- 1.3. The report also seeks approval of the Council's approach to implementing the HS2 Phase 2a ( Crewe – Manchester ) Act Road Safety Fund including engagement with ward members and the affected communities.

### **2. Executive Summary**

- 2.1. In line with the Full Council resolution (February 2022) the Council has submitted petitions against the High Speed Rail Phase 2b (Crewe – Manchester) Bill on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022 and a separate petition against AP1 on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2022.
- 2.2. The petitions set out the Council's objections to the Bill and AP1, as deposited, and sets out what it would like HS2 to do to address them.
- 2.3. The next stage of the hybrid bill process is the Select Committee stage. It is important that the Council is able to present a strong case to the Select Committee, supported by evidence, on each of the petitioning objections it puts forward.

- 2.4. Following Select Committee recommendation, the Lords stage of the passage of the High Speed Rail Phase 2a (Crewe – Manchester) Act required that there be a fund set up to carry out localised road safety works.
- 2.5. In June 2018, the Government announced that it would provide up to £6.5 million to be split between various affected authorities to support road safety schemes in local authority areas along the Phase 2a line of route. This funding was intended to support high quality projects that benefit those communities that stand to be most affected by the impact of the HS2 construction traffic. HS2 will administer the fund and review applications for funding.
- 2.6. The Council will be required to prepare and submit business cases for each scheme it wishes to bring forward using the HS2 Phase 2a – Road Safety Fund allocation, thereby showing the proposed approach to allocating the funding that has been developed.

### **3. Recommendations**

- 3.1. It is recommended that the Highways and Transport Committee:
  - 3.1.1. Note that the Council petitioned against the High Speed Rail Phase 2b (Crewe – Manchester) Bill (Hybrid Bill);
  - 3.1.2. Note that the Council petitioned against the High Speed Rail Phase 2b (Crewe – Manchester) Additional Provision 1 (AP1);
  - 3.1.3. Note that the proposals and mitigations outlined in the Hybrid Bill and AP1 do not meet the standards and requirements that underpin the Council’s supportive position on HS2, these being:
    - 3.1.3.1. An enhanced Crewe hub station that can serve 5/7 HS2 trains per hour, in each direction, with direct HS2 services to London, Manchester and Birmingham; and
    - 3.1.3.2. Appropriate and adequate mitigation and compensation against the negative impacts of the scheme on communities, the Borough’s landscape, environment and ecology and against the disruption caused during construction on the local transport network and to residents;
  - 3.1.4. Note the steps the Council is taking to prepare evidence for the future Select Committee hearings;
  - 3.1.5. Note that the prioritisation of petitioning points, and preparation for Select Committee hearings, will be undertaken in collaboration with the Petitioning Member Reference Group;
  - 3.1.6. Authorise the Executive Director of Place to seek a recommendation from Full Council to review the Council’s underlying position on HS2 should the appropriate requirements in 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.3.2 not be

secured through sufficiently binding Government commitments, or as undertakings in the Hybrid Bill Parliamentary Process.

- 3.1.7. Accept the total £724k funding allocation to the Council from the HS2 Phase 2a Road Safety Fund and approve the proposed funding split and approach to prioritising schemes, as contained at paragraph 6.14, including the engagement with local ward members, for the development of a programme of road safety improvements.
- 3.1.8. Note that the injunction, granted to HS2 Ltd, imposed by the High Court to allow HS2 Ltd to restrain unlawful trespass on and obstruction of access to land which HS2 holds on the route of the HS2 Scheme will cover the Phase 2a route within Cheshire East.

#### **4. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1. On review of the Hybrid Bill and AP1 documents, it was clear that the scheme being proposed did not provide adequate or appropriate mitigation against the negative impact and disruption caused by the scheme, and its delivery, to the Borough and its residents.
- 4.2. The Council's petition has identified alternative solutions that it would like to be brought forward and enhanced mitigations which it believes would minimise these impacts.
- 4.3. The Council is also aware of alternative options and mitigations have been requested by local parish councils in their own petitions and the Council would also seek that these are carefully considered and thoroughly assessed by HS2.
- 4.4. The Council welcomes the inclusion of the Crewe Northern Connection within the proposed powers being sought through the Hybrid Bill to provide the vital connection between the West Coast Main Line and HS2, north of Crewe, that could enable high speed services between Crewe and Manchester.
- 4.5. However, the Hybrid Bill does not provide firm enough commitments that are sufficiently binding to deliver the necessary investments at Crewe hub station that would enable it to adequately serve 5/7 HS2 trains per hour in each direction.
- 4.6. Instead, the Hybrid Bill fails to assume any additional HS2 services to the 2/3 trains per hour calling from Phase 2a and does not assume any services will use the Crewe North Connection until Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) is delivered. NPR delivery will be subject to a future Hybrid Bill and, if progressed and approved, is likely to be some years after HS2 Phase 2b is enacted, and possibly delivered.
- 4.7. Consequently, the Council felt it necessary to object to both the Phase 2b Hybrid Bill and AP1.

- 4.8. The next stage of the petitioning process is the Select Committee hearings where the Select Committee will hear evidence from the Petitioner (the Council) and the Promotor (HS2) and determine whether any amendments are needed. This is usually done by the Petitioner seeking undertakings/assurances through the Select Committee who places obligations on the Promotor.
- 4.9. It is important that the Council is able to present robust and conclusive evidence to support its objections to the Bill.
- 4.10. Whilst HS2 is a Government designed, funded and delivered scheme, the Hybrid Bill and petitioning process provides a key opportunity for the Council to seek to influence the scheme proposals.
- 4.11. It is important to note that there still remains the opportunity to influence the HS2 Phase 2b scheme to seek the key commitments and mitigations outlined in 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.3.2. However, the Council should ensure that its underlying supportive position on HS2 remains conditional on these being binding commitments and the Council's position should be reviewed should one, or both, of these not be secured.
- 4.12. The Council has been awarded an allocation from the overall sum of up to £724,000 by Government to implement road safety improvements along the HS2 Phase 2a line of route or associated construction routes within Cheshire East.
- 4.13. The Council will need to select which schemes to deliver using this Fund and seek approval from HS2 Ltd prior to drawing down the necessary funding. The Council would also like to seek targeted input from ward members and local communities on any schemes they would also like to be considered in this process.

**5. Other Options Considered**

**5.1.**

Option	Impact	Risk
3.1.6 Full Council could not be asked to review its HS2 position should it become clear that one or both of the key requirements in 3.1.3.1 and 3.1.3.2 not be committed to the satisfaction of the Council.	The Council would be deemed to be supportive of the Scheme regardless of the outcome for Cheshire East.	The Council has not implemented the Full Council resolution (February 2022)
3.1.7 The Council could choose not to	Agreeing a programme of schemes is likely to	The Council is able to deliver less schemes

agree a fixed methodology for developing a programme of schemes to fund via the HS2 Phase 2a Road Safety Funding	take longer and may result in schemes that do not necessarily provide the greatest benefit	due to inflation eroding the value of the Fund if the programme takes longer to agree.
--	--	--

## 6. Background

### *Petitioning*

- 6.1.** On 24<sup>th</sup> January 2022, HS2 Ltd deposited the High Speed Rail Phase 2b (Crewe – Manchester) Bill (the Bill) in Parliament, with the Bill having its first reading. On 6<sup>th</sup> July 2022, HS2 Ltd deposited the first additional provision, known as AP1.
- 6.2.** The Council engaged with locally impacted ward members and town and parish councils during the petitioning process by establishing two local cluster groups – a northern cluster group and a southern cluster group.
- 6.3.** The Council submitted its petition against the Bill on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2022 (Appendix 1 of this report) and against AP1 on the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2022 (Appendix 2).
- 6.4.** Key concerns raised in the Council's petition include
- 6.4.1.** That the inclusion of the Crewe North Connection provides the rail track solution that would provide the option for HS2 Phase 2b services, including those between Birmingham and Manchester, to route via Crewe station, rather than through the Crewe HS2 tunnel, when Phase 2b opens. However, the Indicative Train Timetable that accompanies Hybrid Bill proposals for Crewe station do not assume any HS2 Phase 2b services use the Crewe Northern Connection.
- 6.4.2.** The Indicative Train Timetable that accompanies the Hybrid Bill assume no additional HS2 services are calling at Crewe station, other than the 2/3 trains per hour enabled via Phase 2a, until (or indeed if) NPR is delivered.
- 6.4.3.** The Hybrid Bill proposals do not provide sufficient infrastructure and investment at Crewe station, including a Transfer Deck, to allow efficient and accessible Station facilities, to safely accommodate 5/7 HS2 trains per hour and are not future proofed for additional HS2/NPR services calling at Crewe station or using the Crewe North Connection.
- 6.4.4.** Underestimation of the potential impacts to the local highway and public transport network during construction
- 6.4.5.** Lack of provision for innovative approaches to the delivery of the green corridor principle and to deliver active travel

- 6.4.6. Lack of mitigation and/or compensation to address the environmental, landscape and ecology impacts of the Scheme
- 6.4.7. Concerns over the Scheme will reduce the North West Area of available inert landfill capacity by 87%
- 6.4.8. Potential flooding and drainage impacts
- 6.4.9. Inadequate provision for the additional Council resources that would be required to provide appropriate community engagement

**Select Committee Hearings**

- 6.5. The next stage of the Hybrid Bill and AP1 process will be the Select Committee Hearings. At the time of writing, the Select Committee has not yet formed and no dates for the Select Committee hearings have been published.
- 6.6. Each petitioner will then be granted a specific and finite timeslot for their hearing, usually with approximately 4 weeks' notice.
- 6.7. Therefore, it is important that the Council both prioritises its petitioning arguments, in collaboration with the Petition Member Reference Group. This will take into account the evidence that is currently being reviewed and will enable the Council to present a stronger and evidence backed case to Select Committee to support its petitioning arguments.

**HS2 Road Safety Fund**

- 6.8. The Road Safety Fund was set up by Government to help improve traffic, pedestrian, cycle and equestrian safety along the route, and to ensure that the Scheme delivers a lasting safety legacy for Phase 2a.
- 6.9. Following Royal Assent of the HS2 Phase 2a Bill, the Council was allocated up to £724,000 of the £6.5m HS2 Phase 2a - Road Safety Fund from Government.
- 6.10. It can be used by the Council to bring forward road safety focussed projects such as traffic calming measures, increased provision or improving existing pedestrian crossings and enhancing existing cycling provision along the HS2 Phase 2a line of route or along the associated construction routes.
- 6.11. The following parishes and respective wards are impacted by either the Phase 2a line of route or the Schedule 17 construction routes, or both:
  - 1.1..1. Parishes of Hunterson, Blakenhall, Checkley cum Wrinehill, Lea, Walgherton, Wybunbury and Hough) in Wybunbury Ward
  - 1.1..2. Parish of Stapeley in Nantwich South and Stapeley Ward
  - 1.1..3. Parishes of Willaston and Rope in Willaston and Rope Ward
  - 1.1..4. Parish of Shavington cum Gresty in Shavington Ward

**1.1..5.** Parishes of Basford, Wetson and Barthomley in Haslington Ward

**6.12.** Drawdown of the fund will require the preparation of business cases for each proposed scheme and approval by Government and the Council who will need to ensure that the proposed schemes meet the appropriate criteria for the Fund.

**6.13.** Key objectives of the Fund that will be consider by Government when assessing proposed Schemes will be:

- 6.13.1. to leave a legacy of road safety,
- 6.13.2. to mitigate construction traffic impacts
- 6.13.3. does not conflict with the delivery of HS2

**6.14.** As per recommendation contained at paragraph 3.1.7 the funding available will be split as follows;

- 60% (£434k) allocated to the delivery of road safety schemes along the line of Phase 2a or on the known construction routes prioritised in line with the current relevant highways policies.
- 20% (£145k) to community led initiatives which will be selected through an engagement exercise to be undertaken in Q3 2023/24. The format of this engagement and how the schemes which come forward are assessed will be discussed with the affected ward Members in advance of it going live.
- 20% (£145k) retained as a contingency sum for schemes which are subsequently found to be needed once the construction of Phase 2a is on site.

**6.15.** The proposal would be to have all of the schemes selected delivered at the earliest opportunity but definitely in advance of the Phase 2a main construction works commencing.

**6.16.** Members should note that the conditions of the funding allow an immediate 5% draw down for scheme concept design, engagement and business case preparatory costs. Due to the nature of the works in question and the potential for surveys being required to underpin scheme selection that this could be exceeded, hence the Council would have to forward fund these additional costs in advance of business case approval.

### ***High Court injunction***

**6.17.** On the 20<sup>th</sup> September 2022, the High Court imposed an injunction to restrain unlawful trespass on and obstruction of access to land held by HS2 Ltd on the route of the HS2 Scheme and covers Phase One and Phase 2a.

**6.18.** The Injunction is concerned with actions which cause damage, delay or hinderance to HS2 or its contractors. It prohibits:

- 6.18.1. trespass

- 6.18.2. deliberately obstructing or preventing vehicles from entering or exiting HS2's land
- 6.18.3. interfering with any fences or gates on HS2's land
- 6.19.** The injunction was awarded to HS2 Ltd and is only enforceable by HS2 Ltd themselves, and not the Council.
- 6.20.** The Cheshire Resilience Forum is already mobilised to coordinate any appropriate local response to a HS2 protestor encampment in the Borough. This injunction offers a key tool to manage such protestor activity.

## **7. Consultation and Engagement**

- 7.1.** The Council has engaged with local ward members and town and parish councils through the northern and a southern cluster group meetings during the petitioning process to better understand the local concerns, issues and objections which has been reflected in the Council's petition. The Council will continue to engage through the cluster meetings in the preparation for Select Committee hearings.
- 7.2.** The Road Safety Fund will enable prioritised projects to be delivered that are located along the Phase 2a line of route or the Phase 2a construction routes and engagement on scheme options will be focused on these community areas only.

## **8. Implications**

### **8.1. Legal**

- 8.1.1. Petitioning against a Bill requires specialist knowledge and expertise in drafting the petition and presenting this to the Select Committee. Parliamentary Agents are solicitors approved by the House of Commons and Lords to undertake this work on behalf of bodies seeking to petition. The Council has appointed Parliamentary Agents to assist with this process.
- 8.1.2. Section 239 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables a local authority to oppose a hybrid bill where it is satisfied that it is expedient to do so, but only in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Act.
- 8.1.3. The Council has identified areas of concern that represent legitimate petitioning matters .The principal ones being the future capacity and facilities at Crewe s main station. There are other matters all of which can be raised in the Select Committee and supported by evidence. There are no costs award s as each side bears their own preparation and presentation costs. Hearings are relatively brief and the materials and presentations are kept concise. Members of the Select committee are appointed from areas that have no relationship with the line of route and are cross party with a majority party chair.

- 8.1.4. With regard to the Road Safety Fund HS2 have now issued guidance on how claims are made and assessed and a proforma application. The fund is for works carried out near the authorised works under the Act or along Schedule 17 construction routes. The Council will need to assure that the works are not already in a programme and produce details in a business case based around costs timing and possible conflict with HS2 routing. A review panel at HS2 will consider applications they will not assess the technical standards but look at the proposal from the point of view of Hs2 programme and relationship to their traffic impacts.

## **9. Finance**

- 9.1.1. The costs associated with petitioning including internal recharges, consultants' costs, the costs of parliamentary agents and a KC will be funded by HS2 earmarked reserves and the existing HS2 revenue budget and is expected to be consistent with that identified in the Full Council resolution. This budget has been set on the expectation that the Council will petition against the Bill as is normal for a local authority when planning for such a project.
- 9.1.2. Consideration will need to be given to how and when the allocation from the Road Safety Fund is incorporated into the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The Council will also need to determine if the funding offer is index linked or if its buying power will be eroded in the period between allocation and use. The Council should also consider the risk of the fund being insufficient to cover the measures necessary for the wide areas affected by the HS2 line of route and movement of construction traffic which balance mitigating the immediate impacts on residents and users along with the post construction legacy of safer routes and better connectivity.
- 9.1.3. It is recognised that development costs to bring proposed schemes forward may exceed the 5% available for immediate drawdown so there will be a need to forward fund the work. Steps should be taken identify the necessary budget for this and to mitigate against cost overruns and aborted costs arising from rejected schemes.
- 9.1.4. Further work is required to understand the financial implications for the Council arising from the High Court injunction to establish if there are likely to be costs falling upon the Council of managing protes and enforcement of the injunction.

## **10. Policy**

- 10.1.1. A major national project such as HS2 has national policy objectives. Addressing the development impacts of a project of this scale will cover all the Council's aims within the corporate plan.
- 10.1.2. The petitioning objections put forward by the Council are in accordance with its policies.

## **10.2. Equality**

- 10.2.1. An Equality Impact Assessment Report for the scheme will be published as part of the hybrid bill deposit. This will be reviewed in accordance with Cheshire East's own equality and diversity policies.
- 10.2.2. Any petition of the Council to the proposals within the Bill will support equality and diversity within the Borough.

## **10.3. Human Resources**

- 10.3.1. The progression of a petition will have human resource implications across the Place Department, particularly across the planning and highways teams. The uncertainty in timing of the Select Committee and future stages could result in short term resource challenges.
- 10.3.2. Where possible, the Council will manage the work using existing resources and external consultations where required. However, the national shortage of planners could impact the availability of resources to deliver both the petition and the high volume of planning applications received by the Council.

## **10.4. Risk Management**

- 10.4.1. It is considered that preparing a robust petition will increase the ability of the Council to maintain its influence as a key stakeholder and achieve the best possible final decisions for the Borough.
- 10.4.2. There is a risk that the Council could petition but does not get what it wants, having incurred the costs of consultants, Parliamentary Agents and a QC. This will be mitigated by the Council by only taking forward petition "asks" that are supported by a strong evidence base and that we consider would have a reasonable chance of gaining support from the select committee.

**11. Rural Communities**

- 11.1.1. The proposals within the Bill will have significant impacts on a number of rural communities across the Borough, particularly during the construction period.
- 11.1.2. The Council’s petitioning objections will seek maximum mitigation against the environmental impacts of HS2 on our communities.
- 11.1.3. The petitioning process is the final opportunity for the Council to secure improved mitigation measures to minimise disruption to the rural communities across the Borough before the Bill becomes an Act of Parliament.

**11.2. Children and Young People/Cared for Children**

- 11.2.1. The proposals in the Bill could have implications on walking routes to school for residents within the Borough.
- 11.2.2. The delivery and economic impacts of HS2 will create significant new job opportunities for young people across the Borough in which residents of Cheshire East are well placed to benefit from.

**11.3. Public Health**

- 11.3.1. The Council’s petition seeks to ensure that maximum levels of mitigation is provided, including those against the negative environmental impacts of the HS2 proposals. This could include, for example, impacts on air quality and noise pollution.

**11.4. Climate Change**

- 11.4.1. HS2 is not a Council led scheme and HS2 Ltd has its own published carbon strategy. The petitioning process enables the Council to seek changes to the delivery of the scheme that could reduce its carbon impact.

<b>Access to Information</b>	
Contact Officer:	Hayley Kirkham, HS2 Programme Director <a href="mailto:Hayley.kirkham@cheshireeast.gov.uk">Hayley.kirkham@cheshireeast.gov.uk</a> 07811 677 352
Appendices:	Appendix 1: Cheshire East Council Petition against the High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Bill (Hybrid Bill)

	Appendix 2: Cheshire East Council Petition against the High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Additional Provision 1 (AP1)
Background Papers:	<p>High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill Petition, Full Council Report, 24<sup>th</sup> February 2022  <a href="https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/reports-and-accounts/2022-23/2022-02-24-high-speed-rail-bill-petition">Report Template v5.1 (cheshireeast.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill information  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/hs2-phase-2b-high-speed-rail-crewe-manchester-bill-2022">HS2 Phase 2b: High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Bill 2022 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) information  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/hs2-phase-2b-high-speed-rail-crewe-manchester-additional-provision-1">HS2 Phase 2b: High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Additional Provision 1 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>Government Response to the consultation under section 60 of the High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Act 2021  <a href="https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/consultations/government-response-to-the-consultation-under-section-60-of-the-high-speed-rail-west-midlands-crewe-act-2021">Government Response to the consultation under section 60 of the High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Act 2021 (publishing.service.gov.uk)</a></p> <p>HS2 Route Wide Injunction  <a href="https://www.hs2.co.uk/consultations/hs2-route-wide-injunction">HS2 route-wide injunction - HS2</a></p>



## Petition template

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

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

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

### Content

Your petition should include:

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

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

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

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

### Submission

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

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

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



## Payment

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

You can pay the required fee by:

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



## House of Commons

### High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill

#### 1. Terms and conditions

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

##### **Your data**

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

##### **Communications**

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

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

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

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

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

##### **Consent**

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

## 2. Petitioner information

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

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

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

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

### **Arrangement of the petition**

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



### 3. Objections to the Bill

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

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

#### **Introduction**

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

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

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

#### **Background**

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

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

### **Crewe Hub**

#### **Background**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

### **Crewe Hub Station – Capacity**

#### **Issue**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

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

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

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

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

40. Information Paper A3 states –

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

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

**Issue**

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

### **Traffic & Transport**

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

##### **Issue**

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

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

**Solution**

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

**A54 Middlewich alternative highway mitigation strategy**

**Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

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

**Issue**

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

**Solution.**

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

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

### **Insufficient Highway Junction Mitigation**

#### **Issue**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

88. The Promoter's Transport Assessment shows that there is an impact at this junction and a modest improvement is proposed. However, the Council has the followings concerns with this assessment –
- the baseline assessment appears to under-report the level of congestion experienced at this location,
  - the Council is making changes to the junction to introduce a pedestrian crossing. This will add additional vehicle delay to the baseline situation, and
  - the assessment has been undertaken using a strategic traffic model, this has the effect of redistributing traffic onto inappropriate local roads to avoid delays at this junction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Brook Street / Hollow Lane, Knutsford

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

A537 / A50 Toft Road

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

A50/Mereside Road junction.

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

**Solution**

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

**Land for HS2 agreed Highway Junction Mitigation**

**Issue**

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

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

Hough to Walley's Green area (MA01)

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

Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam area (MA02)

- v. A54 Chester Road/A530 Croxton Lane

Pickmere to Agden and Hulseheath (MA03)

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

**Solution**

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

**Temporary highway junction works made permanent**

**Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

**Appropriateness of Construction Routes**

**Issue**

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

109. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide an appropriately sized, and index-linked, fund made available to the Council to enable it to programme appropriate, adequate and reliable maintenance of the construction routes to the standards required in the Bill such that –
- there is no additional financial burden on the Council,
  - costs are controlled for the Promoter, and
  - maintenance of the construction routes is reliable and proactive.

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

#### **Highway structure impacts**

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

110. The Council is concerned that several of the structures on the minor roads proposed to be utilised by HGV traffic are in poor condition. Some of these structures have not yet even been assessed to meet capacity loadings. Additionally, at many of these locations, the road narrows to accommodate the structure. In these locations it may be necessary for temporary traffic management measures to be installed for the construction period. Locations include –
- Ashley Road / Birkin Brook
  - Mill Lane / River Bollin Bridge
  - Cherry Tree Lane / Blackburn's Brook

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

**Traffic and Transport: detailed design**

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

**Solution**

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

**Highways – Air Quality****Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

**Compounds – Highway Impacts**

**Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

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

### **Construction traffic efficiency**

#### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

#### **Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

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

135. This fund would be used to focus on areas such as –
- North Crewe, Middlewich and Winsford area (connecting Crewe to the Rolling Stock depot)
  - Bollin Valley Great North Way to connect the Trans Pennine Trail to Macclesfield travelling through Little Bollington, Tatton Park, Mobberley, around Manchester Airport, Styal, Wilmslow and into Macclesfield – which has a number of interfaces with the proposed route and infrastructure, including along Millington FP7 to Hope Cottage and where HS2 crosses and severs Ashley Road
  - Improvements to the towpath of the Middlewich Branch Shropshire Union Canal from Middlewich to Clive Green Lane
136. This fund should form part of the HS2 Green Corridor and Active Travel Fund mentioned above.

### **Walking and cycling standards**

#### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution 1**

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

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

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

#### **Solution 2**

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

#### **Issue 3 – severance**

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

#### **Solution 3**

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

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

#### **Solution 4**

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

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

### Environment & Landscape

#### Insufficient landscape mitigation and visual screening

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

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

#### Scale of operations in Ashley area

##### **Issue**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

#### **Contamination**

##### **Issue**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

#### **Heritage concerns**

**Issue**

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

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

### 3. Winterbottom Farm

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

### 4. Non designated heritage assets

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

### **Solution**

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

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

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

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

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

##### **Issue**

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

#### **Ecology**

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

##### **Issue 3 – cray fish**

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

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

**Solution**

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

**Issue 4 – connectivity**

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

**Waste & minerals**

**Issue 1**

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

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

#### **Solution 1**

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

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

#### **Issue 2**

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

#### **Solution 2**

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

#### **Issue 3**

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

#### **Solution 3**

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

**Visitor economy**

**Tatton Park and Cheshire Showground**

**Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

**Cheshire Showground impacts**

**Issue 1 – access to the Showground**

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

**Solution**

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

**Tatton Park Impacts**

**Issue 1 – access**

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

### **Miscellaneous matters**

#### **Engagement Team**

##### **Issue**

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

##### **Solution**

226. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide funding for a full-time Engagement Team who will be the direct point of contact between the Promoter and the Council and Cheshire West & Chester Council.

227. This role is in addition to the request for a Travel Plan Monitoring Officer, made elsewhere in this petition.

### **Yellow Park open space**

#### **Issue**

228. Yellow Park in Crewe is an area of informal open space between the West Coast Main Line and the B5067 Middlewich Street which will be affected by the construction of Middlewich Street vent shaft. An area comprising 55% (0.66ha) of the open space will be required for Middlewich Street vent shaft satellite compound. Of the 0.66ha required for Middlewich Street vent shaft satellite compound, 0.22ha of land will be permanently required from Yellow Park at the western end of Ridgway Street, Audley Street West and Mellor Street.

229. The Sherbourne estate, just north of the open space, is one of the most deprived areas in the country. The open space is regularly used by children and young people, particularly to play football. The reduction in size of the open space will clearly negatively affect the ability of the children and young people to play in this area.

#### **Solution**

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

### **Water management**

#### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

233. The assurance should provide that a working liaison group is maintained for the duration of the construction period and for the first 10 years of operation and appropriate resources are made available to fund it.

234. The Council also wishes to discuss the provision of an appropriate budget to deliver wider community benefits.

### **Drainage and flooding**

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

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

#### **Solution**

236. In areas where the Authorised Works sever drainage systems and ditches, the Council seeks an assurance that suitable alternative provision will be made to ensure that there is no consequential adverse effect in relation to drainage and flooding.

237. As part of this, the any additional maintenance liability arising as a result of the construction and operation of the works in respect of flooding, waterlogging or poor drainage must be the responsibility of the Promoter during construction and for a period of up to 50 years after the scheme becomes operational.

238. Winter conditions, or the results of periods of heavy rain, must also be considered during assessment of whether flood prevention works are required, and if so what type. In this assessment, the Promoter should consider recent weather trends and flooding events as opposed to historical assessment methodologies (i.e. 1 in 100-year events) and appropriate mitigation must be provided.

239. The Promoter must also consult the Lead Local Flood Authority on the assumptions used in flood assessments and on any mitigation. The assurance must also provide that the assessments and mitigation measures are either undertaken or reviewed by an independent assessor. It is possible that certain mitigation will require the promotion of an Addition Provision to secure, say, additional land.

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

240. The Council is concerned that the increased risk of surface water flooding arising from the construction and operation of the works authorised by the Bill has been inadequately assessed and has the potential to have significant adverse impacts. Some of the areas in which development will take place have experienced flooding recently and the construction impacts, particularly the changes to landscape from the excavation and deposit of material, are likely to exacerbate the existing problems.

241. The Council is concerned that the Promoter has not (i) carried out a proper assessment of the risks of surface water flooding or the implications on ground water contamination arising from the HS2 proposals in Cheshire East or (ii) considered the recent trends and frequency of flooding events in these areas.

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

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

#### **Solution**

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

#### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

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

#### **Issue**

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

#### **Solution**

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

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

**Issue**

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

**Solution**

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

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

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

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

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

## 5. Petitioner details

**Organisation/group name (if relevant)**

CHESTER EAST COUNCIL

**First name(s)**

HAYLEY

**Last name**

KIRKHAM

**Address line 1**

WESTFIELDS

**Address line 2**

SANDBACH

**Post code**

CW11 1HZ

**County**

**Email**

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

**Phone (landline or mobile)**

07811 677352

**Who should be contacted about this petition?**

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

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

## 6. Main contact's details

**First name(s)**

EMYR

**Last name**

THOMAS

**Address line 1**

SHARPE PRITCHARD LLP

**Address line 2**

ELM YARD, 3-16 ELM STREET, LONDON

**Post code**

WC1X 0BJ

**County**

**Email**

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

**Phone (landline or mobile)**

07584706583

## 7. Next steps

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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



## **Payment**

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

You 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 on 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](mailto: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](mailto:ethomas@sharpepritchard.co.uk)

**Phone (landline or mobile)**

07584706583



## 7. Next steps

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

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

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

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

Please pay the £20 administration fee within 2 working days of submitting your petition (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.



*Working for a brighter future together*

## **Highways and Transport Committee**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	24 November 2022
<b>Report Title:</b>	Financial Review 2022/23
<b>Report of:</b>	Alex Thompson, Director of Finance and Customer Services (Section 151 Officer)
<b>Report Reference No:</b>	HT/49/22-23
<b>Ward(s) Affected:</b>	Not Applicable

---

### **1. Recommendations**

That Highways and Transport Committee:

- 1.1. Notes the report of the Finance Sub-Committee ([Agenda for Finance Sub-Committee on Wednesday, 9th November, 2022, 2.00 pm | Cheshire East Council](#)), specifically the recommendations of that committee.
  - 1.1.1. Finance Sub-Committee recommend Service Committees to:
    - 1.1.1.1. note the financial update and forecast outturn relevant to their terms of reference.
    - 1.1.1.2. note that officers will seek to improve the financial outturn across all Committees to mitigate the overall forecast overspend of the Council.
- 1.2. Notes Appendix 7 and the following sections specific to this Committee:
  - Changes to Revenue budget 2022/23
  - Action Plan 2022/23
  - Corporate Grants Register
  - Debt Management
  - Capital Strategy
  - Reserve Strategy

## 2. Reasons for Recommendations

- 2.1. Committees are responsible for discharging the Council's functions within the Budget and Policy Framework provided by Council. The Budget will be aligned with Committee and Head of Service responsibilities as far as possible.
- 2.2. Budget holders are expected to manage within the budgets provided by full Council. Committee and Sub-Committees are responsible for monitoring financial control and making decisions as required by these rules.

<b>Access to Information</b>	
Contact Officer:	Alex Thompson Director of Finance and Customer Services (Section 151 Officer) <a href="mailto:alex.thompson@cheshireeast.gov.uk">alex.thompson@cheshireeast.gov.uk</a>
Appendices:	Finance Sub-Committee Financial Review 2022-23 which includes: Covering Report Annex 1: Appendix 7 Highways and Transport Committee.
Background Papers:	<a href="#">Medium-Term Financial Strategy</a> <a href="#">First Financial Review, Item No.14</a>



*Working for a brighter future together*

## **Finance Sub-Committee**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	9 November 2022
<b>Report Title:</b>	Financial Review 2022/23
<b>Report of:</b>	Alex Thompson: Director of Finance and Customer Services
<b>Report Reference No:</b>	FSC/6/22-23
<b>Ward(s) Affected:</b>	Not applicable

---

### **1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1.** This report provides members with an overview of the Cheshire East Council forecast outturn for the financial year 2022/23 as reported to Corporate Policy Committee on 6 October 2022. This report gives all service committees an opportunity to consider the First Review forecasts and the associated Action Plans.
- 1.2.** Members are being asked to note the financial challenges being experienced by the Council and to recognise the importance of ongoing activity to minimise the impact on services. The report also requests approval for financial changes taking place during the year that require authorisation in-line with the Constitution.
- 1.3.** The report highlights the negative impact of increasing inflationary pressures on the Council's budget since it was set in February 2022. It also highlights ongoing costs of Covid-19 scarring, where expenditure is still increased due to the effects of the pandemic.
- 1.4.** Reporting the financial forecast outturn at this stage, and in this format, supports the Council's vision to be an open Council as set out in the Corporate Plan 2021 to 2025. In particular, the priorities for an open and enabling organisation, ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making.

## **2. Executive Summary**

- 2.1.** The Council operates a financial cycle of planning, monitoring and reporting. This review is part of the monitoring cycle providing the forecast outturn position and any impacts on planning for next year's budget. This report supports the Council priority of being an open and enabling organisation, ensuring that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making.
- 2.2.** The Council set its 2022/23 annual budget in February 2022. The budget was balanced, as required, and included important planning assumptions about spending in the year. The budget is part of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2022 to 2026.
- 2.3.** The provisional financial outturn for 2021/22 was reported in July 2022 and highlighted good financial management in that year, with an overall revenue outturn favourable variance of £1.1m (0.4% of the net budget). The report also recognised emerging pressure within the final quarter of the year, particularly from rising inflation and complexity of demand for care. It was also acknowledged specific risks remained unmitigated in respect of the Council's Private Finance Initiative and High Needs within the Dedicated Schools Grant. The report also highlighted the end of Covid-19 grant funding. The ongoing assumption was that carried forward grant funding would have to be used to fund ongoing Covid-19 related pressure.
- 2.4.** In monitoring the 2022/23 financial year the national increase in inflation, from 0.4% in February 2021 to 10.1% in July 2022, is having a significant impact on the cost of Council services as well as on the cost of living for local residents. Inflation is affecting several critical areas:
- 2.4.1.** Service demand and contract inflation: Care needs are demand led, but care costs are rising due to increasing complexity of need as well as rising provider costs linked to staff shortages and utility and fuel prices. Fuel prices are also causing increases in transport and waste services.
- 2.4.2.** Pay inflation: Assumptions about achieving target inflation at a national level are not realistic in the short to medium term. This is creating cost of living increases that are subsequently leading to increasing wage demands. Pay negotiations for Council staff are impacted by this too, but are carried out at a national, not local, level. The main Trade Unions are balloting their members on the Employers' final pay offer of a flat figure increase which averages at 6%. The outcome of the pay negotiations are expected in early November.
- 2.4.3.** Covid-19 scarring: Although government funding for Covid-19 related costs has ended there remains an ongoing impact on care services and some services funded from fees and charges. Waste services are also experiencing ongoing tonnage increases from changed behaviour linked to the pandemic.

- 2.5. The findings of this financial review present a need to mitigate emerging financial pressures. The MTFS recognises that the Council has relatively low levels of reserves as funding is instead utilised to manage ongoing service demand. Mitigation can focus on several areas:
- 2.5.1. Appropriate use of balances: Carried forward Covid-19 funding, MTFS Reserve, General Reserves and specific service and company reserves levels are being reviewed and funding released to support essential services where practical. Flexible use of Capital receipts is also under review, which can allow eligible one-off revenue transformation expenditure by services to be funded from the proceeds of asset sales.
- 2.5.2. Efficiencies and Income generation: Services continue to review non-essential spending requirements to release efficiencies, delay spending or generate additional income from key stakeholders.
- 2.6. The financial pressure being experienced by Cheshire East Council is not unique. Local authorities, including Cheshire East Council, continue to liaise with government departments over the severity of so many emerging financial issues. The Council achieves this liaison either directly or through professional or political networks. The County Councils Network's most recent analysis of the costs of inflation warn that "any moves to cut their budgets next year would be 'worse than austerity' and result in 'devastating' reductions in local services – with local authorities offering just the bare minimum" ([CCN News 2022](#)).
- 2.7. The report sets out details of the latest Financial Review of the Council's forecast financial performance for 2022/23, including the forecast revenue position as reported to Corporate Policy Committee on 6 October 2022, and most recent updates to the Capital programme and grant funding received:

#### **Annex 1: Financial Review 2022/23**

- **Financial Stability:** Provides information on the overall financial stability and resilience of the Council. It demonstrates how spending in 2022/23 is being funded, including the positions on overall service budgets, centrally held budgets, council tax and business rates. Further details are contained in the appendices.
- **Appendices:**
  - Appendix 1** Adults and Health Committee.
  - Appendix 2** Children and Families Committee.
  - Appendix 3** Corporate Policy Committee.
  - Appendix 4** Economy and Growth Committee.
  - Appendix 5** Environment and Communities Committee.
  - Appendix 6** Finance Sub-Committee.
  - Appendix 7** Highways and Transport Committee.
  - Appendix 8** Update to the Treasury Management Strategy.
  - Appendix 9** Update to the Investment Strategy.

### 3. Recommendations

Finance Sub-Committee is asked to:

- 3.1. Note the forecast adverse Net Revenue financial pressure of £11.6m against a revised budget of £328.4m (3.5%) as reported to Corporate Policy Committee on 6 October 2022.
- 3.2. Note the forecast Capital Spending of £179.6m against an approved MTFS budget £185.2m due to slippage carried forward from the previous year.
- 3.3. Endorse the approach of Senior Officers to mitigate the adverse forecasts through the activities outlined in each 'Action Plan' contained in Annex 1 (Appendices 1 to 7), which include:
  - Managed restriction of in-year spending, whilst retaining essential services, in consultation with the relevant Committee.
  - Reviewing the level of spending on key contracts and reviewing the need for contract renewals during 2022/23.
  - Pricing and grant reviews to ensure income is being fully recovered on related activity.
  - Enhanced vacancy forecasting and management.
  - Re-alignment of, and appropriate use of balances, such as earmarked reserves, General Reserves and capital receipts.
  - Review and reprofile the Capital Programme to prevent any impact of related inflation on the revenue budget.
- 3.4. Note the contents of Annex 1 and each of the appendices, and note that any financial mitigation decisions requiring member approval will be presented to the appropriate Committee.
- 3.5. Approve supplementary capital estimates up to and including £1,000,000 in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules as detailed in **Appendix 6, Section 5 Capital Strategy, Table 5.**
- 3.6. Set up a Task Group to review the financial assumptions that will underpin the preparation of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2023/24-2026/27.
- 3.7. Note that Council will be asked to approve:
  - 3.7.1. Fully funded supplementary revenue estimates for specific grants coded directly to services over £1,000,000 in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules as detailed in **Appendix 6, Section 3 Corporate Grants Register, Table 1.**
  - 3.7.2. Supplementary capital estimates over £1,000,000 in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules as detailed in **Appendix 6, Section 5 Capital Strategy, Table 6.**

- 3.8.** Recommend to Service Committees to:
- 3.8.1. Note the financial update and forecast outturn relevant to their terms of reference.
- 3.8.2. Note that officers will seek to improve the financial outturn across all Committees to mitigate the overall forecast overspend of the Council.
- 3.8.3. Approve supplementary revenue estimates for specific grants coded directly to services up to and including £1,000,000 in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules as detailed in **Appendix 2 Children and Families Committee, Section 3 Corporate Grants Register, Table 2.**

#### **4. Reasons for Recommendations**

- 4.1. The overall process for managing the Council's resources focuses on value for money, good governance and stewardship. The approach to these responsibilities is captured in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.
- 4.2. The budget and policy framework sets out rules for managing the Council's financial affairs and contains the financial limits that apply in various parts of the Constitution. As part of sound financial management and to comply with the constitution any changes to the budgets agreed by Council in the MTFS require approval in-line with the financial limits within the Finance Procedure Rules.
- 4.3. This report provides strong links between the Council's statutory reporting requirements and the in-year monitoring processes for financial and non-financial management of resources.
- 4.4. In approving the Cheshire East Council Medium-Term Financial Strategy members of the Council had regard to the robustness of estimates and adequacy of reserves as reported by the s.151 Officer. The s.151 Officer's report highlighted the importance of each element of the MTFS and the requirement to achieve all the proposals within it. The recommendations of this report highlight the need for ongoing activity to manage the financial pressure being experienced by the Council.

#### **5. Other Options Considered**

- 5.1. None. This report is important to ensure members of the Committee are sighted on the financial pressure the Council is facing and the activity to date to try and mitigate this issue. Activity is required to ensure the Council balances its expenditure and income without serious impact on essential Council services.

#### **6. Background**

- 6.1. Managing performance is essential to the achievement of outcomes. This is especially important in evidencing the achievement of value for money across an organisation the size of Cheshire East Council. The Council is the third largest Local Authority in the Northwest of England, responsible for

approximately 500 services, supporting over 398,000 local people. Gross annual spending is over £700m, with a revised net revenue budget for 2022/23 of £328.4m.

- 6.2.** The management structure of the Council is organised into four directorates: Adults, Health and Integration; Children’s Services; Place; and Corporate Services. The Council’s reporting structure provides forecasts of a potential year-end outturn within each directorate during the year, as well as highlighting activity carried out in support of each outcome contained within the Corporate Plan.
- 6.3.** The political structure of the Council is organised into six committees, with a single sub-committee, all with financial responsibilities acutely aligned to the management structure. Performance against the 2022/23 Budget within each Committee, and the sub-committee, is outlined in Table 1 below.
- 6.4.** **Table 1 – Revenue Outturn Forecast split by the Six Service Committees and the Finance Sub-Committee as reported to Corporate Policy Committee 6 October 2022**

<b>2022/23</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Forecast Outturn</b>	<b>Forecast Variance</b>
<b>(GROSS Revenue Budget £474.2m)</b>	<b>(NET)</b>		
	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>
<b>Service Committee</b>			
Adults and Health	120.9	132.6	11.7
Children and Families	74.5	78.0	3.5
Economy and Growth	23.6	23.8	0.2
Environment and Communities	44.3	46.2	1.9
Highways and Transport	13.8	14.3	0.5
Corporate Policy	39.8	40.6	0.8
<b>Sub-Committee</b>			
Finance Sub	(316.9)	(323.9)	(7.0)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>11.6</b>

- 6.5.** The Council set a balanced net revenue budget of £327.7m at its meeting in February 2022. Current forecasts against the revised budget of £328.4m, shows a potential net expenditure of £340.0m.
- 6.6.** This position reflects the increase in demand led pressures in social care in both the Children’s Services Directorate and Adults, Health and Integration Directorate. This mirrors national events and the County Council’s Network has recently reported that forecast increases in care costs could be more than double those reported as recently as 2021.
- 6.7.** There are further pressures due to increased costs relating to rising inflation and the current national pay offer. The Council, in-line with most public

sector organisations, relies on government inflation targets when calculating budgets, target inflation remains at 2% but actual inflation is currently exceeding 10%. Some predictions say it may reach 13% by the end of the year. The Council actually forecast local pay increases of 2.5% recognising potentially higher increases for local lower paid workers. However, current national pay negotiations could see wages rise in excess of 6% for some lower paid workers.

- 6.8.** General Reserve balances are risk assessed and it was highlighted in the MTFS that emerging risks such as inflation and particularly the DSG deficit, as having no alternative funding. To address the issue of emerging financial pressure Senior Officers at the Council have set up Action Plans, which will continue to be developed to identify activities required to bring spending back in line with the MTFS.
- 6.9.** The emerging Action Plans reflect the Committee Structure to allow member oversight of the activities being carried out to manage in-year spending. Any appropriate decisions required from members will be brought to the Committee's attention via the Action Plans, to ensure appropriate context is provided.
- 6.10.** There is a clear ambition for each Committee to achieve spending in-line with the approved MTFS. However, in some cases, given the seriousness of the financial pressure being put on the Council, Committee members should consider options to exceed financial performance targets to retain an overall balanced position.
- 6.11.** Whilst some inflation factors may be temporary, the Action Plans must also consider the medium-term resilience of mitigation activity. For example, the use of one-off balances, to mitigate in-year spend, may be effective in the short term, but would not be effective if spending is likely to recur in later years.
- 6.12.** The Government is currently set to announce its Autumn Statement on 17 November 2022 and it may be helpful, in this very challenging environment, in providing some further information to assist local authorities in their business and financial planning
- 6.13.** As noted at recommendation 3.6 of this report, Finance Sub Committee are being asked to set up a task group to review the financial assumptions that will underpin the preparations of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2023/24 to 2026/27. This is vital to ensure that all current assumptions are reviewed and revised where necessary to reflect ongoing and emerging changes to the assumptions contained within the approved MTFS from February 2022.
- 6.14.** The intention is to report an updated Financial Review report to Corporate Policy Committee on 1 December 2022 which will be informed by the latest forecasts, and any information that may come from the Government's 17 November 2022 Autumn Statement.

## **7. Consultation and Engagement**

- 7.1.** As part of the budget setting process the Pre-Budget Consultation provided an opportunity for interested parties to review and comment on the Council's Budget proposals. The budget proposals described in the consultation document were Council wide proposals and that consultation was invited on the broad budget proposals. Where the implications of individual proposals were much wider for individuals affected by each proposal, further full and proper consultation was undertaken with people who would potentially be affected by individual budget proposals.

## **8. Implications**

### **8.1. Legal**

- 8.1.1.** The legal implications surrounding the process of setting the 2022 to 2026 Medium-Term Financial Strategy were dealt with in the reports relating to that process. The purpose of this paper is to provide a progress report for 2022/23.
- 8.1.2.** Other implications arising directly from this report relate to the internal processes of approving supplementary estimates and virements referred to above which are governed by the Finance Procedure Rules.
- 8.1.3.** Legal implications that arise when activities funded from the budgets that this report deals with are undertaken, but those implications will be dealt with in the individual reports to Members or Officer Decision Records that relate.

### **8.2. Finance**

- 8.2.1.** The Council's financial resources are agreed by Council and aligned to the achievement of stated outcomes for local residents and communities. Monitoring and managing performance help to ensure that resources are used effectively, and that business planning and financial decision making are made in the right context.
- 8.2.2.** Reserve levels are agreed, by Council, in February each year and are based on a risk assessment that considers the financial challenges facing the Council. If spending associated with in-year delivery of services is not contained within original forecasts for such activity it may be necessary to vire funds from reserves.
- 8.2.3.** The unplanned use of financial reserves could require the Council to deliver a greater level of future savings to replenish reserve balances and / or revise the level of risks associated with the development of the Reserves Strategy in future.
- 8.2.4.** As part of the process to produce this report, senior officers review expenditure and income across all services to support the development of mitigation plans that will return the outturn to a balanced position at year-end.

**8.2.5.** Forecasts contained within this review provide important information in the process of developing the Medium-Term Financial Strategy. Analysis of variances during the year will identify whether such performance is likely to continue, and this enables more robust estimates to be established.

**8.3. Policy**

**8.3.1.** This report is a backward look at Council activities and predicts the year-end position.

**8.3.2.** The forecast outturn position, ongoing considerations for future years, and the impact on general reserves will be fed into the assumptions underpinning the 2023 to 2027 Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

**8.4. Equality**

**8.4.1.** Any equality implications that arise from activities funded by the budgets that this report deals with will be dealt within the individual reports to Members or Officer Decision Records to which they relate.

**8.5. Human Resources**

**8.5.1.** This report is a backward look at Council activities and states the forecast year-end position. Any HR implications that arise from activities funded by the budgets that this report deals with will be dealt within the individual reports to Members or Officer Decision Records to which they relate.

**8.6. Risk Management**

**8.6.1.** Performance and risk management are part of the management processes of the Authority. Risks are captured at Strategic and Operational levels, both in terms of the risk of underperforming and risks to the Council in not delivering its objectives for its residents, businesses, partners and other stakeholders.

**8.6.2.** Financial risks are assessed and reported on a regular basis, and remedial action taken if and when required. Risks associated with the achievement of the 2021/22 budget and the level of general reserves were factored into the 2022/23 financial scenario, budget and reserves strategy.

**8.7. Rural Communities**

**8.7.1.** The report provides details of service provision across the borough.

**8.8. Children and Young People/Cared for Children**

**8.8.1.** The report provides details of service provision across the borough.

## 8.9. Public Health

- 8.9.1. Public health implications that arise from activities that this report deals with will be dealt with as separate reports to Members or Officer Decision Records as required.

## 8.10. Climate Change

- 8.10.1. Climate change implications that arise from activities that this report deals with will be dealt with as separate reports to Members or Officer Decision Records as required.

Access to Information	
Contact Officer:	Alex Thompson Director of Finance and Customer Services (Section 151 Officer) <a href="mailto:alex.thompson@cheshireeast.gov.uk">alex.thompson@cheshireeast.gov.uk</a> 01270 685876
Appendices:	<b>Annex 1 including:</b> <b>Section 1</b> provides information on the overall financial stability and resilience of the Council. Further details are contained in the appendices. <b>Appendix 1</b> Adults and Health Committee. <b>Appendix 2</b> Children and Families Committee. <b>Appendix 3</b> Corporate Policy Committee. <b>Appendix 4</b> Economy and Growth Committee. <b>Appendix 5</b> Environment and Communities Committee. <b>Appendix 6</b> Finance Sub-Committee. <b>Appendix 7</b> Highways and Transport Committee. <b>Appendix 8</b> Update to the Treasury Management Strategy. <b>Appendix 9</b> Update to the Investment Strategy.
Background Papers:	The following are links to key background documents: <a href="#">Medium-Term Financial Strategy</a> <a href="#">First Financial Review, Item No.14</a>



# Financial Review 2022/23

November 2022

This report receives scrutiny and approval from Members of Cheshire East Council. As a public report, the Council welcomes feedback to the information contained here.

**Anyone wanting to comment is invited to contact the Council at:**

**[shapingourservices@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:shapingourservices@cheshireeast.gov.uk)**

# Introduction

Cheshire East Council is the third largest Council in the Northwest of England, supporting over 398,000 local people with annual spending of over £470m.

Local government is going through a period of financial challenges, with a combination of the impact of increasing demand for services and rising costs due to inflation. There is also increasing uncertainty associated with income from business rates and government grants.

Demand for Council services is increasing, with more individuals and families needing support and services than ever before. This reflects an increase in population but also reflects changes in demographics and the national cost of living increases. This demand is resulting in forecast outturn of £340.0m against a net revenue budget of £328.4m, with the most significant impact within the rising complexity of needs in Adult Social Care.

When the 2022/23 budget was set, in February 2022, it was highlighted that the use of reserves was not sustainable in the medium term. Net spending therefore needs to be contained within the estimates of expenditure that form the budget. The forecasts at first review highlight pressures due to demand, inflation and pay negotiations. These will almost certainly affect the medium term finances of the Council. This situation must be addressed now and as part of the MTFs process for 2023 to 2027.

To support openness and transparency, and provide evidence of strong governance, the report has a main section, to provide background and context, and then nine supporting appendices with detailed information about allocation and management of public money during 2022/23:

The **Financial Stability** section provides information on the overall financial stability and resilience of the Council. It demonstrates how spending in 2022/23 is being funded, including the positions on overall service budgets, centrally held budgets, council tax and business rates. Further details are contained in the appendices.

- **Appendix 1** Adults and Health Committee.
- **Appendix 2** Children and Families Committee.
- **Appendix 3** Corporate Policy Committee.
- **Appendix 4** Economy and Growth Committee.
- **Appendix 5** Environment and Communities Committee.
- **Appendix 6** Finance Sub-Committee.
- **Appendix 7** Highways and Transport Committee.
- **Appendix 8** Update to the Treasury Management Strategy.
- **Appendix 9** Update to the Investment Strategy.

*Alex Thompson*

Director of Finance and Customer Services  
(Section 151 Officer)

# Contents

- Introduction 1
  
- 2022/23 Revenue Forecast 3
  
- Financial Stability
  - Introduction 4
  - Service Performance 4
  - Central Budgets 5
  
- Appendices
  - Appendix 7 – Highways and Transport Committee 9

## 2022/23 Outturn Forecast - Financial Position

2022/23 (GROSS Revenue Budget £474.2m)	Revised Budget (NET) £m	Forecast Outturn £m	Forecast Variance £m	For further information please see the following sections
<b>SERVICE DIRECTORATES</b>				
Adult, Health and Integration	120.9	132.6	11.7	Appendix 1 Section 2
Children's Services	74.5	78.0	3.5	Appendix 2 Section 2
Place	81.7	84.3	2.6	Appendix 4, 5 & 7 Section 2
Corporate Services	39.8	40.6	0.8	Appendix 3 Section 2
<b>CENTRAL BUDGETS</b>				
Capital Financing	18.9	18.9	-	Appendix 6 Section 5
Transfer to/(from) Earmarked Reserves	(2.7)	(8.7)	(6.0)	Appendix 6 Section 6
Corporate Contributions / Central Budgets	(4.7)	(5.7)	(1.0)	Appendix 6 Section 2
<b>TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>328.4</b>	<b>340.0</b>	<b>11.6</b>	
Business Rates Retention Scheme	(49.1)	(49.1)	-	Section 1 - Paragraphs 19-22
Specific Grants	(24.6)	(24.6)	-	Appendix 6 Section 3
Council Tax	(254.7)	(254.7)	-	Section 1 - Paragraphs 8-18
<b>Net Funding</b>	<b>(328.4)</b>	<b>(328.4)</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>NET (SURPLUS) / DEFICIT</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>11.6</b>	

# Financial Stability

## Introduction

1. The Council has a track record of sound financial management. Nevertheless, in common with all UK local authorities the Council finds itself in a position where pressures on the revenue budget are intensifying as a result of rapid inflation, the legacy impact of the Coronavirus pandemic and increasing cost of living pressure on households. These issues have the effect of increasing the demand for services and increasing costs of services.
2. Complexity and market sustainability in Adults' and Children's Social Care remains the most significant financial pressure for the Council in the medium term. Rising inflation in fuel, utilities and wage levels are affecting costs across all services.
3. **Table 1** provides a service summary of financial performance. The current forecast is that services will be £18.6m over budget in the current year. The Action Plans provide further details and changes to service net budgets since the Medium-Term Financial Strategy are analysed in the **Appendices 1-7**.
4. Further items impacting on the level of the Council's balances are detailed in **Table 2** below on Central Budgets and Funding.

**Table 1 - Service Revenue Outturn Forecasts**

2022/23	Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Forecast Variance	FOR INFO COVID Costs Included in Totals
(GROSS Revenue Budget £474.2m)	(NET)			
	£m	£m	£m	£m
<b>SERVICE DIRECTORATES</b>				
Adult Social Care - Operations	117.5	128.5	11.0	4.9
Commissioning	3.4	4.1	0.7	-
Public Health	-	-	-	-
<b>Adult, Health and Integration</b>	<b>120.9</b>	<b>132.6</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Directorate	1.0	0.9	(0.1)	-
Children's Social Care	46.6	48.5	1.9	0.1
Strong Start, Family Help and Integration	8.3	8.3	-	0.1
Education & 14-19 Skills	18.6	20.3	1.7	0.5
<b>Children's Services</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>
Directorate	0.8	0.7	(0.1)	-
Environment & Neighbourhood Services	44.3	46.2	1.9	2.3
Growth & Enterprise	22.8	23.1	0.3	0.1
Highways & Infrastructure	13.8	14.3	0.5	1.6
<b>Place</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Directorate	1.9	1.9	-	-
Finance & Customer Services	11.9	12.3	0.4	-
Governance & Compliance Services	11.7	11.2	(0.5)	-
Communications	0.7	0.7	-	-
HR	2.4	2.2	(0.2)	-
ICT	9.3	10.4	1.1	-
Policy & Change	1.9	1.9	-	-
<b>Corporate Services</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	-
				<i>For Info</i>
<b>TOTAL SERVICES NET EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>316.9</b>	<b>335.5</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>9.6</b>

**Table 2 – Central Budgets and Funding Outturn Forecasts**

2022/23	Revised Budget	Forecast Outturn	Forecast Variance
(GROSS Revenue Budget £474.2m)	(NET)		
	£m	£m	£m
<b>CENTRAL BUDGETS</b>			
Capital Financing	18.9	18.9	-
Transfer to/(from) Earmarked Reserves	(2.7)	(8.7)	(6.0)
Corporate Contributions / Central Budgets	(4.7)	(5.7)	(1.0)
<b>Central Budgets</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>(7.0)</b>
Business Rates Retention Scheme	(49.1)	(49.1)	-
Specific Grants	(24.6)	(24.6)	-
Council Tax	(254.7)	(254.7)	-
<b>Net Funding</b>	<b>(328.4)</b>	<b>(328.4)</b>	<b>-</b>

### Outturn Impact

- The financial impact of the outturn forecast could decrease balances by £11.6m. This is over 75% of the Council's General Reserves balance, so mitigating actions must be taken to reduce the pressure during the year. Any deficit at the end of the year will be drawn down from the Medium-Term Financial Strategy Earmarked Reserve in the first instance, but drawdowns from that reserve are already factored in to the MTFs to manage the effects of variations in spending and income in specific years.
- The Council will continue to manage and review the financial forecasts in response to emerging pressures and how this affects the Council's revenue budget.

### Collecting Local Taxes for Local Expenditure

- Cheshire East Council collects Council Tax and Non Domestic Rates for use locally and nationally.

### Council Tax

- Council tax is set locally and retained for spending locally. Council tax was set for 2022/23 at £1,626.24 for a Band D property. This is applied to the taxbase.
- The taxbase for Cheshire East reflects the equivalent number of domestic properties in Band D that the Council is able to collect council tax from (after adjustments for relevant discounts, exemptions and an element of non-collection). The taxbase for 2022/23 was agreed at 156,607.48 which, when multiplied by the Band D charge, means that the expected income for the year is £254.7m.
- In addition to this, Cheshire East Council collects council tax on behalf of the Cheshire Police and Crime Commissioner, the Cheshire Fire Authority and Parish Councils. **Table 3** shows these amounts separately, giving a total budgeted collectable amount of £313.8m.
- This figure is based on the assumption that the Council will collect at least 99% of the amount billed. The Council will always pursue 100% collection, however to allow for non-collection the amount billed will therefore exceed the budget.
- This figure may also vary during the year to take account of changes to Council Tax Support payments, the granting of discounts and exemptions, and changes in numbers and value of properties. The amount billed to date is £315.3m.

**Table 3 – Cheshire East Council collects Council Tax on behalf of other precepting authorities**

	£m
Cheshire East Council	254.7
Cheshire Police and Crime Commissioner	36.9
Cheshire Fire Authority	12.9
Town and Parish Councils	9.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>313.8</b>

13. **Table 4** shows collection rates within three years, and demonstrates that 99% collection is on target to be achieved within this period.

**Table 4 – 99% of Council Tax is collected in three years**

Financial Year	CEC Cumulative			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	%	%	%	%
After 1 year	98.2	97.9	97.4	97.8
After 2 years	99.0	98.8	98.3	**
After 3 years	99.2	98.9	**	**

\*\*data not yet available

14. The council tax in-year collection rate for the period up to the end of September 2022 is 56.1%. This is a small decrease of 0.2% on the previous year, possibly indicating current cost of living pressures. Additionally, significant numbers of council tax staff have been supporting the government's energy

rebate payments which has impacted resource normally involved in collection.

15. Council tax support payments were budgeted at £18.4m for 2022/23 and at the end of September the total council tax support awarded was £18.9m.
16. During 2021/22 there was a consultation and review of the Council Tax Support scheme resulting in some amendments being made. The revised scheme was confirmed by full Council in December 2021.
17. Council tax discounts awarded are £28.6m which are comparable to the same period in 2021/22. A small increase is attributable to work related to raising awareness of the discounts available to residents.
18. Council tax exemptions awarded is £7.2m which although broadly in line with previous years shows a slight increase due to reasons shown at 17.

**Non-Domestic Rates (NDR)**

19. NDR is collected from businesses in Cheshire East based on commercial rateable property values and a nationally set multiplier. The multiplier changes annually in line with inflation and takes account of the costs of small business rate relief.
20. The small business multiplier applied to businesses which qualify for the small business relief was set at 49.9p in 2022/23. The non-domestic multiplier was set at 51.2p in the pound for 2022/23.
21. **Table 5** demonstrates how collection continues to improve even after year end. The table shows how over 99% of non-domestic rates are collected within three years.

22. The business rates in-year collection rate for the period up to the end of September 2022 is 58.6%. This is a significant increase on last year and begins to revert collection rates back to pre pandemic figures. A return to standard collection processes and government support through additional reliefs has assisted the recovery in collection.

**Table 5 – Over 99% of Business Rates are collected within three years**

Financial Year	CEC Cumulative			
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	%	%	%	%
After 1 year	98.5	98.2	92.4	95.6
After 2 years	99.4	98.4	97.4	**
After 3 years	99.4	99.2	**	**

\*\*data not yet available

# Appendices to the Financial Review 2022/23

**November 2022**

# **Appendix 7 : Highways and Transport Committee**

## **Contents**

### **Highways and Transport Committee Extracts**

- 1. Changes to Revenue Budget 2022/23 since Medium Term Financial Strategy**
- 2. Action Plan 2022/23 as reported to Corporate Policy Committee 6 October 2022**
- 3. Corporate Grants Register**
  - Table 1: Highways and Transport Committee Grants**
  - Table 2: Delegated Decisions for Committee to Note**
  - Table 3: Allocation of Additional Grant Expenditure for Committee to Note**
- 4. Debt Management**
- 5. Capital Strategy**
- 6. Reserves Strategy**

# Appendix 7

## Highways and Transport Committee

### 1. Changes to Revenue Budget 2022/23 since Medium Term Financial Strategy

	MTFS Net Budget £000	Additional Grant Funding £000	Restructuring & Realignments £000	Revised Net Budget £000
<b>Highways and Transport</b>				
Highways & Infrastructure	11,802	-	1,977	13,779
	11,802	-	1,977	13,779

## 2. Action Plan 2022/23 as reported to Corporate Policy Committee 6 Oct 2022

Highways and Transport Committee	Exp £m	Inc £m	Net Revised Budget £m	MTFS Proposal	Value 2022/23 £m	MTFS Ref	RAG Rating	Comments	Variance from MTFS 2022/23 £m
Highways and Infrastructure	23.7	-9.9	13.8	Pay Inflation	0.183	3&4	Red (will not achieve)	Represents current estimate of the impact on Committee services in excess of the MTFS, from a nationally negotiated pay award.	0.053
				ASDV Review (TSS)	-0.125	20	Amber (on track but may not achieve all)	TSS transition has been completed, with teams brought in-house. Re-procurement of contract purchasing system in underway. Supplier engagement events as part of market refresh in autumn. Saving deferred pending new procurement system (DPS).	0.250
				Parking service – postponement of review of charges	0.504	60	Green (on track and should achieve)		0.000
				Carbon Reduction - Replacement of existing illuminated signs and bollards with LED units	0.030	55	Amber (on track but may not achieve all)	Roll out of replacement programme via highways contract on track to complete by March 23. Savings of energy costs will reduce due to increased prices. Draw down of reserves within highways.	0.000

Highways and Transport Committee	Exp £m	Inc £m	Net Revised Budget £m	MTFS Proposal	Value 2022/23 £m	MTFS Ref	RAG Rating	Comments	Variance from MTFS 2022/23 £m
				Local Supported Buses	0.008	61	Green (on track and should achieve)	Monitoring of concessionary travel payments to operators. Savings on concessionary travel reimbursement.	0.000
				Review split of TSS budget between Place and Childrens services		New		TSS budget split is being reviewed as currently leaves Place with a permanent £1m pressure relating to home to school transport. Whilst under review an allocation of £1m from the MTFS reserve is mitigating the issue in 2022/23.	0.000
				Reduction in parking revenue due to covid changes in customer behaviour		New		Permanent pressure due to reduced number of commuters, people parking all day and reduced sales of annual and quarterly permits.	1.320
				Parking		New		Additional costs of inflation and enhanced cleaning on Multi Storey Car Parks offset by in year staffing vacancies and reduced spend on supplies and services and transport.	-0.110
				HS2		New		£150k favourable variance due to significant internal Council resource being utilised for the Main Petitioning work, this has now been	-0.350

Highways and Transport Committee	Exp £m	Inc £m	Net Revised Budget £m	MTFS Proposal	Value 2022/23 £m	MTFS Ref	RAG Rating	Comments	Variance from MTFS 2022/23 £m
								submitted to Government - August 2022. £200k release from reserve.	
				Highways Covid pressure		New		Removal of Emergency Active Travel schemes.	0.061
				Highways Mitigating Actions		New		Release of Flooding and Well Managed Highway Infrastructure reserve.	-0.630
				Local Bus Operator Costs		New		Inflationary pressures on operators, mitigated in 2022/23 by reserves but significant impact 2023 onwards - high level estimate £5m.	
				Local Plan Review		New		Transport Modelling Resource requirements for Local Plan Review.	
				Highways		New		Reprofile or remove capital expenditure to improve revenue forecasting. Lobby DfT to recognise construction inflation.	
				Workforce		New		Revise vacancy forecasts to reflect recruitment difficulties. Slow down recruitment where feasible / safe. Updated staffing forecasts take account of revised recruitment timescales, included in forecasts above.	

Highways and Transport Committee	Exp £m	Inc £m	Net Revised Budget £m	MTFS Proposal	Value 2022/23 £m	MTFS Ref	RAG Rating	Comments	Variance from MTFS 2022/23 £m
				Transformation		New		Use flexible receipts to capitalise costs of transformation - Highways redesign.	-0.067
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>-9.9</b>	<b>13.8</b>		<b>0.600</b>				<b>0.527</b>

### 3. Corporate Grants Register

**Table 1 – Corporate Grants Register**

Grants 2022/23	Revised Forecast FR1 2022/23 £000	Latest Forecast 2022/23 £000	Change from FR1 2022/23 £000	Treatment of Grant  <i>Notes 2 - 5</i>
<b>HIGHWAYS &amp; TRANSPORT</b>				
<b>Specific Use (Held within Services)</b>	1,316	2,155	838	
<b>General Purpose (Held Corporately)</b>				
Pavement Licensing - New Burdens	0	13	13 SRE	
<b>TOTAL HIGHWAYS &amp; TRANSPORT</b>	<b>1,316</b>	<b>2,168</b>	<b>851</b>	

Notes

- 1 The Dedicated Schools Grant, Pupil Premium Grant, Sixth Form Grant and Other School Specific Grant from the Education Funding Agency (EFA) figures are based on actual anticipated allocations. Changes are for in-year increases / decreases to allocations by the DfE and conversions to academy status.
- 2 SRE - Supplementary Revenue Estimate requested by relevant service.
- 3 ODR - Officer Decision Record to approve immediate budget change to relevant service.
- 4 Reserves - transfer to reserves at year end.
- 5 Balances - amount will be included as a variance to budget.

3.1 Cheshire East Council receives two main types of Government grants; specific use grants and general purpose grants. Specific use grants are held within the relevant service with a corresponding expenditure budget. Whereas general purpose grants are held in central budgets with a corresponding expenditure budget within the allocated service area.

3.2 The increase in specific grants relates mainly to bus services and On-Street Residential Chargepoint Schemes. Requests

for the allocation of the additional specific grants received are detailed in **Table 2**.

3.3 Spending in relation to specific use grants must be in line with the purpose for which it is provided.

3.4 **Table 3** shows additional general purpose grants that are approved by the Finance Sub-Committee.

**Table 2 – Note Delegated Decision - Supplementary Revenue Estimate Requests for Allocation of Additional Grant Funding (Specific Use) £500,000 or less**

Committee	Type of Grant	£000	Details
Highways and Transport	Bus Capacity Grant (Specific Purpose)	191	Increase on Financial Review 1 forecast. This grant is from the Department for Transport. To support ongoing work with Bus operator partners, working through an EP or franchising arrangement, to deliver better bus services.
Highways and Transport	On-Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS) (Specific Purpose)	151	This grant is from the Department for Transport. To fund the installation of plug-in vehicle chargepoints for the use of local residents in areas without off-street parking facilities.
Highways and Transport	LTA Enhanced Bus Partnership Grant (Specific Purpose)	171	This grant is from the Department for Transport. The extension of Bus recovery funding to cover the period October – December 2022
<b>Specific Purpose Allocations less than £500,000</b>		<b>513</b>	

**Table 3 – Note Allocation of Additional Grant Expenditure from General Purpose Grants Held in Central Budgets**

Committee	Type of Grant	£000	Details
Highways and Transport	Pavement Licensing - New Burdens (General Purpose)	13	This grant is from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). New Burden grant relating to the introduced temporary measures through the Business and Planning Act 2020 to support businesses selling food and drink during the economic recovery while social distancing guidelines remain in place. The bill streamlines the process of obtaining permission for the placing of tables and chairs outside a business on the pavement.
<b>General Purposes Allocations less than £500,000</b>		<b>13</b>	

# 4. Debt Management

	Outstanding Debt £000	Over 6 months old £000
<b>Highways and Transport Committee</b>		
Highways and Infrastructure	928	753

# 5. Capital Strategy

## Highways and Transport

## CAPITAL

### CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2022/23- 2025/26

Scheme Description	Total Approved Budget	Prior Years	Forecast Expenditure				Total Forecast Budget 2022/26	Forecast Funding					Total Funding	
			Forecast Budget 2022/23	Forecast Budget 2023/24	Forecast Budget 2024/25	Forecast Budget 2025/26		Grants	External Contributions	Revenue Contributions	Capital Receipts	Prudential Borrowing		
		£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	
<b>Committed Schemes</b>														
<b>Highways and Infrastructure</b>														
A500 Dualling Scheme	89,456	9,264	2,096	2,342	18,509	57,244	80,191	53,284	4,300				22,607	80,191
A50 / A54 Holmes Chapel	603	81	45	327	150	0	522		522					522
A51/A500 Corridor Nantwich	250	231	19	0	0	0	19						19	19
A532 Safer Road Scheme	1,223	260	584	379	0	0	963	864					99	963
A536 Safer Road Scheme	2,404	1,461	943	0	0	0	943	849					94	943
A537 Safer Road Scheme	2,733	745	1,988	0	0	0	1,988	1,745					243	1,988
A54 / A533 Leadsmithy Street, Middlewich	563	134	40	389	0	0	429		429					429
A556 Knutsford to Bowdon	504	361	93	50	0	0	143		143					143
A6 MARR CMM Disley	2,122	1,646	10	466	0	0	476		22				454	476
A6 MARR CMM Handforth	800	492	309	0	0	0	309	226	48				34	309
A6MARR Design Checks & TA	473	271	203	0	0	0	203	70	133					203
Air Quality Action Plan	368	221	147	0	0	0	147	147						147
Alderley Edge Bypass Scheme Implementation	60,611	60,317	294	0	0	0	294						294	294
Bridge Maintenance Minor Wks	16,672	14,570	2,102	0	0	0	2,102	1,704					398	2,102
Client Contract and Asset Mgmt	1,141	510	631	0	0	0	631	631						631
Congleton Link Road	88,443	69,970	3,047	5,913	3,895	5,619	18,473	316	15,169				2,989	18,473
Crewe Green Link Road	26,625	26,170	455	0	0	0	455		455					455
Crewe Green Roundabout	7,500	7,053	50	50	150	198	448		448					448
Crewe Rail Exchange	6,712	6,693	19	0	0	0	19	19						19
Flowerpot Phs 1 & Pinchpoint	10,037	1,271	1,228	2,932	1,174	3,433	8,766	2,304	726				5,736	8,766
Future High Streets Fund - Highways	6,169	480	1,914	1,594	1,804	377	5,689	5,486	203					5,689
Highway Maintenance Minor Works	11,219	0	11,219	0	0	0	11,219	10,685					534	11,219
Highway Pothole / Challenge Fund	11,371	7,925	3,446	0	0	0	3,446						3,446	3,446
Highway S106 Schemes	962	0	666	296	0	0	962	41	921					962
S106 Davenport Lane, Arclid	352	60	292	0	0	0	292	245	48					292
Infrastructure Scheme Development	250	0	175	75	0	0	250	250						250
Jack Mills Way Part 1 Claims	300	278	22	0	0	0	22		22					22
Local Access Transport Studies	600	83	517	0	0	0	517	517						517
Local Area Programme	6,566	5,546	1,021	0	0	0	1,021	1,021						1,021
Middlewich Eastern Bypass	92,493	16,176	7,783	10,113	13,817	44,604	76,317	46,778	13,341				16,198	76,317
Middlewich Rail Study	20	0	20	0	0	0	20	20						20
M6 Junction 19	29	23	6	0	0	0	6		6					6
North-West Crewe Package	42,351	7,446	15,748	14,758	741	3,658	34,905	9,710	12,250		1,730		11,215	34,905
Old Mill Road / The Hill Junction	1,324	145	120	1,059	0	0	1,179		1,179					1,179

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2022/23- 2025/26

Scheme Description	Total Approved Budget	Prior Years	Forecast Expenditure				Total Forecast Budget 2022/26	Forecast Funding					Total Funding
			Forecast Budget 2022/23	Forecast Budget 2023/24	Forecast Budget 2024/25	Forecast Budget 2025/26		Grants	External Contributions	Revenue Contributions	Capital Receipts	Prudential Borrowing	
		£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Committed Schemes</b>													
<b>Highways and Infrastructure</b>													
Part 1 Claims	113	34	79	0	0	0	79	79					79
Poynton Relief Road	52,657	29,670	16,202	46	1,355	5,385	22,987	8,335	6,200			8,453	22,987
Programme Management	1,011	784	227	0	0	0	227	227					227
Road Network & Linked Key Inf	83	78	5	0	0	0	5	5					5
Road Safety Schemes Minor Works	5,552	5,056	496	0	0	0	496	496					496
Sydney Road Bridge	10,501	10,103	50	50	100	198	398		398				398
Traffic Signal Maintenance	500	17	483	0	0	0	483	483					483
Traffic Signs and Bollards - LED Replacement	1,250	0	1,250	0	0	0	1,250			1,250			1,250
Winter Service Facility	999	479	130	130	130	130	520					520	520
							0						0
							0						0
<b>Transport &amp; Parking</b>													
Accessibility: Public Transp't	1,020	907	113	0	0	0	113	113					113
Active Travel Fund (Covid-19)	724	436	288	0	0	0	288	288					288
Active Travel (Cycle/Walking route) Investment	2,755	2,179	576	0	0	0	576	576					576
Broadway Meadow Car Park	48	0	48	0	0	0	48					48	48
Car Parking Improvements (including residents parking)	322	262	30	30	0	0	60			14		46	60
Digital Car Parking Solutions	140	93	47	0	0	0	47					47	47
National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 55 Middlewood Way in	569	0	569	0	0	0	569	569					569
Pay and Display Parking Meters	620	531	-	49	40	0	89					89	89
Sustainable Travel Access Prog	3,424	1,552	560	1312	0	0	1,872	1,325	309			238	1,872
Sustainable Modes of Travel to Schools Strategy (SMOTSS)	620	472	148	0	0	0	148	148					148
Town Studies	550	426	125	0	0	0	125	125					125
<b>HS2 Programme</b>													
Crewe HS2 Hub Project Development	12,700	7,661	2,510	1500	1029	0	5,039					5,039	5,039
<b>Total Committed Schemes - In Progress</b>	<b>589,403</b>	<b>300,618</b>	<b>81,185</b>	<b>43,860</b>	<b>42,894</b>	<b>120,846</b>	<b>288,784</b>	<b>149,681</b>	<b>57,271</b>	<b>1,264</b>	<b>1,730</b>	<b>78,839</b>	<b>288,784</b>
													0
<b>New Schemes</b>													
													0
<b>Highways and Infrastructure</b>													
Peacock Roundabout Junction	750	0	20	230	500	0	750		750				750
Integrated Block - LTP	7,925	0	-	2,003	2,003	2,003	6,009	6,009					6,009
Maintenance Block - LTP	23,196	0	800	7,345	7,609	7,878	23,633	17,397				6,236	23,633
Incentive Fund - LTP	5,800	0	-	1,450	1,450	1,450	4,350	4,350					4,350
Managing and Maintaining Highways	16,000	0	4,440	4,529	4,619	4,712	18,300					18,300	18,300
Pothole Fund Grant 2022/23	5,799	0	-	0	0	0	0						0
<b>Total New Schemes</b>	<b>59,470</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,260</b>	<b>15,557</b>	<b>16,181</b>	<b>16,043</b>	<b>53,042</b>	<b>27,756</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,536</b>	<b>53,042</b>
<b>Total Capital Schemes</b>	<b>648,873</b>	<b>300,618</b>	<b>86,445</b>	<b>59,417</b>	<b>59,075</b>	<b>136,889</b>	<b>341,826</b>	<b>177,437</b>	<b>58,021</b>	<b>1,264</b>	<b>1,730</b>	<b>103,375</b>	<b>341,826</b>

# 6. Reserves Strategy

## Highways and Transport Committee

Name of Reserve	Opening Balance 1st April 2022 £000	Forecast Movement in Reserves 2022/23 £000	Forecast Closing Balance 31st March 2023 £000	Notes
<b>Highways and Infrastructure</b>				
HS2	985	(450)	535	To support the Council's ongoing programme in relation to Government's HS2 investment across the borough and Transport for the North's Northern
Flood Recovery Works	400	(400)	0	27 locations identified for repair works as a result of the 2019 flood events. There are also a further 16 which require investigation to ascertain the scope of the works required.
Well Managed Highway Infrastructure Delay	230	(230)	0	Due to the call in of WMHI, the savings proposed relating to winter service cannot be realised and the forecast service costs have increased.
Parking Pay and Display Machines / Parking Studies	178	(28)	150	Purchase of Pay and Display machines and town centre parking studies, and to cover contract inflation on P&D machines in year.
Highways Procurement Proj	104	(28)	76	To finance the development of the next Highway Service Contract.
LEP-Local Transport Body	39	(20)	19	To fund the business case work for re-opening the Middlewich rail line. £20k is anticipated to be utilised in 2022/23, with the remaining £19k required in 2023/24.
<b>HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT TOTAL</b>	<b>1,936</b>	<b>(1,156)</b>	<b>780</b>	

**Work Programme – Highways and Transport Committee – 2022/23**

Reference	Committee Date	Report title	Purpose of Report	Report Author /Senior Officer	Consultation and Engagement Process and Timeline	Equality Impact Assessment Required and Published (Y/N)	Part of Budget and Policy Framework (Y/N)	Corporate Plan Priority	Exempt Item and Paragraph Number
HT/62/22-23	26 Jan 2023	Asset Management Documents and Resilient Network Strategy	To receive the Asset Management Policy, Asset Management Strategy, Highway Infrastructure Asset Management Plan and Resilient Network Strategy.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	No.	TBC.	TBC.	Welcoming, safe and clean neighbourhoods	No.
HT57/22/23	26 Jan 2023	Greenway Crossing of the River Dane	To approve the preferred solution for the Greenway crossing of the River Dane, Congleton and agree the development of the scheme through the SCAPE framework.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	No.	Yes.	No.	Welcoming, safe and clean neighbourhoods	No.
HT/26/21-22	26 Jan 2023	Flowerpot Junction Improvement Scheme	Authorise to make Compulsory Purchase Orders and Side Road Orders for the delivery of the Flowerpot Junction Improvement Scheme and to approve the forward funding of the additional developer contributions in accordance with the capital programme.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Welcoming, safe and clean neighbourhoods	Yes in part.
HT50/22/23	26 Jan 2023	MTFS Budget Consultation	Respond to Budget consultation (Highways & Transport).	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No.
HT/67/22-23	26 Jan 2023	It's Not Just Water - Officer Recommendations	To receive a report setting out the officer recommendations following the Committee's consideration of the member working group's report and recommendations in September.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A	No	No	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No

Reference	Committee Date	Report title	Purpose of Report	Report Author /Senior Officer	Consultation and Engagement Process and Timeline	Equality Impact Assessment Required and Published (Y/N)	Part of Budget and Policy Framework (Y/N)	Corporate Plan Priority	Exempt Item and Paragraph Number
HT/70/22-23	26 Jan 2023	Safe Night-Time Travel for Workers	To consider a report in response to the Notice of Motion referred to the Committee by Council.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A	No	No	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No
HT/72/22-23	26 Jan 2023	Notice of Motion: Criteria for Controlled Crossings	To respond to the Notice of Motion at full Council on 16 <sup>th</sup> October 2022 in relation to the criteria for the installation of zebra crossings and light controlled crossings. The recommendation will set out the next steps and timescale to be taken to review the criteria.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A	No	No	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No
HT/71/22-23	2 Mar 2023	Tree Planting	To consider a report in response to the Notice of Motion referred to the Committee by Council.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A	No	No	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No
HT51/22-23	2 Mar 2023	Second Financial Review Report of 2022/23	To receive an update on the financial position for 2022/23. To note or approve virements and supplementary estimates as required.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	No.	No.	Yes.	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No.
HT/69/22-23	2 Mar 2023	Highways Tree Safety Inspection Policy'	To seek approval to the tree safety inspection policy for highways to allow its implementation from 2023/24 onwards.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A	No	Yes	Ensure that there is transparency in all aspects of council decision making	No
HT/44/22-23	TBC	Middlewich Eastern Bypass Full Business Case Approval	To approve the full business for the scheme for submission to DfT	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A.	TBC.	No.	Welcoming, safe and clean neighbourhoods	No.

Reference	Committee Date	Report title	Purpose of Report	Report Author /Senior Officer	Consultation and Engagement Process and Timeline	Equality Impact Assessment Required and Published (Y/N)	Part of Budget and Policy Framework (Y/N)	Corporate Plan Priority	Exempt Item and Paragraph Number
HT/45/22-23	TBC	A500 Full Business Case Approval	To approve the full business for the scheme for submission to DfT.	Director of Infrastructure and Highways	N/A.	TBC.	No.	Welcoming, safe and clean neighbourhoods	No.

This page is intentionally left blank