

# Crewe Hub consultation

## Response form

The questions on which the government is seeking your views are set out in the Crewe Hub consultation document.

The consultation will close at 23:45 on 12 October 2017. Please ensure that your response reaches us before the closing date.

For more information please visit <https://www.gov.uk/dft#consultations> or call (24/7) 08081 434 434 / Minicom 08081 456 472.

Please respond to this consultation using one of the methods below:

### Online

<https://www.gov.uk/dft#consultations>

### By email

[crewehub@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:crewehub@dft.gsi.gov.uk)

### By post

Crewe Hub Consultation  
Department for Transport  
3/14 Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR

When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If responding on behalf of a larger organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how the views of members were assembled.

## Crewe Hub Consultation

The questions on which the Government is seeking your views are set out below. In each case, the government is interested in your views on its proposals, as well as any additional evidence you feel it should consider.

Please write your response clearly in black ink, within the boxes and, if applicable, attach additional evidence to the response form, clearly stating the question to which it refers.

### Confidentiality and data protection

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act (DPA) 1998, and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

**If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential please tick the box below.**

Please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals with, amongst other things, obligations of confidence.

In view of this, it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, in itself, be regarded as binding on the Department for Transport.

The Department for Transport will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

I wish my response to be treated as confidential.

*Please write your reasons below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

# PART ONE

## Information about you

It is important to give us your name to ensure your response is included.

## Your contact details

First name
Robert
Surname
Mackenzie
Address
Deputy Town Clerk Crewe Town Council 1 Chantry Court Forge Street Crewe
Postcode
CW1 2DL
Email
Rob.mackenzie@crewetowncouncil.gov.uk

**Are you responding on behalf of an organisation or group: \***

*Please circle which answer applies.*

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/>
--------------------------------------	-----------------------

**If yes, please state the name of your organisation:**

Crewe Town Council
--------------------

*Please note: if you are providing a response on behalf of an organisation or group the name and details of the organisation or group may be subject to publication or appear in the final report.*

**What category of organisation or group are you representing? \***

**Please tick one box that applies.**

- Prefer not to say
- Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
- Action group (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)
- Business (local, regional, national or international)
- Elected representative (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)
- Environment, heritage, amenity or community group (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)
- Local government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)
- Other representative group (includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies)
- Statutory agency real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations
- Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation (includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies)
- Other:

**Please tell us whom does the organisation or group represent and, where applicable, how you assembled the views of the members?**

*Please write in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

The Town Council represents the Parish of Crewe. This response is authorised by resolution of the Town Council.

# PART TWO

## Consultation questions

The Secretary of State for Transport is seeking views on the questions listed below in the same order as they are listed in the consultation document. In each case, the Secretary of State for Transport is interested in your views and whether or not you support the proposed changes, and why, as well as any additional evidence that you feel the Secretary of State should consider.

Before answering any of the questions please read the consultation document: *Crewe Hub Consultation* which can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/dft#consultations>

### Crewe Hub vision

#### Question 1

a. **Do you support the vision for a hub station at Crewe as suggested by Sir David Higgins as set out at paragraphs 3.3 to 3.7? \***

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

#### What are your reasons?

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

Crewe Town Council wants to work with local, regional and national stakeholders to secure the best outcomes from the investments in HS rail and associated work at Crewe. The key outcomes we would like to see are:

- Economic Growth in Crewe and the surrounding region within an effective 25 mile "high speed catchment".
- Economic Growth in the Midlands and the North through the provision of frequent high speed links between the Midlands Engine and the Northern Powerhouse. For example links from the Midlands to Northern Powerhouse Rail via HS2. Links to the Midland Main Line to provide direct express services between the Northern Powerhouse and the Nottingham and Leicester City regions might be possible with the construction of an appropriate chord linking the HS2 NW and Eastern routes, vastly reducing journey times.
- Economic Growth in other regions, for example through consideration of direct service from London to Edinburgh, and possibly South Wales to Scotland using HS lines as far as the West Coast Main Line near Wigan.

A hub station at Crewe can link the HS2 services with a wide area via the regional rail network. Six existing lines fan out from Crewe connecting to Chester and North Wales, Shrewsbury, mid and south Wales, Stoke, and Manchester, in addition to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) running north to the North West and Scotland, and south to Stafford, the Midlands and London. Through a hub station at Crewe, a much wider area will have access to high speed trains to Manchester, Birmingham and London, driving economic growth in a wider catchment, and also benefiting the HS2 business case by providing a wider catchment of passengers. None of this would be possible under the original proposals whereby Crewe was by-passed.

With frequent HS services stopping at Crewe, the Hub catchment could extend for 25 miles embracing Cheshire East, Stoke-on-Trent and much of Staffordshire, Cheshire West & Chester, Warrington, the Ship Canal corridor and into North Wales.

As a nationally-important interchange, improved connectivity can spread benefits throughout corridors 50-100 miles long, into Merseyside, Greater Manchester, across the Pennines, along the Marches, into the East Midlands and West Midlands, and further, to the Lakes and Scotland

Realising these benefits is dependent not just on establishing a Crewe Hub Station, but also:

- Frequent HS services to Manchester, Birmingham and London stopping at Crewe
- Fast and frequent feeder services connecting the Hub station with other centres
- Ensuring that the hub has adequate and efficient track, platforms and signalling, and an easy interchange.
- A hub station that is attractive, and accessible by all modes of transport.

The true worth of such renewed and additional investment in transport is ultimately measured by outputs and 'outcomes'. An easier to use, more efficient railway and other integrated transport is scored through outputs such as:

- better connectivity
- an accessible easy-to-use interchange
- shorter journey times linking major centres
- easier-to-organise lifestyles
- agglomeration effects
- greater business and educational commitment to invest in the area
- extra recycled spending power locally
- other wider economic benefits.

These matter most for future quality of life and the range of consumer gains.

The 'outcomes' matter still more. Statements about the Northern Powerhouse and the Midlands Engine are essentially a visioning process that provides a rationale for the railway to be the key mechanism to deliver Gross Value Added, and raise public and business confidence within catchments beyond London and the South East

# Option for splitting and joining HS2 services

## Question 2

- a. Do you support the concept of splitting and joining HS2 trains at Crewe, which could provide more seats from Crewe - London and also allow a HS2 service to Stoke-on-Trent as set out at paragraph 5.8 to 5.14? \*

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

### What are your reasons?

Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.

- i. It will enable more destinations North (and possibly West) of Crewe to be served. This will benefit Crewe, towns and cities connected to Crewe station and the destinations themselves
- ii. It will enable a direct service to Stoke. As part of the same economic interaction area, economic growth and prosperity in Stoke benefits Crewe.
- iii. Subject to electrification of the lines to Chester (21 miles), further HS train splitting could embrace Chester within the HS network, and to Wrexham in North Wales (a further 12 miles of electrification).
- iv. The existing WCML station at Warrington could gain additional services.
- v. All these opportunities strengthen the vitality of Crewe as a national 21<sup>st</sup> Century Hub, and add to the agglomeration effect if and only if there are frequent HS services stopping at Crewe and connecting to really accessible regional passenger rail system. Such a network will allow travellers to avoid the frequent congestion on the M6, M56, and M62 motorways, and reduce air pollution from vehicles.

- b. Please provide any evidence you can provide about the difference splitting and joining HS2 trains at Crewe would make to:

- (i) local economic growth.

Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.

The economic impacts of HS2 in general, and splitting trains in particular will depend upon a coherent approach to transport and economic development in the Midlands and the North. Links between the Midlands Engine and the Northern Powerhouse are probably more important than connections to London in this regard. Crewe and the surrounding areas have a wider ambition for growth than merely being a commuter suburb of London.

Splitting trains on its own will not add significantly to the levels of economic growth already planned for. Only if combined with frequent stopping HS services and an effective regional network will the growth benefits be realised (see question 4)

**(ii) housing provision.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

Housing demand will move in tandem with economic growth. Splitting trains on its own will not add significantly to the levels of economic growth already planned for. Only if combined with frequent stopping HS services and an effective regional network will the growth benefits be realised (see question 4).

# Opportunities for serving additional destinations north of Crewe

## Question 3

- a. What additional destinations north of Crewe might be served through splitting and joining trains at Crewe, as set out at paragraph 5.15 to 5.18?

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

See answer to Q 2a

- b. Please provide any evidence you have about the impact of serving additional destinations would make to:

- (i) local economic growth

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

See answer to Q2a.

- (ii) housing provision

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

See answer to Q2a

## Option for stopping more HS2 services

### Question 4

a. Do you support the concept of stopping more HS2 services at Crewe, as set out in chapter 5? \*

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

### What are your reasons?

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

For the potential of the Crewe Hub to be realised it is vital that there are frequent services from Crewe not just from London, but to Birmingham, Manchester and other key city regions within 50-100 miles (e.g. the East Midlands).

The links from Crewe to Birmingham and Manchester are likely to be just as economically important as connections to London. The propensity of passengers to use a HS service are directly linked to its frequency, as waiting times can be major disincentive. The ideal is to have a more or less "turn up and go" service to all three destinations, and to other towns if they can be connected. Whilst this may not be practically achievable everywhere, we should try to get as near to it as possible.

The frequency of services has a direct impact on the size of the catchment area, whether passengers arrive by train, car, bus cycle or walk, they will travel from further afield if they know that there will be a train more or less waiting for them when they arrive.

As an illustration, conventional modelling values the elements of walking and waiting differently, compared to in-vehicle travel time. Behavioural research has shown that there is a common perception of those elements taking much longer than the actual elapsed minutes – 2½x actual time is the DfT standard. Taking an average interval between trains of 30 minutes, creates a waiting factor averaging 15 minutes, plus a small time element for walking within the station. In total, a nominal 18 minute penalty then becomes 45 perceived minutes when the 2½x factor is applied.

If the HS journey time from Crewe to London is around 1 hour, it is unlikely that a passenger will be willing to spend more than a further hour travelling between their front door and the point of boarding the train (or vice versa). This outcome consequently favours a higher HS2 train frequency than 2 trains per hour, to serve Crewe. At 2 trains per hour, as illustrated above, the waiting time is perceived to be 45 minutes. The remaining 15 minutes within the local hour gives time to make only a short onwards public transport journey to another part of the Hub catchment. Adopting a 4 tph HS service at Crewe would reduce the walking and waiting element to roundly 10 minutes actual, 25 perceived, so there are then 35

minutes to make a useful journey within the Hub catchment, before going over a perceived hour in total.

A more detailed analysis and maps are appended in the “Accessibility” report.

This form of analysis applies to all destinations, not just London.

**b. Indicate your views on the potential service pattern(s) outlined in chapter 5.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

Scenario 3 is the “least worst” of the 3 scenarios offered. It provides Crewe with 2 trains per hour to London, 2 trains per hour to Manchester, and 3 trains per hour to Birmingham. This implies a 30 minute service interval to London and Manchester and a 20 minute interval to Birmingham.

For the reasons explained in Q4a above, a half hour frequency significantly limits the catchment for the service, and narrows the spread of benefits beyond Crewe to the wider area.

The Town Council would therefore request that a modified Scenario 3 be considered (Scenario 3 plus). If one of the London to Manchester trains stopped at Crewe, this would create 3 trains per hour to each of London, Manchester and Birmingham, so that all three destinations would have a larger catchment.

**c. Please provide any evidence you have about the difference stopping more HS2 services at Crewe would make to:**

**(i) local economic growth.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

Local economic growth benefits will only accrue to more towns and cities in the area if services stop more frequently.

The Constellation Partnership HS2 Growth Strategy is expected to show that a full Crewe Hub with frequently stopping HS services at the centre of an effective regional transport network would support the delivery of at least 120,000 new jobs across South Cheshire and Staffordshire by 2040. This net additional growth, over and above that expected from the government’s current HS2 plans will result in greater incomes to households and government, and will increase productivity.

The growth in population will increase local markets, increase the labour pool for existing businesses, and better train services will widen the employee catchment area.

**(ii) housing provision**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

The Constellation Partnership HS2 Growth Strategy is expected to show that a full Crewe Hub with frequently stopping HS services at the centre of an effective regional transport network would support the delivery of at least 100,000 new houses across South Cheshire and Staffordshire by 2040.

Extra housing provision will go hand in hand with economic growth. A more frequent service will sustain more housing. For example commuting times to Manchester of 20 minutes will make Crewe a more attractive place to live. It is also possible that a more frequent London service will attract commuters to the leafier parts of the surrounding area. Increased spending power in the area will increase demand for local goods and services and be a net benefit to the local economy. However it must not result in affordable housing being put out of the reach of local people.

The Town Council foresees the potential for several additional local stations to be opened (or re-opened) in the effective 25 mile HS catchment of Crewe Hub. This is discussed in the attached Accessibility Paper. Such stations would in turn facilitate additional housing provision.

# Option for a new junction north of Crewe

## Question 5

- a. Do you support the principle of a junction north of Crewe station which could allow HS2 services from Crewe to Manchester, Birmingham and Scotland as set out at paragraph 5.19 to 5.28? \*

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

### What are your reasons?

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

A junction north of Crewe is ESSENTIAL to the creation of a Crewe Hub. Without it, only the Liverpool services and services continuing north on the WCML via Warrington (but not on the Phase 2b line) could stop at Crewe, denying HS2 users and the wider region of the benefits of connecting to HS2 at Crewe.

It will also provide an emergency alternative route for classic compatible trains in the event of the tunnel having to be taken temporarily out of use due to a breakdown or maintenance.

- b. Do you have any evidence you can provide about the difference a junction north of Crewe station would make to:

**(i) local economic growth**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

The benefits of the northern junction are linked to those of a hub station and HS2 trains calling more frequently at Crewe since the northern junction unlocks the potential of the hub station. See answer to Q4b.

**(ii) housing provision**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

The benefits of the northern junction are the same as those of a hub station and HS2 trains calling more frequently at Crewe since the northern junction unlocks the potential of the hub station. See answer to Q4b.

# Freight

## Question 6

- a. **What are your views on the level of freight growth that should be considered in planning a Crewe Hub? Please provide full reasons and any evidence you can to support your response.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

As with passenger traffic, Crewe is a key location on the network for freight traffic, and is home to the nationally significant Basford Hall sidings.

Freight trains via Crewe are a growth sector: While some traditional rail freight flows are in decline, e.g. coal to power stations, West Coast freight train volume is forecast to grow by 50-100% because of intermodal services. The WCML is also becoming a main corridor for long distance freight transferred from the motorway network as that becomes more congested.

The development of HS2 will free up some capacity on the WCML for additional freight paths. However, it is important that in planning the design of the Crewe hub, sufficient capacity is built in for current and future freight demand in addition to the extra passenger services that will use or pass through the station.

The design for Crewe station proposed in the Phase 2a bill would compromise freight capacity through the creation of platforms on the independent lines which will result in freight losing a regulation point on the network. This is likely to restrict growth and detrimentally impact on performance both on the classic and also the HS network. It is therefore important that Network Rail and HS2 Ltd develop alternative solutions that do not require platforms on the independent lines. (In any event the proposed platforms on the Independent Lines would be too far from the rest of the station and so add significantly to perceived journey times as well as disadvantaging less mobile passengers.)

**b. What are your views on the relative future priorities of types of freight movements? Please provide full reasons and any evidence you can to support your response.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

Demand is foreseen by the Rail Freight Group to expand on long haul flows especially intermodal, and with ports traffic and biomass being high growth. RFG modelling to the 2030s is available from [tony@rfg.org.uk](mailto:tony@rfg.org.uk)

The expansion of Liverpool Port (Peel Holdings) and increasing congestion on the UK motorway network – particularly the M6/M56/M62 – will strengthen demand for WCML rail freight north of the West Midlands. The M1/M6 corridor carries over 40% of all freight flows in England.

Motorway congestion will also increase the scope for 'just in time' rail freight services to offer timely alternatives for major hauliers (such as Gist and Stobart), for JIT-critical users such as supermarkets, particularly for longer runs from central stores to further-flung distribution centres such as the Scottish Lowlands.

# Local and regional passenger services

## Question 7

- a. **What are your views on future local and regional passenger services that should be considered when planning for a Crewe Hub? Please provide full reasons and any evidence you can to support your response.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

As described earlier, better and more frequent regional services to and from the hub will spread the accessibility and economic growth to many towns within the hub catchment provided there is a “walk on” HS2 service frequency. In turn, more frequent local services will help to offer “walk-on” capability for HS2 – so creating a virtuous circle for the total accessibility and economic growth offer in the Crewe HS catchment. Once again the agglomeration effect will be beneficial.

It is particularly important that local and regional services are no worse as a result of HS2, and also have the ability to expand frequency as HS2 itself increases in volume and impact on track capacity north of Crewe, in association with any ‘classic’ replacement services.

During the period between Phase 2a and Phase 2b completions, HS2 Manchester services are expected to travel along the existing Crewe to Manchester line, replacing the Virgin Pendolino service. The Virgin service stops at Crewe hourly. Unless this is replaced by one of the HS2 services stopping at Crewe, the town will be worse off than it is now. Links to Manchester are particularly important for commuters (both ways) and businesses could suffer if the service is reduced. Manchester is not only a destination in its own right, but provides connecting services through to Yorkshire and beyond.

The same arguments apply to local services as to HS2 services as far as frequency is concerned. If a feeder service is hourly, then a traveller from London might have to wait up to 30 minutes at Crewe station to connect to their onward journey, a perceived time of 75 minutes, which will be a very significant disincentive to using the service. Therefore services must be frequent if the wider 25 mile catchment is to benefit (for example Chester and North Wales). There are also opportunities, subject to a business case, to increase the population within a given drive time of feeder stations by creating additional stations. Possible improvements for consideration are:

- Chester and North Wales: 2 tph (trains per hour) and also (new) hourly to Wrexham. (If electrified, this could be served by a “split” HS2 train.) New intermediate station for Hub access, at Tarporley/Bunbury or at Tattenhall.
- Ideally, through trains from Birkenhead/Wirral, but bi-mode train design required as the Wirral is served by 3<sup>rd</sup> rail electric trains.

- Liverpool and the North West: Intercity service volumes as foreseen by DfT and HS2, with more trains requested to call at Crewe.
- Maintenance of existing regional service levels between Liverpool, Runcorn, intermediate stations and Crewe.
- Manchester Airport to receive better service from Crewe Hub, at least 2 and maybe 3 tph.
- Northwich, Middlewich and Sandbach to be reviewed for new feeder passenger service, potentially running through to Stoke-on-Trent, with regional network expansion also helping Stoke connectivity (see below). In the Manchester direction, it might eventually be possible for Crewe-Northwich and Chester trains to be routed beyond Knutsford over HS2's track to reach Manchester Airport. This would provide new staff and passenger catchments for MIA, and achieve the frequency objective between Crewe Hub and the Airport.
- Existing service levels to Stockport and Manchester to be retained, and improved if merited by demand.
- Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent and East Midlands corridor to be upgraded in service level to achieve high connectivity between Stoke-on-Trent and Crewe Hub, including potential for additional local stations in the Stoke urban area.
- Options include additional service to the East Midlands – a poor Inter-regional corridor at present – plus a new chord near Kidsgrove to enable linking into Crewe Hub of Macclesfield and Congleton towns, with extension of Manchester-Macclesfield services.
- Permanent adoption of new express London Midland service rerouted on WCML between Stafford and Crewe (foreseen in new franchise) – this offers scope for a new intermediate railhead to spread economic benefits and serve Crewe Hub catchment, near Madeley/Keele.
- Medium and long term half-hourly Wales-North West (Cardiff-Marches-Manchester) service.
- Hourly service at least, for intermediate stations between Shrewsbury and Crewe.

This consultation paper is itself inadequate, in Crewe's opinion, on the topic of linkages between HS2 and HS3 (or any emerging equivalent such as a 'northern Crossrail') in the North West Region. Please see the Crewe Operability paper for an extensive discussion on this topic. Such important linkages would require some overlap between HS2 operations and the 'classic' North West network.

## Local funding contribution

### Question 8

- a. **What do you see as the potential for a local funding contribution to any of these interventions alongside complementary works, such as improving the existing station buildings and road access?**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

To make a hub station work, significant investment is required in the surrounding infrastructure – roads, bus infrastructure, cycleways and pedestrian routes. In particular the current traffic congestion needs to be relieved if more passengers are to use the station, parking needs to be rationalised, and access to buses needs to be simpler and clearer. Cycle routes and pedestrian routes also need major investments.

To realise the economic and housing potential of HS2 and a hub station further investment is also needed in regeneration, the provision of housing and employment sites, and making sure the local population has the skills needed for new jobs.

Investment is also needed in the appearance, of Crewe Town, and its retail and leisure amenities to create the perception that it is a good place to relocate to.

These areas should be the priority for local contributions. If successful they will contribute to the revenue streams generated by the train services by increasing passenger numbers.

Crewe Town Council can work with Cheshire East Council to define specific improvements, and scope funding bids and third party funding contributions.

## Additional areas

- a. **If there are any additional areas that you think it is important for us to consider, that have not already been addressed in this consultation, please explain them here.**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

- i. The Phase 2a Bill proposes a new platform on the freight avoiding lines (Manchester Independent Lines) to allow the Cardiff Manchester service to cross under the mainline. Whilst this would have an undesirable impact on freight traffic, the Town Council supports the principle of a grade separated junction to achieve a substantial reduction in passenger train conflicts around Crewe Station. Its relevance is also discussed in the attached Crewe Operability paper. It is hoped that a solution can be designed and funded so as to provide grade separation without adverse impact on freight traffic.

In designing the hub station, it is important that the new platform is as close to, and as accessible as possible to, the existing platforms. As illustrated earlier, passengers are disinclined to spend time moving from one part of a station to another, and every additional minute spent transferring is perceived as 2.5 minutes. Moreover a long walk between trains disadvantages elderly and less able passengers.

- ii. It is important to minimise disruption to both passengers and rail services by implementing all the changes in a single managed programme. Phasing investment across the implementation of HS2 Phases 2a and 2b (including track and signalling as well as platforms and facilities) would create prolonged disruption and passengers could be lost to other modes of transport, possibly for good. Multiple signalling interventions over a decade could also be more expensive than a single managed programme.
- iii. The Town Council would regret the loss of any listed features at or close to the station and notwithstanding the provisions of the Phase 2a Hybrid Bill, exhorts all parties to seek to avoid or minimise any detrimental impact as a result of the station re-design.

## Final comments

**a. Do you have any other comments?**

*Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below. Please attach additional pages as required.*

Much of the foregoing has been informed by advice from Jonathan Roberts of JRC Ltd. He has produced 2 reports for the Town Council on matters related to service provision (“Accessibility”) and the practical considerations to show that our aspirations can be delivered (“Operability”).

The two reports offer more detail than is contained above, and are submitted as separate appendices to this response.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete the Crewe Hub Consultation Response Form.**