



Department
for Transport

Crewe Hub Consultation Response

Moving Britain Ahead



March 2018



High Speed Two: Crewe Hub Consultation Response

Presented to Parliament
by the Secretary of State for Transport
by Command of Her Majesty

March 2018



© Crown copyright 2018

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/publications

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
Telephone 0300 330 3000
Website www.gov.uk/dft
General enquiries <https://forms.dft.gov.uk>

ISBN 978-1-5286-0216-7

CCS0218995008 03/18

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum

Printed in the UK by the APS Group on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

Contents

Foreword	5
Executive summary	6
Crewe station	6
Regeneration and growth	7
Freight	7
HS2 service patterns	8
West Coast Partnership (WCP)	8
1. Introduction	9
1.1 Crewe today	9
1.2 The Government's plans for High Speed 2 (HS2)	12
1.3 High Speed Two and Crewe Hub	13
2. Train services	15
Current services	15
HS2 service patterns	16
3. Crewe Hub Consultation	19
3.1 Background	19
3.2 Q1: Crewe Hub vision	20
3.3 Q2: Options for splitting and joining HS2 services	22
3.4 Q3: Opportunities for serving additional destinations north of Crewe	26
3.5 Q4 Options for stopping more HS2 services	28
3.6 Q5: Options for a new junction north of Crewe	29
3.7 Q6: Freight	33
3.8 Q7: Local and regional passenger services	34

3.9 Question 8: Local funding contribution	36
3.10 Question 9: Additional areas	37
Annex A: Consultation analysis	39
List of organisations who responded	43

Foreword



Today I am responding to your views from our consultation on taking forward the vision of a Crewe Hub. Crewe is a key rail gateway, providing 360 degree connectivity to major destinations and regions, a critical node for freight, and will already benefit from HS2. I am grateful to all those who took the time to respond. Your responses were strongly in favour of realising the vision for a Crewe Hub. I share that vision and am setting out decisions which could give Crewe and the surrounding region even better access to high speed services, serving even more destinations.

Crewe Station opened in 1837 with links to the four largest cities in England. Despite continuing to act as a key gateway, Network Rail advises that the station and associated infrastructure is a major constraint on the network. The signalling needed to keep the network moving requires updating. When the station was last remodelled in the 1980s rail operations were very different, and demand for services was in decline.

Network Rail and HS2 Ltd have been looking at what is needed to allow more HS2 services to stop at Crewe, address these existing constraints and accommodate future growth. I am confirming the decisions needed to ensure our plans for HS2 Phase 2a, from Birmingham to Crewe, support the vision of a Crewe Hub. These decisions also allow the introduction of an additional HS2 service to Stoke-on-Trent.

A Crewe Hub could generate significant opportunities – not only for Crewe itself, but also for the surrounding sub-region. To fully realise that vision will need central and local government to work together, and require future decisions to be taken as part of HS2 Phase 2b. I welcome the progress being made by Cheshire East Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership in identifying how they could invest in the scheme to ensure the benefits are fully realised.

HS2 will become the new backbone of our national rail network. It will increase capacity on our congested railways and improve connections between our biggest cities and regions. It will support our Industrial Strategy, generating jobs, skills and economic growth to help build an economy that works for all. The steps I am taking today will ensure that Crewe and Stoke-on-Trent can benefit fully from HS2.

A stylized, handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, flowing 'C' followed by a series of connected loops and a long horizontal stroke.

**The Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP,
Secretary of State for Transport.**

Executive summary

1. On 17 July 2017, the Secretary of State for Transport launched a consultation to seek views on the vision for a Crewe Hub. The consultation set out options which could give Crewe and the surrounding region even better access to high speed services, serving more destinations. The Secretary of State is grateful to local authorities, Local Enterprises Partnerships, the Devolved Administrations, businesses, communities and members of the public who responded to the consultation.
2. The consultation closed on 12 October 2017, and there were 146 responses. Both individual and stakeholder responses indicated broad support for the concept of a Crewe Hub, including the splitting and joining of HS2 services at Crewe, a junction north of Crewe, and the strategy of combining this with Network Rail (NR) renewals work. Local stakeholders also set out their ambitions to achieve wider benefits such as job creation and housebuilding, for Crewe and the surrounding region.

Crewe station

3. Today the Secretary of State has confirmed the Government's support for the Crewe Hub vision. To that end plans for HS2 Phase 2a will be modified to include:
 - provision of 400m platforms, extending Platform 5, to allow for the splitting and joining of HS2 services, which also opens opportunities to serve Stoke-On-Trent via HS2
 - a more efficient design for the proposed platform on the Manchester independent lines, incorporating a transfer deck to the main station
 - a change to the design of the southern connection from HS2, so that HS2 joins (and takes over) the central two lines on the existing network

4. Realising the Crewe Hub vision in full will require delivery of the planned NR renewals, local and national government working together, and a local funding contribution to support future potential investment decisions including for:
 - a junction north of Crewe, enabling HS2 trains to call at Crewe and then re-join the HS2 main line, as part of Phase 2b
 - completing the full transfer deck across the station to Weston Road and potentially to Gresty Road with new entrances to support local regeneration ambitions and further improve the passenger experience
5. NR continues to evaluate whether, as part of its renewal design, reinstatement of platform 13 would be an affordable alternative to the independent lines platform. If so, this would be a further improvement for transferring passengers and freight.

Regeneration and growth

6. These interventions, if combined with a junction north of Crewe, could in future allow Crewe station to support the Constellation Partnership's ambition of 5–7 HS2 trains per hour calling at Crewe and frequencies of 3–4 trains per hour¹ on each of the regional links. The potential for a transfer deck across the whole of Crewe station with proposed new east and west entrances would additionally improve the passenger environment and support Cheshire East Council's growth ambitions.

Freight

7. Crewe is a nationally important rail freight hub, and almost all freight trains on the West Coast Mainline (WCML) are routed through Basford Hall yard, just south of Crewe. The present freight layout was designed to handle trains made up of individual wagons. These have since been superseded by much longer trains, typically carrying intermodal² containers.
8. Freight operators raised a number of concerns about the Crewe Hub vision, including over their ability to marshal trains on the independent lines. However, such marshalling will need to be reviewed by NR and freight operators in any event in the light of automation provided by planned signalling renewals. NR has confirmed that the current level of freight services will still be able to operate with a Crewe Hub, although there could be issues in realising further freight growth north of Basford Hall after Phase 2a opens and before Phase 2b becomes operational in 2033. As already noted, NR continues work on whether reinstating platform 13 at Crewe station could be an alternative to the independent line platform. In that event, the impact of proposed changes at Crewe on freight would be contained to the period of NR resignalling, and

1 All service levels referred to remain subject to performance modelling and in some cases would require additional investments remote from Crewe to realise

2 Intermodal containers are those which can be carried on multiple forms of transport.

potentially, use of the independent lines as a diversionary route during construction of Phase 2a.

HS2 service patterns

9. Providing 400m platforms at Crewe Station will allow HS2 trains to be split and joined, providing options for more connectivity. We have modelled running a combined London – Preston and London – Liverpool service that splits at Crewe, and so frees up an HS2 path from London which would allow a new HS2 service to Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield via Handsacre junction. Further opportunities to serve additional destinations could come from splitting and joining a second Liverpool service.
10. There was strong support in the consultation for the splitting and joining of HS2 services at Crewe station and 400m platforms. Some responses asked if a second HS2 Stoke-on-Trent service was possible each hour. There is not anticipated to be capacity on HS2 for this (and the business case is unlikely to be strong). Stoke-on-Trent is, though, expected to continue to receive intercity services via the WCML in addition to any HS2 service. Questions were also raised about the impact Crewe Hub could have on Liverpool to London journey times, and the possibility of splitting and joining a Manchester service. We do not currently envisage introducing the second split and join operation until HS2 Phase 2b opens, so for Phase 2a these changes would not affect the headline Liverpool – London journey time (and the second London – Liverpool service will be faster than originally planned). Operational constraints during the operation of Phase 2a mean it would not be desirable to split and join one of the Manchester services. We will continue to consider additional locations that could be served with a second split and join in developing the HS2 Phase 2b business case, and in the light of future advice from the West Coast Partnership (WCP).

West Coast Partnership (WCP)

11. From its appointment in 2019, the new WCP operator will work with HS2 Ltd to design, launch and operate the initial HS2 services, as well as redesign services on the WCML to take advantage of the extra capacity provided by HS2. The WCP operator will ensure that passenger needs are placed at the heart of the design of the new railway and services, working closely with industry partners, devolved administrations, local government, passengers and staff along the route.
12. The WCP will also be closely involved in the detailed design of the future Crewe Hub station to ensure it meets passenger needs, alongside its design of future HS2 and WCML services to meet the needs and aspirations of all users. The WCP operator will consult extensively on proposed service patterns, enabling Government to make decisions on the final HS2 and WCML services in the early 2020s.

1. Introduction

1.1 Crewe today

- 1.1.1 Crewe is already a key hub station on the existing rail network, located 160 miles north of London and 240 miles south of Glasgow, at the point where four regional lines converge with the West Coast Main Line (WCML). Opened in 1837, the station was rebuilt in 1861, and in the late 1890s the independent lines to the west of the main station were built. These are currently used to allow freight trains to reach Liverpool and Manchester without passing through the station. Further major remodelling and rationalisation took place in 1985. Network Rail (NR) is the infrastructure owner of Crewe station, and the operator for the Intercity West Coast Franchise manages the day to day rail passenger operations at Crewe.
- 1.1.2 Passengers can change at Crewe between services for London, Scotland, Birmingham, Shrewsbury, south Wales, Chester, north Wales, Liverpool, Manchester, Stoke-on-Trent and the Trent Valley. Since 2009/10 the number of passengers entering, exiting or interchanging at Crewe has been increasing. In 2010/11 it broke 3 million, in 2015/16 it broke 4 million and the latest official numbers for 2016/17 stood at over 4.5 million. Even without HS2, passenger numbers are forecast to continue to grow³.
- 1.1.3 Crewe station benefits from good connections to other transport infrastructure such as junctions 16 and 17 on the M6 and regional roads, as well as the main airports in the Midlands and the North. There are three car parks for passengers with 1,231 spaces in total⁴, as well as some on-street parking and bike storage at platform level.
- 1.1.4 Crewe also plays a critically important role for national rail freight operations, with much of the freight traffic on the WCML routed through Basford Hall Yard, immediately south of Crewe.

3 <http://orr.gov.uk/statistics/published-stats/station-usage-estimates>

4 The three car parks are: Pedley Road (550 parking spaces), Gresty Road (454 parking spaces) and Weston Road (227 parking spaces).

1.1.5 In November 2016, NR released the “*Crewe Hub – improving connectivity and capacity for our customers*”⁵ report, setting out how Crewe no longer meets the needs of the railway nor enables the desired operational flexibility. Some of the specific challenges at Crewe station identified were:

- Although Crewe has 12 platforms, seven of these are terminating bays, most of which are limited in length with the south facing platforms only able to accommodate 4-car trains
- Some of the through platforms can only be used to serve a limited range of routes, which leaves little capacity or flexibility so that delays have a knock-on impact to other services. Also, the through platforms can only be accessed by trains crossing the network at grade, which constrains capacity
- The existing junctions, north and south of Crewe, are busy and unable to fit more crossing train movements which acts as a constraint when timetabling services. This means that any increase to the frequency of services and future HS2 services is challenging
- Capacity at the existing station means accommodating an increase in services or passengers would be challenging. This means that only limited growth is possible, missing the opportunity to serve potential new markets
- The need for trains to arrive at Crewe station in a specified order to allow crossing moves, and the absence of effective spare capacity, constrains operational flexibility and resilience. These constraints hinder effective service recovery following any delays. This bottleneck effect therefore impacts all routes risking the performance of passenger and freight activities

1.1.6 NR’s report went on to state that stopping more HS2 services than are included in the current business case, and increasing other services, would be very difficult with the current layout.

5 <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Crewe-Hub-improving-capacity-and-connectivity-for-our-customers.pdf>




Figure 1: Section of Crewe station layout

1.2 The Government's plans for High Speed 2 (HS2)

- 1.2.1 HS2 is the new high speed rail network for the UK, connecting London with major cities in the Midlands and the north of England. It is a Y-shaped network that will be delivered in several stages. Trains will also run beyond the Y network to serve places such as Liverpool, Preston, Newcastle and Scotland. Parliament granted powers in February 2017 for the construction of the first part of the route (Phase One) from London to the West Midlands, with train services due to commence in 2026.
- 1.2.2 In October 2014, Sir David Higgins in his report *"Rebalancing Britain"*, recommended accelerating the section of the HS2 route from Birmingham to Crewe, now known as Phase 2a. He had previously recommended that the Government look at the potential to create a Crewe Hub, which could improve both the level of HS2 service and the interchange between HS2 and the existing rail network.
- 1.2.3 The Government accepted this advice, and the Phase 2a hybrid Bill was deposited in Parliament on 17 July 2017. Subject to Parliament's approval, the Bill will provide the powers to build Phase 2a. Construction would begin in 2020 and passenger services would start running along this section of the route in 2027. Phase 2a comprises approximately 58km (36 miles) of HS2 main line and a connection to the WCML south of Crewe. As well as faster journeys, Phase 2a will also release capacity on the conventional rail network south of Crewe.
- 1.2.4 In July 2017 the Government confirmed its preferred route for the remainder of HS2, known as Phase 2b. This will complete the Y network, realising the full capacity and connectivity benefits of HS2. It has two parts: the Eastern Leg from the West Midlands to Leeds, which joins the East Coast Main Line east of Leeds at Church Fenton; and the Western Leg from Crewe to Manchester, with a connection to the WCML at Golborne, south of Wigan. We plan to deposit the Phase 2b hybrid Bill in 2019 to seek the powers to build it. Subject to Parliament's approval, trains would run on the whole network from 2033.




Figure 2: The HS2 Y network

1.3 High Speed Two and Crewe Hub

- 1.3.1 The HS2 business case has since 2013⁶ assumed two high speed services an hour stopping at Crewe in each direction. Plans for Phase 2a included modifications to the existing railway infrastructure in the Crewe area to facilitate the indicative service

6 Economic Case for HS2 2013: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/365065/S_A_1_Economic_case_0.pdf

pattern. Specifically, the hybrid Bill design for Phase 2a proposed the following interventions:

- junction enhancement at Sandbach and Maw Green to allow HS2 trains to pass slower stopping services
- a connection from HS2 lines to the slow lines of the WCML
- junction enhancement south of Crewe, to allow HS2 services to cross from slow to fast lines at higher speed, in both directions simultaneously (in parallel)
- new platforms at Crewe station on the 'Manchester Independent' lines, currently used for freight (see Figure 1). This could allow passenger services, such as the current Cardiff – Manchester service, to approach from the west of Crewe and leave to the east without needing to cross all of the existing lines through the station at grade

- 1.3.2 Further information on the Phase 2a hybrid Bill and accompanying Environmental Statement can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/hs2>.
- 1.3.3 Following Sir David Higgins' recommendation, the Government asked NR and HS2 Ltd to undertake technical work to examine options for a Crewe Hub, to allow additional HS2 services to call at Crewe, to address the existing constraints and make provision for future growth.
- 1.3.4 On 17 July 2017 the Government launched the Crewe Hub Consultation, asking for views on the Crewe Hub vision, 400m platforms for Crewe station, a junction north of Crewe, freight growth, local growth, and local funding options. The consultation closed on 12 October 2017. This document sets out the Government's decisions in light of that consultation, including changes to our plans for Phase 2a to support a Crewe Hub.
- 1.3.5 Achieving the full vision for a Crewe Hub station will require both central and local government to work together. The government is working with Cheshire East Council and the Constellation Partnership to identify how they could invest in the scheme to help realise the wider local benefits, including improvements to the existing station buildings and the local road network.
- 1.3.6 Our vision for a Crewe Hub supports the work done since 2014 by the Constellation Partnership (formerly known as the Northern Gateway Development Zone) to look at maximising the growth supported by HS2. The Partnership has been developing its Growth Strategy, and considering the transport and infrastructure measures to support housing and jobs, creating a highly connected region and bringing places like Crewe, Stoke-on-Trent and Stafford closer together. Crewe Hub is an essential part of these plans.

2. Train services

Current services

- 2.1 Crewe station currently sees approximately 28 trains calling in a standard off-peak hour. Most of these trains are through services with a stop at Crewe of typically for two or three minutes. There are three main groupings as shown below:

Service type	Total services per hour, both directions	Origin and end destination ⁷
Inter city	8	London to Manchester x1 London to Liverpool x 1 London to Chester/North Wales x 1 Birmingham to Scotland (originates London) x1
Regional	12	Cardiff /South Wales to Manchester x 1 Derby to Crewe x 1 London to Crewe x 1 Birmingham to Liverpool x 2 Crewe to Manchester (Airport) x 1
Local	8	Crewe to Manchester Piccadilly x 1 Birmingham to Crewe (via Stoke-on-Trent new franchise service starting December 2018) x 1 Crewe to Chester x 1 Crewe to Shrewsbury x 1
Total Services	28	

Table 1: Current train services at Crewe in a standard off-peak hour

⁷ There are some occasional variances to the origin or destination of services and in the peak patterns towards London and Manchester there are some additional services. Freight movements, empty coaching stock and other network trains or light engine moves regularly take place through the station area.

HS2 service patterns

- 2.2 Figure 4 below shows the assumptions for the HS2 business case⁸ which include two HS2 services stopping at Crewe station each hour, in each direction, providing services to London, Preston and Liverpool. Once Phase 2a opens, HS2 would provide a best journey time to London of 55 minutes in comparison to 96 minutes today. No further changes to the HS2 stopping service patterns at Crewe station when Phase 2b opens in 2033 have been assumed. It should be noted that these indicative service patterns are used to model the benefits and business case of HS2. Actual future service patterns and timetables will be developed by the WCP operator and Network Rail, with a public consultation on proposed HS2 and WCML services expected to be held in the early 2020's. Figure 4 below shows how this service pattern could change with 400m platforms at Crewe, and splitting and joining of HS2 services to support an HS2 service to Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield.

8 Economic Case for HS2 – The Y Network and London – West Midlands February 2011: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110720164411/http://highspeedrail.dft.gov.uk/sites/highspeedrail.dft.gov.uk/files/hs2-economic-case.pdf>




Figure 3: HS2 central case Indicative Train Service Specification (ITSS) for HS2 Phase 1 and Phase 2a. (Each line in diagram represents one train per hour.)




Figure 4: Crewe platform extension ITSS with 1tph split and join at Crewe and service to Stoke and Macclesfield via Stafford

3. Crewe Hub Consultation

3.1 Background

- 3.1.1 On 17 July 2017, the Secretary for Transport launched a consultation to seek views on options to take forward a Crewe Hub vision. The consultation set out options which could give Crewe station and the surrounding region even better access to high speed services, serving more destinations.
- 3.1.2 The consultation closed on 12 October 2017 and 146 responses were received. The Secretary of State is grateful to those local authorities, Local Enterprises Partnerships, the Devolved Administration, businesses, communities and members of the public who responded to the consultation.
- 3.1.3 The consultation presented options for taking forward a Crewe Hub and sought comments to inform the ongoing work. The consultation asked for views on:
- Providing 400m platforms at Crewe station in 2027 which could enable longer HS2 trains to and from London to split and join at Crewe, meaning other destinations, such as Stoke-on-Trent, could be served by a high speed service
 - Providing a junction north of Crewe station to connect the WCML and the high-speed line, in 2033 as part of HS2 Phase 2b. This could enable northbound high speed connectivity from Crewe, providing more seats between Crewe and London
 - Levels of future freight growth that should be considered in planning a Crewe Hub
 - Levels of growth in local and regional passenger services that should be considered in planning a Crewe Hub
 - The role the local area could play in realising a Crewe Hub, including by way of local funding contributions and evidence for potential levels of growth that will be facilitated

3.2 Q1: Crewe Hub vision

Do you support the vision for a hub station at Crewe as suggested by Sir David Higgins? Please indicate whether or not you support this vision and provide full reasons to support your response.

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.2.1 There were 137 responses to this question, 125 were in support, 9 were against and 3 responded “don’t know”. The majority of respondents supported the Crewe Hub vision, citing reasons which included increased connectivity and rail capacity, support for local and regional growth and future potential rail traffic, the potential for more long distance commuting, and complementing Northern Powerhouse proposals.
- 3.2.2 A number of responses sought to encourage the government to go further in its plans, asking for more places to be served, specifically Liverpool and Stoke-on-Trent. Crewe station itself and the surrounding area was felt to be in need of redevelopment.
- 3.2.3 A very small number of responses were unsupportive, expressing disapproval with HS2 and its business case, or believing that a Crewe Hub would provide no benefit to the local area. Others cited concerns over the impacts on HS2 services to Liverpool, connectivity to Staffordshire and Wales, and whether house prices would rise making them unaffordable. Concern was expressed that the Crewe Hub vision could result in the termination of HS2 services at Wigan and Manchester. It was suggested that the current Pendolino service provides a faster journey times from Crewe and Preston to Edinburgh and Glasgow than indicated in the HS2 Train Services Specification.

Government Response

- 3.2.4 The strength of support for the Crewe Hub vision, as well as calls for further and more detailed interventions, demonstrates the importance of the concept to the region. Close working with Cheshire East Council and other local stakeholders, remains key to the implementation and future success of the project.
- 3.2.5 The Government wants to see the Crewe Hub vision realised. To that end, the Secretary of State is confirming that plans for HS2 Phase 2a will be modified as follows:
- to add provision for 400m platforms (taking advantage of the opportunity to extend Platform 5) to allow for splitting and joining of HS2 trains
 - a more efficient design for the proposed platform on the Manchester independent lines, incorporating a new transfer deck between that platform and the existing station. This will improve the passenger experience from the original proposal

- a change to the design of the southern connection from HS2, so that HS2 joins (and takes over) the central two lines on the existing network. This will give better operational performance in Phase 2a, and reduce the impact on freight services on the West Coast Main Line (WCML). We believe it remains the right answer for Phase 2b, and would support the overall vision for Crewe Hub that includes a junction north of Crewe.

3.2.6 These modifications fall within existing Network Rail (NR) land and so will not require amendment to the powers sought in the Phase 2a hybrid Bill. Where appropriate, they will be included in a Supplementary Environmental Statement and consulted accordingly. NR continues to develop its planned signalling renewal at Crewe (and between Crewe and Weaver junction). The design of this renewal will need to support the new connection south of Crewe. Within that design work, NR is also considering whether reinstatement of platform 13 might be an alternative to the independent line platform. If that is possible, it could further improve the passenger experience and reduce impacts for freight operators. However until that position is confirmed, HS2 will need to continue with a solution for Phase 2a that is operable and deliverable in its own right.

3.2.7 To fully realise the Crewe Hub vision will require local and national government working together and a local funding contribution to support future potential investment decisions including for:

- a junction with HS2 north of Crewe, so that trains can call at Crewe and then re-join the HS2 main line, which will be considered as part of the development of HS2 Phase 2b
- the extension of the transfer deck across the station to Weston Road and potentially to Gresty Road with new entrances to support regeneration sites

3.2.8 HS2 Ltd and NR will continue design development of these elements, pending agreement of full business cases and funding, decisions on which will be subject to considerations of affordability (including the scale of any local contribution to costs) and value for money. These interventions, could allow Crewe Station to support the Constellation Partnership's ambition of 5-7 HS2 trains per hour and frequencies of 3-4 trains per hour⁹ on each of the regional links. This could provide the capacity to ensure the Crewe Hub has optimum connectivity, benefitting both HS2 and regional services.

9 All service levels referred to remain subject to performance modelling and in some cases would require additional investments remote from Crewe to realise.

- 3.2.9 A full transfer deck across the station with new east and west entrances would support Cheshire East Council's growth ambitions and the development of various regeneration sites. The section from the independent lines to platform 12, if required, would be delivered as part of the HS2 project. The government is supportive of creating growth around the station but believes that new entrances, car parks and road access should be for local partners to fund.
- 3.2.10 We expect the WCP operator to take account of the points raised about journey times from Crewe and Preston to Scotland in the HS2 Train Services Specification when developing its detailed HS2 and WCML service patterns.

3.3 Q2: Options for splitting and joining HS2 services

- 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 an HS2 service to Stoke-on-Trent? Please indicate whether or not you support this concept and provide full reasons to support your response.
- b Please provide any evidence you can about the difference it would make to:
 - (i) local economic growth
 - (ii) housing provision
 - (iii) Background

- 3.3.1 Providing 400m platforms at Crewe for HS2 services allows splitting and joining of services travelling from and to London at Crewe. Dividing a train in this way separates it into two portions to serve two different destinations. This could allow the separate Liverpool and Preston services planned under HS2 to travel as a single train to Crewe from London, and then split to reach both destinations. However, if both Liverpool services and the Preston run fast to Crewe, there is then no HS2 service to Stafford. We have therefore modelled the benefits of splitting and joining one and two trains per hour for services running from 2027 and from 2033 assuming that an additional London-Stafford-Stoke-Macclesfield HS2 service is also introduced as set out in the consultation document (and the train service diagram at figure 3 above). This drew on a number of data sources and assumptions in line with Department for Transport's WebTAG guidance. Table 2 presents the indicative benefits of splitting and joining one train per hour at Crewe and including a service to Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield from 2027 and 2033.

Change in BCR Components (67-year PV, £bn 2015 prices)		
	Services from 2027	Services from 2033
1. Net transport benefits	1.0	0.8
2. Wider Economic Impacts (WEIs)	0.2	0.2
3. Net benefits including WEIs = (1) + (2)	1.1	1.0
4. Operating costs	0.7	0.6
5. Rolling Stock Cost	0.1	0.1
6. Platform lengthening costs	0.03	0.03
7. Total costs = (4) + (5) + (6)	0.8	0.7
8. Revenues	0.5	0.4
9. Net costs to Government = (7) – (8)	0.3	0.3
10. Incremental BCR without WEIs = (1)/(9)	3.4	3.2
11. Incremental BCR with WEIs = (3)/(9)	4.1	3.8

Table 2. Incremental change in full Y network BCR components of splitting and joining one train per hour at Crewe and serving Stoke-on-Trent

Note: the Benefit Cost Ratios (BCRs) show early indicative estimates and are subject to change as cost assumptions are refined and modelling and appraisal assumptions are updated. Figures may not sum due to rounding.

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.3.2 There were a total of 139 responses to this question, 113 respondents were in support of the concept of splitting and joining HS2 services at Crewe, with 14 responses against and 12 “don’t know”. Question b (i) received 21 comments and question b (ii) 17 comments.
- 3.3.3 The strong support for splitting and joining, requiring the provision of 400m platforms was founded in comments about the benefits of better connectivity, more services and more destinations, in particular Stoke-on-Trent. These comments encompassed the efficient use of train paths by using splitting and joining services. There were a few comments on the capacity and route utilisation, increased seating capacity, increasing the availability of HS2 services, a better regional journey time benefit and maximisation of economic potential.
- 3.3.4 There were a number of general comments or observations, and the most common theme was that provision for splitting and joining services would allow for future flexibility and demands. There was some concern about the impact Crewe Hub HS2 services could have on existing services. There were also requests for all trains to be 400m in length and for the introduction of in-cab signalling on the existing network to create more train paths.

- 3.3.5 There were requests for at least two classic compatible trains per hour to Stoke-on-Trent, with the suggestion that the potential London-Stafford-Stoke-on-Trent service be extended to Manchester rather than terminating at Macclesfield. In contrast, a suggestion was made that Stoke-on-Trent could be better served by Pendolino trains without the need for new rolling stock.
- 3.3.6 Unsupportive comments were mostly centred on concern over the practicalities of splitting and joining trains, noting that it had an inherent time penalty and risked passing on service disruption. A small number of responses related to Stoke-on-Trent passengers ‘travelling backwards’ and disagreement with the premise that splitting would provide extra capacity.
- 3.3.7 There were a number of comments supporting HS2’s potential to open new job markets and increase economic activity in the Crewe region and in north Wales. A few respondents commented that connections to Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) and the Midlands Engine were more important to the Northern economy than connections to London. The North Wales and Mersey Dee Rail Task Force’s “*Growth Track 360*” campaign was highlighted as including a group of schemes which would benefit from HS2.
- 3.3.8 Some Liverpool stakeholders in particular were concerned about the journey time penalty and also flagged the increased risk to performance and reliability imported by splitting and joining. The impact on journey times to Liverpool is shown in table 3 below.

	HS2 base case	1 Split & Join	2 Split & Joins
Fastest Liverpool service	94 minutes	94 minutes	97 minutes
2nd Liverpool service	105 minutes	97 minutes	97 minutes

Table 3. Journey times between London and Liverpool¹⁰

Government Response

- 3.3.9 Having carefully considered the points made by respondents to the consultation, and advice from HS2 Ltd, the Secretary of State has decided that 400m platforms at Crewe, enabling the splitting and joining of services, would provide additional connectivity and capacity benefits, and meet the ambitions of local stakeholders.

¹⁰ Analysis of journey times and splitting and joining impacts will evolve continue to in the light of future modelling, design refinement, and timetabling analysis.

- 3.3.10 Running both Liverpool services each hour via Phase 2a and Crewe would help even out the passenger loadings between them, and provides the opportunity for an additional HS2 service to Stoke-on-Trent via Handsacre Junction and Stafford. The Secretary of State intends to ask the West Coast Partnership (WCP) to include a service to Stoke-on-Trent in its market development and service planning. We recognise there may also be a case to extend this service to Manchester Piccadilly, as well as to look at other options to serve not just Stoke-on-Trent but other destinations with either HS2 services or new direct WCML services to London. The WCP operator will be asked to examine the potential for such services, alongside meeting stakeholder aspirations for other improved local and regional services, recognising the limitations of rail network capacity in areas not directly relieved by the HS2 network. There is currently not anticipated to be capacity on HS2 for a second Stoke-on-Trent service each hour (and the business case for such a service is unlikely to be strong). The HS2 current modelling assumes that Stoke-on-Trent continues to receive intercity services via the WCML.
- 3.3.11 The Secretary of State appreciates concerns over potential timetable impacts from splitting and joining. Whilst there is a small time penalty involved in splitting and joining of trains, this has been taken into account in the indicative modelling which shows that the benefits outweigh the penalties. Actual timetables will be developed in the light of advice from the WCP and in line with normal industry processes.
- 3.3.12 We do not currently envisage introducing the second split and join operation until HS2 Phase 2b opens, which means that the headline HS2 Liverpool – London journey time for Phase 2a would remain as previously planned (the second Liverpool – London service will be faster than originally planned). Splitting and joining will also incur a time penalty for the Preston-London service, although it does not affect the fastest HS2 journey time (which is always provided by a Scotland-London, not a Preston-London, service). Other additional locations that could be served with the second split and join will be considered as part of the development of the Phase 2b business case.

3.4 Q3: Opportunities for serving additional destinations north of Crewe

- a Which additional destinations north of Crewe might be served through splitting and joining trains at Crewe?
- b Please provide any evidence you have about the impact serving additional destinations would have on:
 - (i) local economic growth
 - (ii) housing provision

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.4.1 Question a received a total of 110 comments.
- 3.4.2 The destinations respondents said they would like additional services north of Crewe to serve can be seen in figure 5 below (some are in fact south of Crewe).
- 3.4.3 Question b (i) received 18 comments and question b (ii), received 10 comments.
- 3.4.4 Those commenting that additional services would stimulate economic growth, cited the North Wales and Mersey Dee Rail Task Force's "*Growth Track 360*" campaign, long distance market studies and the Constellation Partnerships Growth Strategy as evidence.
- 3.4.5 Some responses commented that house prices would increase as a result of better transport, and that there was a need for a flexible approach to housing provision to accommodate future changes in demand. There were comments that all of the scenarios would lead to housing growth and the Constellation Partnership's "*HS2 Growth Strategy*" was cited as supporting 100,000 new houses.




Figure 5: Responses to the question: Which additional destinations north of Crewe might be served through splitting and joining trains at Crewe?

Government Response

- 3.4.6 The consultation results show a clear desire for HS2 services to serve more destinations, a need for consideration of future flexibility for operators and the ability to cater for passenger demand. The WCP operator will develop options for future HS2 and WCML services by undertaking detailed demand and operational analysis, working with NR, HS2 Ltd, other rail operators and wider stakeholders. WCP are expecting to consult on these options in the early 2020's. The Government's proposals for Phase 2a do not preclude development of opportunities for future service enhancements including those dependent on future electrification of the Chester and North Wales lines.
- 3.4.7 With regard to the responses to growth and local housing, DfT and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government are supporting the Constellation Partnership and local authorities in the realisation of related elements of their Growth Strategy as detailed in their "*HS2 Growth Strategy*¹¹".

3.5 Q4 Options for stopping more HS2 services

- a Do you support the concept of stopping more HS2 services at Crewe? Please indicate whether or not you support this concept and provide full reasons to support your response.
- b Please indicate your views on the potential service pattern(s) outlined in this document.
- c Please provide any evidence you can about the difference stopping more HS2 services at Crewe would make to:
 - (i) local economic growth
 - (ii) housing provision

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.5.1 There were 135 responses to question a, with 114 in support and 9 against, whilst a further 12 responded "don't know". Question b received 89 comments, question c (i) 15 comments and c (ii) 13 comments.
- 3.5.2 The majority were positive responses and suggested that stopping more services at Crewe would result in increased connectivity, provide an economic benefit and offer more choice. Some commented that more frequent trains would enable better interchanges.

¹¹ Constellation Partnership, HS2 Growth Strategy <http://constellationpartnership.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Constellation-Partnership-Brochure-17.10.17.pdf>

- 3.5.3 There were a small number of negative comments, expressing concern about losing direct services to Scotland from Crewe or suggesting that current plans would only provide a similar number of seats per hour from Crewe to London with less frequent services. West Midlands Rail (WMR) broadly agrees with the principal of stopping more HS2 services at Crewe but remains to be convinced that every service from Birmingham Curzon Station to the North West and Scotland needs to call at Crewe. In particular, WMR would like to understand the impact on journey times that a Crewe stop would have on Birmingham to Manchester and Birmingham to Scotland journey times. Others felt that more stopping services would provide the greatest benefit to Crewe by enabling the Crewe Hub vision, and that the additional services from Manchester and Birmingham would have spare seating capacity enabling better transfers between services at Crewe.

Government Response

- 3.5.4 The Secretary of State understands the desire for more trains stopping at Crewe. The infrastructure proposed for Phase 2a, if supported by a junction north of Crewe in Phase 2b, would enable capacity for 5 to 7 trains per hour to stop at Crewe. Whilst it is accepted that stopping trains slows services down, current modelling suggest that there could be a good case for doing this. The journey time impact of calling at Crewe would depend on the design of a junction north of Crewe, the southern connection to the HS2 mainline, and the infrastructure in the Crewe station area.
- 3.5.5 The WCP will use the results of this consultation to develop options for future HS2 and WCML services stopping at Crewe by undertaking detailed demand and operational analysis, working with NR, HS2 Ltd, other rail operators and wider stakeholders. WCP are expecting to consult on these options in the early 2020's.

3.6 Q5: Options for a new junction north of Crewe

- 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? Please indicate whether or not you support this principle and provide full reasons to support your response.
- b Please provide any evidence you can about the difference a junction north of Crewe station would make to:
 - (i) local economic growth
 - (ii) housing provision

Background: HS2 junction north of Crewe (Scenario 3)




Figure 6: Option for new junction north of Crewe

- 3.6.1 Scenario 3 in the consultation document would see a junction between the WCML north of Crewe and the high speed line to Manchester, and the right infrastructure at Crewe itself could enable additional HS2 services to stop at Crewe in 2033. We have looked at the case for stopping the planned two HS2 services each hour between Birmingham and Manchester, as well as the service from Birmingham to Scotland (which is assumed to alternate between Edinburgh and Glasgow in different hours, and also calls at Preston).
- 3.6.2 The modelled service specification for this scenario introduced a split and join for the second Liverpool service from London. For illustrative purposes, the demand modelling set out in the HS2 Phase Two Economic Case assumes the resulting extra HS2 unit carries on to Lancaster.
- 3.6.3 This scenario would see Crewe receive five HS2 trains per hour from the south and up to seven trains per hour from the north (seven as a result of splitting and joining). Figure 7 shows the indicative service pattern for Scenario 3 compared to the HS2 central case TSS.




Figure 7: Crewe platform extension and northern junction ITSS.

3.6.4 Some important limitations on the analysis done to date include:

- The interventions necessary to deliver these services are not included or funded within the current scope of the HS2 programme
- The interventions are subject to a full operability assessment to evaluate the deliverability of these services. As part of this, we will need to understand the capacity and availability of the infrastructure to enable these services
- The results are based on journey time estimates, which are subject to change once the full feasibility of any services via these routes has been undertaken
- The results have not been factored into further infrastructure spend that might be needed in response to an increase in passenger demand at Crewe

- These results are indicative and further analysis is ongoing. Any decision to take these options forward would need to be on the basis of a full business case

3.6.5 The combined impact of the proposed junction north of Crewe, platform lengthening, and a second splitting and joining service are presented in the table below.

PV, £bn 2015 prices	Change in BCR components
	Services from 2033
1. Net transport benefits	2.7
2. Wider Economic Impacts (WEIs)	0.7
3. Net benefits including WEIs	3.4
4. Operating costs	1.3
5. Rolling Stock cost	0.3
6. Revenues	1.4

Table 4 Incremental change in BCR components of exploiting capability of a junction north of Crewe

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.6.6 There were a total of 138 responses to this question, 109 supported the principle of a junction north of Crewe and 16 did not support it, a further 13 responded “don’t know”. Question b (i) received 5 comments and b (ii) received 2 comments.
- 3.6.7 Of the positive responses a large number commented that a junction north of Crewe would maximise the benefit of a Crewe Hub and enable connections further north, specifically Manchester and Scotland. Many commented that a junction north of Crewe would increase future flexibility, capacity and connectivity. There was a clear preference for “Scenario 3” (which is based on two services splitting and joining, and a junction north of Crewe) to unlock connectivity benefits. Most were supportive of more HS2 services at Crewe. A small number agreed with the proposed service pattern, thought that it would stimulate growth, and that it could provide synergies with NPR ambitions.
- 3.6.8 There were some broader neutral requests, comments or observations. Some requested that Liverpool be served via a junction north of Crewe, a few said Warrington should be served and that more connections to the existing network should be made. Some asked whether freight services would be enhanced as a result of a northern junction, and stressed that any proposal should not impact on existing services. Finally it was suggested that a junction north of Crewe should be grade separated for full flexibility.
- 3.6.9 There were a small number of negative responses, some concerned with environmental impacts, such as habitats or canals, and wanting a brownfield site to be used. One response commented that a junction north of Crewe could increase

journey times and that there would be little advantage over existing services. Concern was expressed over the potential local impacts of a junction North of Crewe in conjunction with the Rolling Stock Depot at Wimboldsley.

Government Response

- 3.6.10 The Secretary of State notes that enhanced regional connectivity facilitated by a junction north of Crewe has the potential to support additional growth not only around Crewe, but across Cheshire and the rest of the North through increased productivity, housing and jobs growth. Improving HS2 connectivity through a junction north of Crewe could support additional ‘agglomeration effects’ over and above existing plans; further lowering the costs of doing business, driving efficiencies and in turn raising productivity.
- 3.6.11 The decision on a junction north of Crewe is for Phase 2b. HS2 Ltd will continue to develop the potential design and business case. Final decisions will be subject to affordability (including the scale of any local contribution to costs) and value for money.

3.7 Q6: Freight

- 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.
- 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.

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.7.1 There were a total of 31 comments to question a and 24 for question b.
- 3.7.2 The strongest views on question a relate to future port growth, at Liverpool in particular, which is forecast to increase rail freight demand. It was also suggested that additional capacity could be created by using the Middlewich branch line and connections through Chester. Weaver Junction was highlighted as a current bottleneck for freight and there were requests for work to be undertaken to resolve this issue. More generally it was recognised that HS2 would release capacity on the WCML for freight traffic. With regards to the Crewe Hub vision, respondents commented that it might have a negative impact on existing freight services, and there was concern that the independent line platforms could restrict future freight growth.
- 3.7.3 Responses to question b were also in relation to shipping port growth, intermodal traffic and future capacity of the railway. The main concerns were that Crewe be

configured appropriately in order to accommodate future growth, and that the Crewe Hub should lead to no reduction in freight capacity on existing lines. There were also requests for additional lines, the prioritising of differing traffic types (in particular to north and south freight movements), the creation of a Basford Hall freight terminal, and the use of the Middlewich branch line for freight traffic.

- 3.7.4 It was further suggested that there is potential to use the capacity released by HS2 and the connection at Handsacre to the WCML for rail freight journeys to the North West and Scotland.

Government Response

- 3.7.5 Crewe is a nationally important rail freight hub, with almost all freight trains on the WCML routing through Basford Hall. We understand that a large number of moves in and around Crewe are not timetabled and there are a number of rail related businesses which rely on these moves for their business.
- 3.7.6 Freight operators raised a number of concerns about the Crewe Hub vision, particularly around their ability to marshal wagons on the independent lines. However the independent line resignalling, which is required irrespective of HS2, is expected to in any case affect the way those lines are used. NR continues work to assess what operational flexibility will be possible following the automation provided by re-signalling, and will shortly begin engaging with freight operators to consider future freight requirements in the Crewe area.
- 3.7.7 NR is content that plans for Crewe Hub and Phase 2a can support the current level of freight, although there could be issues in realising future freight growth north of Basford Hall once Phase 2a opens, and before HS2 Phase 2b becomes operational in 2033. NR also continues work on whether reinstating platform 13 at Crewe Station could provide an alternative to the independent line platform. In that case the impact on freight growth would be contained to the work on NR resignalling, and potentially, use of the independent lines as a diversionary route during construction of Phase 2a. Alternative station layouts cannot be confirmed until NR business plans are agreed as part of Control Period 6.
- 3.7.8 The responses to the consultation will be used to inform future work on the Crewe Hub, the junction north of Crewe and ongoing NPR work. Whilst NR has identified solutions to enable current volume of freight, these will not preclude freight growth in the future.

3.8 Q7: Local and regional passenger services

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

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.8.1 There were 35 comments made in response to his question. Some of the themes were relevant to earlier questions. There was a broad range of responses, which have been summarised below.
- 3.8.2 Regional services suggested included:
- Manchester and Manchester Airport services
 - an improved connection between Derby, Stoke-on-Trent and Crewe
 - new services north on WCML
 - passenger services to run on the Sandbach, Middlewich and Northwich line
 - increased frequency of Shrewsbury services
 - new cross country services to the south and south west
 - North Wales, Liverpool and Chester services
 - improved east – west services
- 3.8.3 General comments:
- future flexibility and capacity to be considered in planning
 - capacity on existing networks be released as a result of the work
 - there should be no impact on existing services
- 3.8.4 There were specific timetabling requests for future Crewe Hub local and regional services, centring on utilisation of capacity, reducing long gaps between services to regional destinations such as Manchester and increasing frequency to destinations such as Shrewsbury. There was some concern around the number of seats available on services to the South from Chester, Crewe, Macclesfield, Stockport, Warrington and Wilmslow, as well as on fast trains from Crewe and Warrington to the North and Scotland.
- 3.8.5 There was a question over how connecting passengers, from Stoke-on-Trent or Shrewsbury, travelling to Scotland would use HS2 services in the future.

Government Response

- 3.8.6 The Secretary of State understands the points raised about Crewe, local and regional train services. Whilst many of the individual issues raised are outside the immediate scope of the Crewe Hub vision, they are nonetheless important for future planning of the rail network. We will work on further developing these with the WCP, NR, HS2 Ltd, and industry partners in the future.
- 3.8.7 The options for infrastructure at Crewe do not preclude development of opportunities for future service enhancements. Some may require works outside the Crewe area to be realised.
- 3.8.8 The WCP and other operators will develop options for future services working consultatively with NR, HS2 Ltd, other rail operators and wider stakeholders, taking account of a range of factors including the latest information on demand. Any decision to develop these or other additional service scenarios would need to be on the basis of there being appropriate funding and a full business case. WCP will continue to look at ways to increase the number of seats between Crewe and Manchester.

3.9 Question 8: Local funding contribution

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?

Consultation Response Summary

- 3.9.1 There were a total of 68 comments in relation to the question on local funding contributions. Due to the nature of the question there was a mixture of comments some related to funding of any future projects whilst others gave specific interventions. In the analysis of this data we have categorised two broad topics of response, funding and interventions.
- 3.9.2 Many responses indicated that local authorities should provide funding for interventions in and around the station. Many responses separately indicated that central Government or its agents and major stakeholders such as NR should fund the projects. Some felt that private sector developers, local funding contributions, development schemes and use of, Land Value Uplift, Community Infrastructure Levy or S106 funds should be used to fund the projects and interventions. A small number felt that rail freight, train operating companies should contribute or a similar funding scheme to that of Thameslink and Crossrail could be used.

3.9.3 A number of suggestions were made as to what would enhance the local area and complement the Crewe Hub visions:

- a high level walkway from the station to the town
- enhanced local public transport
- enhance cycle provision, including lanes, safe crossings and parking
- regeneration of Crewe station and retention of listed frontage
- return disused platforms to use
- improved local road access and car parking, and a connection to the M6 from the south
- connection to Crewe diesel depot
- relocation of the DB depot
- relocation of the Cardiff line

Government Response

3.9.4 The Secretary of State understands local aspirations and the plans of Cheshire East Council, and the Constellation Partnership as well as other stakeholders and respondents. The responses from the consultation will be used to inform future work and shared with Cheshire East Council and the Constellation Partnership. Areas of priority will be for local stakeholders to decide and funding options will be subject of a future discussion between central and local government, and stakeholders. A well-integrated and high quality Crewe Hub is key to ensuring the maximum benefits are realised from the proposals.

3.10 Question 9: Additional areas

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.

Consultation Response Summary

3.10.1 There were a total of 64 comments, covering a very wide range of topics, and many of these have been addressed in previous questions. However environment impacts are not covered in other questions, and so are discussed here.

- 3.10.2 Respondents asked for further consideration of environmental impacts and natural habitats in and around the junction north of the Crewe area, as well as impacts on the local parishes of Minshull Vernon, Wimboldsley and Stanthorne where HS2 proposals would already have an impact. There were requests for HS2 to use construction techniques which minimise visual intrusion and reduce severance of communities. It was suggested that this would also help reduce blight and maintain the maximum amount of productive farmland. Some respondents were concerned over the impacts on local transport during construction.

Government Response

- 3.10.3 The Government is acutely aware of the impact that major projects such as HS2 can have on communities. Both Government and HS2 Ltd are committed to the protection of the environment through seeking to avoid significant adverse effects, minimising impacts where they occur and determining options for mitigation where needed. Work is ongoing on the business case and design for a junction north of Crewe. Environmental impacts, and their possible mitigations, will play an important role in decision-making about the design. If proposals for a junction north of Crewe were to be taken forward, the environmental impacts and any appropriate mitigation would be assessed and be subject to consultation. HS2 and NR will seek to use sensitive modern construction methods to minimise construction impacts on communities and habitat, and staging of works will be considered carefully as design progresses.

Annex A: Consultation analysis

Approach to consultation

The consultation was organised and managed by the Department for Transport (DfT). DfT analysed the responses and produced the summary data of results.

The consultation was publicised on the www.gov.uk website as well as via leaflets sent to all properties within 1km of the Crewe Station and along the HS2 line of route. A consultation information stand was set up at Crewe Station and staffed by DfT officials on a number of occasions during the consultation period, furthermore at nearby HS2 information events, a Crewe Hub consultation information stand was set up and staffed by DfT officials. Information on the consultation was also sent to local authorities, parish councils, statutory and technical respondents and other stakeholders along the route.

A Written Ministerial Statement was laid in Parliament announcing the start of the consultation and a press release was issued by DfT.

Consultation Methodology

We received 146 responses to the consultation responses via multiple response channels (web form, email and post) and processed them using the following four stages:

1. Receipt and digitisation of all responses to a consistent digital format.
2. The development of an analytical framework: to enable a team of policy professionals to categorise all responses according to the issues they raise.
3. The application of the analytical framework: a systematic process of applying the analytical framework to all responses, with quality checking to ensure accuracy.
4. Reporting: the translation of the analysed data into this response document which presents a summary of the issues raised in the consultation.

The summary of consultation data produced by DfT does not make recommendations or seek to draw conclusions from responses; attempt to respond to comments made by respondents; or seek to verify or pass judgement on the accuracy of comments made by respondents. Its purpose is to organise, analyse and report on the responses received and provide results in a format that is as accessible as possible for the general public, stakeholders and for decision makers in Government.

Consultation Responses

Of the 146 responses, 63 identified as organisations and elected representatives, 83 identified as members of the public.

Other comments

A small number of respondents express opinions on HS2 in general. Of those these, a few expressed opposition, questioning the business case and criticising the cost and potential local disruption, compared with perceived benefits. Conversely many respondents gave general backing to the project, giving examples of local benefits, and requests that more should be done in terms of services, destinations and infrastructure.

A large number of respondents, including key stakeholders, made requests and suggestions in parts of their responses that were outside the scope of the consultation, beyond the remit of the DfT, or in the remit of other Government bodies or local stakeholders. In these instances DfT have shared the response results appropriately with its partners and stakeholders, to ensure that this information is captured and available for future consideration.

Response channels

There were three ways to submit a response to this consultation, all of which were advertised in consultation materials and on the Government publications website (www.gov.uk). The three response channels were postal, email address and an online response form.

Response types

A total of 146 responses were received, in a number of different formats. Table 1 describes these in more detail.

Some responses were categorised as null responses, including: identical responses from a single respondent, blank responses and requests for specific information. Enquiries received through the response channels were redirected to appropriate teams at the DfT or the HS2 Ltd Enquiries team.

Response Type	Count
Online response form Responses submitted via the response form on the .Gov website	83
Offline response form Completed response forms submitted via post or email	63
Total	146

Table 1 Responses by Type

Response by sector

Respondents that used the response form or the consultation website to respond to the consultation were asked to indicate the sector that most appropriately described them. Other responses received from organisations, with no sector indication given, were categorised based on information from the response or through publicly available information about the responding organisation. A list of responding organisations per sector is show in Table 2

Sector	Count
Members of the public	83
Action groups & Unions (includes interest groups campaigning on various aspects of the HS2 proposals)	6
Businesses (local, regional, national or international, chambers of commerce)	9
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)	4
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups (includes environmental groups, educational establishments, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)	14
Local government & Health Authorities (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships,)	17
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations	1
Statutory agencies	3
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisations	9
Total	146

Table 2 Responses by sector

About the findings

The broad findings of the consultation are summarised in chapter 3 of this document. Where possible the responses raised by respondents were gathered into similar themes as part of the analytical processing, whilst all themes have been analysed and considered. A further consolidation of themes has been conducted to present the broad findings and key messages. Where responses could not be grouped together they have been addressed individually. This process maintains the readability of the document.

Data in the findings

Numbers in chapter 3 are used to provide the reader with an indication of the balance of views expressed by respondents. It is important to note that this consultation was an open and qualitative process, rather than an exercise to establish dominant views across a representative cross-section of the public. Therefore, no conclusions can be reliably drawn about any population's views beyond those who responded to the consultation. The intention is to accurately reflect the issues raised, rather than attributing any weight to the number of respondents raising them.

Where appropriate and possible, numbers have been used to illustrate whether a particular point of view was expressed by a greater or smaller number of respondents.

Throughout the report, respondents' views are summarised using quantifiers such as 'many', 'some' and 'a few' to ensure the narrative remains readable. These are not based on a rigorous metric for use of quantifiers in the report – we have exercised editorial judgement over what quantifiers to employ.

In chapter 3, specific views or issues are presented without presenting a number of how many responses were made containing this view or issue. This helps to provide a balance between qualitative findings and the numbers of respondents raising specific points.

Disaggregation & Conditional Responses

Due to the complexity and depth of the consultation, some respondents gave both positive and negative comments to the proposals in their comments but may have selected, "yes", "no", or "don't know", in the parent question. In describing the results, the parent question has been disaggregated from the comment section. Furthermore some parent question responses were conditional upon the part or all of the comments requests being met.

List of organisations who responded

ASLEF (The Train Drivers Union), Crewe Branch
Campaign for Rail
Canal & River Trust
The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport
Cheshire East Council
Cheshire West and Chester Council
Cheshire & Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership
Civil Engineering Contractors Association NW
Coleg Cambria
Constellation Partnership
Conwy County Borough
Crewe Diesel Depot
Crewe Town Council
Cycling UK
Freightliner
Growth Track 360 (North Wales and Mersey Dee Task Force)
Highways England
Historic England
Inland Waterways Association
Macclesfield Chamber of Commerce and Enterprise
Marches LEP and Shropshire Council
Marches Strategic Rail Group
Mersey Travel Liverpool City Region
Mid Cheshire against HS2
Mid Cheshire Development Board

Mid Cheshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Midlands Connect
Natural England
Network Rail
North Cheshire Rail Users' Group
North Staffs Rail Promotion Group
North Wales Business Council
North Wales Economic Ambition Board, Conwy County Borough
North Wales and Mersey Dee Business Council
North West Business Leadership Team
North Staffordshire Community Rail Partnership
Railfuture
Rail Freight Group
Sandstone Ridge Trust
Scottish Association of Public Transport
SG World Ltd
The Skills and Growth Company
South Cheshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry Ltd
Stafford Borough Councillor
Staffordshire Chamber of Commerce
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire LEP
Stanthorne & Wimboldsley Parish Meeting
Taylor Wimpey Ltd
TEM Group
Transport for Greater Manchester
Transport for North
Transport Salaried Staffs Association Crewe & Cheshire General Branch
TravelWatch North West
Welsh Government

West Midlands Rail

Weston and Basford Parish Council

The Wrexham-Bidston Rail Users' Association (WBRUA)

Wirral Transport Users Association

Wybunbury Parish Council

Wybunbury Ward Councillor (Cheshire East Council)

20 Miles More Ltd

