



Economy Scrutiny Committee

Date: Thursday, 10 March 2022

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension

This is a **combined agenda pack** for information only

Access to the Public Gallery

Access to the Public Gallery is on Level 3 of the Town Hall Extension, using the lift or stairs in the lobby of the Mount Street entrance to the Extension. **There is no public access from any other entrance.**

Filming and broadcast of the meeting

Meetings of the Economy Scrutiny Committee are 'webcast'. These meetings are filmed and broadcast live on the Internet. If you attend this meeting you should be aware that you might be filmed and included in that transmission.

Membership of the Economy Scrutiny Committee

Councillors - H Priest (Chair), Bayunu, Doswell, Farrell, Johns, Moore, Noor, Raikes, Stanton and Shilton Godwin

Agenda

- 1. Urgent Business**
To consider any items which the Chair has agreed to have submitted as urgent.
- 2. Appeals**
To consider any appeals from the public against refusal to allow inspection of background documents and/or the inclusion of items in the confidential part of the agenda.
- 3. Interests**
To allow Members an opportunity to [a] declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they might have in any items which appear on this agenda; and [b] record any items from which they are precluded from voting as a result of Council Tax/Council rent arrears; [c] the existence and nature of party whipping arrangements in respect of any item to be considered at this meeting. Members with a personal interest should declare that at the start of the item under consideration. If Members also have a prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they must withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of the item.
- 4. Minutes** 5 - 12
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022.
- 5. Manchester Airport** 13 - 30
Report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure attached

This report provides an update on the role of Manchester Airport in the economy of the city; the current economic situation of the Airport following the impact of COVID-19; and the next steps in the economic future for the Airport.
- 6. Manchester Housing Allocations Policy** 31 - 46
Report of the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) attached

Following an extensive period of review and agreement by social landlords and by the Council's Executive Committee, Manchester's current statutory social housing allocations scheme was implemented in November 2020. In addition to the planned full evaluation after 24 months, it was agreed that an interim evaluation should be undertaken after 12 months.
- 7. HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg - Environmental Statement Consultation & Hybrid Bill Petitioning Response** 47 - 144
Report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development)

This report informs the Executive about the deposit of the HS2 hybrid Bill in Parliament on 24th January 2022; the public consultations on the Environmental Statement (ES) and Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) for the Bill; and outlines the Council's proposed response to these consultations. The report further outlines the key areas on which the Council is proposing to petition against the hybrid Bill, subject to the approval of Council on 4th March to submit a petition.

- 8. Update on COVID-19 Activity** 145 - 182
Report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure and Director of Inclusive Economy

This report provides Committee Members with a further update summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this Committee. Further detail on specific issues will be available as required.

- 9. Overview Report** 183 - 192
Report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit

This report provides the Committee with details of key decisions that fall within the Committee's remit and an update on actions resulting from the Committee's recommendations. The report also includes the Committee's work programme, which the Committee is asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

Information about the Committee

Scrutiny Committees represent the interests of local people about important issues that affect them. They look at how the decisions, policies and services of the Council and other key public agencies impact on the city and its residents. Scrutiny Committees do not take decisions but can make recommendations to decision-makers about how they are delivering the Manchester Strategy, an agreed vision for a better Manchester that is shared by public agencies across the city.

The Economy Scrutiny Committee has responsibility for looking at how the city's economy is growing and how Manchester people are benefiting from the growth. .

The Council wants to consult people as fully as possible before making decisions that affect them. Members of the public do not have a right to speak at meetings but may do so if invited by the Chair. If you have a special interest in an item on the agenda and want to speak, tell the Committee Officer, who will pass on your request to the Chair. Groups of people will usually be asked to nominate a spokesperson. The Council wants its meetings to be as open as possible but occasionally there will be some confidential business. Brief reasons for confidentiality will be shown on the agenda sheet.

The Council welcomes the filming, recording, public broadcast and use of social media to report on the Committee's meetings by members of the public.

Agenda, reports and minutes of all Council Committees can be found on the Council's website www.manchester.gov.uk.

Smoking is not allowed in Council buildings.

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive
Level 3, Town Hall Extension,
Albert Square,
Manchester, M60 2LA

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Michael Williamson
Tel: 0161 234 3071
Email: m.williamson@manchester.gov.uk

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022

Present:

Councillor H Priest – in the Chair
Councillors Bayunu, Doswell, Farrell, Moore, Noor and Raikes

Apologies: Councillor Johns, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Leader
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment
Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment
Brian Henry, Head of MAES
Lisa O’Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group
John Thornhill, Chief Executive LTE Group

ESC/22/05 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022 were approved as a correct record.

ESC/22/06 Growth & Development Directorate Budget 2022/23

Further to minute (ESC/21/53), the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update on the saving proposals being proposed as part of the 2022/23 budget process.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25;
- Overall, the settlement announcement was towards the positive end of expectations and it was expected that mitigations in the region of £7.7m, as previously identified, would be sufficient to balance the 2022/23 budget;
- The budget assumptions that underpinned 2022/23 to 2024/25 included the commitments made as part of the 2021/22 budget process to fund ongoing demand pressures as well as provision to meet other known pressures such as inflation and any pay awards (estimated at 3% from 2022/23);
- Whilst this contributed to the scale of the budget gap it was important that a realistic budget was set which reflected ongoing cost and demand pressures;

- The focus would now be on identifying savings and mitigations to keep the Council on a sustainable financial footing; and
- It was proposed that budget cuts and savings of £60m over three years would be developed for Member consideration which equated to just under 12% of 2022/23 directorate budgets. In addition, £30m of risk-based reserves had been identified as available to manage risk and timing differences.

The Leader advised that whilst there were no major changes to the proposed budget following the report in November, a decade of austerity had resulted in £420 million having been removed from the Council's budget, resulting in a 15% reduction in spending power compared to a national average of 2.4% and if Manchester had had the national average applied to its budget, it would have a further £85 million in its budget today.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) commented that the 2021/22 budget process had included £393k savings in respect of holding/deleting 11 posts in planning and building control. Whilst the service redesign was expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2022, it would take time to implement the changes and recruit to all the posts. To allow for service delivery, and succession planning it was necessary to amend the structure and invest in some areas, therefore it was anticipated that ongoing savings of c£150k would be realised from reduced staffing costs across planning and building control. This would require alternative savings of £243k to be identified and delivered in 2022/23.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- There was concern in relation to the ability to effectively ensure the enforcement of illegal planning if it was still proposed to reduce the number of staff within planning and building control;
- Was it possible to have a breakdown of the proposed savings at a ward or neighbourhood level;
- What opportunities had been identified from the review of Council assets to help tackle the level of savings needed in future years; and
- Had there been any work undertaken around the anticipation of additional costs and pressures on the service as the Council emerged from the impact of covid.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) commented that the original saving of £393k had been identified through existing vacant posts and through the forthcoming service redesign, additional resource would be added to the service to ensure it operated effectively. She also advised that due to the nature of the work of the Directorate, it was difficult to break this down to a ward or neighbourhood level as a large part of the Directorate's budget was made up from staff costs who worked across the city. It was proposed that a more detailed overview of the work of the team could be provided for Members.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment acknowledged the need to improve how the work of the Directorate was reported back to ward members on work in their respective wards.

In terms of Asset Management, it was reported that this was something that the Directorate was actively looking at and a Strategic Asset Management Plan would be implemented this year which would look to ensure that the assets held by the Council across its Development, Operational and Commercial estates were used to maximise the benefits to the city.

The Leader commented that there had been a number of areas as part of the wider budget setting process that had been looked at as to how they would likely be impacted as the Council emerged from the impact of covid, such as the discretionary support the Council had been able to give to residents and the support to businesses. She added that the current competitive environment for government funding was not helpful and was not a long term sustainable approach.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Note the forecast medium term revenue budget position.
- (2) Endorse and recommend that the Executive approve the budget proposals.
- (3) Propose that as part of the Committee's Work Programme setting meeting in May 2022, it receives a report that provides a detailed overview of the Directorate and the teams that sit within it.

ESC/22/07 Manchester Work and Skills Strategy Refresh

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy that provided an update on the development of a new Work and Skills Strategy for Manchester, to replace the previous version which had reached the end of its life.

Key points and themes in the report and accompanying presentation included:

- Providing a context and background;
- The new strategy used the Our Manchester Strategy themes as a structural framework;
- The Work and Skills Strategy would support a range of other city strategies;
- An overview of research and engagement; and
- The timetable for the delivery of the new strategy, noting that this would be presented to Executive for approval in May/June 2022.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Every attempt should be made to ensure all opportunities for employment and retraining were provided to Manchester residents;
- Training opportunities needed to be available to people who were already in employment but wanted to expand their skills set or retrain;
- An exercise should be undertaken to map how this strategy intersected with a range of other Council strategies and identify key priorities;
- Welcoming the inclusion of the real living wage and every lever the Council had should be used to ensure more employers across the city paid this;
- Requesting that papers relating to the work of the Work and Skills Board be circulated to members of the Committee for information;
- The need for parity of esteem between academic and vocational pathways as part of the careers advice service;
- The need to breakdown silo working and encourage improved relationships between the Department of Work and Pensions and Department for Education to ensure that people received the most appropriate support and employment and training pathways;
- The need to promote and articulate the positive experiences and outcomes that could be achieved via an apprenticeship programme;
- The need to recognise that the Digital Inclusion Teams to improve digital skills amongst priority groups, particularly the over 50s, was too prescriptive and needed to address skills gaps and digital behaviours amongst younger people also;
- Supporting the work to address economic inequality and requesting more information on the Poverty Impact Assessment; and
- Would the consultation on the first draft of the strategy include face to face consultation.

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that entry level jobs and apprenticeships in the Council were ringfenced for Manchester residents. She stated that all levers and spheres of influence were used by the Council to encourage employers and other anchor institutions to support this programme and to pay the Real Living Wage, particularly in the foundation employment sector, supported further by the Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter and using the Shared Prosperity Fund to deliver this programme.

She described that the Our Town Hall Project had delivered a range of good quality work experience opportunities and suggested the Committee might wish to receive a more detailed report on this subject area at a future meeting. She further described that the relationship between good employment and mental health was understood, and this had helped inform the Build Back Fairer in Greater Manchester strategy in line with the recommendations of Professor Michael Marmot that aimed to address a range of inequalities.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised that consultation on the first draft of the strategy would include face to face consultation. She further advised that key partners were engaged with the Work and Skills Board and she would consult with the Chair on

how best to relay the work of the Board to the Committee, recognising that this would be of interest to Members.

The Director of Inclusive Economy further noted the comment regarding the importance of promoting the many positive aspects of apprenticeships and work was ongoing with schools to ensure the parity of esteem was achieved when delivering careers advice. Recognition was also made to the reference regarding digital skills and behaviours, she advised that this was included in the strategy with the ambition being to ensure all was done to ensure people were ready and equipped to enter the world of employment.

Lisa O'Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group informed the Members on their work to address digital skills and digital access, particularly in the support offered to learners in response to the challenges to online learning that presented during the pandemic.

The Strategy and Economic Policy Manager stated that work was underway to map the intersection between the different strategies and once this exercise was completed this information could be shared with the Members. He further commented that the Poverty Impact Assessment information could also be shared with the Committee once this exercise was completed.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that the promotion of apprenticeships needed to be a continual programme of engagement and communication to articulate the many positive experiences and promote this as an attractive pathway into employment. He said the strategy would be delivered in collaboration with a number of partners in the city that included employers and local businesses.

Decisions

The Committee recommend;

- (1) Recommend that the Director of Inclusive Economy, in consultation with the Chair, agree how the work of the Work and Skills Board is periodically shared with the Committee for information outside of the formal meeting structure.
- (2) Recommend that a report on the delivery of work and skills through the Our Town Hall Project is included on the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

ESC/22/08 LTE Group Update

The Committee considered the report of the Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group and the Chief Executive LTE Group that provided an update on key areas of activity.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The Manchester College's progress, performance and contribution to Manchester's work and skills outcomes since the last report to the Economy Scrutiny Committee in 2021;
- Progress update and next steps on LTE Group estates and infrastructure plans including site disposals; and
- Progress on apprentice provision via Total People.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Welcoming the progress reported, in particular in relation to the gender balance of learners and the number of employment placements provided; and
- What support was offered to learners who transitioned from Community Hubs into the Centres of Excellence.

Lisa O'Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group stated that the College had strong, well established relationships with employers that had assisted with securing good quality work experience placements. She stated that whilst COVID-19 had impacted on this she was confident that this would remain, adding that they were seeking to improve the two week placement offer. She further described that their learners were very diverse, and they were regarded as a trusted provider across the city. She stated that the Manchester College worked to challenge and remove the barriers experienced by young people accessing quality employment, noting that they had witnessed an increase in the numbers of females entering the construction industry.

Lisa O'Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group stated that there was a programme established to support learners to orientate and familiarise themselves as they transitioned to the centres of excellence. She further noted that numbers of SEND learners were increasing year on year.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

ESC/22/09 Manchester Adult Education Service

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy and Head of MAES.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An introduction and background, noting that the vision for MAES continued to be 'To deliver inspirational adult education that connects Manchester's adults to their potential, their community and their future';
- The response to COVID-19;

- MAES performance in 2020/21; and
- The skills challenges in the city.

The key point that arose from the Committee's discussions was: -

- Noting the resources needed to deliver the work and ambition of the service at scale for the benefit of Manchester residents.

The Director of Inclusive Economy commented that the central government funding to deliver adult education had reduced by over 40% during the previous ten years. She described that despite this challenging environment the service remained committed to improving opportunities for residents. She advised that it was recognised that the physical infrastructure of the estate needed to be improved, and monies from the Shared Prosperity Fund would support this. She commented that the Greenheys Adult Learning Centre had been identified as a priority site. She further advised that MAES would continue to strengthen and build upon their relationships with local employers and the Job Centre Plus to promote this offer recognising that they were a visible and trusted provider that were rooted in local communities.

The Director of Inclusive Economy also discussed the wider engagement work that was delivered collaboratively with the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE). The Chair recommended that a report on this work with the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector be added to the Committee's work programme for consideration at a future meeting.

The Head of MAES informed the Committee that the intention was to increase the Level 3 provision for adults, noting that it was recognised that there was a need for this.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends that a report on the MAES External Review is provided to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.
- (2) Recommends that a report on the work delivered in partnership between MAES and the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector is provided to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

ESC/22/10 Update on COVID-19 Activity

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

ESC/22/11 Overview Report

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

In response to a question from a Member who enquired when a report on purpose-built student accommodation would be submitted for consideration, the Chair advised that this would form part of discussion on the wider Housing Strategy. She advised this would be considered in the new municipal year.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the recommendations arising from consideration of the previous agenda items.

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Economy Scrutiny Committee - 10 March 2022

Subject: Manchester Airport

Report of: Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure

Summary

This report provides an update on the role of Manchester Airport in the economy of the city; the current economic situation of the Airport following the impact of COVID-19; and the next steps in the economic future for the Airport.

Recommendations

That Committee is recommended to consider and note the report.

Wards Affected: All

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the issues addressed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the City

Aviation contributes 2-3% to global carbon emissions. The emissions that arise from flying need to be considered as part of global and national carbon budgets in the context of global efforts to keep global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees C of pre-industrial levels.

Manchester Airports Group (MAG) has worked to reduce carbon emissions across its estate. All MAG airports have already been certified as carbon neutral, including Manchester Airport. MAG has also committed to its airports being net zero by 2038, which fully aligns with Manchester City Council's commitment to achieve net-zero emissions by 2038.

Our Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Manchester Airport is a significant economic asset and pre-pandemic employed 25,000 people on site. This combines MAG employment and that of third parties on site.

<p>A highly skilled city: world class and home-grown talent sustaining the city's economic success</p>	<p>As the anchor employer in Wythenshawe, the Airport provides a range of jobs within the aviation sector. The Council, Manchester Airports Group (MAG) and other partners work closely to advertise the job and training opportunities linked to the Airport. All MAG airports have an AeroZone, offering a free interactive education centre for schools and colleges, aiming to inspire the next generation to work in the aviation industry and the Airport Academy, which provides training programmes for jobseekers to gain employment at the Airport and its ancillary facilities services.</p>
<p>A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities</p>	<p>Manchester Airport and the Council work closely together to promote job opportunities at the Airport. Businesses operating out of Airport City also work with the Council to attract and retain talent from the local area and provide training schemes and social value commitments within Wythenshawe.</p>
<p>A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work</p>	<p>The infrastructure to access the Airport and Airport City has improved in recent years to make it more accessible via public transport and walking and cycling, including a new pedestrian and cycle bridge over the motorway linking Woodhouse Park and the Airport. Travelling to the Airport is more convenient and safer via local public transport services, allowing sustainable transport choices to be made.</p>
<p>A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth</p>	<p>The Airport operates routes to 210 destinations (pre-COVID) and generates £2.4billion for the local economy. It supports businesses and industries across the city, the city region and the North West through tourism, business travel and freight. A transformation programme is being undertaken by MAG to improve customer experience at the Airport, this includes the newly refurbished Terminal Two. MAG have committed to a net-zero future for the Airport.</p>

Contact Officers:

Name: Pat Bartoli

Position: Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure

Telephone: 0161 234 3329

E-mail: pat.bartoli@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy, please contact one of the contact officers above.

- Manchester Airport City Development and Infrastructure Framework –Report to Executive, 6 April 2011
- Aviation and Carbon Emissions – Report to Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee, 9 December 2021

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Manchester Airport is one of the UK's busiest airports, providing routes globally for trade and travel throughout the year. It is a major economic driver, and the success of the Airport has led to the establishment of a business, manufacturing and logistics district at Airport City that hosts large, international businesses.
- 1.2 Manchester and its residents directly benefit from the proximity, the size and scale of the Airport in terms of the number of people employed directly by the Airport but also those indirectly supported through the supply chain. The Airport contributes to the tourism industry and the business ecosystem, supporting the economic growth of the whole of the North of England. It is a key asset for the city, supporting its growth and provides a major draw for investment and development.
- 1.3 Manchester Airports Group (MAG) owns and operates Manchester (MAN), London Stansted (STN) and East Midlands (EMA) airports. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, MAG airports handled around 62 million passengers (21% of the UK total) and around 670,000 tonnes of freight (26% of freight tonnage handled at UK airports) each year.
- 1.4 During the Covid-19 pandemic and through the introduction of social restrictions as part of the public health drive to reduce infections, the aviation sector was tightly controlled for almost two years. This curbing of movement had a considerable impact on the operations of the Airport and the wider sector.
- 1.5 This report provides an update on Manchester Airport's contribution to the local economy before the pandemic, the performance of MAG over the last two years, and their approach to recruitment going forward as the sector begins to recover. The report will also discuss Airport City and its contribution to Manchester and the growth of opportunities in the area.

2.0 Position of Manchester Airport in the Local Economy

- 2.1 Manchester Airport is a major international airport servicing a catchment area of over 20 million people across most of the North of England, and parts of Wales, and the West Midlands within a 2-hour travel time. This strong catchment has allowed the airport to grow a large and diverse international route network, which has supported Manchester's role as an economic powerhouse at the heart of the North of England.
- 2.2 Pre-pandemic, MAG's airports supported direct employment (both with MAG and third parties on-site) of nearly 44,000 jobs, supporting GVA of £3bn. Over half of these benefits arise from Manchester Airport, which also hosts the majority of MAG's head office functions. Indirect and induced employment in the wider economy from MAG increases the impacts to over 130,000 jobs and over £8bn of GVA pre-Covid.

- 2.3 Wythenshawe & Sale East, the parliamentary constituency in which the Airport is located, had 4,376 aviation jobs (7.1% of jobs in the constituency). The wage levels for these jobs are 30% higher than the constituency average.
- 2.4 Before the pandemic, Manchester Airport had direct routes to 210 destinations. It is the only UK airport aside from Heathrow with direct routes to key long-haul markets, making it an international gateway for trade and travel, acting as a major draw for investment and development in Greater Manchester and the North West. The attraction of new services and destinations has been a key objective for the Airport for many years, and it has succeeded in building a strong network of global connections.
- 2.5 For example, over two years the direct routes to China helped to grow export values from Manchester Airport to China by 41%, bringing with it £250 million to the visitor economy. The number of people travelling between Manchester and Beijing increased by 80%, with the route growing faster than the other available UK-China direct routes. There was also a 114% increase in northern students gaining Chinese internships, with more than 70% of that group coming from a low-income background.
- 2.6 The benefits of connectivity to China were further demonstrated during the pandemic, when Manchester Airport was able to work with local partners, including the universities, Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and the Manchester China Forum (MCF) to support the chartering of 31 flights from Chongqing Jiangbei Airport to Manchester. This supported over 7,000 students to study at universities in Manchester and across the North of England.
- 2.7 In addition to its role in supporting the GM economy, the GM Councils have directly benefited from MAG's regular dividend payments to shareholders. In the five years immediately prior to the pandemic, MAG distributed over £600m in dividend payments to the GM Councils, providing an above market return in excess of many FTSE companies on the Councils' long-term investment in the Group.
- 2.8 Since 2017, the Airport has been undertaking a programme of refurbishment and modernisation. In July 2021, the Terminal 2 extension opened to passengers. The new extension is the first phase of the £1.3 billion Airport Transformation Programme, aimed at improving customer service and experience for users of the Airport and offer better, future-proofed facilities. Work on the second phase of the Transformation Programme was paused in 2020 to limit capital expenditure during the pandemic.

3.0 Current economic situation of Manchester Airport

- 3.1 The COVID-19 pandemic devastated the aviation and travel sectors, practically overnight, as aviation businesses were effectively closed. The Office for National Statistics' Index of Services has consistently shown that air transport is the most impacted sector of the UK economy (see Appendix 1). Where other economic sectors have recovered close to (and in some cases

above) pre-pandemic levels, the aviation industry has never exceeded 70% of 2019 output and by December 2021 remained well below sectors such as retail, food & beverage, and accommodation, which have broadly recovered their 2019 output.

- 3.2 In the peak summer period in July 2020, Manchester Airport had 447,000 arriving and departing passengers, compared to 3.2 million in July 2019. This equates to around 14% of pre-COVID traffic.
- 3.3 In the first months of 2020/21, as the scale of the pandemic became clear, MAG made non-staff operational cost savings in excess of £183 million and paused elements of its main transformation programmes, freezing all other non-essential maintenance expenditure. The decision was taken in Autumn 2020 to restructure the business, including redundancies at Manchester Airport. As airports were so affected by the uncertainty of the pandemic and (at the time) lack of recovery, it was not clear when colleagues would be needed again.
- 3.4 MAG received strong support from its shareholders through an injection of £300m additional equity capital and an agreement to pause dividend payments. The new equity was split according to existing shareholding, such that Manchester City Council (which has a 35.5% shareholding in MAG) contributed £106.5m. This support has been critical for the business over the most difficult period in the history of the sector, and MAG recognises the importance of returning to dividend payments as soon as possible given the importance of this income stream to shareholders.
- 3.5 The lifting of some of the UK's international travel restrictions in October 2021 saw passenger numbers begin to rise quickly in October and November. This period of recovery not only showed the strength of the sector when restrictions were lifted, but also the strength of recovery at MAG airports relative to other UK airports. As shown in the graph in Appendix 2, the group led the recovery of the UK airports market in passenger numbers. This reflects the diverse airline mix and the strength of the low-cost, short-haul carriers that operate from Manchester Airport.
- 3.6 However, the Omicron variant clearly demonstrated the impact of UK testing requirements and public uncertainty on the recovery of international travel. Following the re-introduction of more stringent requirements, the recovery of MAG's passenger numbers fell back by around one-third in December 2021 and January 2022. Now that most of these restrictions have been lifted, passenger numbers are growing again and the outlook for 2022 is positive.
- 3.7 Throughout the pandemic, MAG has actively campaigned for changes in travel restrictions and direct Government support for the industry. MAG has commissioned independent scientific research which provides evidence to support the lifting of travel restrictions and testing requirements.
- 3.8 MAG acknowledges that although there is latent demand from passengers, navigating international travel will remain challenging for some, particularly as

a result of the wide range of measures in place in other countries. MAG is working closely with the UK Government on the pathway to removing the remaining barriers to travel, such as passenger locator forms, and the most effective ways to restore consumer confidence and encourage passengers to return to flying.

4.0 Employment, recruitment, and training opportunities at the Airport

- 4.1 Since 2016 the Council has worked closely with MAG colleagues to support all aspects of their recruitment and training provision at the airport. Pre-Covid this included the annual peak season recruitment, Terminal 2 Transformation programme, Airport City social value activity and development of the Airport Academy - MAG's in-house training and recruitment facility.
- 4.2 MAG's Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy published in 2020 acknowledges the Airport's role as an economic enabler and major employer in the regions its airports serve. By supporting local people from all backgrounds to find employment in the aviation sector and related businesses, the company (and business partners operating at the airport) benefits from a secure talent pipeline at the same time as strengthening its local economies.
- 4.3 MAG recognises that its airports have an impact on their local communities, and it is essential for its airports to engage with and respond to local stakeholders. Pre-pandemic, the Airport facilitated over 90 face-to-face outreach events annually to understand feedback from local communities. This has been made more difficult due to the pandemic, but they continue to hold virtual meetings. Airport consultative committees bring together communities, local authorities, airlines, and passenger groups to discuss performance and future plans. These also include subcommittees dedicated to areas of particular interest such as environmental impacts and accessibility. Local volunteering opportunities and participation are also encouraged by MAG, with staff allowed up to two full days of work time per annum to volunteer.
- 4.4 In 2020 and as a response to COVID, work with MAG was re-aligned to support existing airport staff impacted by organisational change. Employees of MAG and its supply chain were offered dedicated assistance through the In-Work GM and Help to Get Work schemes. Colleagues in DWP were also engaged to provide additional support where needed.
- 4.5 In December 2021 a virtual careers event was arranged to provide Manchester Airport staff with information, advice and guidance on opportunities and support available. Employers such as The Hut Group attended the event to discuss current vacancies, with services such as Manchester Growth Company, National Careers Service and CAB also on hand to advise staff. This was followed by an in-person jobs fair on 10th February 2022.
- 4.6 MAG's airports always require additional resource during the busy summer months, and the Group is now actively recruiting for close to 1,000 roles

across its three airports. More than 500 of these new roles are at Manchester, particularly in security and hospitality. These roles will be essential to deliver a good passenger experience as demand returns. However, along with other sectors, recruitment has been challenging given the competitiveness of the employment market. MAG is therefore reviewing its recruitment, training, and onboarding processes, as its proposition for employees, to maximise its attractiveness as a potential employer and minimise attrition of current employees.

- 4.7 The Manchester Airport Multi Agency Team (MAT) was established in 2019 to maximise opportunities arising from airport growth and associated increase in jobs, business activity and infrastructure investment. The MAT comprises colleagues from the airport and the Council, in addition to citywide partner organisations. MAT activity is driven via the Airport Growth and Impact Action Plan. This document guides the various MAT work strands including maximising job and training opportunities for residents, social value and linking with schools to raise careers awareness and aspirations.
- 4.8 The Airport Academy (AA) is MAG's in-house training and recruitment facility for Manchester Airport and the associated supply chain. Delivered in partnership with Trafford College, the AA provides free training programmes for residents to gain the right skills to secure employment at the airport. The AA is unique in that it offers unemployed and harder to reach residents the opportunity to learn the basics of aviation roles, together with the terminology needed to enter a career at the airport. Residents learning with the AA have access to current vacancies and receive bespoke support in applying for roles, including CV and mock interview workshops.
- 4.9 Since its inception the Council has worked closely with colleagues in the AA to develop the facility and create the right conditions to enable us to build a future pipeline of talent, ensuring all residents regardless of age, experience or skillset have access to employment opportunities at the airport. MAG has the AeroZone programme at all its airports. It features an on-site educational centre which provides activities to encourage children and young people to consider a career in the aviation industry. AeroZone is available free of charge to local schools and colleges and will support a minimum of 5,000 young people each year.
- 4.10 An Airport Academy Steering Group has been established with partners such as DWP, Stockport MBC and Manchester Growth Company. The AA Steering Group is dedicated to developing outreach activity with local schools, community organisations and training providers, in addition to developing new ways of working to support residents of all ages and levels to access training and pursue a future career at the airport. In 2019, the Airport Academy supported 435 people in and around Manchester into jobs at the airport.. The goal is that by 2025, 80% of people completing one of these programmes will be successful in gaining employment with MAG or an on-site partner.
- 4.11 As part of the ongoing response to Covid and associated economic recovery activity, the Council has endeavoured to remain in regular contact with

colleagues from MAG and the Airport Academy throughout the pandemic. This includes, as mentioned previously, support for existing MAG staff, as well as preparing to re-launch job and training opportunities as restrictions are eased.

- 4.12 The Council continues in its role supporting the Airport Academy to promote new training programmes for residents, as the airport continues its transition from Covid restrictions to full capacity. In late 2021, virtual and physical careers events were held for residents looking to access current and upcoming entry level roles at the airport.
- 4.13 Into 2022, the Council continues to work closely with MAG and the AA team to plan and deliver activities to support the phased re-opening of the airport. This includes re-establishing the Manchester Aerozone offer for young people, supporting take up of new Airport Academy courses, promotion of large-scale virtual and physical careers events in January-March in preparation for the anticipated summer peak.

5.0 Looking forward

- 5.1 Faced with uncertainty around recovery from the pandemic, MAG has developed a number of scenarios for 2022 to prepare for a range of outcomes for the remaining course of the pandemic and likely consumer behaviours. This includes cases where the sector continues a stable, sustained recovery as restrictions continue to lift and the UK moves to an endemic phase; but also more pessimistic scenarios reflecting staggered or slower recoveries due to the emergence of new variants of concern or other unexpected events which suppress passenger demand.
- 5.2 While it is too early in the recovery to be sure about which trajectory the recovery will take, the removal of remaining inbound travel restrictions in February is expected to drive further growth of passenger demand as the sector goes into its summer season. Data around booking intent (i.e., when a passenger is referred to a booking website) shows that demand for future travel this summer is recovering back towards 2019 levels. The likely shape of the recovery will become clearer after airlines confirm their summer schedules. Currently MAG's central scenario is for passenger numbers to return to pre-pandemic levels by 2023/24. Many of the Airport's long-haul routes are not currently operating while travel restrictions remain in place internationally, and one of the Group's main priorities is ensuring that these long-haul routes resume as soon as possible. There are currently 27 long haul routes operating from the Airport, compared to 45 in 2019.
- 5.3 Manchester Airport is entering this period of recovery with the benefit of having completed the first phase of its Manchester Airport Transformation Programme. This is a £1.3 bn programme to create state-of-the-art facilities that provide an enhanced customer experience and strengthen its ability to compete for new routes and services. The Airport opened the Terminal 2 extension in July 2021, and the new facilities have already received positive feedback from passengers. As traffic volumes recover, more flights will move to operate from the new facilities.

5.4 The Transformation Programme more supported the creation of more than 1,500 jobs in the construction phase alone, including more than 150 apprenticeships. The modern infrastructure created by the programme will be an important part of a strong recovery. Further phases of the Transformation Programme, including the redevelopment of the original Terminal 2 facilities, are planned once the trajectory of the post-pandemic recovery is clearer.

6.0 Airport City Update

6.1 Airport City Manchester is an Enterprise Zone with the capability to provide 5 million sq. ft. of offices, hotels, advanced manufacturing, logistics facilities and retail space. Anchored by Airport City and Manchester Medi-Park, the Enterprise Zone covers five sites across Wythenshawe, providing a high-quality destination for offices, hotels, logistics, advanced manufacturing, life sciences, biotech, retail and leisure. The area as a whole is forecast to create 16,000 new jobs in the next 10-15 years, following its launch in 2012. As it is located directly adjacent to Manchester Airport, it benefits from the airport's wide catchment and international connectivity. The scale and significance of Airport City means that it plays a major role in regional growth and employment.

6.2 The joint venture ownership of Airport City (a partnership between Columbia Threadneedle Investments 50%, MAG 20%, Beijing Construction Engineering Group International 20% and the Greater Manchester Pension Fund 10%) has delivered significant benefits since its launch, including the £15m roadway infrastructure (Enterprise Way), the pedestrian bridge over the M56 spur (co-funded with Manchester City Council) and improvements to the Outward Lane Junction. It has been able to attract large companies, with the highest profile being The Hut Group, who are due to complete building a new £60m headquarters by the end of 2024. Further developments include a new £50 million Holiday Inn and Ibis Budget hotel and a new £45m Tribe Hotel which is due to start on site imminently.

6.3 In recent years the Council has worked with a range of partners to support Airport City businesses to meet their objectives.

6.4 The Council has supported Amazon to recruit and retain staff at their Airport City South facility. The original Amazon volume recruitment provided permanent jobs to around 900 Manchester residents. Ongoing recruitment cycles continue to offer further opportunities. In 2018/19 both Virgin Media and Vodafone relocated substantial operations to the Airport City Enterprise Zone. Working alongside MIDAS, the Council has supported Virgin and Vodafone with their transition, as well as initial and ongoing recruitment campaigns. As Covid recovery activity continues, discussions are underway with Virgin to plan further volume recruitment campaigns in March 2022 and beyond.

6.5 Preparations continue for The Hut Group's (THG) development of large-scale offices and warehousing facilities over two sites within Airport City in 2022. THG has committed to maximising local recruitment throughout the development of these sites. Since 2018 the Council has worked closely with

THG to draw up plans for future recruitment and local benefit. This is in addition to supporting apprentice, graduate, and general recruitment to existing roles at THG's temporary Airport City offices.

- 6.6 In addition to previously mentioned ongoing work with Amazon, THG and Virgin Media, the Council is currently in discussions with Interstate, the operator of two new Holiday inn and Ibis Airport City hotels. As the hotel developments near completion in April this year, it is anticipated that there will be a considerable number of job opportunities available at these sites in 2022 and beyond. The same employment opportunities will continue with Interstate upon the completion of the Tribe Hotel in early 2024.
- 6.7 To support key recruitments and local benefit aspirations across Airport City, in 2016, the Council established a local partnership to maximise opportunities for communities close to Airport City.
- 6.8 The Wythenshawe Skills and Employment Group (WSEG) is a partnership approach to supporting take-up of learning, training, employment support and job opportunities across Airport City. MAG colleagues form part of WSEG, together with over 20 partner organisations including DWP, Wythenshawe Community Housing Group, The Forum Trust, Manchester College, Manchester Adult Education Service, Manchester Growth Company and Businesses Working with Wythenshawe (BW3). The WSEG continues to work collaboratively with the employers mentioned above, in addition to connecting to and supporting new business engagement and recruitment campaigns as economic recovery continues.

7.0 Airport future challenges and opportunities

- 7.1 In addition to the impact of COVID-19 on the sector, MAG expects there will be further macro-economic challenges due to rising inflation and changes to disposable income because of cost-of-living increases. This could have an impact both on passenger demand and ongoing costs for the business, such as future energy costs.
- 7.2 Beyond the travel and wider impacts of the pandemic, MAG's CSR Strategy addresses longer term challenges and opportunities for the Group. The strategy focuses on three priorities:
- zero carbon airports;
 - opportunity for all; and
 - local voices.
- 7.3 One of MAG's strategic priorities is reaching net zero, both in terms of its own emissions and the emissions of the industry as a whole. The business continues to be focused on taking a leadership role on sustainability. Its work has been widely recognised as industry leading: in 2021, MAG was rated by the Financial Times as one of 300 climate leaders and the highest rated transport business in Europe.

- 7.4 In 2006/7, MAG made the commitment to make its airport operations carbon neutral by 2015. Manchester Airport became the first in the UK to be certified as carbon neutral in line with this target, followed by East Midlands and London Stansted. Appendix 3 shows this in practice.
- 7.5 MAG is now working to eliminate the remaining emissions from its airports. Over the next decade, MAG will transition to a fleet of ultra-low emission vehicles and will also tackle remaining emissions from heating and cooling. This will take MAG as close as possible to zero emissions, with any remaining emissions compensated for by the purchase of permanent carbon removals. Moreover, MAG has a target that is fully aligned with the commitment made by Manchester City Council and across Greater Manchester, to achieve net zero emissions no later than 2038.
- 7.6 MAG has been at the heart of cross-sector work to decarbonise, chairing the Sustainable Aviation coalition throughout the development of the Decarbonisation Road-Map and bringing companies together to support a pledge for UK aviation emissions to reach net zero by 2050. This group came together to work in coalition to address the sustainability challenges the industry faces. The Road-Map has provided confidence to stakeholders, including Government, that achieving net zero aviation by 2050 is a practical reality. This will mean that MAG's scope three emissions (those which the Group has less direct control over, such as aircraft emissions) will also reach net zero.
- 7.7 To minimise emissions from surface access journeys to and from its airports, MAG works closely with local partners. At Manchester Airport, this includes Transport for Greater Manchester and the transport operators. In recent years infrastructure supporting public transport at Manchester Airport has been substantially improved with the addition, in 2015, of another two platforms to the railway station. This has doubled rail capacity, providing connectivity across the North and North Wales. In 2016, Manchester Airport welcomed the Metrolink extension, after a £50m investment, and by 2019 passenger numbers had grown to 200,000. Both rail and Metrolink services have been reduced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic but are expected to be restored as demand recovers.


8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 Manchester Airport continues to demonstrate its importance in the local economy and to Greater Manchester and the North of England more broadly. COVID-19 has evidently impacted upon the operations of the Airport; however, plans are in place for a positive and green recovery. This is supplemented by an expanding business and logistics district that, alongside the Airport, is providing opportunities for employment for the local area. More opportunities for investment and growth in the Airport district are expected.

9.0 Recommendations


- 9.1 Recommendations appear at the front of this report.

Appendix 1



This page is intentionally left blank


Appendix 2



This page is intentionally left blank

Journey to Carbon Neutrality

Direct and indirect 'scope 1 & 2' emissions



This page is intentionally left blank

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Economy Scrutiny Committee - 10 March 2022

Subject: Housing Allocations Policy Review

Report of: Strategic Director, Growth & Development

Summary

Following an extensive period of review and agreement by social landlords and by the Council's Executive Committee, Manchester's current statutory social housing allocations scheme was implemented in November 2020. In addition to the planned full evaluation after 24 months, it was agreed that an interim evaluation should be undertaken after 12 months. The pandemic resulted in significant emergency actions that have reduced the amount of useable data. Nevertheless, the evidence to date is that the scheme is working as intended with no unexpected outcomes.

Recommendations

1. The Committee is recommended to note that implementation of the new scheme has been significantly affected by the pandemic and the special measures put in place for the most vulnerable.
 2. The Committee is recommended to note that evidence shows that the scheme is working as intended.
 3. The Committee is recommended to note that the effectiveness of the new scheme will best be evaluated by the planned evaluation after 24 months, at the start of 2023.
-

Wards Affected: All

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the issues addressed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city
n/a

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Provide advice and information around other housing options where this may be appropriate - this includes affordable home ownership and the private rented sector.

A highly skilled city: world class and home-grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	n/a
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Ensuring the Policy assists with balancing communities and encouraging potential in partnership with RP partners, using Local Letting Policy where necessary.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	Encouraging RP partners to reduce CO2 emissions and reduce their use of plastics will contribute to a low carbon city as well as zero carbon social homes built. Discussing climate change conversations with tenants of social housing supporting them in adopting a low carbon lifestyle.
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Ensuring people have a settled home that's right for them this will enable them to flourish and contribute within the city.

Contact Officers:

Name: Rebecca Heron
 Position: Strategic Director, Growth & Development
 Telephone: 0161 234 3030
 E-mail: rebecca.heron@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Alan Caddick
 Position: Director, Housing & Residential Growth
 Telephone: 0161 234 4811
 E-mail: alan.caddick@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Martin Oldfield
 Position: Head of Housing
 Telephone: 0161 234 3561
 E-mail: martin.oldfield@manchester.gov.uk

Name: James Greenhedge
 Position: Housing Access Manager
 Telephone: 0161 600 8190
 E-mail: james.greenhedge@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose key facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy, please contact one of the contact officers above.

- Manchester City Council Part VI Allocations Scheme 2011
- Manchester City Council Part VI Scheme for the Allocation of Social Housing 2020
- Housing Act 1996

- Homelessness Code of Guidance
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/homelessnesscode-of-guidance-for-local-authorities>
- Allocations Code of Guidance
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/allocation-of-accommodationguidance-for-local-housing-authorities-in-england>
- Update on Homelessness and Housing, Neighbourhoods and the Environment Scrutiny Committee Report – Wednesday 17th July 2019
- Report on Housing Allocations Policy Review (Update), Neighbourhoods & Environment Scrutiny Committee – March 2021
- Report on Housing Allocations Policy Review, Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee – 6th November 2019, Executive – 13th November 2019
- Report to Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee, 10th March 2021

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The report to Neighbourhood and Environment Scrutiny Committee November 2019 and to the Executive Committee in November 2019 described how Manchester's current Housing Allocations Scheme had remained fundamentally the same since 2011 and provided the context and evidence as to why the Allocations Scheme needed to be reviewed.
- 1.2 It described how the supply of homes had become constrained - particularly to applicants in band 3 - due to a combination of falling supply, increasing demand and the effect of awarding additional priority (band 2) to households working or volunteering. While recognising that total demand cannot be met, even for those in high priority, it was the case that significant numbers of homeless and other households in crisis and in band 3 were increasingly unlikely to make a successful bid for a home.
- 1.3 The report described comprehensive engagement with stakeholders to develop proposals for a revised scheme while ensuring that proposals would accord with the council's Public Sector Equality Duty.
- 1.4 The objective was for the new scheme to give a greater chance of getting a social home to the large numbers of applicants in the priority categories.
- 1.5 Consequently, the allocations scheme implemented November 2020 has three priority bands: band 1, largely unchanged from the previous scheme, band 2 now comprising most applicants with urgent housing need, and band 3 comprised of fewer categories of applicants with less urgent housing need. This means that there are many more applicants in band 2 who therefore have a chance of making a successful bid for a new home even though the average waiting time may be lengthy.
- 1.6 The report described how the operational transition from the old to the new scheme had been relatively smooth, despite the effects of the pandemic. It noted that a detailed evaluation of the scheme to review its effectiveness will be undertaken following 24 months of operation but that a lighter-touch interim evaluation would be made after the scheme had been in operation for 12 months.
- 1.7 This report provides the interim evaluation. It looks at how allocations made to the new scheme have been distributed across the priority categories of need, to consider the overall efficacy of the scheme in practice, including some examples of specific outcomes.

2.0 Evaluation context: pandemic effects and data comparison

- 2.1 The pandemic necessitated emergency housing responses that were outside the normal operation of the allocations scheme. This means that strictly accurate classification data is not available and therefore some degree of well-informed professional judgement has been necessary to produce this interim evaluation.


2.2 All data used in the evaluation are from the Manchester Housing Register (Manchester Move).

3.0 Scheme evaluation

New scheme objective - Provide a greater chance of obtaining a home for those in most need

3.1 The objective was for the new scheme to give a greater chance of getting a social home to the large numbers of applicants in the priority categories. It was agreed that the scheme should give equal banding priority to most categories of rehousing applicants, based on need alone. Priority within bands would continue to be given by date order (length of time in the band).

Figure 1: Lets by Band




3.2 Figure 1 shows the history of the allocations scheme and how much of a barrier additional priority for working or volunteering had become. It is clear to see how lets to applicants in band 3 had become significantly less likely year by year as demand increased and turnover (supply) reduced. From 2013-14 to 2017-18, the relative positions of applicants in bands 2 and 3 had switched, with applicants in band 2 significantly more likely to make a successful bid while the impact on applicants in band 3 in crisis situations and unable to work was increasingly difficult to manage.

3.3 Lets during 2020-21 to the old scheme reflect arrangements for the pandemic. This period also shows how more band 1 applicants were making successful bids whereby previously this band had been relatively less active, lets to band 1 will reduce as the scheme progresses.

- 3.4 Lets during 2020-21 to the new scheme were relatively few, but the percentage distribution by band was showing the effectiveness of the new scheme, with a significant drop in lets to new band 3, this trend is expected to continue.
- 3.5 Lets during the April – October period, all to the new scheme, are noticeably different. There was a drop in lets to band 1 as the effects of the pandemic lessened. At the same time, there was an increase in lets to new band 2.
- 3.6 The lets to the lower bands showed a remarkable decrease, partly because Wythenshawe Community Housing Group and One Manchester both revised their own allocations schemes being mindful of the challenges shared by all social landlords and producing schemes that have more in common with the council scheme than before.
- 3.7 These data show the scheme starting to produce outcomes as expected.
- 3.8 The next part of this report looks at data in more detail.

4.0 Analysis of lets made to the priority bands 1-3 over time

Figure 2 - Lets to Priority Bands 1-3 (April '19 – October '21)



- 4.1 The data shown in Figure 2 are consistent with Figure 1. The effect of the initial period of the pandemic is obvious from February/March 2020 as lets plummeted. The anticipated reduction in lets to band 3 is also clear from November 2020 when the scheme changes took effect, with over 89% of lettings going to bands 1 and 2.
- 4.2 The increase in lets to band 1 is partly attributable to a backlog following the drop at the start of the pandemic and partly attributable to general supply and demand situation (20% drop in vacant properties).

4.3 It is anticipated that lettings to band 1 will reduce as we progress with lettings. Band 1 applications are regularly reviewed to ensure they remain in urgent need, but the supply and demand situation makes it increasingly difficult for some band 1 applicants to be rehoused in shorter timescales.

4.4 Analysis of lets by need category and band

4.5 Figure 3 shows how many lets have been made by need categories and band to new scheme, the table also compares this data to those lets that occurred in 2019/20 to the comparable need groups.

Figure 3 - Lettings to new scheme, April 2021 – end Oct 2021, by need category & band

	b1	b2	b3	b4	other	2021	2019/20
All forms of homelessness						%	
Homelessness		244	12			20.2	10.4
Domestic Abuse	88	2				7.1	4.1
Serious violence or harassment	55	3				4.6	1.9
Move on from supported accommodation		70				5.5	2.8
Lack of facilities		2				0.2	0.0
Other priority							
Armed Forces with housing needs	5					0.4	0.2
Young Person Leaving Care	70					5.5	0.4
Demolition	11					0.9	0.1
Fosterer/Adopter	4					0.3	0.0
Leaving Hospital	37					2.9	2.1
Medical reasons	87	99				14.7	8.2
Downsizing	59	4				5.0	1.1
Move out of adapted home	3					0.2	0.2
Risk to a child	4					0.3	0.4
Other needs							
Manager's Discretion	86	6	1			7.3	9.2
Overcrowding	28	142	24			15.3	13.0
Child Living in an unsuitable flat		26				2.1	0.0
Other categories							
No housing need				86		6.8	4.8
Non-Qualifying					9	0.7	0.1
2019/20 old scheme categories							
Working Household						0	23.5
Community Contribution						0	10.0
Young Person Tenancy Qualification						0	5.5
Total						100%	100%


4.6 The data show that all need groups have benefited from the implementation of the new scheme, especially those in some form of homelessness including

domestic abuse. Despite the environmental challenges that occurred during the first 12 months of the scheme it's clear that the scheme is working as intended and that it's providing more opportunity to rehouse those in most need. It's also a fair assumption to say that this trajectory is likely to continue, as we see a backlog of repairs addressed and more homes come available.

- 4.7 Note that Band 4 "no housing need" were largely lets to Wythenshawe Community Housing Group and One Manchester's own allocations schemes, along with some lets to lower demand properties, mostly of sheltered accommodation.

5.0 Homelessness Lettings (from Figure 3, in more detail)


- 5.1 Homelessness is not only experienced by people in temporary accommodation. Other categories of rehousing applicant are homeless, for example while living in supported accommodation, or in a refuge. Applicants on the housing register due to being in some form of homeless accounted for 37.6% of all lettings from April to October 2021. This compares to 19.2% in 2019/20 (note, though, that this is subject to some degree of error due to how the old scheme categorised working households and community contribution lettings, making comparison difficult).
- 5.2 Figure 4 shows how the scheme is working as intended. It is enabling more successful bids from people in priority need due to different forms of homelessness.
- 5.3 It is worth noting that more people needing to be rehoused because of domestic abuse are now in band 1, where previously some would have been in lower bands. The priority given to people suffering domestic abuse was a particular concern of Members during the review discussions. It is worth noting that anyone needing to be rehoused because of domestic abuse is officially homeless, even if they have not presented for homelessness assistance.

Figure 4 – Lets to All Forms of Homelessness (%)

6.0 Other Priority Need Groups

6.1 It is important to remember that Members and Manchester Move partners were strongly of the view that there are several high priority categories of rehousing applicants. Along with homelessness the new scheme was developed to prioritise other need groups. Figure 5 shows lettings to these other need groups.

6.2 These data clearly show that applicants with the priority housing needs agreed by social landlords and Members have been properly prioritised by the scheme, as intended.


Figure 5 – Lets to Other Priority Applicants

6.3 One of the major successes of how the scheme is progressing is the number of young people being rehoused that are ready to move on from leaving care, this is a managed process through a leaving care panel which has seen good success rates of not only young people being rehoused but in terms of tenancy sustainability.

7.0 Homelessness and pressures on Temporary Accommodation and Supported Accommodation (TA/SA)


7.1 Homelessness colleagues are currently working on an action plan to reduce the use of TA and end placements into Bed & Breakfast accommodation following a review by the DHULC.

7.2 Lettings from temporary and supported accommodation have increased over time from 22% (17/18 old scheme) to 33.2% (21/22) new scheme and this is anticipated to continue to rise as the scheme settles and the backlog of band 1 applicants continues to reduce.

Figure 8 – Lets to Temporary & Supported Accommodation

- 7.3 The new scheme is operating as intended. People are now more likely to be rehoused from TA/SA.
- 7.4 There are some data available that allow us to make a quite detailed comparison of 84 of the 256 lets to homeless applicants under the new scheme (refer to Figure 3), looking at what band they would have been in under the old scheme.
- 7.5 The data (Figure 9) are clear that most homeless applicants rehoused from band 2 under the new scheme would have been in band 3 under the old scheme. The numbers in bands 2 and 3 are practically reversed. While it is not possible to make a definitive statement about each individual applicant, we know that in general, applicants in band 3 under the old scheme were unlikely to be offered a new home.
- 7.6 This is clear evidence of the new scheme working as intended, opening up the opportunity for many more homeless households to be rehoused from band 2.

Figure 9 – Homeless Lets by Band Compared to Bands Under Old Scheme (2020-21)



* Mainly W2 (WCHG own scheme, and some uncategorised).

8.0 Feedback from Manchester Move Partners

8.1 The Manchester Move partners were asked for feedback on the scheme, focusing on any unintended consequences. All the feedback received stated that the scheme is working as intended and without issues.

8.2 Additional comments were made about the supply and demand situation, repeating the challenge discussed by partners and by Members throughout the scheme review period. For example, one of the Manchester Move partners stated *“we participated in all the workshops and fundamentally not about Covid but supply and demand. We are trying to chop up the same size cake for different groups in need, however you do it someone won’t get a piece.”*

9.0 Equalities Impact Assessment

9.1 The appendix to this report shows the distribution of lets made to the new allocations scheme compared to the composition of the Manchester Housing Register (Manchester Move applications) by applicants’ protected characteristics.

9.2 The expectation is that the distribution of lets matches the distribution of the housing register. It will not be an exact match. Given the number of variables involved – people bidding for homes only in certain areas, people needing homes of varied sizes, people needing adapted homes, etc – it is reasonable to see some variation between lets and the housing register.

9.3 In general, something more than a 10+% variation could be potentially significant and merit investigation, especially a 10%+ negative variation (where the percentage of lets to a protected characteristic group is 10% or more lower than the housing register percentage).

9.4 The table shows that there are no apparent unintended consequences of the allocations scheme. The distribution of protected characteristics across the housing register and across lets made to the new scheme are similar. Small percentage differences arise from the fact of the small numbers involved. The full evaluation in twelve months' time will present more data.

10.0 Data and Information for the full evaluation

10.1 Whilst undertaking the evaluation it has been clear that data and information provided has been difficult to interpret due to how historical data has been recorded. This has led to inconsistencies with data and gaps of information, making the evaluation challenging. With Northwards returning to the council's management this has also seen the Manchester Move service sitting within the council. Therefore, work will be undertaken to improve access to data, working with the Manchester Move service team as well as the council's PRI team to obtain a more consistent reporting regime moving forward which will assist the next evaluation of the scheme in December.

11.0 Conclusions

11.1 The scheme very clearly appears to be working as intended. The vast majority of lets are to households in the priority need categories developed and agreed by the Manchester Move partners and elected Members.

11.2 A total of 92% of all lets are going to those most in need.

11.3 Around 38% of lets are directly to households experiencing some form of homelessness.

11.4 Notwithstanding the evident success of the scheme to deliver as intended, the supply and demand situation will continue to be an enormous challenge. An obvious consequence of supply and demand is that there are continuing pressures on the homelessness service and temporary accommodation. Work will be undertaken outside of this evaluation with homelessness colleagues and the Housing Access Board to determine any appropriate solutions, and without damaging the integrity of the allocations scheme that is operating as intended for those most in need.

11.5 In doing so, it is unavoidable that any subsequent actions to increase access for specific groups of applicants would have deleterious consequences for the other priority groups on the register and any such actions would have to be fully understood and agreed by the Manchester Move partners and by Members before being implemented.

11.6 The full evaluation scheduled for end 2022/early 2023 will provide more evidence and will be better informed by a longer period of lets to the scheme rules. This will allow us to include additional analysis around the housing register, need groups and demographics, bed need, and geographical information with regards to lettings by Registered Providers.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix

Table: percentage of lets made to new scheme compared with percentage of applicants on the housing register, by protected characteristic

	Register %	Lets %
main applicant		
female	55	57
male	45	43
blank	0	0
total		
Sexuality		
Bisexual	2	1
gay man	1	1
gay woman/lesbian	1	1
Not say	9	11
other	0	0
straight	86	86
blank	0	0
total		
same gender as birth		
yes	95	95
no	1	1
not say	3	4
blank	0	0
total		
Over 55	14	18
Disabled		
yes	18	26
no	78	69
not say	4	5
blank	0	0
total		
religion/belief		
Buddhist	0	0
Christian	32	32
Hindu	0	0
Not say	10	13
Jewish	0	0
Muslim	27	20

None	29	32
Other	2	2
Sikh	0	0
blank	0	0
total		
ethnicity		
African	19	15
Arab	4	3
Bangladeshi	2	1
Caribbean	4	4
Chinese	0	0
Gypsy/traveller	0	0
Indian	1	0
Other Asian	2	2
Other Black	1	1
Other ethnic	3	3
Other mixed	1	1
Other white	4	4
Pakistani	8	6
Vietnamese	0	0
White Asian	1	1
White & black African	2	2
White & black Caribbean	3	3
White British	37	47
White Irish	1	1
Blank	8	7
total		

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Economy Scrutiny Committee – 10 March 2022
The Executive – 16 March 2022

Subject: HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg - Environmental Statement
Consultation & Hybrid Bill Petitioning Response

Report of: Strategic Director (Growth and Development)

Summary

This report informs the Executive about the deposit of the HS2 hybrid Bill in Parliament on 24th January 2022; the public consultations on the Environmental Statement (ES) and Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) for the Bill; and outlines the Council's proposed response to these consultations. The report further outlines the key areas on which the Council is proposing to petition against the hybrid Bill, subject to the approval of Council on 4th March to submit a petition.

Recommendations

The Economy Scrutiny Committee is requested to

- (1) Comment on the report and recommendations and to endorse the recommendations as detailed below.

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Note the deposit in Parliament of the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill and the accompanying ES and EQIA.
 - (2) Note and comment on the proposed contents of the City Council's submission in response to the consultations on the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill ES and EQIA.
 - (3) Note Council approval to submit a petition to object to aspects of the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill and comment on the proposed areas for the City Council's petition; and
 - (4) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director – Growth & Development, in consultation with the Leader and Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, to finalise the responses to the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill Environmental Statement and EQIA and submit to DfT
-

Wards Affected: Ardwick, Ancoats & Beswick, Baguley Burnage, Didsbury East, Didsbury West, Fallowfield, Levenshulme, Northenden, Piccadilly, Rusholme, and Woodhouse Park.

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the issues addressed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city

At the national level, whilst there are likely to be additional carbon emissions in the short-term from the construction of HS2, the project is likely to be less carbon intensive than other non-rail alternative transport schemes that would deliver similar transport outcomes. More crucially, high speed rail can encourage a modal shift away from car use, especially where it creates capacity on the conventional railway, to encourage more shorter-distance trips by rail.

In addition, improvements to rail capacity will enable more freight to be transported using rail, reducing the number of journeys by road, and has the potential to reduce demand for domestic flights. The integration of HS2 and NPR and investment in new rail infrastructure also provides opportunities for decarbonisation of rail, across the North.

All these factors are important contributions to acting on the climate change emergency declared by Manchester City Council, helping to reduce carbon emissions in line with policy aspirations to become a zero-carbon city by 2038, supporting the emerging Clean Air Plan for Greater Manchester.

Major investment in both Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport HS2/NPR stations will provide excellent facilities for public transport connections and support the integration of the transport network in Manchester, as part of the wider integration of transport for Greater Manchester and across the North. This would contribute to the city's zero-carbon targets and the planning of sustainable transport infrastructure to support future growth.

All new development around Piccadilly under the Strategic Regeneration Framework will be expected to be zero-carbon. Similarly, we expect HS2 Ltd. to use sustainable materials and methods of construction, which will not impact on the city's zero-carbon targets - the target for the city to be zero-carbon by 2038 at the latest aligns with the current estimated completion dates for HS2 in 2036-2041. We will be challenging HS2/DfT on these issues as part of our response to the Environmental Statement.

We are also challenging HS2 Ltd on proposals for highways layouts and levels of car parking in the city centre. The City Centre Transport Strategy includes the ambition to reduce vehicles in the city centre and increase the use of public transport and active travel modes for travelling around, to and from the city centre. If proposals appear to be contradictory to our local policies and targets on climate change, then we will look to petition against those aspects as part of the parliamentary process.

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
<p>A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities</p>	<p>A high-speed line between Manchester, the West Midlands and London, and improved rail connections in the North of England, as proposed by Transport for the North through Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) will support business development in the region. The scheme has the potential to provide a catalyst which can attract further investment into Greater Manchester by creating a new gateway into the regional centre and boost the investor confidence in the area.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposals for HS2/NPR stations at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport provide major opportunities for stimulating economic growth and regeneration in the surrounding areas.</p>
<p>A highly skilled city: world class and home-grown talent sustaining the city's economic success</p>	<p>The high-speed rail network serving the city centre and the Airport, regeneration of the Piccadilly area, will enable and further development around the Airport, and thus contribute towards the continuing economic growth of the city, providing additional job opportunities, at a range of skill levels, for residents. As part of the high-speed rail Growth Strategy, a Greater Manchester High Speed Rail Skills Strategy has been developed, to best enable residents to access the opportunities created by both the construction of the High-Speed rail infrastructure and from the additional investment and regeneration arising from it.</p>
<p>A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities</p>	<p>The economic growth brought about by high-speed rail, and the regeneration of the Piccadilly area, will help to provide additional job opportunities for residents, as well as improved connections for our communities to jobs in the city centre and beyond.</p> <p>The area will also provide new leisure opportunities, including new areas of public realm, accessible to all members of the public.</p>

<p>A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work</p>	<p>The Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) provides a vision and framework for the regeneration of the Piccadilly area as a key gateway to the city, with a unique sense of place. Providing new, high quality commercial accommodation, new residential accommodation and the public amenities including public realm, retail, and leisure opportunities, will create a desirable location in which to live, work and visit.</p> <p>HS2 will enable the provision of improved public transport, through the capacity released on the classic rail network and, if aligned with Greater Manchester's plans, integration with other transport modes at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport. This can encourage more public transport journeys and less reliance on cars. Improvements to rail capacity will also enable more freight to be transported using rail, reducing the number of journeys by road.</p> <p>The provision of HS2 and NPR will also support the planned development around Piccadilly and the Airport included within the draft Places for Everyone Framework.</p>
<p>A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth</p>	<p>HS2, together with NPR and the proposed Northern Hub rail schemes, will bring a step change in rail connectivity both across GM and to the rest of the UK. HS2 and NPR will radically enhance north-south and east-west connectivity between the country's major cities, which will increase labour market accessibility, open new markets for trade and stimulate economic growth, as well as better connecting people to job opportunities.</p> <p>The city's plans for Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport Station are to provide world-class transport interchanges that can act as gateways to the city and city region.</p>

Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

None directly from this report.

Financial Consequences – Capital

Whilst there are no direct financial consequences arising from this report, the Council notes the importance of DfT having an identified funding strategy which guarantees the delivery of the HS2 and NPR schemes in their entirety to ensure the economic benefits of the investment are maximised.

Contact Officers:

Name: Rebecca Heron
 Position: Strategic Director - Growth and Development
 Telephone: 0161 243 5515
 E-mail: Rebecca.Heron@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Pat Bartoli
 Position: Director of City Centre Growth & Infrastructure
 Telephone: 0161 234 3329
 Email: Pat.bartoli@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Fiona Ledden
 Position: City Solicitor
 Telephone: 0161 234 3087
 E-mail: fiona.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy, please contact one of the officers above.

- Report to Executive 14 December 2016 - Manchester Piccadilly High Speed 2 (HS2) Phase 2 Route Announcement
- Report to Economy Scrutiny 1 February 2017 - High Speed Rail – High Speed 2 (HS2) and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR)
- Report to Executive 18 October 2017 - Greater Manchester HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail Growth Strategy
- Greater Manchester HS2 and NPR Growth Strategy: The Stops are Just the Start 2018
- Report to Executive 7 March 2018 – Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework Update 2018

- Report to Executive 27 June 2018 – Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework Update 2018
- Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework 2018
- HS2 Working Draft Environmental Statement 2018, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-phase-2b-working-draft-environmental-statement>
- Report to Economy Scrutiny 7 November 2018 - HS2 Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES)
- Report to Executive - 12 December 2018 - HS2 Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES)
- HS2 Phase 2b Working Draft Environmental Statement Consultation Response of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority 2018
- HS2 Phase 2b Working Draft Environmental Statement Consultation Response of Manchester City Council 2018
- HS2 Phase 2b Design Refinement Consultation 2019, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/hs2-phase-2b-design-refinement-consultation>
- Report to Executive – 11 September 2019 – HS2 Phase 2b Design Refinement Consultation 2019
- HS2 Phase 2b Design Refinement Consultation 2020, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/hs2-phase-2b-western-leg-design-refinement-consultation>
- Report to Executive - 9 December 2020 - HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg Design Refinement Consultation Response
- HS2 Phase 2b hybrid Bill and related documents, available at: HS2 Phase 2b - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Previous reports to Executive have set out the connectivity, economic growth and regeneration benefits that can be brought about by HS2 and NPR for the city, Greater Manchester, and the UK. We believe these schemes are vital to increasing the capacity and connectivity improvements needed to Britain's rail network, and will deliver a transformational step-change in the connectivity of the North's major regions, helping to underpin economic growth and deliver levelling up across the North and the UK.
- 1.2 Previous reports to Executive have also outlined Government's intention to implement a new high speed rail network (HS2), from Manchester to London via Birmingham and Crewe. A response to The Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES) Consultation, which was a precursor to the Environmental Statement (ES), was submitted to HS2 in 2018 outlining the Council's Key concerns to a number of matters
- 1.3 The hybrid Bill for HS2 Phase 2b "Western Leg", between Crewe and Manchester was deposited in Parliament by the Department for Transport (DfT) on 24th January 2022.
- 1.4 The Council is fully supportive of the introduction of HS2 and NPR and the provision of stations at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport. However, we have consistently retained a clear position on the need to ensure that the schemes are delivered in a manner that fully complements the connectivity, place-making, local employment, and sustainable growth objectives as set out in the Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) and the Greater Manchester HS2 and NPR Growth Strategy. This has been reiterated in several responses to Government consultations on HS2 made in 2014, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, as well as through ongoing direct engagement with HS2 Ltd and DfT.
- 1.5 This report summarises our proposed response to the Phase 2b Manchester-Crewe hybrid Bill, including the response to the Bill's Environmental Statement and Equalities Impact Assessment consultations, and the key issues to be covered in a petition to the hybrid Bill.

2.0 Background – the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill

- 2.1 The Phase 2b Crewe-Manchester Bill includes provision for new high-speed rail stations (providing for HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail services) at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport, along with a tunnelled section of railway that will connect the respective stations. It also covers the provision of other related infrastructure, including new highway layouts, car parking and Metrolink services at the two stations.
- 2.2 Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) is a proposal to deliver a high-speed rail network between Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Newcastle, Sheffield, and Hull. The Government's preferred outline plans for NPR are included in the recently published Integrated Rail Plan (IRP). The IRP does not embrace

the ambition for a better connected North as envisaged by Transport for the North (TfN), as key elements including proposals for Sheffield and Hull for examples are not included. The hybrid Bill includes provisions to facilitate the integration of Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) at both Piccadilly and Manchester Airport high speed stations. It does not cover the whole of the proposed NPR scheme, but rather elements to enable its future delivery.

3.0 HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill Environmental Statement

- 3.1 The Environmental Statement (ES) is an assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed HS2 railway, including the effects of construction and operation.
- 3.2 The council provided a response to the WDES in 2018, which was a high-level overview of the items to be considered in the full ES. The full ES should respond to the issues of concern raised in the WDES consultation. The council's assessment of the ES to date has noted that many of our concerns raised in the WDES have not been addressed.
- 3.3 The ES is broken down into eight 'community areas'¹ and various topic specific chapters. The community areas which are of most relevance to the council are MA06: Hulseheath to Manchester Airport, MA07: Davernport Green to Ardwick and MA08: Manchester Piccadilly. The ES is also accompanied by a separate Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) and an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
- 3.4 The structure of the ES covers the following:
- **Volume 1 – Introduction and Methodology** - an introduction to the working draft Environmental Statement and an overview of the route and the environmental impact assessment process.
 - **Volume 2 – Community Area Reports and Map Books** - The Community area reports describe likely significant route-wide environmental effects of the construction and operation
 - **Volume 3 – Route Wide Effects** - This describes the impacts and effects that are likely to occur at a geographical scale greater than the community areas described in Volume 2.
 - **Volume 4 – Off-Route Effects** - This describes an assessment of the off-route effects of the proposed scheme i.e., effects in locations remote from the HS2 route corridor.
 - **Volume 5 – Appendices and Map Books** – comprising details on:
 - Agriculture, Forestry and Soils
 - Air Quality
 - Climate Change

¹ MA01: Hough to Walley's Green | MA02: Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam | MA03: Pickmere to Agden and Hulseheath | MA04: Broomeedge to Glazebrook | MA05: Risley to Bamfurlong | MA06: Hulseheath to Manchester Airport | MA07: Davenport Green to Ardwick | MA08: Manchester Piccadilly Station

- Community
- Ecology and Biodiversity
- Electromagnetic Interference
- Health
- Historic Environment
- Land Quality
- Landscape and Visual
- Major Accidents and Natural Disasters
- Socioeconomics
- Sound, Noise and Vibration
- Traffic and Transport
- Waste and Material Resources
- Water Resources and Flood Risk
- Scope and Methodology
- Draft Code of Construction Practice
- Alternatives Report
- Planning Data
- Wider Effects Report
- Working Draft Environmental Statement consultation summary report
- Borrow Pit Report
- Other background data and map books

3.5 To secure the best outcome and lay the necessary foundations for any future petition (please see below for more information on petitioning), each of the above volumes and topics must be reviewed and responded to.

3.6 The Council's full response to the ES must be submitted to the Government by 11:45pm on the 31st March 2022. The Council's response fully supports, and is aligned with, the responses being submitted by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council, Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council, and Manchester Airport Group (MAG).

3.7 **MA06 Hulseheath to Manchester Airport Community Area**

3.7.1 This is an area of land between the River Bollin and the M56, as well as the westbound carriageway of the M56 in the City Council's boundary.

3.7.2 Proposed work includes: a viaduct over the River Bollin a balancing pond for railway drainage; an embankment, a cutting at Halebank, closure and realignment of Sunbank Lane and other footpaths; a box tunnel under the M56, the redesign of M56 Junction 6 and improvements to the existing road network around the proposed Airport Station.

3.7.3 It includes a four platform Airport HS2 Station and associated access, servicing, and parking. These lie within Trafford Council's administrative boundary, although the proposal impacts on both Manchester and Trafford Council areas.

3.7.4 In this area, the scheme will provide a connection between HS2 and a future NPR route between Manchester and Liverpool via the Manchester Airport High Speed station. Manchester Airport is located to the south-east of the proposed HS2 Station at Manchester Airport.

3.8 **MA07 Davenport Green to Ardwick Community Area**

3.8.1 This section is 13.4km long, of which 12.8km is in tunnel under the wards of Ardwick, Longsight, Rusholme, Withington, Didsbury West, Didsbury East, Northenden and Baguley. 573m of the route is in cutting at Ardwick.

3.8.2 There are several features associated with the tunnel. This includes four vent shafts/headhouses proposed at: Altrincham Road/M56 junction 3a (Northenden Ward) (Vent Shaft 1); Withington Golf Course, Palatine Road (Didsbury West) (Vent Shaft 2); The Christie Car Park D, Wilmslow Road (Didsbury East/boundary with Didsbury West) (Vent Shaft 3); and Fallowfield Retail Park, Birchfield Road (Rusholme) (Vent Shaft 4).

3.8.3 The vent shafts/headhouses will be approximately 25m x 43-54 wide and 6m high. Each vent shaft will have a construction compound and there will be additional auto transformer stations at Palatine Road and Birchfield Road.

3.8.4 At the Ardwick end there would be a 'porous portal' (a perforated structure at the tunnel entrance, designed to allow the passage of air from the tunnel) with a head house substation and a tunnel portal building.

3.9 **MA08 Manchester Piccadilly Community Area**

3.9.1 The route would exit the tunnel at the Siemens Train Care Facility, Rondin Road in Ardwick Ward, into a cutting. It then rises to a viaduct that widens to accommodate the 2 NPR "passive provision" viaducts. A viaduct then extends over the Pin Mill Brow Junction and expands to 6 tracks which lead into the 6 platforms at the proposed station. The HS2 station would be located alongside the existing Piccadilly station building at a similar height. All platforms will have a roof and canopy.

3.9.2 The Manchester Piccadilly Station area will be 1km (0.6 miles) in length.

3.9.3 In this area, the Proposed Scheme will provide a connection between HS2 and a future NPR route between Leeds and the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed station.

3.9.4 A new Metrolink station will be constructed underneath the HS2 station which will have 4 platforms. This will replace the existing 2 platform Metrolink station underneath the existing Piccadilly station. The construction of the HS2 station at Piccadilly will sever Metrolink services to Ashton during its construction which presents an opportunity to build a new station which has 4 platforms, which would be much more complex to achieve under the existing Piccadilly station.

- 3.9.5 The hybrid Bill also proposes a “turnback facility” (used to allow trams which are not continuing their journey to turnaround) at the New Islington tram stop to replace the existing Sheffield Street turnback, which will be out of service due to the construction of HS2.
- 3.9.6 There will be an Autotransformer station at Midland Street. At Pin Mill Brow and other streets around Piccadilly, changes to the road layout are proposed. Two multi-storey car parks are planned to be constructed on New Sheffield Street (site of the proposed boulevard in the SRF). Eight compounds are proposed for the construction of the railway.
- 3.9.7 In this area, the Proposed Scheme will provide passive provision for a connection between HS2 and a future NPR route between Leeds and the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed station.

3.10 **Key Themes & Issues**

- 3.10.1 Due to the volume of material included in the ES, and the timescales involved in responding to the consultation, this report aims to provide an overview of the key topics and areas of the ES where officers consider that avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation is:
- a) Critical to Manchester; and
 - b) Likely to be successfully secured

It should be noted that most the analysis of the ES has highlighted the lack of detail and the need for further information from HS2 Ltd. Many of the issues previously raised by the City Council and partners, in our response to previous consultations, have not been addressed in the ES.

3.11 **Volume 1 – Introduction and Methodology**

- 3.11.1 Design – The HS2 Ltd Design Vision sets core principles around three themes of people, place and time and creating a sense of place that will stand the test of time. It is important that these high-level principles are followed through to the detailed design of all elements that could singularly or cumulatively have an impact on Manchester.
- 3.11.2 HS2 Ltd design approach should be consistent with its own guidance. It should fully assess the location and context. It should then develop a suitable and appropriate design response to suit the location and context, rather than providing generic, engineering solutions which would not be appropriate for Manchester.
- 3.11.3 The resulting structures should be a high-quality design response. This is important in terms of landscaping and integrating and retaining existing features such as trees, as well as ensuring that the structures are of a high-quality design.
- 3.11.4 The proposed stations and their landscaping and associated works, including

the approach viaduct to the new station at Piccadilly, will need an exemplary design response that responds positively to their context and support the regeneration masterplans in these locations. It is important that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is engaged in early and detailed discussions over the designs of these new structures to ensure the highest design quality and landscaping, and to ensure that they respond positively to their setting. In the case of Piccadilly, the design should respond sensitively to the historic environment and adjacent Grade II listed train shed.

- 3.11.5 Further detailed investigation and surveys are needed in terms of historic buildings, character appraisal, archaeology and built heritage to inform the proposals and to enable a proper assessment of impact and mitigation interventions needed.
- 3.11.6 Volume 1 also states that the route-wide approach has been developed with Historic England and Local Authorities at Phase 1 and Phase 2a. A route wide Written Scheme of Investigation has also been prepared setting out a framework for design, evaluation, and investigation.
- 3.11.7 Site Investigation is still to be done, which means that it is likely that there are still unknowns about land quality.
- 3.11.8 In the Landscape and Visual Impacts section, the ES states that measures to mitigate are part of an integrated design approach. It is important that best practice and high-quality design are at the forefront in developing bespoke responses, and that any harm or adverse impact is avoided rather than mitigated.
- 3.11.9 Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) is mentioned in relation to the 25-kilovolt electrification traction power of trains. It is being assessed and sensitive receptor sites are being identified along the track route corridor. The Christie Hospital and the Airport have been identified and HS2 Ltd are looking to mitigate any impacts.
- 3.12 **Volume 2 – Community Area Reports and Map Books - Comments Applicable to MA06, MA07 and MA08**
- 3.12.1 **Agriculture, Forestry and Soils** - Soils have been assessed thoroughly at the same time as the land quality survey. The soils assessment focusses mainly on soils as an agricultural resource, and of ensuring it isn't damaged during construction. There is robust mitigation protocol referenced, which would be effective if rigorously adhered to. Other important aspects of soil management appear to be deferred to other topic areas, for example soils supporting important ecological sites are dealt with in ecology, peat in carbon etc.
- 3.12.2 The main issue of concern for our ES response is that the assessment methodology makes assumptions about the impact sensitivity of some businesses and therefore a danger that these impacts and their importance are downplayed. There is overlap here with socioeconomic impacts.

- 3.12.3 There are very few forestry areas affected and the impact is regarded as negligible, which seems appropriate.
- 3.12.4 **Air Quality, Land Quality, Sound, Noise and Vibration** - HS2 Ltd. will develop Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to supplement the final Code of Construction Practice. There is an expectation that the Plans should be developed in consultation with the Council.
- 3.12.5 Likely significant sound, noise, and vibration impacts have been identified at certain locations/premises, but the level of detail is not sufficient to properly assess and needs to be provided.
- 3.12.6 Any buildings that qualify for noise insulation or temporary re-housing are reported in the ES.
- 3.12.7 Proposed construction hours include Saturday working hours from 0800 - 13.00 hours and 24 hours working. Variations to standard working hours will need to be discussed and agreed with the Council as part of the LEMP work to mitigate potential noise disturbance.
- 3.12.8 **Noise** - Vibration Impacts of the tunnelling boring machine (TBM) are expected to have significant effect on the use of the MRI scanner at the Christie Hospital for 25-30 days. A Specific Vibration Risk Assessment was undertaken after liaison with the Christie but concludes that HS2 Ltd. will liaise with the Christie further. It is essential that this takes place.
- 3.12.9 **Climate Change** – There has been no consideration of the impact on climate change at the local level or consideration for the Climate Emergency and local carbon budgets.
- 3.12.10 This is particularly of concern around Piccadilly Station, which is a dense urban environment, with further development planned. Indications show that Manchester is already falling below the levels necessary to meet the overall carbon budget that has been set, and HS2 construction traffic will significantly compound the matter. This needs to be addressed as a priority.
- 3.12.11 Overall and over the long term, the proposal would meet the aims of assisting with a more sustainable transport system and encourages the use of sustainable construction practices
- 3.12.12 **Community** - In total – 79 Commercial, 19 Residential and 35 other types of properties are impacted / demolished as part of the scheme in Manchester including several important community services and buildings between Ardwick and Piccadilly.
- 3.12.13 Multiple residential properties in Chapeltown, Ducie Street, Pollard Street and New Islington will experience temporary impacts associated to construction activity.
- 3.12.14 The route through Piccadilly Station, involving several level changes, will be

problematic for users of the station, particularly for those with mobility challenges.

- 3.12.15 The Piccadilly Station proposals locate the HS2 platforms to the north of the existing rail station (facing towards the Inner Ring Road). As proposed, this does not provide adequate integration with the existing station and access to the city centre would be extremely poor from this location, due to the topography, existing buildings, and potential route through a 70-metre-long tunnel at Store Street.
- 3.12.16 The alternative route through the existing Network Rail station is not considered appropriate given the pressures on the current concourse from more passengers (25% increase in the last four-five years). 2016/17 figures from the Office of Rail and Road show 27 million passengers per year and 41 million visitors to the station per annum. DfT figures indicate that rail passenger numbers (alone) will increase to almost 60 million by 2040.
- 3.12.17 HS2 passengers using only the current entrance is a wholly inadequate solution. A fully integrated station design (as shown in the Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) and the GM HS2 & NPR Growth Strategy) would provide a common, accessible approach for HS2 and non-HS2 passengers (see section 5.7 for more information on Piccadilly Station).
- 3.12.18 The required Ventilation shaft, headhouse and auto-transformer station at Palatine Road continues to have a significant impact upon Withington Golf Club, including its future viability. As proposed, there would be a permanent loss of the club house, car parking and part of the golf course playing area, alongside a temporary loss of wider land impacting 4 of the golf course's holes for a period of 5 years. It's noted that once construction is completed, that the golf course could viably reopen. Ongoing liaison with the club by HS2 Ltd. will be required.
- 3.12.19 The Birchfields Road vent shaft will continue to have implications for businesses at the Fallowfield Retail Park and the local community through loss of amenity and parking implications. Impacts will include the loss of land/units at the retail park. The car park is also used by parents to drop off children at the nearby Birchfields Primary School and Manchester Enterprise Academy (MEA Central), to improve the safety of children as part of a 'park and stride' scheme promoted by the Council.
- 3.12.20 **Construction** - Temporary soil stockpiles could contain contaminated soils. More details are needed on the methodology to be employed for soil excavations, transportation and as to how the stockpiles will be managed to prevent contamination from leaving the compounds, in the form of dust or leachate. This will ensure that the lands beneath the compounds does not become contaminated because of the temporary storage
- 3.12.21 Hoardings to segregate the HS2 construction site will be at least 2.4m high but may up to 3.6m and possibly altered to enhance acoustic performance.

- 3.12.22 304 residential properties are forecast to experience noise above the eligibility criteria for noise insulation, but below the eligibility criteria for temporary rehousing criteria. This is of concern and HS2 will need to ensure that they are responsive to residents throughout the construction process.
- 3.12.23 Tunnelling Boring Machine (TBM) expected to have significant effect on the use of the proposed MRI scanner at the Christie for 25-30 days. A specific Vibration Risk Assessment was undertaken after liaison with the Christie, but this concluded that HS2 will liaise with the Christie further.
- 3.12.24 **Cultural Heritage** – A major adverse effect is predicted in relation to the removal / repositioning of the Grade II listed Milestone adjacent to Withington Fire Station. The repositioning of the asset to a different location would erode the integrity of the asset and undermine its significance. Whilst the retention of the asset is positive, its relocation would still be considered to have a major adverse impact overall.
- 3.12.25 The Piccadilly hybrid Bill station design will result in considerable loss of non-designated heritage assets in the Ardwick / Piccadilly area. All reasonable options which would avoid the permanent loss of these assets should be appropriately explored.
- 3.12.26 Prominent late-19th century buildings at 163 Ashton Old Rd and 223 Ashton Old Road (M11 3WU) are of architectural and historic merit and have the potential to be impacted by the construction compounds but are not identified in the ES maps.
- 3.12.27 Concerns around the potential for movement around the collection of Listed Buildings next to Ladybarn Road. This should be monitored during the construction and operational phases.
- 3.12.28 **Ecology** – It is noted that a 10% net gain in biodiversity for replaceable habitats along the Crewe to Manchester Route is being implemented by HS2 Ltd. after construction.
- 3.12.29 The impact on Bollin Bank is unclear (HS2 viaduct over the River Bollin Linking Woodhouse Park in Manchester and Cheshire East). As well as the direct loss, it could be permanently isolated from the rest of Sunbank Wood. This is due to the transition from viaduct to embankment, which occurs directly in the woodland. No consideration has been given to the temporal impacts during the construction period.
- 3.12.30 No bat emergence surveys were undertaken in any building or structures in MA08; we would not accept an ES for a planning application with this lack of survey effort.
- 3.12.31 The loss of hedgerows in MA07 is described as of being significant at a local/parish level. Since this includes the loss of native species-rich hedgerows, this is an underestimation of the value of the hedges. Species rich hedges are very rare in Greater Manchester and any loss would be

considered significant.

- 3.12.32 No details of the black redstart location found in MA08 have been given. The ES identifies that the construction in this area will result “in the disturbance of black redstart nesting habitat”. No mitigation is proposed for the loss of nesting habitat because there is “extensive alternative nesting habitat in the area”. However, this overlooks the fact that black restarts require nesting habitat linked to nearby feeding areas.
- 3.12.33 **Health** – The demolition of recreational facilities affecting the ability to participate in specific physical activity at the following locations: In Aldow Industrial Park demolition of Totem Gymnastics, a children’s gymnastics club, Cloud Aerial Arts (an acrobatic, gymnastics and yoga centre) and CrossFit Ancoats (a specialised cross fit gym).
- 3.12.34 The demolition of building providing service, reducing access to service supporting health and wellbeing at the following locations: Manchester Offenders: Diversion, Engagement and Liaison (MO:DEL), and Manchester Action on Street Health (MASH) on Fairfield Street)
- 3.12.35 The presence of construction traffic, including HGV, on local roads leading to amenity impacts and safety concerns, deterring the use of local roads by non-motorised users in MA08
- 3.12.36 An increase in HGV traffic and changes to the noise environment will lead to reduced levels of amenity from the local environment in MA07 (A34 Kingsway and A34 Birchfields Road)
- 3.12.37 **Landscape and Visual** – No reference is made to the Mayfield development which is located within close proximity to Piccadilly Station. The vision for Mayfield is for a distinctive, world class development delivering significant new commercial space, and up to 1,500 new homes alongside a mix of retail and leisure facilities all centred on a new 6.5-acre city centre park. The outdated baseline is likely to impact on the accuracy of the baseline assessment of value, susceptibility to change and overall sensitivity. This is likely to result in an inaccurate assessment of effects and their significance.
- 3.12.38 No consideration is given to future aspirations as set out within the SRFs which are relevant to the site.
- 3.12.39 There are concerns that the landscape and visual mitigation provided in the city centre will not be adequate.
- 3.12.40 The Airport Station itself lies outside the City Council boundary. However, there will be visual impacts from the station, associated multi-storey car parks, new highway layouts and landscaping works. The new station and associated buildings works should be of an exemplary design quality in terms of architectural design and public realm and landscaping works. Mitigation works associated with the construction and operational aspects of the scheme should be carefully considered to minimise any adverse effects.

- 3.12.41 There is a lack of photomontages to see how the scheme will develop at key points from construction operation and beyond.
- 3.12.42 There is no assessment of potential increased impacts on the townscape character because of the potentially taller vent shafts at Palatine Road, which may appear incompatible within the largely suburban, residential context. The potential increased visibility of the vent shafts as a result of repositioning may make them a more dominant feature in the local townscape context.
- 3.12.43 Existing landscape features including high quality trees and hedgerows should be given due consideration at the advanced design stages. The impact caused by any new highways should be minimised and mitigated.
- 3.12.44 The Mersey Valley Managed Open Space is one area where the character would be significantly affected to a moderate, adverse level. As this landscape is of high value and contributes significantly to the character of the area, opportunities should be taken to avoid any adverse impacts by redesigning the scheme to one where there is less impact.
- 3.12.45 There are considerable concerns over the proposed loss of mature trees in the Mersey Valley that also contribute significantly to the character of the area. The trees provide a high value mature landscape feature and attempts should be made to avoid loss by redesigning the proposals to retain this existing important feature.
- 3.12.46 Due to the lack of appropriate criteria within the methodology, there is a reliance on professional judgement to assess the baseline and effects. Whilst this is part of the assessment process and in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the overall assessment lacks robustness.
- 3.12.47 **Major Accidents & Natural Disasters** – There is a general concern that HS2 are controlling everything centrally and seem to be relying on the local authorities to contact other bodies such as GMEU, GMRU and GMRF. These bodies have not been contacted by HS2 to discuss risk and impacts.
- 3.12.48 Concern that the potential mitigation measures that are put in place by HS2 Ltd. are as low as reasonably practicable, but no testing is proposed to the mitigation systems prior to HS2 becoming operational which leaves doubt that the mitigation measures will work effectively should a disaster / major incident occur.
- 3.12.49 **Socio Economic** – Members should note that up to 40,000 additional jobs are estimated as a result of HS2/NPR with an implemented Piccadilly SRF.
- 3.12.50 A total of 490 HS2 jobs will be required within MA07, however, it is not clear what proportion of these can be taken up locally. Similarly, it is not clear what training / guidance HS2 Ltd can provide to ensure local skills can be used, outside of the apprenticeship roles. The GM local industrial strategy

highlights our STEM framework which we need to work with HS2 on.

- 3.12.51 We oppose any loss of jobs caused by the removal of businesses by HS2 and expect HS2 to actively assist businesses to relocate and to liaise with MCC to support them in this.
- 3.12.52 We wish to seek financial compensation for the loss of any part of its business rate income caused by the development of the HS2 route within the borough that has been demonstrated to cause businesses to fail or had a significant impact on their income. It is not expected that the local authority should bear the financial consequences to the detriment of its residents and businesses.
- 3.12.53 Indirect construction employment - it is not clear how supply chain employment will be generated or how businesses may gain early guidance as to how to bid in to/benefit from supply chain activity.
- 3.12.54 **Traffic and Transport** - MCC are concerned that during construction and operation residential neighbourhoods will suffer with increased non-residential parking from construction workers and later passengers. Travel Plans developed for construction workers must not force off road parking, i.e., parking on grass verges.
- 3.12.55 HS2 Ltd have completed a traffic modelling study, but we have several concerns on this, notably that NPR traffic hasn't been included in modelling around the airport and major streets have not been included in the baseline data. For example, Oxford Road is open to normal traffic in the model but has been closed to Cars and HGVs for many years. This has resulted in the traffic modelling being unreliable and cast doubt on the validity of the traffic interventions proposed to the road network around Piccadilly and the Airport stations.
- 3.12.56 Beyond provision of junction improvements to provide direct access to the stations, HS2 Ltd. have not proposed any mitigation for locations on the road network where they have identified their scheme will have impacts on traffic flows, congestion, and bus delays.
- 3.12.57 Bus journey time impacts are significant during construction and show increases of over 40% on some corridors. This level of impact is not acceptable and there has been no mitigation proposed by HS2 Ltd. in the ES. This needs to be addressed.
- 3.12.58 Cycle facilities at key locations such as Pin Mill Brow, Thorley Lane, and the New Airport Access gyratory do not meet current standards and need to be improved.
- 3.12.59 The Council and our partners share a number of concerns about HS2 Ltd.'s highways proposals at the Airport station. These have been raised formally and informally with HS2 Ltd. on numerous occasions.

- 3.12.60 The Council and its partners feel that inadequate evidence has been provided on how the Airport station can be accessed; what the implications are for Junctions 5 and 6 of the M56 and the wider M56; the wider highways access; and impact on airport operations and accessibility.
- 3.12.61 Our concerns about highways access cover both the construction phase and the longer-term operation of the Airport station. There is also a lack of detail about how demand from NPR traffic will be managed.
- 3.12.62 With most of the route through the MA07 area in tunnel, emerging at Ardwick Depot, the key traffic and transport issues are around the vent shaft / headhouse locations shown in the WDES. The parking at the Christie Hospital Car Park D on Wilmslow Road; the A665 Chancellors Lane, the Siemens Ardwick Train care Facility on Rondin Road, the Fallowfield Retail Park on Birchfields Road and Hooper Street could all be affected.
- 3.12.63 The Council's policies on parking and air quality mean that significant additional private car parking capacity for rail commuters would be difficult to accept, in particular the two multi-storey car parks proposed in the ES, within the city centre. Access to the proposed multi-storey car parks is also not in accordance with the approved Piccadilly SRF.
- 3.12.64 Pin Mill Brow gyratory junction proposal is not appropriate in scale or function. It occupies a wide area, limiting development potential and creates a hostile environment for cyclists and pedestrians, with no evidence of conformity to current design requirements. It is understood that the design was developed to achieve no major adverse effects on traffic capacity, but the proposed Pin Mill Brow gyratory does not cater for the forecast future demand in either 2038 or 2046.
- 3.12.65 The proposed quantum of cycle parking (500 spaces) at Piccadilly Station is insufficient. By comparison, Cambridge station currently has 3,000 undercover cycle parking spaces.
- 3.12.66 Other key specific issues identified in MA08 are:
- There is no consideration of walking and cycling routes or how these would form part of an integrated, place based approach to street design.
 - There is little evidence of a holistic place making approach that seeks to link in wider existing networks.
 - The hybrid Bill needs to integrate the Beeline proposals within the vicinity of Piccadilly Station and HS2 track alignment.
 - There is no mention of enhanced wayfinding to ensure passengers can make their onward journeys easily and in an efficient manner.
 - No clear connections heading to the north and the city centre are indicated.
 - Station design needs to provide the highest quality arrival experience, with legible onward connection by active modes.
 - The scale of the station and multiple rail alignments have the potential to create a severe severance effect. Permeability through these pieces of

- infrastructure is key and must be demonstrated through the ES process.
- The HS2 station must be fully integrated with bus and coach services to ensure sustainable transport connections are provided.
- Metrolink forms a key interchange mode that must be fully integrated with the station designs considering future expansion and introduction of increased capacity through initiatives such as tram-train.
- The proposed location of the revised Pin Mill Brow junction impacts on several high-rise buildings and an urban park proposed in the Piccadilly SRF. This is not acceptable to the Council and alternative layouts need to be explored and discussed. Any changes to the highways layout in this location needs to be in accordance with approved planning.

3.12.67 **Water Resources and Flood Risk** – The Palatine Road vent shaft will change the flood flow immediately surrounding the vent shaft site. Modelling is underway and will continue during the passage of the Bill, to identify avoidance and mitigation measures to reduce the impact on peak flood levels around the Palatine Road vent shaft. Any permanent moderate adverse effects are unacceptable.

3.12.68 The hydrology assessment within the Mersey Model report uses event data between 1955 and 2012. The model has been further calibrated against Storm Christoph (Jan 2021). The results outline no substantial change in the overall model results. It is recommended further engagement with the Environment Agency continues to ensure the hydrology is appropriate for future detailed design. We are concerned that the hybrid Bill is going ahead without

3.12.69 Mitigation measures will be required to reduce the impact of the Proposed Scheme on peak flood levels at the receptors in Northenden, Stenner Lane and along Palatine Road. Details of mitigation & 'Significance' need to be agreed with EA.

3.13 **Volume 3: Route-wide Effects**

3.13.1 **Agriculture, Forestry and Soils** - There is a well-established robust land classification methodology for the whole route. The approach assesses all best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1-3a) as of the same value: there are areas of grade 1 peatland in the western section, which are quite a scarce resource nationally but especially locally.

3.13.2 **Community** – it is noted that details of potential construction worker impacts are to be completed and that community issues will generally be dealt with at the local level. Comments are included in the Community Area sections of this report.

3.13.3 **Socio-economics** – 'it has been assumed that 88% of the business occupiers displaced by the scheme will successfully relocate to alternative locations and no employment will be lost. The other 12% of occupiers are assumed to close rather than relocate'. It is noted that this assumption was based on the research into the relocation of companies and jobs on account

of the London 2012 Olympic Games. Given the potential effects of this estimate and for the purposes of assessing the worst-case scenario, it is considered that the London-based case study does not represent the base case for the Crewe to Manchester route. Similarly, the assumption that a proportion of the 88% of the businesses which are in rural areas will be able to re-locate is not considered representative of the worst-case scenario for loss of FTEs. It should be noted that businesses are likely to be far more vulnerable after the Covid pandemic and their cash reserves may be much lower which will mean they are more fragile to any form of business interruption and as such the 12% figure given could be higher than the London based case study.

- 3.13.4 There is already significant development in progress and planned around the HS2 stations. This has material implications for economic impact and appropriate mitigation.
- 3.13.5 As noted above, an estimated 8,870 full time equivalent posts would be created during the construction period. HS2 Ltd. has committed to providing a minimum of 2,000 apprenticeships over Phase 1 and Phase 2a. A similar commitment should be provided for Phase 2b and HS2 Ltd. should work with the Council and Greater Manchester Combined Authority on this.
- 3.13.6 As highlighted above, the Council and partners would like to see schemes in place to ensure that as many of the HS2-related jobs as possible go to local people. HS2 Ltd. should engage with the City and GM partners to ensure this, building on work already in place in GM.

3.14 **Code of Construction Practice**

- 3.14.1 The ES includes a Code of Construction Practice, including mitigation measures to reduce and manage traffic and transport impacts as well as issues such as noise. The document also includes a commitment to limit the use of materials and the generation of waste.
- 3.14.2 Details of how construction would be managed are still emerging and officers will continue to work with HS2 Ltd. to further understand the impact and the proposed mitigation to limit this.
- 3.14.3 **Waste Material** – 'The disposal of 10,000,000 tonnes per annum of inert waste represents approximately 100% of the total inert landfill capacity in the North West region' is of concern. More information is needed on estimated levels of inert waste over the project (2025-2038) and disposal measures employed to allow WPAs to understand capacity requirements.

3.15 **Conclusion – Environmental Statement**

- 3.15.1 We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Environment Statement. However, there is a lack of detail on issues of major significance and clearly much more work needs to be done to satisfy the Council and that the scheme has holistically considered all the impacts and mitigations what Manchester

requires during and after construction. There are a significant number of areas of concern which we will raise as part of the Council's response to the ES. We will also continue to press HS2 Ltd. and DfT to work with the City Council and our GM Partners on the gaps that have been identified.

- 3.15.2 Officers will continue working with HS2, DfT, TfN and other partners on the detailed design development of the proposed scheme. We will continue to argue for world class, fully integrated stations with a build it once, build it right approach.

4.0 HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill EQIA

- 4.1 Equalities Impact Assessment Report – this considers the potential effects of the construction and operation of HS2 Phase 2B on people with protected characteristics and explains how HS2 Ltd. proposes to avoid /reduce any adverse effects. These are people protected by the Equality Act 2010.
- 4.2 Christie Hospital - The landscape and visual assessment in the ES has identified a significant adverse visual effect at The Christie Hospital because of the construction of the Wilmslow Road vent shaft and associated construction traffic. There will also be night-time effects associated with additional lighting required for the Wilmslow Road vent shaft satellite compound, which will intensify existing night-time sky glow. Evidence from Cancer Research suggests that some drugs used in chemotherapy treatment can increase sensitivity to light or change in visual stimuli. There is therefore the potential for wider impacts on patients at The Christie Hospital.
- 4.3 Christie Hospital -The permanent loss of Car Park D, including the loss of all Blue Badge parking spaces and wheelchair shelters, will give rise to disproportionate and differential effects for disabled people including those with cancer attending the hospital for treatment or to visit other patients.
- 4.4 Disabled people, older people and children are being particularly disadvantaged by disruption construction, loss of public spaces, impacts of routes changing, less parking, air quality, replacing accessible trams with buses, relocating bus stops, temporary access and impact on loss of play areas and disruption to children's education etc. Further consideration is needed on the cumulative effect on these groups when developing mitigations. There is a lack of clarity on what the mechanisms will be for ongoing equalities analysis, equality stakeholder engagement and the need to refresh the data based on Census 2021. HS2 is required to revise the disproportionate data analysis model. Disability groups most likely to be affected are mobility, mental health, neurodiversity and sensory and this will be for all ages.
- 4.5 Housing impact – Vulnerable householders are at risk of mental health or physical impact due to uncertainty of HS2 altering existing routes or evictions if residences are compulsory purchased and not considering the residents surroundings (e.g., specific accessibility needs for your house).

- 4.6 The Council is concerned that the proposed HS2 station is not appropriately integrated with the facilities of the existing Piccadilly Station. A more integrated design would provide a common and more legible approach for HS2 and non-HS2 passengers, enabling choice between a wider variety of ancillary facilities and reducing unnecessary changes of level and therefore allowing better accessibility for all.
- 4.7 Buildings and structures are required to be demolished in most community areas assessed within the Councils boundaries. The Council would wish to ensure that adequate engagement, assistance, and support is provided for all affected, specifically those that would require additional support with understanding and going through the compensation process. Further support and information are required for impacted local businesses and community facilities and homes on the mechanisms being considered, alongside what support can be provided with the financial compensation
- 4.8 **Conclusion - EQIA**
- 4.8.1 We are concerned at the lack of detail within the EQIA. We hope to work with HS2 to resolve the issues to identified to make sure HS2 works for everyone in our city.
- 4.8.2 Lighting around the Christie for construction of the Ventilation shaft needs HS2 to mitigate the impacts to patients who have a light sensitivity due to cancer treatment by working with the Christie Hospital.
- 4.8.3 The loss of disabled car parking at the Christie needs replacing by HS2 Ltd.
- 4.8.4 Disabled, older and vulnerable people (including children) are being particularly disadvantaged by the disruption caused by HS2 construction activities. The level changes in the HS2 station integration with the classic Piccadilly Station is one shortfall.
- 4.8.5 Demolitions and compulsory purchases must ensure that residents and business are adequately compensated and have their needs considered during relocation.
- 5.0 **Petitioning the Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill**
- 5.1 The extraordinary Council meeting on 4th March 2022 granted delegated authority to the Strategic Director for Growth and Development in consultation with the Leader of the Council to petition against the HS2 Phase2B hybrid Bill.
- 5.2 The paper presented at the Council meeting gave an overview of likely petitioning items. This Executive paper describes the issues of concern in more detail, although it should be noted that, due to the size and complexity of the hybrid Bill further issues may be identified following this report, which it is felt may need to be included in the final petition.

- 5.3 As with previous responses to HS2 Ltd consultations, Manchester is continuing to work closely with Greater Manchester (GM) Partners in preparing their respective petitions. The Council's petition will be aligned with those of other GM partners, whilst emphasising and highlighting issues of particular concern for the city.
- 5.4 As part of the Council and GM partner's ongoing work with HS2 Ltd on development of the scheme, a series of Critical Issues have been identified and these have been regularly raised and discussed with HS2 Ltd and DfT. The Critical Issues relate to areas of concern for the city and GM Partners and are issues which are fundamental to the success of HS2 Phase 2b in GM. The Critical Issues form the basis of our petition response, which has been refined in line with the exact contents of the hybrid Bill.
- 5.5 The Council's response to previous consultations on HS2 notes the critical importance for the HS2 and NPR proposals to be aligned with, and support, the city's range of existing and emerging strategies and policy documents. These include:
- City Centre Transport Strategy to 2040
 - Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25
 - Our Manchester Strategy and Our Manchester Industrial Strategy
 - City Centre Strategic Plan (CCSP)
 - Greater Manchester HS2 & NPR Growth Strategy
 - Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan
 - Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF)
 - Strategic Regeneration Frameworks (SRFs) for the localities surrounding, and linked to, the Stations including:
 - Piccadilly SRF 2018
 - Mayfield SRF
 - Portugal Street East SRF
 - IQ Manchester (North Campus) SRF
 - Wythenshawe Hospital Campus SRF
 - Airport City
- 5.6 The key issues proposed to be included within the Council's petition are set out below. All these issues have been raised previously with DfT and HS2 Ltd on numerous occasions, both through our formal consultation responses and informal engagement.
- 5.7 **Manchester Piccadilly Station**
- 5.7.1 It is imperative to create a station at Manchester Piccadilly that is a world class, fully integrated transport hub which can actively maximise economic growth and the regeneration of the eastern side of the city centre. A 'Build it Once, Build it Right' strategic approach to transport investment at Piccadilly can ensure the earliest transformation of Piccadilly Station; avoid significant and long-term disruption and blight; and promote investor confidence. We believe that the design for Manchester Piccadilly High Speed station should

specifically consider Piccadilly in terms of the integration between HS2, NPR, the wider rail network and local growth and regeneration.

5.7.2 The surface terminus station proposed for Manchester station within the hybrid Bill does not deliver the right solution to provide the required level of reliability and resilience to effectively support the wider High-Speed network. Furthermore, it significantly impacts on the delivery of the place-making and economic growth agenda set out in the approved Piccadilly SRF and the GM HS2 / NPR Growth Strategy. The hybrid Bill proposal illustrates a ‘bolt on’ of NPR onto the HS2 scheme, as opposed to taking a holistic view of how to best deliver a fully integrated HS2 and NPR solution, considering long term capacity, reliability, connectivity, and future proofing.

5.7.3 A report commissioned by MCC and TfGM from Bechtel to review the proposed HS2/NPR station at Piccadilly Station concluded that a fully underground and re-orientated through-station could address the constraints of the existing proposal, offer much more flexibility and long-term capacity for future train service provision, as well as potentially reducing the amount of track and tunnel required to connect to the Airport station. Specific issues at Piccadilly highlighted in the report, and to be raised in the Council’s petition, relate to:

- **Capacity, Reliability, Resilience & Future Proofing** – lack of capacity in the current surface station, which would be at full capacity on day 1 of its operation.
- **Customer Experience** – the need for a fully integrated and connected multi-modal transport hub, able to accommodate predicted future user numbers.
- **Place making & Supporting Economic Growth** - the loss of development land, and therefore economic and regeneration benefits because of the combined HS2 and NPR surface station.
- **Sequencing of investment** – “build it once, build it right” approach,
- **The application of onerous standards for HS2** – which may have impeded the development of an optimum solution for Piccadilly station.

5.7.4 In addition, the provision of a NPR route towards Leeds, included within the Integrated Rail Plan, suggest that a significant amount of surface infrastructure will be needed in the Ardwick area to enable the NPR trains to use a surface station. This infrastructure will cause blight and severance to the surrounding communities, as well as leading to a loss of a significant amount of developable land, impeding future economic growth and provision of jobs. Such infrastructure would not be needed with an underground station.

5.7.5 The Council’s petition will request a fully underground HS2/NPR station be designed and approved for Piccadilly Station”.

5.8 Gateway House

5.8.1 Gateway House is a building completed in 1969 and located on Station

Approach at Manchester Piccadilly Station. The HS2 Manchester-Crewe hybrid Bill does not include powers for HS2 Ltd to acquire and demolish Gateway House and therefore fails to provide an adequate interchange facility at Manchester Piccadilly Station. It further fails to provide an attractive and fit for purpose gateway into the city centre that will meet anticipated increased pedestrian capacity through Piccadilly Station and facilitate the regeneration set out in the Manchester Piccadilly SRF. This failure will create congestion, unnecessary pressure on the station entrance, an unappealing and low-quality arrival plaza and gateway to the city centre and discourage the use of public transport. Furthermore, the retention of Gateway House restricts sustainable connection between the Western end of the Boulevard envisaged in the SRF, the new station, the core of the city centre and the Piccadilly SRF area.

- 5.8.2 We believe that the removal of Gateway House is necessary to deliver regeneration and support economic growth, which is a stated objective of HS2. Its removal would enhance connectivity across the city centre and align with the SRF for Piccadilly. The proposals within the hybrid Bill also assume that Metrolink will be routed underneath Gateway House. It is currently not clear if this will be technically possible while Gateway House remains. We will, therefore, request that the hybrid Bill be amended to include the acquisition and demolition of Gateway House and an undertaking given that the final design of Manchester Piccadilly provides an integrated station and station approach, that delivers a high-quality gateway which is in accordance with the strategic vision for Manchester.

5.9 **Piccadilly Highways Works**

- 5.9.1 The hybrid Bill gyratory junction layout at Pin Mill Brow is too expansive and does not consider local transport and environment, zero carbon and clean air policies, which look to reduce car trips into the city centre, or of the station's city centre location. They also take a considerable amount of land in the SRF area, creating a loss of vital development land, and a poor local environment. The proposed gyratory will, therefore, result in significant adverse impacts on the regeneration proposals within the city centre.
- 5.9.2 The Council is also concerned about the quality of traffic modelling that has been undertaken by HS2 Ltd to inform the highway design that is proposed. The modelling does not consider some recent GM led highways improvements (for example Oxford Road traffic calming and bus lane improvements) or take account of the "Right Mix" plans within the GM 2040 Transport Strategy and City Centre Transport Strategy. This is important as it will have a fundamental impact on traffic flows across the city centre including the assumptions made for Pin Mill Brow, which seek to reduce the amount of private car journeys in favour of an increase in public transport and active travel journeys.
- 5.9.3 The Council's petition will, therefore, request that DfT replaces the hybrid Bill gyratory design with an alternative which takes up a much smaller land area and so better integrates with the Piccadilly SRF and is more closely aligned

to policies aimed at reducing journeys into the city centre by private car, as well as being less of a barrier to pedestrians and cyclist.

5.10 **Parking & Multi Modal Interchange at Piccadilly Station**

- 5.10.1 The hybrid Bill includes two multi storey car parks with a total capacity of approximately 2,000 parking spaces, situated on the proposed Boulevard included in the Piccadilly SRF, adjacent to the HS2 Manchester Piccadilly station. The amount and location of car parking at Manchester Piccadilly is unacceptable to the Council and needs to be appropriate to its city centre location, next to a major transport hub, and in the context of the Piccadilly SRF and wider policy initiatives, including Manchester's Climate Change Framework, the City Centre Transport Strategy, GM 2040 Strategy and GM Clean Air Plan, as well as the government's own Transport Decarbonisation Plan.
- 5.10.2 The Boulevard within the SRF is envisaged as a major piece of public realm, connecting the Piccadilly Central areas and East Manchester into the city, and providing a key business address which can drive development within the area. It is intended to be pedestrian dominated space, with traffic movements restricted to access only. Placing two large car parks with 2,000 spaces will result both in the loss of prime development land, but will also detract from the environment, attractiveness, and purpose of the Boulevard, as well as un-necessarily encourage car trips.
- 5.10.3 Our petition will request that parking numbers are considerably reduced (ideally providing spaces for essential rail operation uses only); that parking is moved to a different location; and that HS2 Ltd. work with MCC and other GM partners to find an acceptable solution which promotes a move to public transport and other sustainable transport modes.
- 5.10.4 We will also be requesting that HS2 Ltd. work collaboratively with Council and GM Partners to provide a "multi modal interchange" adjacent to the HS2 station, providing a bus/coach facility, that can enable easy switching between bus, heavy rail and Metrolink transport.

5.11 **Network Rail Maintenance Ramp**

- 5.11.1 The hybrid Bill proposes the relocation of the current ramp used by Network Rail to access the viaduct at Piccadilly Station for maintenance and catering. MCC have significant concerns about the proposed vehicle route to the new access ramp, as set out in the hybrid Bill, which routes vehicles through an area of the Mayfield development. This area is not suitable for road vehicles and is planned for closure under proposals in the approved Mayfield SRF and significantly compromises the development by routing heavy duty traffic through the area. The proposals will impact the first phase of the Mayfield development and the overall quality of the environment of the area, detracting from the ability to secure and retain business in the area, and consequently the ability to deliver the growth and jobs outcomes. Therefore, the current proposals are unacceptable.

5.11.2 The Council's petition will request that HS2 work with the Council, the Mayfield Partnership and TfGM to develop an alternative, locally acceptable route for the Network Rail ramp, that minimises adverse impacts on one of the city's most significant growth and regeneration areas.

5.12 Relocation of North Block Services

5.12.1 To construct the new HS2 station, it is necessary to demolish and relocate an office block which is situated next to Gateway House. This building is known as "North Block". The proposal within the hybrid Bill is to build a replacement facility over the Network Rail "relay room", which is located between the proposed Network Rail Ramp and the train operator catering facilities. These proposals are likely to extend the disruption to residents, because the relay room itself is likely to need to be upgraded in the 2040s, shortly after HS2 and NPR construction completes. The petition requests an amendment to the hybrid Bill to include provision to enable the relay room to be relocated during HS2's construction.

5.13 Metrolink at Manchester Piccadilly

5.13.1 The Council are in full support of the relocation and enhancement of the Metrolink stop at Piccadilly Station to beneath the HS2 station, as proposed in the hybrid Bill. The relocation and improvement of the Metrolink Stop is essential to both the future capacity of the Metrolink system and the experience of passengers. The Metrolink stop at Piccadilly needs to align with the proposals set out in the Piccadilly SRF and GM Growth Strategy, to enable the transformative growth and regeneration of the area, creating a world-class, 'one station solution.'

5.13.2 The relocation of Metrolink enables a future Metrolink stop to be provided at Piccadilly Central to serve the SRF area. The hybrid Bill only provides "passive provision" for future construction of the Piccadilly Central stop. We believe that the hybrid Bill should provide the powers to enable the full delivery of Piccadilly Central.

5.13.3 We consider that further work needs to be done to properly mitigate the impacts on Metrolink operations during the construction of HS2's Piccadilly station. We expect HS2 Ltd. to manage this in partnership with Transport for Greater Manchester and to prioritise reducing disruption to Metrolink customers and operations.

5.13.4 The hybrid Bill proposals include the full closure of the Ashton Line for a period of approximately 2 years, with a replacement bus service. This level of disruption is totally unacceptable to MCC and GM partners.

5.13.5 MCC oppose the location of the tram turnback at New Islington as it impacts on the adjacent Pollard Street development (which has received planning permission), resulting in potential delays to the project and loss of jobs. We believe that the turnback facility should instead be located at the Velopark

tram stop, which would both avoid the impact on Pollard Street and provide the potential opportunity for additional future services to be run to serve the Etihad Campus and Coop Live Arena. Our petition will request that the turnback is located at Velopark, rather than New Islington, and that the potential disruption to Metrolink services and passengers is minimised.

5.14 **Issues with the Manchester Tunnel: Tunnel Portal Relocation & Ventilation Shafts**

5.14.1 Changes made to the track alignments during previous reviews of the HS2 route to Manchester, to avoid the Ardwick depot, the widening of the viaduct, and inclusion of the passive provision for NPR, conflict with existing and approved plans set out within the Piccadilly SRF and cause severance to the Mayfield area. The Council requests that a 'place based' approach is taken at the Piccadilly and Ardwick areas, to ensure that the proposals fully support the regeneration and growth plans at Piccadilly and Mayfield. There is also a need to consider the impact of the new alignment on proposed future alignments for NPR, as well as future alignments for tram train, and alternative highways layouts, re-emphasising the need for a fully holistic approach.

5.14.2 The proposal in the hybrid Bill to locate a ventilation shaft immediately adjacent to Birchfields Primary School, on part of the Fallowfield Retail is unacceptable. It will have a significant impact on both the primary school and the nearby MEA Central Academy School particularly during construction; remove local retail facilities; and cause job losses through the impacts on the retail park. It will also remove the 'Park & Stride' scheme, which helps to improve children's safety. The Council have previously suggested 4 alternative locations for the ventilation shaft in the immediate area, which we do not believe have been adequately considered by HS2 Ltd. MCC's petition will request that the hybrid Bill be amended to relocate this ventilation shaft to another location, as previously suggested, preferably at the site of the University of Manchester Armitage Sports Centre.

5.14.3 The final designs of the ventilation shafts and headhouses need to provide for appropriate flood mitigation at the proposed Palatine Road site; respond sensitively to the local environment; and fully mitigate any impact on residents and business during constructions.

5.15 **Manchester Airport Station Design & "Shallow Cutting"**

5.15.1 As the UK's third busiest airport after Heathrow and Gatwick, and which plays a pivotal role in providing access to international markets from the North of England, Manchester Airport and is central to delivering the levelling up agenda and post COVID-19 economic recovery. HS2, NPR and Metrolink connectivity at Manchester Airport will require fully integrated station solutions. The design of the HS2 Airport Station also needs to be fully integrated with local development plans and existing planning policies, including Places for Everyone, ensuring proper connections to the surrounding development areas included within this plan.

5.15.2 In the hybrid Bill, the HS2/NPR station forecourt is raised by approximately 5m above the level previously proposed in the 2018 Working Draft Environmental Statement, i.e. a change from 'deep cutting' to 'shallow cutting'. We are also concerned that these design changes will give rise to unacceptable impacts on nearby residents, as well as causing significant integration problems for the surrounding development site. There is concern that residents in the Newall Green area of Manchester will be impacted by the shallow cutting as this community sits just above the tunnel portal entrance. There is the potential for the shallow cutting to result in a greater impact from the noise of HS2 trains entering and leaving the tunnel, as well as its proximity to the construction site. Our petition will request that the hybrid Bill be amended to mitigate these impacts, including further engagement on design amendments and environmental impact mitigation, particularly the noise impacts near the tunnel portal for Newall Green residents during and after construction.

5.16 **Metrolink at Manchester Airport**

5.16.1 The HS2 Ltd hybrid Bill proposals sever TfGM's existing Metrolink powers to operate and maintain a Metrolink route that connects to the HS2/NPR Manchester Airport Station. The hybrid Bill includes provision for an isolated Metrolink stop above the high-speed station without providing the necessary replacement powers to connect to the wider network. This is a totally inadequate and unacceptable approach which needs to be rectified through the hybrid Bill process.

5.16.2 Furthermore, because of HS2's proposal for a disconnected Metrolink stop, the hybrid Bill proposes access to Manchester Airport from the HS2 station by a shuttle bus. These shuttle buses will add congestion to an already congested highway network. This does not align with local policy.

5.16.3 Our petition requests that the hybrid Bill is amended to include sufficient powers for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a Metrolink route that connects to the Airport high speed station. These powers should also be sufficient to enable TfGM to construct a turnout immediately to the west of the high-speed station for its proposed tram-train extension to the southwest.

5.16.4 A further issue is caused by the shallow cut station design, which has resulted in the Metrolink tram stop and approach viaducts being similarly raised to a significant height above existing ground level, leading to an increase in construction cost, embodied carbon, and environmental impacts. MCC and GM Partners expect that any increase in costs to the Metrolink scheme and mitigation will be covered by the DfT

5.17 **Highways Issues at Manchester Airport**

5.17.1 The Council and GM Partners do not believe the proposed highway accesses between the HS2 Airport station and Junction 6 of the M56 will accommodate future demand relating to the Strategic Road Network as a result of HS2,

NPR and committed local developments. It is evident that significant changes are needed to the highway works in this location. These should be agreed with the Council and the other affected local highway authorities.

- 5.17.2 The Council is further concerned about the fact that the local highway network will be used by approximately 1,000 HGVs per day during construction. This will have significant adverse impacts on the Airport, the local economy, residents, the highway network, and the environment.
- 5.17.3 MCC and GM partners have previously requested that HS2 Ltd. consider options to use rail to move a proportion of materials required to construct the Airport station and tunnel portal, to reduce the level of road-based construction traffic. As part of our petition, we will set out our expectation that HS2 Ltd. undertake a specific, comprehensive study on the use of a railhead system to transport materials to and from the Manchester Airport high speed station site, and, if supported by this study and a full environmental impact assessment, that an Additional Provision is promoted to provide for the use of a conveyor/ railhead system. We would expect that this work considers the impact on residents and maximises the legacy opportunities from the temporary rail links needed for the construction material.
- 5.17.4 Further information will also be requested on how vehicle parking numbers have been determined, to ensure the right level of provision at the Airport Station, which also considers the impact on congestion and zero-carbon policies, and policies to encourage travel by public transport and active modes.

5.18 **Other Potential Petitioning Issues: Impact on the West Coast Main Line (WCML)**

- 5.18.1 The hybrid Bill documents refer to over 60 potential weekend closures on different parts of the existing WCML during the construction of the HS2 Crewe-Manchester line. We believe that this will cause unacceptable disruption to passengers (over 9-years), especially given the trend for increased leisure rail travel following the Covid-19 pandemic. MCC's petition will seek further information on this and request that alternative options are looked at to minimise the disruption on rail passengers.

6.0 **Immediate Next Steps**

- 6.1.1 The immediate priority is for the formal response to the ES to be finalised and submitted by 31st March 2022.
- 6.1.2 Officers will continue to work on developing the Council's petition and the evidence to support it. The exact dates of the formal petitioning period are currently unknown, however when the period does start, the Council will have 25 days to submit its petition (objection) to the hybrid Bill.

7.0 **Next steps on the wider HS2 programme**

- 7.1 Table 3 below sets out the anticipated high-level timetable based on the latest information available.

Table 3: HS2 Phase 2b Hybrid Bill programme (estimated dates)

Key Activities	Timelines
hybrid Bill deposit (including Environmental Statement)	24 th January 2022
Environmental Statement Consultation	25 th January – 31 st March 2022
Second Reading/ Petitioning Period (inc. preparation time)	Mid-May – Summer 2022
Negotiations with HS2 Ltd	Summer - Autumn 2022
Select Committee Hearings (Commons)	Autumn 2022 – Winter 2023
Overall hybrid Bill parliamentary process	2022 – 2024/25
Royal Assent	Late 2024 / Early 2025
Construction	2025 – 2035
Testing and Commissioning	2035 – 2040
Operation	2040

Manchester Council, with GM Partners, will continue to work with HS2 Ltd. and DfT on the HS2 Phase 2b hybrid Bill to ensure that it delivers the maximum benefit to Manchester and GM.

8.0 Hybrid Bill – Conclusion

- 8.1 The City Council and partners have reiterated their strong support for HS2 and the station locations at Manchester Airport and Piccadilly Station. HS2 is vital in increasing the capacity and connectivity of Britain's rail network, and the combination of HS2 and NPR improvements can help deliver a transformational step-change in the connectivity of the North's major city regions, helping to underpin economic growth across the North of England and deliver levelling up.
- 8.2 However, there remain several concerns that still need to be resolved with the HS2 scheme as set out in the hybrid Bill, before the full benefits can be realised. As a result, the Council are proposing to petition certain elements of the hybrid Bill to ensure Manchester gets the right infrastructure for this once in a generation opportunity we need to future-proof our city and drive economic growth and levelling up.
- 8.3 Officers will continue working with HS2 Ltd., DfT, TfN and other partners on the design development during negotiations through and following the hybrid Bill process. It is important that MCC are engaged in detailed discussions over the designs of the new stations and associated infrastructure (including vents shafts) to minimise their impact on our residents, local communities and ensure seamless integration with their surroundings.
- 8.4 Recommendations appear at the front of the report.

9.0 Urgency of Decision

- 9.1 This report is considered to be 'urgent business' and as such the decision should be exempted from the 'call-in' process for the following reason(s):
- 9.2 There is an absolute deadline of 31st March for the submission of the response to the ES & EQIA. Calling in this decision puts the Council at risk of missing this deadline as if the decision were to be called-in there would be no further Economy Scrutiny Committee before 31st March and the Council would have missed its chance to make representations in respect of the effects the ES and EQIA would on the city the residents.

10.0 Key Policies and Considerations

(a) Equal Opportunities

- 10.1 HS2 and NPR, and the development of the areas surrounding the stations are anticipated to provide additional job opportunities available to residents and improved transport connections to those opportunities. As part of the GM Growth Strategy, a GM High Speed Rail Skills Strategy has been developed to ensure that residents are able to acquire the skills to access the jobs created, and work continues with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority to deliver this.

(b) Risk Management

- 10.2 The Council will work closely with Government, Transport for the North (TfN), TfGM and other partners to minimise risks arising from the design, construction and delivery of HS2, NPR and the GM Growth Strategy.

(c) Legal Considerations

- 10.3 The team are being supported by the city solicitor's department throughout the ES and hybrid Bill petition process.

This page is intentionally left blank

High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement and Equality Impact Assessment

Manchester City Council Consultation Response Summary

Table of contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1.	Background to the hybrid Bill, ES and EqIA	1
1.2.	Assessment of the ES and EqIA.....	1
1.3.	Manchester Context	2
1.4.	Key Issues.....	2
1.5.	Further engagement	3
2.	MCC comments on Volume 1: Introduction and Methodology.....	5
2.1.	Introduction.....	5
2.2.	The Proposed Scheme (Background to HS2 and Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation)	5
2.3.	Permanent Features.....	6
2.4.	Construction of the Proposed Scheme	8
2.5.	Environmental Impact Assessment	8
2.6.	Scope and Methodology Summary for Environmental Topics & Approach to Mitigation & Monitoring	9
2.7.	Strategic, route-wide and route corridor alternatives	16
3.	MCC Comments on Volume 2: MA06 (Hulseheath to Manchester Airport) community area report and map books	19
3.1.	Introduction.....	19
3.2.	Agriculture, Forestry and Soils.....	19
3.3.	Air Quality	19
3.4.	Community & Construction Impact.....	19
3.5.	Ecology and Biodiversity	20
3.6.	Health	21
3.7.	Historic Environment	21

3.8. Land Quality	21
3.9. Landscape and Visual	22
3.10. Socio-economics.....	22
3.11. Sound, Noise and Vibration	23
3.12. Traffic and Transport.....	23
3.13. Waste and Material Resources	24
3.14. Water Resource and Flood Risk	25
4. MCC comments on Volume 2 – MA07 (Davenport Green to Ardwick) community area report and map books	27
4.1. Introduction.....	27
4.2. Agriculture, Forestry and Soils.....	27
4.3. Air Quality	27
4.4. Community	28
4.5. Construction Management	29
4.6. Ecology and Biodiversity	29
4.7. Health	31
4.8. Historic Environment	32
4.9. Land Quality	33
4.10. Landscape and Visual.....	33
4.11. Socio-Economics	34
4.12. Sound, Noise and Vibration	34
4.13. Traffic and Transport.....	35
4.14. Waste and Material Resources	35
4.15. Water Resource and Flood Risk	36
4.16. Conclusion	36

5.	MCC comments on Volume 2 – MA08 (Manchester Piccadilly station) community area report and map books	38
5.1.	Introduction.....	38
5.2.	Agriculture, Forestry and Soils.....	38
5.3.	Air Quality.....	38
5.4.	Community	38
5.5.	Construction	39
5.6.	Ecology and Biodiversity	40
5.7.	Health.....	40
5.8.	Historic Environment	41
5.9.	Land Quality	42
5.10.	Landscape and Visual.....	42
5.11.	Socio-economics.....	46
5.12.	Sound, Noise and Vibration	46
5.13.	Traffic and Transport.....	47
5.14.	Waste and Material Resources	49
5.15.	Water Resource and Flood Risk	49
5.16.	Conclusion	49
6.	MCC comments on Volume 3 – Route-wide effects	51
6.1.	Traffic and Transport	51
7.	MCC comments on Volume 5 – Wider Effects Report.....	51
8.	MCC comments on supporting documents – Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).....	51
8.1.	General issues.....	51
8.2.	Specific issues.....	52

9.	Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA).....	55
9.1.	Introduction.....	55
9.2.	Scope and Methodology.....	55
9.3.	Stakeholder Engagement.....	56
9.4.	Accessibility.....	56
9.5.	Socio-Economic.....	56
9.6.	Conclusion.....	57



List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
CP1	Control Point 1
CP2	Control Point 2
CP3	Control Point 3
DfT	Department for Transport
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EQIA	Equalities Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
EZ	Enterprise Zone
GM	Greater Manchester
GMASS	Greater Manchester Archaeology Advisory Service
MCC	Greater Manchester Combined Authority
GMS	Greater Manchester Strategy
GMSF	Greater Manchester Spatial Framework
HS2	High Speed 2
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
LA	Local Authority
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MAG	Manchester Airport Group
MCC	Manchester City Council
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NIC	National Infrastructure Commission
NPEIR	Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review
NPR	Northern Powerhouse Rail
NTS	Non-Technical Summary
SRF	Strategic Regeneration Framework
TC	Trafford Council
TfGM	Transport for Greater Manchester
TfN	Transport for the North
WC	Wigan Council
WDEQIA	Working Draft Equalities Impact Assessment
WDES	Working Draft Environmental Statement



High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement and Equality Impact Assessment

Introduction

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the hybrid Bill, ES and EqIA

- 1.1.1. The High Speed 2 (HS2) Phase 2b: High Speed Rail Crewe to Manchester hybrid Bill was deposited in Parliament on 24 January 2022. The hybrid Bill was supported by an Environmental Statement (ES) and Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) produced by HS2 Ltd. Parliament opened a public consultation on the ES and EqIA on 25th January 2022 which closes on 31st March 2022.
- 1.1.2. The Environmental Statement (ES) is an assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the proposed HS2 railway, including the effects of construction and operation.
- 1.1.3. The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) considers the potential effects of the construction and operation of HS2 Phase 2b on people with protected characteristics and explains how HS2 Ltd. proposes to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects.
- 1.1.4. The Council intends to submit a formal response to these consultations. As part of our approach to reviewing these documents, the Council, has been working in partnership with Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), other GM Local Authorities and Manchester Airports Group in reviewing the ES and EqIA to ensure our local and regional responses are aligned appropriately.
- 1.1.5. This report provides a summary of the issues identified by the Council, so far, which are likely to be included in the Council's ES & EqIA responses. The Council's review of the ES & EqIA documents (which are over 30,000 pages) is ongoing.

1.2. Assessment of the ES and EqIA

- 1.2.1. Overall, we welcome the opportunity to comment on the ES and EqIA. However, there is a lack of detail on issues of major significance and clearly much more work needs to be done to satisfy the Council that the scheme has holistically considered all the impacts and mitigations that Manchester requires during and after construction. There are a significant number of areas of concern which we will raise as part of the Council's response to the ES. We will also continue to press HS2 Ltd. and DfT to work with the City Council and our GM Partners on the gaps that have been identified.
- 1.2.2. Officers will continue working with the Department for Transport (DfT) HS2 Ltd. and Transport for the North (TfN), and other partners, on the detailed design development of the proposed scheme. We will continue to argue for world class, fully integrated stations with a "build it once, build it right" approach.

1.3. Manchester Context

- 1.3.1. The Council has continually supported the introduction of HS2 and NPR and the provision of stations at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport. We believe these schemes are vital to increasing the capacity and connectivity improvements needed to Britain's rail network and have the capacity to deliver a transformational step-change in the connectivity of the North's major regions, helping to underpin economic growth across the North and the UK.
- 1.3.2. However, we have consistently retained a clear position on the need to ensure that the schemes are delivered in a manner that fully complements the connectivity, place-making, local employment, and sustainable growth objectives in the Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) and the Greater Manchester HS2 and NPR Growth Strategy.

1.4. Key Issues

- 1.4.1. As part of the Council and GM partners' ongoing work with HS2 Ltd. on development of the scheme, a series of 'critical issues' have been identified and these have been regularly raised and discussed with HS2 Ltd. and DfT and have been the subject of formal responses to previous consultations on the Phase 2b route. The critical issues relate to areas of major concern for the city and GM Partners and are issues which are fundamental to the success of HS2 Phase 2b in Manchester and GM. As covered in the main report, the critical issues form a substantial base for the Council's intended petition against specific aspects of the hybrid Bill.
- 1.4.2. The critical issues are set out in more detail in the main report and are summarised below:
- The design of **Manchester Piccadilly station** as a surface, turn back station, as opposed to an underground, through station, which could provide greater capacity, reliability, resilience, future proofing and passenger experience and result in a reduced land take.
 - The **retention of Gateway House**, which inhibits connectivity to the rest of the city centre and fails to provide a suitable entrance and arrival point to the city at the Manchester Piccadilly HS2 station.
 - The extent of **highways infrastructure proposed at Piccadilly**, which are overly large, would unduly encourage car travel and increase pollution, sever areas of the city, and do not allow for active travel.
 - The level and location of **car parking proposed at Manchester Piccadilly**, which is too high and not in keeping with the adjacent station's role as a city centre public transport hub, unnecessarily encourages car travel, and takes up prime development land.
 - The need for a **multi-modal interchange** which provides bus and coach parking facilities.

- The proposed **access to a new ramp for Network Rail maintenance**, which routes traffic through the Mayfield development, having an unacceptably negative impact.
 - **Inadequate integration of, and powers for, Metrolink** at both Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport. The location of the proposed **Metrolink turnback at New Islington** rather than our preferred site at Velopark, and the proposal to sever the Ashton line for two years.
 - The **relocation of the ‘North Block’ facilities** above the relay room at Manchester Piccadilly, which are likely to extend the disruption to local residents.
 - The proposed location of the **ventilation shaft and headhouse** on the Fallowfield Road Retail Park on Birchfields Road, and the need to provide adequate flood storage required for the proposed Palatine Road ventilation shaft.
 - An **inappropriate design for highways access to Manchester Airport Station** at Junction 6 of the M56, which does not take into account future demand from NPR services, planned development and Airport growth.
 - The **level of construction traffic** proposed and the need for consideration of measures to enable materials to be removed using rail at Manchester Airport.
- 1.4.3. A review of the hybrid Bill document has confirmed that the Council’s critical issues have not been resolved within the hybrid Bill design. The ES and EqIA response provides an opportunity to highlight environmental concerns the Council and GM partners have with the current hybrid Bill design, in the context of the overall critical issues.
- 1.5. Further engagement**
- 1.5.1. Through the Council’s response to the ES and EqIA we will seek the opportunity to engage further with Government and HS2 Ltd. to resolve issues of concern.



High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement

Chapter 1

MCC Comments on Volume 1

2. MCC comments on Volume 1: Introduction and Methodology

2.1. Introduction

- 2.1.1. The following section sets out MCC comments on Volume 1: Introduction and Methodology in terms of its purpose and presentation. MCC comments on the specific technical scope and methods are provided in detail in other sections of this report and are therefore not repeated here. As such the MCC response should be read as a whole.
- 2.1.2. Volume 1: Introduction and Methodology presents a technical summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the need for an EIA and the role of this as part of the hybrid Bill. It also summarises the description of the development, the location and its characteristics, evolution of the development design and alternatives considered and introduces the scope and methods used for individual topics assessed as part of the EIA.
- 2.1.3. However, whilst Volume 1 provides high-level summary of the EIA, it also includes statements which rely on technical assessments.
- 2.1.4. On the basis of our review, our response concludes that insufficient detail on the technical scope and methods, the Proposed Scheme design commitments, and the consultation and engagement undertaken to date has been provided to enable an appropriate assessment of the Proposed Scheme. That is due to the high-level nature of the document and the lack of background information provided.

2.2. The Proposed Scheme (Background to HS2 and Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation)

- 2.2.1. Volume 1, Section 2 provides a list of milestones of the Proposed Scheme development and outlines the need for them within the location selected, including opportunities for faster journeys between London Euston and Manchester Piccadilly and more employment and trading opportunities.
- 2.2.2. Whilst MCC welcomes the opportunities for local employment, no evidence is provided on the proportions of local employment or confirmation on how the estimated construction jobs will be accommodated from the supply chain. MCC would welcome the opportunity to engage with HS2 Ltd. to discuss the local requirements for construction employment and seek to secure the training opportunities provided by HS2 Ltd. to allow for local employment to be secured at the scale required.
- 2.2.3. Volume 1, Section 3 lists how and when engagement was undertaken on the design and assessment of the Proposed Scheme, and the Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES), and parties involved in the process.

- 2.2.4. However, this section does not provide any specific detail of the main issues raised via consultation nor on how the main issues pertinent to the EIA have been considered.
- 2.2.5. Whilst some engagement has taken place with MCC and GM Partners since the WDES consultation, this has been limited and high level. MCC and the GM Partners have been disappointed at the detail provided and feel that further meaningful engagement is needed, particularly in terms of understanding the outcome of impact assessments and developing mitigation measures.
- 2.2.6. MCC and GM Partners reiterate the importance of a truly collaborative approach to the delivery of the HS2 proposals, particularly where there are major interfaces between schemes and developments. Failure to work effectively in a joined up, transparent manner will significantly increase cost, programme risk and disruption caused of the HS2 programme, and will impact on the ability of the scheme to provide a fully integrated solution which can fully deliver the benefits and opportunities anticipated.
- 2.2.7. MCC has welcomed the opportunity to engage with HS2, albeit this has been limited, to develop the design of the Proposed Scheme to ensure that it is integrated with the wider Manchester and Greater Manchester aspirations. However, there are a number of areas where proposals do not currently achieve this, as set out in our response to the WDES and other Phase 2b consultation responses.
- 2.2.8. MCC would request that HS2 demonstrate records to identify how/when stakeholders were approached or consulted directly. In addition, MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. provide an engagement strategy which details the ongoing strategy for engagement and consultation with the stakeholders, local communities and organisations / businesses impacted by the Proposed Scheme. This process is expected to be ongoing prior to the construction phase and during the construction works.

2.3. **Permanent Features**

- 2.3.1. The Permanent Features of the Proposed Scheme section sets out nine design principles, within the parameters of being cost effective and sustainable and respecting the operational and maintenance requirements of a high-speed railway. It also offers overview descriptions across different categories.
- 2.3.2. It is of significant note that only one of the nine design principles relates to *“the natural world”*, i.e., that the proposals should *“demonstrate a commitment to the natural world”*.

- 2.3.3. It should also be noted that the statements in this section are very generalised, making it difficult to provide specific comments. Key issues in this section include the following.
- 2.3.4. Reference is made to “The Green Corridor”, to reduce and compensate for the impacts of constructing the railway, including the creation of wildlife habitat, screened spaces, footpaths and bridleways, as well as additional funds to help stakeholders adjacent to the route to carry out green infrastructure projects. No specific details are provided in respect of the MCC area. MCC request that HS2 engage with MCC and other local partners to ensure that such additional funds are allocated to environmental projects of benefit to local communities.
- 2.3.5. HS2 state that relevant design standards and guidance will be considered during the detailed design stages. MCC seek confirmation from HS2 that they will rigorously apply current and future design standards and guidance, including for highway capacity and levels of operation, both during and following construction.
- 2.3.6. The heights, and therefore impact, of structures such as embankments and viaducts are under-stated, in that they are only measured to the top of the rail, and do not take into account the additional heights of overhead line equipment, telecommunications masts, noise fence barriers, or the trains themselves. MCC request confirmation from HS2 that their assessment of visual impacts has gauged the impacts arising from the full heights of the permanent installations rather than just the heights of viaducts and embankments.
- 2.3.7. This section describes how the quantity of surplus excavated material is not known at present, which casts doubt on the assessments for the traffic movements associated with its removal.
- 2.3.8. It is stated that land used only for construction purposes will be restored as agreed with the owner of the land and the relevant planning authority once the construction works are complete. MCC seeks clarification on who the “*relevant planning authority*” is, and clarity on whether they will have a role in conditioning or approving schemes to restore construction land.
- 2.3.9. The timing of compensation for, or replacement or enhancement of resources adversely affected during construction, such as habitat for wildlife species, needs to be carefully considered to avoid a detrimental impact on wildlife species. MCC requires confirmation from HS2 that necessary habitat replacement and creation is undertaken prior to disturbing sensitive habitats.
- 2.3.10. A description is given of how the design of stations will integrate with local development plans and strategies, but there is no indication that the traffic or pedestrian flows associated with such future strategies have been included within the assessments. MCC request clarification on this matter.

2.4. Construction of the Proposed Scheme

- 2.4.1. MCC sees the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) as a cornerstone document to support minimising disruption during the delivery of the Proposed Scheme. MCC concerns regarding the CoCP are set out later in this document.
- 2.4.2. Engagement with MCC on the development of the Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMPs) in Manchester is essential. MCC would request that HS2 set out the quality management arrangements for LEMPs, in particular if there are areas that MCC feel a LEMP does not adequately address.

2.5. Environmental Impact Assessment

- 2.5.1. Section 7 of Volume 1 provides a staged overview of the EIA, with the aim of providing an objective and systematic account of the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development and identify how these are used throughout the EIA.
- 2.5.2. It is noted that no further refinements to the scope and methodology since the publication of the working draft in 2018 have been made.
- 2.5.3. Further information and clarification are required on the following issues:
- If assessments were based on local policies and baseline information, and the extent to which stakeholders were engaged as part of the baseline gathering.
 - A breakdown of the Proposed Scheme, in addition to justification on why any phases of development are omitted.
 - The selection criteria for committed developments and the potential zone of influence chosen for individual topic chapters, and how any future developments will be considered, including the cut off point for further assessment for updating any cumulative assessment.
 - Information on the geographical scope of the cumulative assessment (route-wide or community area) i.e. whether topic sections include a cumulative assessment, and if those cumulative assessments include interactions between the Proposed Scheme and other projects. HS2 are requested to explain and justify where cumulative assessments are not undertaken in any topic section.
 - That where surveys have not been carried out, and assumptions used, that additional information and supplementary assessment in the form of a revised ES will be deposited to Parliament, further consultation is undertaken.

2.6. Scope and Methodology Summary for Environmental Topics & Approach to Mitigation & Monitoring

Agriculture, Forestry and Soils

2.6.1. Further clarification is required on:

- What business impacts are covered in this chapter and to what extent they are covered in other topics.
- Primary functions for soil other than for supporting food production (e.g., flood water attenuation and carbon storage)

Air Quality (AQ)

- 2.6.2. The AQ monitoring does not appear to have taken into account the GM Clean Air Plan (CAP), approved in July, within the assessment. MCC would request that justification is provided regarding the omission of the CAP monitoring data, and any further assessment should include the CAP monitoring data within any baseline review or modelling works where appropriate.
- 2.6.3. MCC would request details in relation to modelling of ventilation and intervention shafts (if required) within the stretch of tunnelled railway.
- 2.6.4. Whilst it is noted that electric locomotives will be used during the operational phase, no reference has been made regarding non-exhaust pollutant emissions. MCC would therefore request that emissions caused by sources such as braking and friction between wheels and the tracks, are considered within the assessment.
- 2.6.5. Design Manual for Road and Bridges (DMRB) guidance has been used to inform where further air quality assessment is required, rather than Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), as required in GM. DMRB guidance appears to be more conservative, and hence more extensive assessment may be required. E.g., this could result in an underestimation of affected roads, and therefore of potential impacts as a result of the Proposed Scheme. MCC request that HS2 Ltd. address the requirements of the locally required guidance.
- 2.6.6. The air quality assessment has included future year background concentrations sourced from DEFRA's background mapping database, for the construction year of 2025 and operational year of 2030 (background concentrations are not available beyond 2030). The use of these background concentrations does not represent worst-case predictions and may result in significant underpredictions of future concentrations. MCC would therefore request that HS2 Ltd. identify this as a significant limitation and consider appropriate mitigation for effects which may be considered more significant than assessed at this stage.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.7. Only permitted crushing, screening, concrete batching plant shall be used within compounds.
- 2.6.8. Mitigation will be implemented to ensure negligible impact of dust throughout the entirety of each phase of construction.
- 2.6.9. The CoCP states that exemptions will be sought by HS2 for plant and machinery that is not compliant with Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan (CAP) and Clean Air Zone (CAZ), however, it should be noted that exemptions within the CAP and CAZ will be statutory, and thus additional exemptions cannot be applied for. All plant and machinery used within the construction phase of the development should be compliant with the CAP and CAZ.

Climate Change

- 2.6.10. A three-staged assessment was undertaken in relation to climate change, including Greenhouse Gas emissions, In-combination Climate Change Impacts and Climate Change Resilience. It is however not made clear whether similar methodologies for identifying effects was applied for the three assessments.
- 2.6.11. It is noted that de-construction is excluded from the assessment of Greenhouse Gases (GHG) which is understood given the long-life of the Proposed Scheme. However, further assumptions are required to identify any assets which may have a shorter timescale than the 120-year lifecycle assumed, e.g., if any assets are required to be demolished and replaced within the 120-year lifecycle or for the destruction of the rolling stock which is replaced every 30 years, and whether the GHG emissions associated with those have been taken into account.
- 2.6.12. MCC note that a cumulative assessment was not undertaken for the GHG section of the climate change assessment, and MCC requests that this assessment is either included or a justification for scoping this out be provided.
- 2.6.13. Employment estimates are for 6,060 FTE based at the proposed construction compounds and the travel associated with those is considered significant in respect to the potential GHG emissions. MCC would request that these are included in the lifecycle assessment. Areas of concern are compounds located in proximity to J6 of the M56 and Manchester city centre where transport related issues are identified to be the most significant. MCC would also request that HS2 justify the exclusion of plant transportation to and from construction compounds.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.14. MCC would expect the operational phase of the development to commit to the use of 100% green energy for HS2 assets.
- 2.6.15. MCC have welcomed for proposals for carbon capture and request clarification on the planting strategy in relation to planting timing and locations.

Community

- 2.6.16. A summary of the topic scope is provided in Volume 1. Given the high-level information provided, MCC's comments on the specific technical scope and methods are provided in detail in other sections of this report and are therefore not repeated here.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.17. Appropriate mitigation, compensation and support will be required for residents, businesses, and community groups whose properties are significantly impacted.
- 2.6.18. Support through an agency service to assist existing businesses to find suitable alternative premises should be offered to all impact businesses, and not just where HS2 Ltd. consider there to be 'sufficient demand'.
- 2.6.19. MCC request that HS2 Ltd. provide a Community Task Force established with a remit to specifically consider and address community issues, including the agreement of appropriate mitigation, compensation or re-provision of community services and facilities.
- 2.6.20. Where compulsory purchase is required, MCC expect a definitive commitment to providing a longer notice period than the minimum three-month period specified in the Bill to notify businesses who are to be displaced. A minimum 12-month notice period should be committed to.
- 2.6.21. Landowners and impacted business owners are being provided 3-hours access to funded, initial independent advice and signposted to services to assist their understanding of their rights to compensation and to recover costs associated to any such claims for compensation. This needs to be directly requested by the business / landowner to HS2 Ltd. More engagement and outreach should be provided to local businesses to make them aware of this support in a timely way

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 2.6.22. MCC expect HS2 to deliver smarter and bolder in relation to ecological mitigation. The UK Government has now made a [policy commitment](#) to aim to deliver a net gain in biodiversity on this phase of HS2.
- 2.6.23. MCC has key concerns including habitat loss, fragmentation, and isolation through land loss but also due to the duration of construction disruption.

- 2.6.24. The ES does not consider the importance of trees of note (for example significant numbers of highway trees will be affected in MA07/MA08) that are not veteran trees but are important landscape features.
- 2.6.25. MCC have concerns regarding the potential impacts during both construction and operation phases with reference to movement of non-native invasive species (such as Japanese Knotweed) being imported into Manchester from the rail network.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.26. MCC would like to see species action plans developed for supporting the delivery of the new Manchester Biodiversity Strategy and Nature Recovery Network.

Historic Environment

- 2.6.27. The impact on all Grade II Listed Buildings has been assessed as “moderate” rather than “high” significance. The result is the downgrading of impact, with a resulting lack of required mitigation. HS2 Ltd. must identify this as a significant limitation and consider appropriate mitigation for effects which may be considered more significant than assessed at this stage.
- 2.6.28. MCC are concerned with the lack of agreement regarding the baseline of affected designated and non-designated heritage assets with heritage stakeholders. As such, MCC have concern that a number of heritage assets have been missed from the assessment.
- 2.6.29. There is concern that not all areas required for construction have been adequately assessed due to access, particularly in more rural areas.
- 2.6.30. Non-designated heritage assets have been identified on some but omitted from others. This inconsistency provides an opportunity for error in assessment. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. provide reasoning for this.

Electromagnetic Interference

- 2.6.31. The scope and methodology of the electromagnetic interference (EMI) assessment is based on desktop modelling, therefore MCC would request that real-world baseline and post-construction/operational surveys are undertaken at dwellings/receptor sites closest to the route of the Proposed Scheme to verify the desktop modelling of electromagnetic field (EMF) emissions undertaken for the ES.
- 2.6.32. Tower cranes can cause temporary interference to TV reception during the construction phase. The locations where this could occur should be identified and highlighted. Interference zones determined by direction of signal transmission (for terrestrial and satellite TV) should also be outlined.

Land Quality

- 2.6.33. Please see the comments in the construction section on-site investigations, the temporary railhead and noise control embankments. This can be found in the code of construction practice section – 8.2.4.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.34. MCC expect that detailed remediation strategies/options appraisals will be produced by HS2 following site investigation works to determine the most appropriate remedial technique.

Landscape and Visual

- 2.6.35. The ES does not describe how, post completion, the landscape elements of the construction areas will be reinstated as part of the mitigation.

Major Accidents and Disasters

- 2.6.36. All identified risk events and all mitigation is included, but given the lack of detail, context, timeframes, and stakeholders, there is no assurance that these measures will be implemented appropriately and that stakeholders will have sufficient oversight of these proceedings.

Socio-economics

- 2.6.37. The ES assumes that 88% of the business occupiers displaced by the scheme will successfully relocate to alternative locations and no employment will be lost, while the other 12% of occupiers will close rather than relocate. It is noted that this assumption was based on the research into the relocation of companies and jobs on account of the London 2012 Olympic Games. The London-based case study does not represent an appropriate base case for the Crewe to Manchester route, and this should be reassessed.

2.6.38. Mitigation:

- 2.6.39. It is acknowledged that a significant number of facilities, businesses and properties are identified as being required to be demolished at a route-wide level. MCC would expect the detailed design to limit the loss of property as far as possible.

- 2.6.40. MCC would wish to seek financial compensation for the loss of any part of its business rate income caused by the development of the HS2 route within the city that has been demonstrated to cause businesses to fail or had a significant impact on their income. It is not expected that MCC should bear the financial consequences to the detriment of its residents and businesses.

- 2.6.41. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. identify the percentage of the potential employment opportunities to be required at a local level to determine the

potential impacts on the current supply chain. MCC would wish to work with HS2 Ltd. to establish a brokerage and skills support approach for equipping the needs of HS2 during the construction and operational stages, to enable maximum advantage to local residents.

Sound, Noise & Vibration

- 2.6.42. It is considered that the transitory nature of works does not justify the scoping out of vibratory rollers or pneumatic breakers, particularly given the duration of these works, which we anticipate could start during the first phase of construction works and continue intermittently throughout the works.
- 2.6.43. Paragraph 8.14.28 (Vol 1, Page 204) makes mention of diesel-powered specialist engineering trains undertaking maintenance from 00:00-05:00. It is assumed that the trains will be operated so that any adverse noise levels are no greater than for night-time passenger services. While it is understood a full assessment of these vehicles may not be possible at this time, MCC considers it insufficient to assume the vehicles will not exceed these limits without any evidence, given the sensitivity of operational hours.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.44. It is currently unclear whether additional mitigation is proposed (outside of the embedded mitigation incorporated into the design). There is also no assessment on the residual impacts, and as such it is unclear how effective any proposed mitigation is.
- 2.6.45. More narrative would be beneficial to understand how the benefits per mitigation type are balanced across the various disciplines (i.e. what are the main determining factors when prescribing mitigation?).
- 2.6.46. MCC questions the proposed timetable for the selection and dissemination of information regarding mitigation measures to relevant Local Authorities.
- 2.6.47. MCC would welcome an explanation of the justification for the screening out of potential noise impacts associated with operational road traffic. It appears that changes to the road layout are considered but it is not clear whether the assessment includes operational phase traffic associated with the Proposed Scheme (if required).
- 2.6.48. The ES states that during construction and operational phases, noise and/or vibration monitoring shall be attached to moving vehicles. MCC do not believe that this will be useful in determining potential environmental noise and vibration impacts given the significant uncertainty regarding environmental conditions and from a noise environment surrounding a moving source.
- 2.6.49. An assumption is made that in practice, noise barriers may differ from the general performance assumption, while maintaining the required acoustic

performance. Clarity is needed on the method used to ensure variations on general assumptions remain valid.

- 2.6.50. MCC would welcome the justification for day-time and night-time noise trigger levels used, as well as the 20 times per night metric, as these do not appear to correspond to guidance outlined within 'The Noise Insulation (Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems) Regulations 1996', as stated in the ES.
- 2.6.51. It is noted that the draft CoCP provides provisions for rehoming, noise insulation and/or compensation to minimise impacts from noise due to construction. While this is welcomed by MCC, it is requested that a scheme of works is drafted as a priority, for meeting noise insulation requirements.

Traffic and Transport

- 2.6.52. MCC have no comments in relation to the scope and methodology summary provided in Volume 1, as the specific impacts of traffic and transport are considered in more detail in other sections.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.53. Mitigation for construction and operational traffic is not sufficient – the methodology used is too simplistic and doesn't sufficiently recognise the scale of the impact and consequently doesn't identify suitable measures.
- 2.6.54. Beyond provision of junction improvements to provide direct access to the stations, HS2 have not proposed any mitigation for locations where they have identified the Proposed Scheme will have impacts on traffic flows and bus delays on the wider road network.

Waste and Material Resources

- 2.6.55. Waste and Materials Resources are considered as a route wide effect with no consideration given to individual areas. The assessment considers the impact of the off-site disposal of solid waste to landfill. However, MCC request further information as to why a similar assessment has not been undertaken for treatment capacity.
- 2.6.56. There is no consideration of the practicalities and realities of the movement of waste as it is unlikely waste will be disposed at a significant distance from the place of production.
- 2.6.57. The ES suggests that it is the responsibility of Waste Planning Authorities to provide sufficient waste infrastructure and future capacity. Further detail and engagement on this with Waste Planning Authorities is necessary.
- 2.6.58. The statement that "*The disposal of 10,000,000 tonnes per annum of inert waste represents approximately 100% of the total inert landfill capacity in the Northwest region*" is a significant concern. MCC would request more

information on estimated levels of inert waste over the lifetime of the project to allow Waste Planning Authorities to understand capacity requirements.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.59. Mitigation for the impacts identified within the document are for the sustainable use of materials and reuse within the wider works. Whilst there are references to the circular economy and the waste hierarchy, there are no commitments to targets for diversion from landfill other than that they will be explored through detailed design. This is considered insufficient.

Water Resources and Flood Risk

- 2.6.60. Construction monitoring does not outline the approach to managing flood events during construction for both the site and off-site impacts. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. provide reasoning for this.
- 2.6.61. Climate change has been assessed based on February 2016 guidance. Guidance has been revised twice since this time which will now be more representative of catchment characteristics, and this needs to be addressed.

Mitigation:

- 2.6.62. Application of the Higher (H++) climate change allowance within hydraulic modelling for the stage is deemed appropriate. However, at the detailed stage, it would be expected that a wider suite of return periods is modelled using the Central allowance so exceedance events and less frequent flood events can be better understood for designs.
- 2.6.63. The process to determine appropriate options to manage watercourse diversions or the routing above or below the new line appears to be inconsistent. A clear understanding and rationale of how options have been selected and discounted is required to demonstrate that a sequential and consistent approach has been taken is required.
- 2.6.64. Surface water flood risks have not been taken into account at this stage. A detailed understanding of surface water risks, flow routes and new risks created by the line will require a detailed assessment at the next stage.

2.7. Strategic, route-wide and route corridor alternatives

- 2.7.1. Volume 1, Section 10, sets out the alternatives considered during the development of the Proposed Scheme, under four categories - strategic alternatives, route wide rail alternatives, route corridor alternatives and local alternatives. However, the Alternatives Report does not provide sufficient detail to describe or allow consideration of the alternatives sifting and decision-making process, nor does it seek any ES consultation response.

- 2.7.2. From the evidence provided, it appears that the latest proposals do not always represent the best option as derived from the sifting process. The report does not invite comment from consultees, and it seems that the decisions have been taken on an inconsistent basis.
- 2.7.3. For example, in relation to traffic around M56 Junction 6, HS2 acknowledge that the traffic volumes upon which they based their decision making on access to the Airport Station were only one third of the actual traffic forecast, yet the original decision has been retained. MCC require that adequate modelling be shared to demonstrate the adequacy of the proposals and to confirm the validity of the decision making on alternatives.

High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement

Chapter 2

MCC Comments on Volume 2: MA06 (Hulseheath to Manchester Airport) community area report and map books

3. MCC Comments on Volume 2: MA06 (Hulseheath to Manchester Airport) community area report and map books

3.1. Introduction

- 3.1.1. This is an area of land between the River Bollin and the M56, as well as the westbound carriageway of the M56 in the City Council's boundary.
- 3.1.2. Proposed work includes: a viaduct over the River Bollin a balancing pond for railway drainage; an embankment, a cutting at Halebank, closure and realignment of Sunbank Lane and other footpaths; a box tunnel under the M56, the redesign of M56 Junction 6 and improvements to the existing road network around the proposed Airport Station.
- 3.1.3. It includes a four platform Airport HS2 Station and associated access, servicing, and parking. These lie within Trafford Council's administrative boundary, although the proposal impacts on both Manchester and Trafford Council areas.
- 3.1.4. In this area, the scheme will provide a connection between HS2 and a future NPR route between Manchester and Liverpool via the Manchester Airport High Speed station. Manchester Airport is located to the south-east of the proposed HS2 Station at Manchester Airport.

3.2. Agriculture, Forestry and Soils

- 3.2.1. MCC have no comments on this section in MA06.

3.3. Air Quality

- 3.3.1. Two 'slight' adverse, not significant, impacts are predicted during the construction phase traffic assessment.
- 3.3.2. MCC require HS2 to undertake further review and assessment prior to any works, to inform an Air Quality Action Plan outlining all mitigation measures as required.

3.4. Community & Construction Impact

- 3.4.1. The Ringway area will experience significant and prolonged amenity, environmental and traffic disruption impacts associate with their proximity to the proposed route, as well as multiple construction compounds in the area and road closures. MCC require HS2 to provide greater details of mitigation for construction activity across these areas, alongside early notification of residents for any disruption to be caused. This should include permanent landscaping with acoustic barriers offered to the properties closest to the construction activity. Noise Insulation is proposed for residents at Sunbank Lane such as additional glazing to windows glazing.

- 3.4.2. In addition, the impact of the Sunbank Lane satellite compound on the Ringway community has not been appropriately and fully mitigated for, both in terms of impacts upon their amenity and in respect of visual impacts.
- 3.4.3. The loss of five residential properties and permanent impacts upon the amenity of 10 further residential properties will occur in Ringways, Sunbank Lane.
- 3.4.4. Major highway works at M56 Junction 6 would be expected to cause significant traffic impacts, and this needs to be mitigated.
- 3.4.5. The M56 East Satellite Compound, Manchester Airport High Speed Station North and South Satellite compounds and the Manchester Airport High Speed Station Main Compound will each be accessed via the A538 creating substantial traffic disruption, which again must be mitigated.
- 3.4.6. A number of public footpath closures and diversions would be required, affecting footpaths in Ringway. HS2 need to provide replacement footpath routes where existing routes would be impacted.
- 3.4.7. The closure of Sunbank Lane is not acceptable given the duration (6yrs 3 months) and 2.8km increase in journey distance for the alternative route. MCC requests that HS2 re-assess proposed diversions and consider providing a route adjacent to the construction route which would provide direct access for pedestrians.
- 3.4.8. The cycle facilities at the New Airport Access junction are not provided to current standards.

3.5. Ecology and Biodiversity

- 3.5.1. MCC note the impact on the River Bollin in Manchester. MCC require HS2 Ltd. to ensure protection and enhancement of key strategic green infrastructure assets.
- 3.5.2. Ponds located within MA06 will be permanently lost. Mitigation plans do not show the creation of the 2 for 1 pond replacement policy.
- 3.5.3. Native woodland planting should include ground flora not just saplings.
- 3.5.4. MCC note that within MA06 it is proposed to create 5.2ha of species rich and marshy grassland in response to the loss of grassland in three locations: south of Ashlar, east of the River Bollin and south of Davenport Green Wood.
- 3.5.5. MCC note there will be a high loss of hedgerow resulting in a permanent adverse residual effect.
- 3.5.6. Bats of regional importance have been identified within MA06. Loss of foraging habitat for the bats will be addressed by the provision of hedgerows. Given the

high loss of hedgerows in the area and the lack of compensation for these losses, it is unclear whether compensation provided will be sufficient.

- 3.5.7. The impact on the arm of Sunbank Wood Site of Biological Importance (SBI) is unclear. As well as the direct loss of habitat the arm could be permanently isolated from the rest of Sunbank Wood. This is due to the transition from viaduct to embankment, which occurs directly in the woodland. HS2 have given no consideration to the impacts during the construction period.
- 3.5.8. It is not clear once construction is completed how connected the woodland near Chapel Lane SBI/Hennersley Bank AWI will be to Sunbank Wood SBI. While HS2 crosses the Bollin on a viaduct, the route appears to become an embankment at the location of the arm of Sunbank Wood.

3.6. Health

- 3.6.1. MCC welcome the presence of a High-Speed station providing employment opportunities with direct operational employment and training at Manchester Airport.
- 3.6.2. However, HS2 Lt. have not provided adequate mitigation for all health-related impacts. MCC require HS2 to provide appropriate mitigation for loss of any community facility.
- 3.6.3. Safe cycle routes are not in place to take cyclists all the way to the proposed cycle parking at the HS2 Manchester Airport station. MCC require HS2 Ltd. to ensure protected cycle routes continue fully into the proposed cycle parking. HS2 Ltd. should also ensure that cycle parking is undercover, closest to the station/platforms, easy to find, and include a direct, undercover route to the station concourse and storage and changing facilities.
- 3.6.4. MCC has concern that demolition of residential properties and relocation of residents could potentially reduce the beneficial health and social networks gained through social contact around Sunbank lane.
- 3.6.5. The increase in HGV traffic and changes to the noise & visual environment will lead to reduced levels of satisfaction with the local environment.

3.7. Historic Environment

- 3.7.1. The ES does not detail the noise and vibration mitigation, and therefore, an assessment on the impact on historic landscape has not been carried out.
- 3.7.2. MCC require HS2 Ltd. to undertake further analysis of the River Bollin East Viaduct as a requirement.

3.8. Land Quality

- 3.8.1. MCC understand that potentially contaminated spoil from the tunnelling process is likely to be stored and processed at South Manchester Portal Tunnelling Compound. HS2 Ltd. need to make clear how these soils will be transported and managed.

3.9. **Landscape and Visual**

- 3.9.1. There is insufficient information about vegetation lost due to construction. The land potentially required for construction covers a broad area and there is no indication of trees, some of which are ancient woodland, hedgerows and grassland lost.
- 3.9.2. MCC disagree with the effect upon the landscape of the River Bollin Broad Urban Fringe. HS2 will cross via the River Bollin East Viaduct and carve a large cutting through the area. MCC are concerned that the findings are understated and are likely to be significant. As a result, the River Bollin Broad Urban Fringe should have been considered in more detail.
- 3.9.3. The viewpoint from Yew Tree House on Sunbank Lane requires that HS2 provide landscape works in the vicinity of the new turning access adjacent to proposed balancing pond off Sunbank Lane to the west of Yewtree House, close to FP13.
- 3.9.4. Viewpoint from Sunbank Lane by Keepers Cottage requires that HS2 should ensure that the large compound areas to north (adjacent to Yew Tree House) are to be reinstated with hedgerows, trees and pastoral fields.
- 3.9.5. The Manchester Tunnel South Portal Main Compound will result in the loss of extensive areas of scrub, trees, hedgerows, rough grassland and an extensive, informal network of footpaths. MCC require HS2 to increase the proposed depth/quantity of planting adjacent to the tunnel portal and associated pumping station and storage tank.

3.10. **Socio-economics**

- 3.10.1. MCC require that HS2 Ltd. consider using the Census 2021 datasets for any strategies prepared after April 2022 to ensure that the latest information is used.
- 3.10.2. Approximately 1,480 FTE staff will be required within MA06 during the construction phase. MCC require that HS2 Ltd. work with local partners on a recruitment strategy to ensure as many as possible are locally employed. MCC further request that HS2 Ltd. identify the potential impacts on the current supply chain.
- 3.10.3. The Holiday Inn Express at Manchester Airport is dependent on its prominent location adjacent to the Airport and the M56, along with its customer parking provision, however the sensitivity of the hotel is considered to be medium. The

Holiday Inn Express should be the same sensitivity level as the Manchester Airport during the construction phase.

- 3.10.4. 320 jobs are expected to be displaced or lost as a direct result of the HS2 scheme. This is considered by HS2 to be minor in the context of the total number of people employed in the area. The businesses impacted should be compensated along with MCC for loss of business rates.

3.11. **Sound, Noise and Vibration**

- 3.11.1. Piling may be required and is expected to be a significant source of noise and vibration around the Airport Station.
- 3.11.2. It is not currently clear how construction impact criteria are being applied. Businesses / residents could experience major impacts for extended periods but are not eligible for noise insulation. Some of the works near to these receptors will be ongoing for 40-50 months.
- 3.11.3. Noise Levels at Keepers Cottage, Thorley Lane and Ringway are predicted to exceed daytime triggers, however no mitigation measures are proposed.

3.12. **Traffic and Transport**

- 3.12.1. The scale of the junction and highway infrastructure for Manchester Airport is not appropriate. HS2 should ensure that the highway infrastructure around Manchester Airport is fit for purpose.
- 3.12.2. HS2's traffic modelling assessment at the airport does not consider the cumulative effects of development around the area for HS2 and future NPR traffic demand. It is, therefore, considered that the HS2 proposals to deliver only an upgrade to M56 J6 is not adequate and will require subsequent further works that will be highly disruptive to the operation of the HS2 station and surrounding Strategic Road Network.
- 3.12.3. All highway improvements and mitigations must be supported by robust highway modelling, and this is currently not the case
- 3.12.4. There is no evidence of a M56 and M60 link assessment. This section of the motorway around M56 J6 already suffers from insufficient capacity.
- 3.12.5. The proximity of the HS2 alignment to M56 J6, and the proposed design for the 'operational' junction layout, highly constrain the ability to increase road capacity should it be required in the future.
- 3.12.6. The M56 tunnel requires the existing M56 to be diverted onto a temporary alignment and then switched back to its original alignment at the end of construction. This will cause 4+ years of disruption to a critical part of the strategic motorway network. HS2 need to justify this against the alternative of building a new alignment for the M56 'offline' to minimise disruption.

- 3.12.7. The proposed access to the HS2 Manchester Airport station diverts the A538 into a gyratory. This lengthens journey times for all vehicles including buses.
- 3.12.8. The HS2 provision for cycle parking (300 spaces) at Airport Station is inadequate (Cambridge station has 2,800 spaces) and does not support active travel policy objectives. There is no distinction in the type of parking (i.e., long stay vs short stay and adapted cycle parking for disabled cyclists is not provided. The closure of Sunbank Lane overbridge will cause a reduction in active travel due to removal of the M56 bridge.
- 3.12.9. MCC are concerned that logistic movements have not been considered on Sunbank Lane. It is not clear if the businesses (DHL, Amazon etc) in that area have been engaged. Traffic management in the area at peak seasonal times can already be challenging.
- 3.12.10. Some local roads, such as Thorley Lane and Mill Lane are not considered suitable for construction traffic.
- 3.12.11. There is a major utilities connection required from Styal Road to the Airport HS2 Station along significant highway network lengths. HS2 Ltd. have provided no details of the impact of this and how traffic will be managed.
- 3.12.12. The access and integration of bus facilities at the HS2 Manchester Airport station is insufficient. Onward bus connectivity is vital from the Manchester Airport station if national and regional (GM 2040) policy objectives on sustainability are to be met.
- 3.12.13. The impact of not having a Metrolink connection at the HS2 Manchester Airport station from Day 1 of the operation has not been considered. The proposal to use shuttle buses from the HS2 station to the Airport terminals in advance of Metrolink will cause further traffic congestion and air quality impacts.
- 3.12.14. The amount of car parking at the HS2 Manchester Airport station is excessive (3,800 spaces) and will encourage use of private vehicles.
- 3.12.15. There is no mention of accessible parking provision at the Airport station. This should be at least 5% of all spaces. Similarly, there is no electric vehicle parking identified. At least 10% of all parking spaces should be provided with EV charging provision. No Motorcycle parking provision has been made. MCC require adequate provision for all the user types mentioned in HS2 parking designs.

3.13. **Waste and Material Resources**

- 3.13.1. The Waste and Material Resources chapter does not include an assessment of individual community areas. There has been no consideration of the proposals against waste policies included in authority area local plan's or of local waste infrastructure capacity.

3.14. Water Resource and Flood Risk

- 3.14.1. MCC require further details with respect to the proposed tunnel dewatering at the Fairywell Brook and its impacts downstream.
- 3.14.2. The syphons proposed within the area are not a favourable solution to the management of the watercourses as they have the potential for high maintenance burdens and blockage, and it is not clear who the final maintainer would be.
- 3.14.3. Given the importance of the flows within the Timperley Brook for discharge of surface water from Manchester Airport, MCC recommend a gauging station to calibrate future hydrology assessments.
- 3.14.4. There is concern regarding the hydraulic efficiency of the M56 culvert which joins the Timperley Brook via the inverted syphon as well as the rationale for locating this at a 90-degree angle.
- 3.14.5. A spring which feeds into the Timperley Brook appears to be lost during construction and no mitigatory measures are put in place.

3.15. Conclusion

- 3.15.1. The information provided to date does not allow for environmental effects or the adequacy of any proposed mitigation in the MA08 (Manchester Piccadilly station) Community Area to be determined. MCC will require HS2 Ltd. to address all concerns raised in respect to the ES..

High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement

Chapter 3

MCC Comments on Volume 2: MA07 (Davenport Green to Ardwick) community area report and map books

4. MCC comments on Volume 2 – MA07 (Davenport Green to Ardwick) community area report and map books

4.1. Introduction

- 4.1.1. This section is 13.4km long, of which 12.8km is in tunnel under the wards of Ardwick, Longsight, Rusholme, Withington, Didsbury West, Didsbury East, Northenden and Baguley. 573m of the route is in cutting at Ardwick.
- 4.1.2. There are several permanent physical features associated with the tunnelled section of the route. These includes four ventilation (vent) shafts/headhouses proposed at: Altrincham Road/M56 junction 3a (Northenden Ward) (vent shaft 1); Withington Golf Course, Palatine Road (Didsbury West) (vent shaft 2); The Christie Car Park D, Wilmslow Road (Didsbury East/boundary with Didsbury West) (vent shaft 3); and Fallowfield Retail Park, Birchfield Road (Rusholme) (vent shaft 4).
- 4.1.3. The vent shafts and headhouses would be approximately 25m x 43-54 wide and 6m high. Each vent shaft will have a construction compound and there will be additional auto transformer stations at Palatine Road and Birchfields Road.
- 4.1.4. At the Ardwick end there would be a 'porous portal' (a perforated structure at the tunnel entrance, designed to allow the passage of air from the tunnel) with a head house substation and a tunnel portal building.

4.2. Agriculture, Forestry and Soils

- 4.2.1. This area is urban/suburban in nature and has been scoped out of the ES.

4.3. Air Quality

- 4.3.1. MCC are concerned that HS2's model verification tables are underpredicting results of carbon monoxide and nitric oxide (NOX/NO2) concentrations, due to the failure to apply required adjustment factors, and we will require further justification to fully understand the predictions caused by the implementation of the Proposed Scheme.
- 4.3.2. The permanent loss of part of the car parks for The Christie Hospital and Fallowfield Retail Park (including the 'Park & Stride' spaces for nearby schools) has not been considered within the assessment. MCC consider that a further assessment should include the effects of potential vehicle displacement to nearby residential streets and/or alternative car parks and, if necessary, resources should be provided for the creation/promotion of alternative modes of travel and additional mitigation may be required to offset any adverse impacts on air quality and safety.

- 4.3.3. MCC require HS2 to undertake further review and assessment prior to any works, to inform an Air Quality Action Plan outlining all mitigation measures as required.

4.4. **Community**

- 4.4.1. It is acknowledged that several residential properties (4), commercial properties (31) and other buildings/structures, are identified by HS2 Ltd. as being required to be demolished in MA07. As with other community areas, MCC expect the detailed design to avoid or limit the loss of property, as far as possible, and to ensure that adequate and timely engagement and support is provided to the affected residents, businesses and organisations, including any mitigation or alternative.
- 4.4.2. The proposed vent shaft, headhouse and auto-transformer station at Palatine Road will have a significant impact upon Withington Golf Club, including its future viability. MCC expect that further engagement and specialist support will be provided by HS2 Ltd. to the golf club to ensure that a viable solution is found which will preserve the future viability of the club facility. Further work and engagement with MCC by HS2 Ltd. to establish suitable design proposals is required.
- 4.4.3. The Wilmslow Road vent shaft will result in the loss of 135 parking spaces at the Christie Hospital, as well as of 3 properties which provide ground floor commercial units with residential accommodation above. MCC require the layout for the headhouse design to be designed to retain as much car parking as possible; to avoid the need to demolish homes/businesses in this area; and to avoid the need for the removal of mature trees on Wilmslow Road. The design should also be in keeping with the character of the area. Further engagement with the hospital and MCC is required to establish suitable mitigation and a re-provision strategy for the loss of parking spaces (including accessible parking provision) and to establish suitable design proposals for the above surface landscaping and headhouse. MCC will also require HS2 Ltd. to work closely with businesses regarding relocation and seek to mitigate the loss of jobs
- 4.4.4. MCC consider that the Birchfields Road vent shaft will have significant implications for businesses at the Fallowfield Retail Park and the local community and require a less sensitive alternative location for the Birchfields Road vent shaft. The loss of land at the retail park will result in business closures, job losses and the loss of valued community retail services. The use of this location would also cause significant amenity, noise disruption and traffic impacts for both local residents and the directly neighbouring Birchfields Primary School. The car park is used by parents to drop off children at the primary school and Manchester Enterprise Academy (MEA Central).
- 4.4.5. If, ultimately, land at the retail park is to be required, the construction period and plans for the vent headhouse must be managed to limit impact upon the

operations of the retained businesses as well as the neighbouring schools and residents, including provision of appropriate noise mitigation measures. Replacement arrangements should be identified to allow for the continuation of the 'park and stride' school drop off scheme.

4.5. Construction Management

- 4.5.1. Moderate contamination risks have been identified by HS2 in Ardwick (although these may be high if significant contamination is found, due to the former gas works on site). Lower risks are identified in relation to the vent shafts, but contamination could still be present. Site Investigations are required prior to construction, to determine if any remediation is required, and then for detailed remediation at all construction areas.
- 4.5.2. Regarding noise impacts assessed by HS2, daytime construction hours are proposed for the Birchfields vent shaft, but night-time construction hours are proposed for the Withington vent shaft. There is an inconsistent approach to construction in these high-density residential areas. HS2 Ltd. should review working hours in areas of high population density to ensure a consistent approach is taken and agree a bespoke approach in consultation with MCC.
- 4.5.3. There are expected to be vibration impacts during construction at the Christie Hospital. The Tunnelling Boring Machine (TBM) is expected to have significant effect on the use of the proposed MRI scanner at the Christie for 25-30 days. A specific Vibration Risk Assessment has been undertaken after liaison with the Christie but concludes that HS2 Ltd. will liaise with the Christie further. MCC request information on whether any further assessment is proposed and exactly what equipment will be affected.
- 4.5.4. There is a major 24/7 haul route between the tunnel portal and Ashley Railhead for removal of tunnel spoil – the route of this has not yet been ascertained so concerns exist around suitability, hours of operation, impact on residents and alternative routes in the event of incidents. HS2 Ltd. should identify the route and provide proper construction management, traffic modelling and mitigation, all of which should be correctly identified and assessed in the ES.

4.6. Ecology and Biodiversity

- 4.6.1. MCC consider that insufficient information has been provided regarding the impacts that an increase in nitrogen deposition will have on the Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Sites of Biological Importance (SBI) located within MA07. Changes in traffic movements on roads near to the Rochdale Canal SAC will increase nitrogen deposition, which could result in adverse effects on floating water-plantation. Due to the lack of information, it is concluded that there may be an adverse effect on the SAC that is significant at the international level. This missing

information should have been presented within the ES and it is therefore requested that HS2 complete necessary assessments to provide this data.

- 4.6.2. MCC consider that the scheme does not take in to account the importance of individual street and highway trees of note that are not veteran trees but are important landscape features. MCC expects there to be a full Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) assessment conducted on all trees of note to ensure that a full understanding of the ecosystem is captured and an appreciation of their value and function is considered when determining mitigation. Mitigation planting should be proposed by HS2 Ltd. in consultation and agreement with MCC at the appropriate stage.
- 4.6.3. Four mature street trees are located on Wilmslow Road. HS2 must ensure that these trees are protected during the construction phase of the development with root protection areas put in place.
- 4.6.4. MCC consider that landscaping and habitat improvement plans around the South Portal should include improvements to Fairywell Brook, Open Space and Woodland in the MCC District.
- 4.6.5. MCC consider that there has been missed opportunities for habitat enhancements and improvements at vent shaft locations. HS2 Ltd. should explore habitat enhancement opportunities further in consultation with MCC.
- 4.6.6. MC expect that vent shaft landscaping will consider climate resilient and wildlife friendly nature-based solutions within their developments, for example, the use of rain gardens and permeable surfacing. MCC expect that suitable screening and green wall / green roof opportunities will be considered on all headhouse and vent shaft locations. It is expected that the final detailed design on these matters would be consulted upon by HS2 Ltd. and agreed with MCC.
- 4.6.7. In the Palatine Road area, MCC request that HS2 Ltd. ensure that all areas of woodland creation also benefit from suitable planting of woodland wildflower assemblages that will be integrated fully into the wider Mersey Valley.
- 4.6.8. Within the MA07 area, there are several properties, structures and trees which require demolition or removal. However, only 22 properties have been subject to initial inspection for bat roosts or bat roost potential, and this needs to be addressed and agreed in consultation with GMEU and MCC and implemented prior to demolition or removal of said properties, structures, and trees.
- 4.6.9. HS2 Ltd. should make appropriate provision to compensate for the loss of habitats for the assemblages of bats of regional importance identified within MA07, including an additional exploration of hedgerow creation opportunities.
- 4.6.10. A potential area of Open Mosaic Habitat has been identified in the Ardwick area. No survey has been undertaken but it is described as being up to "district

/ borough value". Given that this habitat is one of principal importance MCC would consider its value to be higher than district/ borough level. It is recommended that a habitat survey is completed on this area to identify the habitat type present and categorise its value so that appropriate mitigation and/or compensation can be proposed and implemented by HS2 in consultation with MCC.

- 4.6.11. The loss of hedgerows in MA07 is described as being significant at a local/parish level. Since this includes the loss of native species-rich hedgerows, this is an underestimation of the value of the hedgerows. Mitigation planned should relate to this level of significance and appropriate mitigation and/or compensation should be proposed and implemented by HS2 Ltd. in consultation with MCC.

4.7. Health

- 4.7.1. MCC are concerned about the increase in HGV traffic and changes to the noise and visual environment caused during construction in various locations in this community area (MA07), which will lead to reduced levels of satisfaction with the local environment, including at Wilmslow Road, Moseley Road, Old Hall Lane, Kingsway and Birchfields Road.
- 4.7.2. Little detail is provided on mitigation measures other than compliance with the CoCP and HS2 Ltd. engaging with local authorities and community representatives to identify measures aimed at fostering and maintaining good relationships between the workforce and local communities. Such measures should be further developed by HS2 Ltd., in consultation with MCC, and included within the community engagement framework, as appropriate.
- 4.7.3. MCC are concerned that the presence of a significant construction workforce on worksites and at satellite compounds (i.e., Altrincham Road vent shaft, Palatine Road vent shaft, Wilmslow Road vent shaft, Birchfield Road vent shaft, Manchester Tunnel north portal, Manchester tunnel north portal main compound) leading to the presence of workers in local community facilities. Little detail is provided on mitigation measures other than compliance with the CoCP. Again, measures should be further developed by HS2 Ltd., in consultation with MCC, and included within the community engagement framework.
- 4.7.4. Construction of the Proposed Scheme intersecting public rights of way (PRoW) leading to changes in the amenity value of PRoW, increased distance due to diversions, and introduction of features such as footbridges and underpasses, deterring the use of PRoW for active travel and recreation. The statements suggest that the adverse effects on health are small and temporary and does not identify other mitigations. MCC are concerned that the lack of mitigation proposed and suggest HS2 reconsider mitigation at local levels in consultation with MCC.

- 4.7.5. The presence of construction traffic, including HGVs on local roads will result in amenity impacts and safety concerns, deterring the use of local roads by non-motorised users. Further mitigation measures need to be developed by HS2 Ltd, in consultation with MCC.

4.8. **Historic Environment**

- 4.8.1. Further research should be undertaken by HS2 Ltd. to understand which Conservation Areas in this community area (MA07) qualify as being of 'high significance', as this may change the overall significance of effect rating. HS2 Ltd. have currently assessed Conservation Areas as 'medium significance'. Equally, many non-designated heritage assets have been identified as being of 'low' significance (with some exceptions). MCC disagree with the conclusions regarding the Withington Conservation Area and the Northenden Conservation Area, where disturbance would have a considerable impact. This is not reflected in the 'neutral' impact given. HS2 Ltd. should reconsider their findings and potential mitigation in consultation with MCC.
- 4.8.2. In instances where there is some unknown potential for archaeological interest, the degree of significance is yet to be identified. This requires further investigation by HS2 Ltd. and consultation with MCC & GMAAS.
- 4.8.3. There is no justification for the removal of the Grade II listed Milestone adjacent to Withington Fire Station for temporary works / land required for construction. The repositioning of the asset to a different location would completely erode the integrity of the asset and absolutely undermine its purpose and, thus, significance. Options for retention should be further explored by HS2 Ltd. in consultation with MCC.
- 4.8.4. No justification is offered by HS2, nor alternatives explored, to avoid the total loss of numerous non-designated heritage Assets (principally located in the Ardwick area). Recording can provide mitigation to some extent but should not be the first point of call.
- 4.8.5. There is concern around the potential for movement around the collection of Listed Buildings to Ladybarn Road. This should be monitored by HS2 Ltd. during the construction and operational phases to identify and record threats to integrity of the structures and their setting.
- 4.8.6. The installation of the overground station and associated viaducts will result in considerable, irrevocable loss of a great deal of non-designated heritage assets in the Ardwick (as well as Piccadilly) area. All reasonable options which would avoid the permanent loss of these assets should be further explored and consulted on with MCC. Further, MCC have high concerns over potential non-designated heritage assets which are yet to be identified. HS2 Ltd. should robustly demonstrate that measures would be in place to identify and then appropriately consider further mitigation as works commence, in consultation with MCC.

4.8.7. Where loss of heritage assets cannot be demonstrably avoided, building records should be undertaken by a qualified conservation specialist in line with Historic England's Guidance on building recording (Level 3 minimum for non-designated heritage assets - Level 4 for Listed Buildings).

4.9. **Land Quality**

4.9.1. MCC expects that the analysis of contaminated land data for HS2 Ltd. within Manchester to be provided as soon as it is available in order for it to be reviewed and assessed, which will in turn determine the need for mitigation (if any). MCC require HS2 to provide confirmation on the current mechanisms/agreements in place to ensure appropriate consultation takes place throughout each stage of this process.

4.9.2. MCC request a bespoke focussed strategy on how site investigations/land surveys will be undertaken within potentially contaminated areas within the tunnelled section of the Proposed Scheme specifically.

4.9.3. MCC are aware that there is no demolition or decommissioning data available for former fuel stations within the study area. MCC would expect detailed site investigation data to be provided for these areas to determine if decommissioning has taken place and if mitigation is required to address potential risks to human health and controlled waters receptors.

4.10. **Landscape and Visual**

4.10.1. HS2 Ltd. do not provide any viewpoints in areas defined as 'land potentially required during construction' so it is unclear how views might be affected. There is the potential for the effects to be greater in magnitude than predicted and more design information is required from HS2 Ltd. to determine the magnitude, scale of effect, and significance during the operation stage.

4.10.2. HS2 Ltd. have not provided sufficient viewpoint (VP) assessments in several key areas to allow MCC to understand the landscape impacts of the current proposals and consider if sufficient and appropriate mitigation has been detailed in the ES. It is therefore difficult to fully consider the visual impacts at this stage and further assessments should be provided by HS2 Ltd. during the final detailed design stage to inform the design and any additional mitigation which may be required.

4.10.3. Further photomontages are required, alongside detail of the landscape mitigation being relied upon, to ensure a robust justification of how the significant effects arising will be mitigated over time. Without this justification, further significant residual effects could occur which are not considered in this assessment.

4.10.4. The final design of any above ground structures and public areas associated with HS2 in this community area will be key to ensuring that any adverse

landscape or visual impacts of the Proposed Scheme are minimised. HS2 Ltd will be expected to develop the final design details in consultation with MCC.

4.11. Socio-Economics

- 4.11.1. HS2 Ltd. have made an assessment of the potential effects within individual community areas by the Proposed Scheme which is welcomed. However, the assessment of effects is significantly inconsistent, with the sensitivity of receptors (i.e. those affected) selected without clear justification and often underestimated. On this basis, MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. re-assess the potential effects on the receptors likely to be affected and provide appropriate mitigation to reduce these effects.
- 4.11.2. MCC are concerned that 640 jobs are expected to be displaced or lost as a direct result of the HS2 development and its impact on businesses identified within MA07. The impact from the relocation or loss of jobs is considered to be minor in the context of the total number of people employed in the area. However, given the dependency of these business on the current location and the likelihood of successful relocation considered to be low, the loss of the business and its employees is considered to be significantly adverse. Additionally, there is a lack of information from HS2 on how businesses will be supported in their search for alternative sites and premises.
- 4.11.3. As with other community areas, MCC will request HS2 Ltd. to provide additional supportive information which provides confidence to stakeholders that all businesses affected will be supported prior to and throughout the construction works to minimise any potential effects as far as practical.

4.12. Sound, Noise and Vibration

- 4.12.1. MCC are strongly concerned about the impacts of sound noise and vibration on local communities during construction and operation.
- 4.12.2. MCC require clarification on the methodology used to determine how appropriate noise levels would be achieved by the vent shafts and headhouses during operation, as this is insufficient.
- 4.12.3. HS2 Ltd. have not provided sufficient noise baseline data in several locations, which does not allow MCC to consider if the impacts stated by HS2 Ltd. are reasonable assumptions. HS2 Ltd. also rely significantly on mitigations which are not clearly defined in the ES. MCC require full detail on mitigation regarding sound, noise and vibration impacts identified.
- 4.12.4. HS2 Ltd. indicate that ground-borne ground-borne vibration during the construction phase will be controlled via selection of construction methods to ensure that the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) is not exceeded on a monthly basis. MCC considers this statement insufficient at

this time and requires further evidence as to how this will be achieved and mitigated, if necessary.

- 4.12.5. HS2 Ltd. indicate the provision of ‘increased construction screening’ at the four vent shaft locations. However, no further details have been provided regarding the effectiveness of the mitigation, and further assurance that this screening will suitably mitigate adverse effects on local communities is required.

4.13. Traffic and Transport

- 4.13.1. The impact on the strategic and key route network during construction requires further mitigation in order to ensure that traffic delays are minimised and that local communities are not disproportionately impacted. MCC will require HS2 Ltd to work with the Council and TfGM to ensure any adverse effects during construction are minimised on the highway and thereby local communities.
- 4.13.2. MCC are concerned about the major 24/7 haul route between the tunnel portal and railhead for removal of tunnel spoil, in terms of hours of operation and impact on residents. Further information is required on construction management, traffic modelling and mitigation to ensure no unacceptable effects.
- 4.13.3. MCC have a number of concerns with construction traffic routes suggested in the ES and require HS2 Ltd to revisit these routes in consultation with MCC.
- 4.13.4. The Princess Parkway / Palatine Road and Sharston Interchange are existing areas for concern in terms of community severance and poor accessibility for those not using motor vehicles. HS2 Ltd should design proposals to ensure severance of communities is minimised, in consultation with MCC.
- 4.13.5. MCC are concerned that parking arrangements during operation and construction around vent shaft locations will require additional mitigation to ensure no adverse effects on the highway network and local communities. MCC will require HS2 Ltd to further develop their mitigation for these anticipated effects.

4.14. Waste and Material Resources

- 4.14.1. HS2 have not assessed waste and material resources on a “community area” basis. Therefore, there are no direct considerations against local policies or plans regarding waste infrastructure capacity.
- 4.14.2. MCC will require HS2 Ltd. to provide a project plan for waste management which provides sufficient information to allow MCC to consider if there are likely to be any local issues and a strategy to mitigate against any potential issues that may arise.

4.15. Water Resource and Flood Risk

- 4.15.1. The hydrology assessment which is found in the Mersey Model report uses event data between 1955 and 2012. The model has been further calibrated against Storm Christoph (Jan 2021). MCC note that river levels on Saturday 19th February 2022 marginally exceeded those of Storm Christoph. MCC require HS2 Ltd. to undertake further hydrological assessment to ensure that there are no changes following another high magnitude event in short succession.
- 4.15.2. The flood report identifies that some properties in the location of the Didsbury Flood Basin will receive an increased risk of flooding. Additional detail is required from HS2 Ltd. to understand how and where compensatory storage will be located to mitigate this risk. MCC will require additional detail for how the scheme will mitigate flood risk during the construction phase, noting that within the Didsbury Flood Basin area, the scheme will be working in the middle of an active flood plain.
- 4.15.3. MCC have identified several assets (ponds, drains, culverts etc.) which do not seem to have been considered by HS2 Ltd. MCC will require clarification if all these individual assets were considered and if not, further studies to understand potential impacts and any additional mitigations required.

4.16. Conclusion

- 4.16.1. The information provided to date does not allow for environmental effects or the adequacy of any proposed mitigation in the MA08 (Manchester Piccadilly station) Community Area to be determined. MCC will require HS2 Ltd. to address all concerns raised in respect to the ES.

High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement

Chapter 4

MCC Comments on Volume 2: MA08 (Manchester Piccadilly Station) community area report and map books

5. MCC comments on Volume 2 – MA08 (Manchester Piccadilly station) community area report and map books

5.1. Introduction

- 5.1.1. This chapter specifically details the MCC consultation response comments in respect of issues and requirements which have been identified within MA08, Manchester Piccadilly Station.
- 5.1.2. Other chapters within this MCC consultation response detail issues and requirements identified in relation to the other sections of the ES. Where those issues apply to all or several of the Community Areas, they have been set out in the Chapter titled “MCC Points raised to ES Consultation which are Common across chapters and Community Areas”. To avoid repetition, those issues and requirements have not been re-stated here but in reading this section it should be noted that those issues and requirements also apply to this Community Area.

5.2. Agriculture, Forestry and Soils

- 5.2.1. This area is urban/suburban in nature and has been scoped out of this topic.

5.3. Air Quality

- 5.3.1. The modelling of the reconfigured Pin Mill Brow junction is not accurate. It is understood that this will result in different traffic flows in the operational scenario to those shown in the ES.
- 5.3.2. MCC require HS2 to undertake further review and assessment prior to any works, to inform an Air Quality Action Plan outlining all mitigation measures as required.

5.4. Community

- 5.4.1. Substantial areas of land within this community area will be required with significant impacts for the local community and established businesses. 48 commercial properties and 26 other buildings/structures, including a number of important community services, are required to be demolished in MA08.
- 5.4.2. Adequate engagement, assistance and support is to be provided by HS2 Ltd. to the affected business community. This needs to include resourcing for the Business and Local Economy Fund and Communities and Environmental Fund, universal access to an agency service to assist businesses find alternative premises and provision of access to independent legal advice. This should include a severance package which reflects construction and disturbance impact, as well as the permanent loss to businesses. A detailed programme for the delivery of support services is required.

- 5.4.3. There will be permanent loss of the community facility premises for SOL Christian Academy, Manchester Action on Street Health (MASH), Manchester Offenders: Diversion Engagement and Liaison Service (MO:DEL), True Jesus Church, Totem Gymnastics, Cloud Aerial Arts, CrossFit Ancoats, Straight Blast Gym and Frontline Fitness Performance Centre. Replacement provision for these community facilities needs to be established in each case as a matter of urgency.
- 5.4.4. Large numbers of residential properties in Chapeltown Street, Ducie Street, Pollard Street and New Islington will experience a prolonged combination of significant amenity impacts associated with construction activity, alongside adverse visual effects. Appropriate mitigation and engagement need to be provided.
- 5.4.5. HS2 Ltd. do not identify any permanent construction effects on public open space in Community Area MA08. This assessment does not take account of the multiple impacts upon existing public realm spaces within the city centre, or the impacts upon the cityscape.
- 5.4.6. MCC is concerned that the proposed HS2 Ltd. station is not appropriately integrated with the facilities of the existing Piccadilly Station and would not deliver suitably strong connectivity links between the proposed station, the city centre and its communities.
- 5.4.7. The detailed station design needs to be formulated and optimised in co-ordination with MCC, TfGM and relevant stakeholders. The station design should be revised to align with the approach detailed in the Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (2018) and the Greater Manchester HS2 and NPR Growth Strategy (2018). A new fully integrated underground station for HS2 & NPR is needed to successfully integrate with the existing station and maximise the land's significant economic potential.

5.5. **Construction**

- 5.5.1. The HS2 Ltd. Predictions and Assessments for noise are out of date. Committed developments on and around Heyrod Street and Store Street have not been included in the impact assessments. HS2 Ltd. should update their assessments to include all development.
- 5.5.2. There are contamination risks in the Ardwick/Piccadilly area, and these may be high if signification contamination is found. Site investigation is required to determine if any remediation is required, and the specific controls needed (i.e., dust/odour) during these works.
- 5.5.3. 304 residential properties are forecast to experience noise above the eligibility criteria for noise insulation. There are no details of any verification once glazing has been fitted. HS2 Ltd. should provide details of Noise

Insulation proposals and any intake/extract points in addition to details of any verification once glazing has been fitted.

- 5.5.4. MCC has concerns with respect to Manchester Piccadilly High Speed Station sustainable mode analysis. The assessment of impacts to cyclists is not adequate or accurate for the temporary highway works situation. We also require that cycle facilities to current standards are provided as part of any permanent or temporary highway arrangements around Piccadilly and Pin Mill Brow.
- 5.5.5. The proposed westbound Great Ancoats Street closure at Every Street is not acceptable as it constitutes a closure of the Inner Ring Road without details of wider area mitigation. Southbound closures of the A6 London Road between Fairfield and Store Street and Adair Street in the same stage of construction are also unacceptable without wider area mitigation, as they are key city centre access routes. HS2 Ltd. should provide proper construction management, traffic modelling and mitigation for proposed closures.
- 5.5.6. No detail is provided on how adequate footway widths will be determined and maintained during construction. Minimum widths will not be adequate on many of the busy footways around Piccadilly Station.

5.6. **Ecology and Biodiversity**

- 5.6.1. Changes in traffic movements on roads near to the Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation in the Ardwick area will increase nitrogen deposition which could result in adverse effects on floating water.
- 5.6.2. HS2 Ltd. does not consider the importance of individual street and highway trees of note that are not veteran trees but are important landscape features.
- 5.6.3. MCC welcome proposals to improve habitat around the Medlock in MA08 but would encourage further opportunity to enhance connectivity South into the Lower Medlock Valley.
- 5.6.4. MCC note that no bat emergence surveys were undertaken in any building or structures in MA08, or replacement roosting provision made, which would normally be expected as part of an ES.
- 5.6.5. The ES identifies that the construction in this area will result in the disturbance of black redstart bird nesting habitat. However, no details are given of the location and no mitigation is proposed.

5.7. **Health**

- 5.7.1. HS2 Ltd. have not provided adequate mitigation for all health-related impacts. A general mitigation for loss of the community facility identified is indicated to explore options to include:

- improving or altering the remaining portion of the community facility.
 - improving other existing community facilities in the area that could reduce the effect;
 - improving accessibility to other community facilities; and/or
 - identifying land that could be brought into use as a community facility.
- 5.7.2. Visual intrusion and changes to the noise environment a result of construction work and HGV traffic could lead to reduced levels of satisfaction with the local environment at the following locations: Residential properties on Chapeltown Street, Pollard Street, Ducie Street, and in the vicinity of Old Mill Street in New Islington.
- 5.7.3. The presence of construction traffic, including HGV, on local roads will lead to amenity impacts and safety concerns. It will deter the use of local roads by pedestrians and cyclists.
- 5.7.4. The presence of workers in local community facilities could lead to changes in levels of community cohesion and trust at the close to the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed station main compound and Manchester approach satellite compounds B, C and D.
- 5.7.5. MCC have concerns about the isolation of recreational facility, affecting ability to participate in physical activity at the following locations:
- Permanent closure of Sheffield Street means that Straight Blast Gym (SBG) will become physically isolated.
 - The Fairfield Street diversion and the permanent closure of North Western Street will mean that Frontline Fitness Performance Centre will become physically isolated.
 - Change of vehicular access to Mancunian Boxing Club (current access from Chancellors Lane and the A635 Mancunian Way will be permanently closed and new access routes established from Union Street.).
- 5.7.6. HS2 Ltd. advised it is continuing to engage with the owners and operators of, Frontline Fit and SBG Manchester to identify reasonably practicable measures to help mitigate the likely effects.
- 5.7.7. Demolition of community facility will reduce the beneficial health effects gained through educational attainment at SOL Christian Academy on Fairfield Street. HS2 Ltd. has advised that it will engage with SOL Christian Academy, to identify reasonably practicable measures to help mitigate the likely significant effects but no mitigations are identified for the specific premises.
- 5.8. Historic Environment**

- 5.8.1. The extent of removal of significant historic fabric to Piccadilly Station is unclear, and options for maximum retention are not illustrated or investigated. MCC notes that there is clear harm to the listed columned bridges and blocked-arch wall along Sheffield Street.
- 5.8.2. Visual impact on the setting of heritage assets around Piccadilly Station is likely to result in a change. As such, MCC require a detailed plan for consultation at an early stage in order to avoid any unnecessary adverse impact.
- 5.8.3. The proposed extent of removal of significant historic fabric to Piccadilly Station is unclear, and options for maximum retention are not clearly illustrated or investigated. The overall impact is therefore impossible to determine at this stage. This is a major concern for MCC which should be re-assessed by HS2 through final detailed design, in close consultation with MCC and Historic England.
- 5.8.4. It is considered that the installation of the overground HS2 station will result in considerable, irrevocable loss of a number of non-designated heritage assets in the Ardwick / Piccadilly area. Where loss of heritage assets cannot be demonstrably avoided, MCC require that building records should be undertaken by a qualified conservation specialist.
- 5.8.5. MCC maintains significant concerns over potential non-designated heritage assets which are yet to be identified. For instance, prominent late-19th century buildings at 163 Ashton Old Rd and 223 Ashton Old Road do not feature on the map, but are clearly of some architectural and historic merit, and have the potential to be impacted by the construction compounds.

5.9. **Land Quality**

- 5.9.1. MCC understand that potentially contaminated spoil from the tunnelling process is likely to be stored and processed at the North Manchester Portal Tunnelling Compound. HS2 Ltd. need to make clear how these soils will be managed.
- 5.9.2. MCC are aware that there is no demolition or decommissioning data available for a former petrol filling station within MA08. Mitigation is required to address potential risks to human health and controlled waters receptors.

5.10. **Landscape and Visual**

Townscape Assessment – Scope and Methodology Report

- 5.10.1. The Piccadilly, Ardwick and West Gorton industrial and infrastructure character area baseline requires further detail to form a robust townscape assessment.

- 5.10.2. The methodology for assigning value does not reflect the urban environment of the two-character areas identified as being significantly affected within the MA08 area. The assessment of value has the potential to be lower in urban areas due to the methodology HS2 Ltd. has used.
- 5.10.3. Similarly, the criteria for determining landscape sensitivity are focussed on non-urban environments and the components that constitute a high or medium-high sensitivity landscape largely do not apply in an urban context. This is disproportionately under-estimating the impact in Manchester, with the weighing leaning towards rural settings.
- 5.10.4. The photomontages have only been prepared for views which meet specific, limited criteria. In a city-centre location which is highly complex, and taking into consideration the size, scale and importance of the proposals, and the high numbers of visual receptors, a photomontage of each key viewpoint would be appropriate. MCC require block model or wireline photomontages for each identified view.

Townscape Assessment – MA08 Community Area Report

- 5.10.5. The assessment of the landscape baseline and sensitivity (which measures assessed value and susceptibility to change) of the Piccadilly, Ardwick and West Gorton Local Conservation Areas (LCA) lack detail and are not robust.
- 5.10.6. The assessment states that substantial parts of the character area will be returned to suitable development use, but in year 1 are likely to constitute empty sites surrounded by hoarding, which is a 'high' magnitude of change. However, it goes on to state that the changes will largely be in keeping with the existing character and the overall assessment is one of “minor adverse impact”. The substantial areas of land surrounded by hoardings are likely to impact on the townscape character and this is not reflected in the assessment. MCC require a re-assessment of change against the key characteristics of the baseline in order to establish the degree of change, the nature of that change, and the significance.
- 5.10.7. For the year 30 operational phase, the assessment states that there is insufficient information to understand the changes that the character area will experience in this period. It is unclear how an assessment of minor adverse and not significant impacts can justifiably be determined from this. The urban nature of the character area, city along with the substantial areas available for new development, means that the area is likely to undergo transformative change over the next 30 years, and an assessment of minor adverse impact is likely to be misleading.
- 5.10.8. Clarity is required on the selection of committed developments. No committed developments of relevance for landscape and visual have been identified, and there is no mention of key schemes in the area such as Mayfield. The townscape around the station is dynamic and fast changing,

with a high number of consented schemes, along with the proposals in the Piccadilly SRF and other surrounding SRF's (Portugal Street East, Mayfield, North Campus (ID Manchester), and Kampus (Aytoun Street)) coming to fruition. A more robust approach to methodology to identify and assess cumulative effects and future baseline is required in order to demonstrate the likely effects (currently assessed as not significant).

- 5.10.9. The visual assessment has not identified any locations within this study area where additional lighting during continuous night working and/or overnight working during construction will result in significant visual effects at night.
- 5.10.10. The ES states construction works are likely to require lighting early morning and evening, when residential properties are likely to have blinds drawn. Therefore, lighting during typical hours is not considered as part of night assessment for residential properties. MCC request further consideration to ensure a robust approach to assessing night-time visual effects.
- 5.10.11. No mention is made of advance planting to screen and potentially reduce visual effects during construction.
- 5.10.12. No significant temporary landscape effects during construction are anticipated but nearby developments which are likely to influence the character of the townscape, such as Mayfield, need to be considered. MCC require a more robust approach to identifying and assessing cumulative schemes which will impact on townscape character.
- 5.10.13. Mitigation integrated into the design includes tree planting. After 15 years it is assumed that trees planted for mitigation and screening are expected to have grown to 7.5m based on the assumption of 0.5m per year. This does not account for tree planting in urban areas, which would require substantially larger specimens. MCC require more detail on tree planting in an urban environment in order to include it as mitigation.
- 5.10.14. There will be no significant landscape effects during the operational phase according to the ES. MCC require a more robust methodology, approaches to townscape assessment to demonstrate no significant effects.
- 5.10.15. The study area has been limited to 750m within MA08 due to the urban character. However, both the construction phase and operational phase indicate potential for views beyond 750m within urban areas, resulting in the potential for 'missed' longer range views. MCC require additional mid and long-range views to reflect the potential extent of visibility considering that buildings in this area will be multistorey.
- 5.10.16. The City Centre Core, Historic and Commercial Grain townscape character area is poorly defined and out of date. The assessment states that there is a relatively consistent mass and height of 4-7 storeys. The city centre is increasingly characterised by taller buildings as individual landmarks or clusters which have changed the city skyline.

- 5.10.17. The assessment of future City Centre Core, Historic and Commercial Grain is incomplete and 'no affects' on landscape susceptibility because of future development is not robust. It references only two schemes, and e.g. there is no consideration on the impact of the wider North Campus (ID Manchester) area.
- 5.10.18. The scale of the proposed development in this area will have a substantial effect on the townscape around the station during construction and operation. However, due to the high-level division of the city into large townscape areas and character areas which cover a substantial part of the city, the full magnitude of the construction phase effects are not assessed and are given an assessment of 'low'. The full magnitude of the construction phase impacts is not assessed. MCC require an assessment which includes the operation phase impacts on the station area as a whole, and at a detailed level to reflect the character around the station.
- 5.10.19. MCC require design consideration for the station and city which includes:
- Consideration of the potential gateway and arrival point to the station, which is proposed as located to the rear of the existing Gateway House. The rear of Gateway House is unlikely to provide a positive arrival experience and legibility on approach to the station is likely to be poor with Gateway House forming a physical barrier to views towards the station.
 - Consideration of the impacts on townscape character and urban grain as a result of the station, associated infrastructure and overhead viaduct structures.
 - Consideration of the impacts on movement and linkages of the overhead viaducts and station and resultant road closures, including consideration of the aspirations for movement and linkages as set out in the SRFs covering the area.
 - Consideration of land use impacts, with substantial areas of land returned to suitable development use but likely to be undeveloped sites surrounded by hoarding.
 - Consideration of the impacts on the public realm and public open space network.
 - Consideration of proposed new planting and the potential effectiveness of what is proposed to create high quality public realm and mitigate against any adverse effects.

Visual Assessment

- 5.10.20. The photographs and descriptions are outdated, and in some cases inappropriate (e.g. not facing towards the likely direction of travel). The foreground of the view will substantially change during construction and operation. An update of the photography, description and future baseline to reflect the Great Jackson Street proposals should be carried out. Additional mitigation should be provided to the viaduct along its length on the approach

to the rear of the new station to provide the mitigation that is relied on in the description of impact - otherwise the assessed impact and effects will need to be revisited.

- 5.10.21. Stemming largely from the lack of photos and limited description of likely impacts, it is considered that the visuals described in the MA08 Community Area report do not provide adequate detail in order to fully understand whether the design is acceptable in visual terms. Additional operational photomontages and descriptions of impact should be provided to support the assessment, and assessed effects should be revisited in light of the new photomontages. MCC require a much more robust consideration of future and cumulative effects.

5.11. **Socio-economics**

- 5.11.1. Approximately 470 FTE will be required within MA08 during the construction phase. MCC require that HS2 Ltd. work with local partners on a recruitment strategy to ensure as many as possible are locally employed. MCC further request that HS2 Ltd. identify the potential impacts on the current supply chain.
- 5.11.2. 2,630 jobs are expected to be displaced or lost as a direct result of the HS2 Ltd. development and its impact on businesses identified within Community Area MA08. The impact from the relocation or loss of jobs is considered to be minor in the context of the total number of people employed in the area. However, given the dependency of these business on the current location and the likelihood of successful relocation considered to be low, the loss of the business and its employees is considered to be significantly adverse. Additionally, there is a lack of information from HS2 on how businesses will be supported in their search for alternative sites and premises.
- 5.11.3. MCC would request HS2 Ltd. provide additional supportive information which provides confidence to stakeholders that all businesses affected will be supported prior to and throughout the construction works to minimise any effects as far as practical.

5.12. **Sound, Noise and Vibration**

- 5.12.1. Design details for internal and external plant and fixed equipment at Piccadilly Station have not been provided, so emissions cannot be assessed at this point.
- 5.12.2. As for other topics, a number of predictions and assessments regarding committed developments are out of date, and developments have not been included within the impact assessments. MCC does not consider existing assessments adequate to fully demonstrate suitability of the proposals.

- 5.12.3. MCC notes the provision of increased construction screening at numerous sites across MA08, however, no further details have been provided regarding the effectiveness of the mitigation. MCC requires further assurance that this screening will suitably mitigate adverse effects.
- 5.12.4. It is understood that current modelling of the reconfigured Pin Mill Brow junction is not accurate and as a result under-estimate the amount of traffic reassignment likely to occur off roads that approach the junction. MCC requires that the existing noise modelling is updated and resubmitted to reflect any necessary amendments to the transport assessment.
- 5.12.5. Construction and operational noise levels at a number of locations exceed the noise limits during daytime and night-time hours respectively. However, impacts are not listed as significant. While it is noted that mitigation is proposed in the form of noise insulation, clarification is required on the impact categorisation.

5.13. **Traffic and Transport**

- 5.13.1. MCC consider the facilitation of access and integration of bus facilities at the station to be insufficient. This mode is vital for onward connections from the station if national and regional policy objectives on sustainability are to be met. HS2 Ltd. should improve the integration of bus facilities in line with the City Centre Transport Strategy.
- 5.13.2. MCC consider that the quantum of car parking proposed at Piccadilly Station to be excessive (2,029 spaces) and will encourage greater use of private vehicles. The parking strategy should be reconsidered to encourage greater use of sustainable travel modes over private vehicles in line with guidance set out in the GM 2040 vision and City Centre Transport Strategy documents.
- 5.13.3. MCC are concerned that the access to HS2 and associated car parks for Piccadilly are not appropriate and require HS2 Ltd to revisit these highway works and parking proposals to ensure that associated vehicular movements are acceptable to local partners.
- 5.13.4. There is no mention of accessible parking provision (should be approximately 5% of total parking), electric vehicle parking, car club bays or motorcycle parking provision.
- 5.13.5. MCC consider that the pedestrian assessment in the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed Station Sustainable Mode Analysis as not adequate or accurate and fails to pick up existing crowding issues during peak times.
- 5.13.6. The Pin Mill Brow gyratory proposal is not appropriate in scale or function. It occupies a wide area, limiting development potential and creates a hostile environment for cyclists and pedestrians. It is understood that the design was developed in this way so as to achieve no major adverse effects from a traffic capacity basis. However, the proposed Pin Mill Brow gyratory does not cater

for the forecast future demand in either 2038 or 2046 or MCC plans to reduce general traffic in the city centre.

- 5.13.7. MCC require that highway improvements and mitigations are supported by robust highway modelling, and this is currently not the case. The unacceptability of road closures is covered in the construction section.
- 5.13.8. Pin Mill Brow should facilitate high quality pedestrian routes to connect to the proposed development sites created by HS2 Ltd. At present the design appears to assume footways alongside very busy multi-lane roads with no separation, green infrastructure or public realm considerations. Full consideration should be given to the need for space in line with the city location and active travel policy. HS2 Ltd. should provide detail of the pedestrian facilities and measures to enhance the environment for active travel users.
- 5.13.9. The assessment of impacts to cyclists in the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed Station Sustainable Mode Analysis is not adequate or accurate. There have been no surveys of cycle volume in the area around the existing Piccadilly station to enable an assessment on impacts to be made. Future growth in cycling and investment in infrastructure in and around the regional centre are also not accounted for. Cycle facilities at key locations such as Pin Mill Brow gyratory are not provided to the latest LTN1/20 standards.
- 5.13.10. MCC consider there is insufficient information to determine the quality of the cycle parking provision at the proposed HS2 Ltd. Piccadilly station. The cycle parking facilities need to be of a high quality to support greater cycle mode share. MCC consider the proposed quantum of cycle parking (523 spaces) at Manchester Piccadilly is insufficient.
- 5.13.11. The ES does not assess the impacts of closures to the Metrolink network on the Ashton Line during construction and does not assess the impacts of the additional traffic associated with this or highway improvements.
- 5.13.12. Not all of the bus routes listed for Ashton Old Road use Ashton Old Road to access the city centre. This raises the question of whether the predicted journey time increases have been properly assessed. The 31% increase in journey time is considered to be significant but no explanation is offered for the cause of this delay to be able to be determined if mitigation measures are necessary. HS2 Ltd. should correct this assessment and provide details of mitigation against the indicated bus delays.
- 5.13.13. Committed developments are only within 1km of the centreline of the HS2 route. Within Manchester City Centre the geographical scope needs to be widened for committed developments as it is likely to generate far-reaching transport impacts. HS2 Ltd should agree the list of committed developments with MCC.



5.14. Waste and Material Resources

- 5.14.1. The submitted Waste and Material Resources chapter does not include an assessment of individual community areas. There has been no consideration of the proposals against waste policies included in local plan's or of local waste infrastructure capacity.

5.15. Water Resource and Flood Risk

- 5.15.1. The report indicates that flooding from March 2019 has not yet been assessed with respect to this location. It is recommended that detailed analysis of previous flooding is assessed and taken into account to ensure any additional mitigations are proposed at the next stage.

5.16. Conclusion

- 5.16.1. The information provided to date does not allow for environmental effects or the adequacy of any proposed mitigation in the MA08 (Manchester Piccadilly station) Community Area to be determined. MCC will require HS2 Ltd. to address all concerns raised in respect to the ES.

High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Environmental Statement

Chapter 5

- MCC Comments on Volume 3: Route-wide effects
- MCC Comments on Volume 5: Wider-effects report
- MCC Comments on Draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)

6. MCC comments on Volume 3 – Route-wide effects

6.1. Traffic and Transport

- 6.1.1. Over 60 weekend possessions / blockades on different parts of the existing West Coast Main Line (WCML) during the construction of the HS2 Crewe-Manchester line are proposed. We believe that this will cause unacceptable disruption to passengers travelling to Manchester (over approximately 9 years), especially given the trend for increased leisure rail travel following the Covid-19 pandemic. MCC's petition will seek further information on this and request that alternative options are looked at to minimise the disruption on rail passengers.
- 6.1.2. The Ardwick railhead construction will further result in disruption over 4 weekends between 2026 – 2030.

7. MCC comments on Volume 5 – Wider Effects Report

- 7.1.1. The Wider Effects Chapter seeks to describe whether deviating the alignment or level of the route (the "limits of deviation" (LOD)) within these statutory limits would alter the significant predicted effects reported elsewhere in the ES, or create new or different significant effects. HS2 state that sensitivity analysis has been undertaken to identify where such spatial changes are feasible and assess the environmental implications. MCC have not been provided with the sensitivity analysis and therefore cannot be certain of HS2 Ltd's assumptions and judgements. It is reported by HS2 Ltd. that significant effects of changes with the LOD would only be assessed for significant effects at a later stage.
- 7.1.2. MCC are concerned as to how exactly the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs), which HS2 Ltd. and its contractors would be subject to during construction, would be accorded with in reality and the process of how HS2 Ltd. would assess and decide the need for potential additional mitigations of effects. Should HS2 Ltd. need to change the Proposed Scheme within the LOD, significant environmental effects, which are currently not assessed or identified in the current ES, could be missed or insufficiently mitigated against. MCC will require HS2 Ltd to demonstrate its sensitivity testing and work with relevant local partners to continually review the environmental impacts of any significant design changes.

8. MCC comments on supporting documents – Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)

8.1. General issues

- 8.1.1. MCC note that this document is high level and lacking in detail in many areas which need specific measures/strategies. The CoCP discusses mitigation, monitoring and management of environmental issues but does not address

the key area of avoidance or protection from effects. MCC are concerned that this document is reactive in nature, only seeking to mitigate, rectify or report on issues once they have already occurred. MCC would require a more proactive approach to ensure all issues/risks are identified and then applying a hierarchy of avoid, protect, mitigate.

- 8.1.2. MCC are concerned that the high level nature of the CoCP will mean that contractors will approach delivery in different ways. The CoCP should provide specific direction and strategy to contractors to ensure consistency between different HS2 contractor submissions to public and local authorities, including a detailed minimum standard.
- 8.1.3. The CoCP seeks to establish the high-level principles of how various environmental issues would be managed by HS2 and its contractors during construction. MCC understand that this document is a very important mechanism in the implementation of the Proposed Scheme which will dictate how any given construction issue is managed to a large degree. MCC will require HS2 Ltd. to further develop the document in consultation with relevant local partners and provide much more clarity on how HS2 Ltd. intend the principles, processes, and procedures to function in reality during the implementation. MCC will be seeking HS2 Ltd. to commit to robust information sharing, project management, and oversight /approval processes, with relevant local partners, on a multitude of environmental issues, i.e. relating to Air Quality, Historic Environment, Ecology, Land Quality, Landscape and Visual, Noise and Vibration, Traffic and Transport, Waste and Materials, Water Resources and Flood Risk.
- 8.1.4. MCC are concerned that the current draft CoCP highlights that specific exemptions, for example regarding construction plant equipment, would be sought by HS2 Ltd. to Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan (CAP) and proposed Clean Air Zone (CAZ). However, MCC do not support the principle of HS2 Ltd or its contractors being exempt from Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan (CAP) and proposed Clean Air Zone (CAZ). MCC will seek to require HS2 Ltd. to comply and not prejudice Manchester meeting it's clean air targets.

8.2. **Specific issues**

- 8.2.1. MCC would welcome more information on to how the stockpiles containing contaminated soils will be managed to prevent contamination from leaving the compounds to ensure that the lands beneath the compounds does not become contaminated as a result of the temporary storage. Specific controls will need to be given in the Remediation Strategies, Construction Management Plan and/or CoCP.
- 8.2.2. MCC would expect that any soil embankments for noise control or landscape reinstatement will need to be suitability constructed with capping soils validated as suitable for use. It is noted that this will be covered as part of the

- remediation strategy, however, soil sampling frequencies and validation procedures will need to be agreed.
- 8.2.3. In terms of site investigations, MCC would expect detailed site investigation data, detailed risk assessments and any remediation/validation requirements to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Additional resources shall be provided to Local Authorities during the process to assist with the review and assessment of site investigation data and subsequent remediation/validation information if required.
- 8.2.4. It is proposed that a temporary railhead will be used to receive (by rail) and stockpile material required for the construction of the Proposed Scheme. MCC would request clarification as to whether an analysis of the existing capacity on the railway line has been undertaken and what the findings and implications are.
- 8.2.5. MCC welcomes the requirement for contactors to produce and submit monthly reports on noise, dust and air quality data. In the event of complaints or exceedances, details must be shared with MCC within 48 hours.
- 8.2.6. Detail on plant assumptions for the construction assessment are not provided. The relevant details should be provided, and the potential impacts defined. MCC should be consulted when details are available to ensure that forecast impacts are accurately identified, and that appropriate mitigation is secured.
- 8.2.7. The timings for baseline sound levels used for the construction sound assessment are unclear and inconsistent, and need to be clarified

High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) – Phase 2b

Equality Impact Assessment

Chapter 6

- MCC Comments on Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

9. Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)

9.1. Introduction

9.1.1. MCC welcomes the commitment of HS2 Ltd. to consider equality as part of the assessment for the Crewe to Manchester scheme. However, we feel there are still a number of issues that could be improved and resolved and as a result below we outline a number of points MCC would wish to be considered as the design of the scheme evolves.

9.2. Scope and Methodology

9.2.1. MCC welcomes the commitment from HS2 Ltd. to preparing a comprehensive Scope and Methodology Report for the EqIA assessment, which is separate to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

9.2.2. It is noted that the scope of the EQIA takes account of the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED): to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. consider the potential impact on other equality groups which are not protected under the Equality Act duty.

9.2.3. MCC would also request that HS2 Ltd. EqIA consider the potential impacts (or provide justification why such an impact is not likely) on those groups that Local Authorities have due regard duties to or who are considered in Local Authority EqIA frameworks and additional vulnerable groups to be assessed. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. identify measures considered to understand the differential and disproportionate impact on adults and children in the disability groups identified, in order to identify sufficient mitigations, in consultation with stakeholders.

9.2.4. The EqIA Scope & Methodology Report and EqIA Main report also includes limited information on the mechanisms to be secured for ongoing equalities analysis, equality stakeholder engagement and the need to refresh the data based on Census 2021 release and revisit the disproportionate data analysis model. MCC would therefore request that HS2 Ltd. consult with stakeholders to address the ongoing changes to equality baseline information and agree mechanism for delivery of the mitigation measures proposed.

9.2.5. MCC notes that the level of effects considering a combination of factors – noise, pollution, possible congestion, access as well as the impact on mental health - should be considered and addressed within the EqIA where practical, as different groups might have different positive/negative impacts. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. consider the cumulative effect on the protected groups identified within the EqIA and those suggested above when considering and developing mitigations.

- 9.2.6. MCC request that HS2 Ltd. provide a justification for the approach to selecting Local Super Output areas and that appropriate mitigation is provided should the potential effects be different to those identified in this EqlA.

9.3. **Stakeholder Engagement**

- 9.3.1. HS2 Ltd. must set out in more detail their engagement approach and support to be provided to affected businesses and organisations, including the strategy for providing alternative facilities where applicable, access to advice and timescales for engagement.
- 9.3.2. It is acknowledged that a significant number of facilities, businesses and properties are identified as being required to be demolished at a route-wide level. As highlighted in other sections, MCC would expect the detailed design to limit the loss of property as far as possible. It also needs to be ensured that adequate and timely engagement and support is provided, including details of compensation and mitigation, to the affected residents, businesses and other organisation as a matter of urgency.
- 9.3.3. Details of the programme and approach to engagement and mitigation for the education settings and the community they serve i.e. education awareness, health and safety etc.
- 9.3.4. In addition, MCC would request that Local Planning Authorities affected by the scheme are informed on the support requirements for all parties affected, specifically those identified as PCGs under the Equality Act 2010.

9.4. **Accessibility**

- 9.4.1. MCC are concerned that the proposed HS2 station is not appropriately integrated with the facilities of the existing Piccadilly station. A more integrated design would provide a common and more legible approach for all passengers, reducing unnecessary changes of level and therefore allowing better accessibility for all. MCC would request that HS2 Ltd. ensure that designs/modification reflect a similar or higher level of accessibility considerations in accordance with the Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (2018), GM HS2 and NPR Growth Strategy (2018).

9.5. **Socio-Economic**

- 9.5.1. Where building and structures are required to be demolished, further support and information are required for impacted local businesses and community facilities and homes on the mechanisms being considered, alongside the support that can be provided with the financial compensation. MCC request that appropriate resources be provided through the Communities and Environmental Fund and Business and Local Economy Fund and be informed by a quantified assessment of the impact upon community assets and business

- 9.5.2. Construction works have the potential to impact on disabled residents who use the area (for example barriers, increased traffic, temporary lights, signs etc may impact on wheelchair users, partially sighted or blind residents) and also parents or carers with pushchairs. MCC would request that the EqIA considers, and where practical, addresses the impacts associated with travel disruption, with particular attention given to disabled residents and visitors of the area.
- 9.5.3. MCC request clarification on whether the mitigation measures outlined in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and Local Environmental Management Plans are considered sufficient to mitigate the potential effects on the Protected Characteristic Groups (PCGs) identified and whether additional mitigation will be considered following detailed design.
- 9.5.4. Further consultation is required to underpin the assessment within the CoCP of arrangements in the case of evacuation. Further details are required about how the Emergency Response teams will be engaged and feed into the future community emergency plans and how the CoCP will be used by the appointed undertaker to protect the PCGs identified within the EqIA. On this basis, relevant Local Planning Authorities would request approval of the final form of the CoCP.
- 9.5.5. MCC require further details on the programme and approach to engagement and mitigation of the effects on the PCGs identified which provides confidence to stakeholders that all premises and associated PCGs affected will be supported prior to and throughout the construction works to minimise any potential effects as far as practical.

9.6. **Conclusion**

- 9.6.1. It is noted that many of the environmental impacts identified in the ES, including the specific impacts within the community areas, will be intrinsically linked to equality issues. Therefore, the EqIA and ES should be complementary documents which support each other. However, and as noted above, MCC will require significantly more information from HS2 Ltd. to ensure the Proposed Scheme avoids, reduced or mitigates any adverse impacts on all parties affected, specifically those identified as PCGs under the Equality Act 2010. It is understood that HS2's Ltd will seek to continually assess and review the impacts and implications of the Proposed Scheme on PCGs throughout the construction and operation of HS2, and this should be done in consultation with MCC and other stakeholders.

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Economy Scrutiny Committee – 10 March 2022

Subject: Update on COVID-19 Activity

Report of: Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure and Director of Inclusive Economy

Summary

This report provides Committee Members with a further update summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this Committee. Further detail on specific issues will be available as required.

Recommendations

The Committee is requested to note the update.

Wards Affected: All

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the issues addressed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city

Manchester Strategy Outcomes	Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	This unprecedented national and international crisis impacts on all areas of our city. The 'Our Manchester' approach has underpinned the planning and delivery of our response, working in partnership and identifying innovative ways to continue to deliver services and to establish new services as quickly as possible to support the most vulnerable in our city. A reset of the Our Manchester Strategy is now underway following a meeting of the Our
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	

A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Manchester Forum on 16 June 2020. An extensive engagement exercise will take place to inform a draft document in late 2020 and a final version in February 2021.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	

Contact Officers:

Name: Pat Bartoli

Position: Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure

Telephone: 0161 234 3329

Email: pat.bartoli@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Angela Harrington

Position: Director of Inclusive Economy

Telephone: 0161 234 3171

Email: angela.harrington@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Hilary Sayers

Position: City Centre Growth Manager

Telephone: 0161 234 3387

Email: hilary.sayers@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection): None

Economic Recovery Workstream- Sitrep Summary

Thursday 3 March 2022

Latest updates shown in yellow.

Issue/theme/activity area	Impact/ challenges experienced	Key planning and response activity being undertaken
<p>General Overview</p>	<p>ONS data: recent releases by the ONS show that unemployment was at 4.1%, employment was at 75.5% for October to December 2021, however wages are lagging behind inflation despite an increase in basic pay for the same period. Vacancies across most industries rose in January, with the biggest increase UK-wide in the accommodation and food services sector.</p> <p>ONS trade data shows that UK exports of goods to the EU have fallen by £20billion, compared with 2018, the most recent 'stable' period (before COVID and Brexit):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the combined impact of the pandemic and 	<p>Powering Recovery: Manchester's Recovery and Investment Plan' launched in Nov. Four investment priorities around: innovation; city centre and urban realm; residential retrofit programme; and North Manchester regeneration. Seeking govt funding for over 50 projects of £798.8 m. The plan can be accessed here.</p> <p>United City business-led campaign launched 22/11 and supported by MCC.</p> <p>Business Sounding Board and Real Estate subgroup continue to meet regularly to share intel across sectors and to help support MCC lobbying.</p> <p>Weekly MCC newsletter issued to over 10,000 businesses with updates.</p> <p>Business support and engagement; the various networks are beginning to function again in person post-pandemic. In addition, interest is being assessed amongst stakeholders in some new place specific groups such as St Ann's Square and King Street. Options to address the challenge of empty premises are to be further</p>

	<p>Britain's exit from the single market caused a 12% fall in exports between January and December 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Imports from non-EU countries remain higher than from EU countries for the 11th consecutive month and continue to be driven by increasing imports of fuels• The Business Insights and Conditions Survey (BICS) reports that 66% of exporters and 79% of importers faced challenges in late December 2021 to early January 2022 with additional paperwork, change in transportation costs and customs duties or levels being the top challenges for traders.• Outbound shipments of clothing and footwear to the EU were both down by almost 60% compared with 2018. Clothing exports have been	<p>considered- some 'pop-up' use by community or charity groups has proved successful.</p>
--	--	--

affected because a high proportion of garments sold by UK retailers are made in Asia or the US, making them ineligible for the tariffs negotiated in the post-Brexit trade deal.

Latest ONS [economic data](#) and business indicators:

- In the week to 26 February 2022, overall retail footfall in the UK increased by 11% from the previous week, a period affected by adverse weather conditions throughout the UK, and was 83% of the level seen in the equivalent week of 2019; this is 7% higher than two weeks ago (Springboard).
- The seven-day average estimate of UK seated diners increased by 12 percentage points in the week to 28 February 2022, to 131% of the

	<p>level in the equivalent week of 2019; this follows a 10-percentage point fall in the previous week (OpenTable).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approximately 19% of the workforce were estimated to be using a hybrid model of working, with a further 11% of the workforce estimated to be working from home in mid February 2022; 62% of the workforce were estimated to be working from a designated workplace (not from home).• The number of people who are wearing face coverings in shops and public transport is decreasing, with a reduction in the number of people worried about the effect of COVID (43% of adults surveyed, which is lowest proportion since October 2021). <p>COVID rules change: as of 24 February, the government lifted</p>	
--	--	--

the law requiring anyone who tests positive for COVID to self-isolate, and children and people working in education will no longer be required to test twice a week. The government will continue to recommend that people should stay at home if they test positive but as of 1 April, this will end, and free public testing will also end. A Spring booster will be available to those over 75 and anyone over 12 who is immunosuppressed.

2022 Michelin Guide: eleven Manchester city centre restaurants made the [2022 Michelin Guide](#), with Mana – who received the city’s first star in over 40 years in 2019 – retaining its star.

Deloitte Crane Survey:

Deloitte released its annual Crane Survey for the year from 2 January 2021 to 5 January 2022. The report covers the city centre plus the Blackfriars,

Greengate and Chapel St areas of Salford. The key headlines are that Manchester and Salford have been remarkably resilient during 2021 and whilst there has certainly been some rebalancing of market activity over the last 2 years, overall construction levels are well above average for the city.

Completions during 2021:

- 5,549 new homes
- 404,584 sqft of office space
- 466 hotel beds
- 143,848 sqft of retail and leisure space
- 938,876 sqft of education space
- 492 student beds

New leaseholder protections: the [Building Safety Bill](#) will go to the House of Lords on 21 February, featuring amendments including a Government guarantee that no leaseholder living in medium or

high-rise buildings will have to pay a penny for the removal of cladding. Developers and product manufacturers that do not help fix the cladding scandal could be blocked from the housing market; the government will be able to block planning permission and building control sign-off on developments, effectively preventing them from building and selling new homes.

Further details on revamped New Century Hall: the historic music venue has been rebranded [New Century ahead of its opening](#). The building has undergone extensive refurbishment and will host a 'multi-use social hub' as an event space, as well as a diverse food offer New Century Kitchen. In the basement will be the Access Creative College, which provides courses in creative industries. A further

200,000sqft of speculative, net zero carbon office space will be provided.

RIBA NW shortlist revealed: three Manchester buildings have made [RIBA's North West shortlist](#) for the RIBA Regional Awards 2022. The entries include the Anco&Co PRS scheme on Blossom Street, the Special Exhibition Gallery at the Science & Industry Museum, and the Grosvenor East Building for MMU on Oxford Road.

New openings: [The Alan, a new design-led hotel](#) at 18 Princess Street has opened, with 137 rooms provided. Pizza restaurant [Rudy's has lodged an application](#) to convert the former Dawson's music shop on Portland Street into their third store. The new Hello Oriental food hall opened on 12 February in Symphony Park at Circle Square, with an Asian

	<p>supermarket, specialist retailers and open kitchens and restaurant and event space. The foodhall features an impressive architecturally designed ceiling. At the Great Northern Warehouse, a new roller skating experience will open in May, creating 35 jobs. The leisure venue has been development by the founder of Junkyard Gold Club.</p>									
<p>Footfall –</p>	<p>Footfall trends- City Centre (Springboard / CityCo) Week 8, 20th February – 26th February</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Week on week %</th> <th>Year on year %</th> <th>Pre Covid</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>St Ann's Sq</td> <td>+17.7%</td> <td>+169.0%</td> <td>-24.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Week on week %	Year on year %	Pre Covid	St Ann's Sq	+17.7%	+169.0%	-24.8%	
	Week on week %	Year on year %	Pre Covid							
St Ann's Sq	+17.7%	+169.0%	-24.8%							

Exchange Sq	+13.8%	+194.1%	-28.7%
King Street	+21.3%	+264.7%	-33.3%
Market Street	+10.1%	+162.4%	-31.2%
New Cathedral Street	+12.8%	+181.7%	-49.7%

Footfall trends- District Centres (Springboard)
Week 8, 21st February – 27th February

	Week on week %	Year on year %	Pre-Covid
Cheetham Hill	+28.5%	+32.4%	-14.1%

	Chorlton	+24. 6%	+7.3 %	- 34. 4%	
	Fallowfield	+33. 8%	+12. 9%	- 2.0 %	
	Gorton	+5.5 %	+33. 9%	- 9.9 %	
	Harpurhey	+19. 6%	+11. 3%	- 25. 8%	
	Levenshulme	+26. 1%	+23. 2%	- 32. 9%	
	Northenden	+17. 5%	+51. 9%	- 3.9 %	
	Rushholme	+13. 6%	+46. 6%	- 6.1 %	

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Victoria Avenue</td> <td>- 8.8%</td> <td>+17.6%</td> <td>- 36.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Withington</td> <td>+20.8%</td> <td>+22.9%</td> <td>- 3.9%</td> </tr> </table>	Victoria Avenue	- 8.8%	+17.6%	- 36.9%	Withington	+20.8%	+22.9%	- 3.9%	
Victoria Avenue	- 8.8%	+17.6%	- 36.9%							
Withington	+20.8%	+22.9%	- 3.9%							
<p>Higher Education Institutions</p>	<p>MMU – 96% teaching is taking place face to face. Students returned 3rd week of January. Backlog of missed graduation ceremonies have now taken place. Covid infection rates down to very low levels.</p> <p>RNCM - 90% students back, 10% still online due to Covid.</p> <p>Manchester Metropolitan’s brand new £35m School of Digital Art (SODA) is now open</p>									

	<p>with the school being well oversubscribed for their first intake of students.</p>	
<p>Aviation</p>	<p>The Prime Minister announced on 5 January that from Friday 7 January, pre-departure tests would no longer be required for travellers from abroad arriving in England. From 10 January, on arrival, lateral flow tests replaced more expensive PCR tests on day 2.</p>	<p>COVID 19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following the start of restriction-free travel once again, MAG experienced an increase in passenger numbers across all three airports during February. Half term saw the highest levels of passenger demand since before the pandemic. MAG expected to welcome nearly 1.5 million passengers between 11 and 27 February, compared to only 73,000 over the same period in 2021. • The Government announcement that fully vaccinated people would no longer be required to take any tests when travelling from the UK saw a sharp increase in bookings. The total airline seat capacity across MAG’s airports is around 20% higher for February and March than January. <p>Recruitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAG continues its recruitment drive at Manchester Airport. There are 500 jobs available at Manchester, directly with MAG, and hundreds more with other businesses operating at the airport. Last month, MAG held a jobs fair at Old Trafford

		<p>cricket ground with close to 500 attendees with some people securing job interviews directly at the jobs fair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following on from this, MAG is hosting a Manchester Airport jobs fair in Wythenshawe at the end of the month and will be advertising shortly for how people sign up.
<p>Culture</p>	<p>Culture Recovery Fund</p> <p>Changes to COVID restrictions from 24/2/22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government has removed remaining domestic restrictions in England. • People are no longer required to wear face coverings. Audiences no longer have to show an NHS COVID Pass at venues and events. 	<p>Response to changes to restrictions</p> <p>Venues are no longer requiring visitors to wear masks but staff members may continue to wear them. Some are continuing running socially distanced events such as HOME’s Socially Distanced cinema screenings. Venues continue to ensure processes are in place to maintain cleanliness and aid social/physical distancing.</p> <p>Organisations are ramping up delivery of programmes, productions, events and exhibitions into spring.</p> <p>Music Economy research</p> <p>MCC has commissioned industry consultants Sound Diplomacy to undertake a study of the Manchester Music Economy. The final draft has been received and plans to announce the findings are being prepared for later in March.</p> <p>Cultural Core Funding</p>

		<p>In 2022, multi-year funding programmes for application by cultural organisations are being made available by ACE, GMCA and MCC. All 3 funders extended their current programmes by 1 year to give additional stability to grant recipients during COVID.</p> <p>ACE 2023-26 Investment Programme The application process for companies wishing to secure ACE core NPO (National Portfolio Organisation) funding opened on 28 February 2022, and closes on 18 May. Programme priorities are in line with the ACE 10 year ‘Let’s Create’ strategy.</p> <p>ACE made a priority funding announcement on 23/2 as an addendum to programme guidance. The Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport has issued an instruction for ACE align resources with the Government’s Levelling Up priorities.</p>
<p>Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continued development interest in the city for both commercial and residential scheme.</i> • <i>All schemes are back on site, and construction levels increased since the beginning of the pandemic, although with some overall delays to programmes.</i> • <i>Risks around supply chains/access to</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printworks works to start: this month, owners DTZ Investors will start the refurbishment project, approved in 2020, which will feature a 10,000sqft digital ceiling, a large interactive screen, and work to upgrade the 23-screen cinema, and revamp of the façade. • Start on Piccadilly tower: a new residential tower as part of the Portugal Street East has now started. It will be 25-storeys when completed and provide 177 apartments. • ID Manchester moving forward: the legal documentation for the joint venture between Bruntwood SciTech and the University of Manchester has been finalised which means the project can take another step forward. • Work begins on Airport hotel: construction has started on a new £42m 412-bed TRIBE hotel at Airport City Manchester,

	<p><i>materials, with associated increases in costs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Access to finance for hotel and retail schemes likely to be more challenging.</i> • <i>Economic Recovery & Investment Plan identifies key schemes which can drive recovery and create new jobs. Ongoing work to identify funding opportunities for schemes.</i> • <i>Long term impact on office demand being monitored on an ongoing basis, but positive indications from office agents and the Business Sounding Board, with recent reports of increased demand, especially for flexible, high quality office space.</i> <p>Emerging Trends in Real Estate Europe 2022: the annual survey</p>	<p>which will be the first of its kind in the UK. Due to open in summer 2022, it will include a restaurant, bar, and a crew lounge for airport staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancoats Dispensary starts: work to the historic building is officially underway to create 39 one and two bed apartments available for affordable rent. The work is scheduled to complete in 2023. • Office lettings: streaming provider Roku has taken 115,000sqft at No.1 Circle Square as its first office in Manchester. The team will now be recruiting for more than 50 engineering roles before the end of 2022. This represented the largest single transaction in terms of square footage across Manchester in 2021. DCMS has chosen Bloc on Marble Street for a 12,000sqft office. At One Express, on George Leigh Street nearly all the space has been let since it reopened following refurbishment, with a variety of businesses taking leases including a number of digital focused. Deliveroo has opened a new Manchester office growing its headcount to 180 roles in Manchester, making it the largest office for the company outside of London. • Sports Direct takes more space: the retailer has doubled its footprint in the Arndale, taking a new 15-year lease in the former BHS unit. It will host a range of brands under the parent company Frasers Group such as USC, Evans Cycles, and Game. It will also have a Belong esports arena. • Piccadilly planning applications submitted: two applications have been submitted for Piccadilly Gardens. Thackeray has lodged an application to convert unused space on the upper floors of the three-storey building at 7-9 Piccadilly into 43,000sqft of offices, retaining Greggs and Superdrug on the ground floor. Legal & General have also
--	--	---

by PwC and the Urban Land Institute (ULI) has seen a significant leap in confidence going into next year. It surveys property professionals, and the results reveal that the sector is recording the highest levels of business confidence since 2014. However, the areas the industry are most concerned about are [construction costs and resource availability](#), availability of suitable land/assets and the continually updating sustainability requirements.

submitted for a revamp of the pavilion in the Gardens, which would split the retail units by removing the canopy and refurbishing the units, as well as inserting art installations around the remaining section of the wall. (Ref: 132578/FO/2021)

- **Water Street towers approved:** four towers of [39, 48, 55 and 60 storeys](#) have been approved at Planning Committee on 17 February. Known as 'Trinity Island' the towers will deliver 1,950 apartments as well as £10million investment into the open space around the development.
- **Affordable housing scheme approved:** 89 apartments will be built on the corner of Pigeon Street and [Laystall Street](#), which will feature a new build on Pigeon Street, with the historic 32-34 Laystall Street extended to provide 8,000sqft of workspace. The homes available will 10 apartments available for social rent, 34 for affordable rent and 45 for shared ownership.
- **Logistics buildings approved:** a series of three logistics units at the [World Freight Terminal](#) at the Airport have been approved. The application, by Columbia Threadneedle Investments, who is an Airport City partner, will provide 85,000sqft to meet freight storage demand at the Airport.
- **Consultation on Store Street site:** Preston-based hospitality firm A Very Inc are seeking to redevelop the former Presbar Diecasting Foundry on Store Street, creating The Foundry, featuring a large beer hall and brewery, as well as the night market for independent retailers, and a bakery. Diecast Studios would include a gym, tech hub and creative studios. The [consultation is open until 28 February](#) and A Very Inc. are hosting an event on Thursday.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kier purchases Cheetham Hill site: a 4.9-acre brownfield site has been purchased by Kier Property and Investec with a view to creating industrial and trade units on the site. The site is approximately one mile north of the city centre and forms part of the established Cheetham Hill Industrial area. It is also directly opposite Cheetham Retail Park and adjacent to Manchester Fort Shopping Park.
<p>Affordable Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk to developer and investor confidence. • Working with RP's and other developers to understand current impact and forward plans. • Assessing sources and levels of investment, and any obstacles • Investigating grant funding, financial and other support needed to enable early start of key projects • Understanding supply chain issues and identifying appropriate support measures. 	<p>Current forecasts suggest 562 new affordable homes will be built across Manchester in 2021-22 – 432 of which have already completed. This includes 258 social rent, 165 affordable rent, 99 shared ownership and 40 rent to buy homes.</p> <p>Notable completions this year include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Extra Care schemes delivered by Southway at Gorton Mill House (106 homes) and Dahlia House (56 homes). An additional Extra Care Scheme - Oaklands House (36 homes) - is due for completion in March • One Manchester have completed over 170 new affordable homes in 2021-22 including the UK's first zero carbon homes at Blackrock Street • 48 large family homes have been bought & refurbished for homeless families through the Housing Affordability Fund <p>In addition, there are currently c.1,000 new affordable homes currently under construction across the city and expected to complete over the next few years. This includes a number of large-scale developments including the Former Edge Lane Business Centre (216 homes) and the Former Belle Vue Stadium Site (130</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing guidance/share good practice for safe operation of sites • Expediting design & planning phases of projects. • Risk of registered providers slowing down or pausing programmes to consolidate finances/liquidity • Ensure Zero Carbon and Fire safety provision are part of the programmes. • Potential flooding of the PRS sector as the short term let market shrinks. 	<p>affordable homes). There are also currently 3 city centre schemes under construction at Swan Street (19 homes), Addington Street (50 homes) and Islington Wharf (54 affordable homes)</p> <p>Updates on further key schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction has begun on MCC’s development of 69 older persons social rent homes at Silk St in Miles Platting & Newton Heath • A public consultation on Russell Road LGBT Extra Care Scheme took place in January with a further pre-planning consultation scheduled for February ahead of submitting planning after the local elections • A public consultation on the 730-home redevelopment of Jacksons Brickworks is underway. The scheme brought forward by Your Housing Group features a mix of open market sale, shared ownership, social rent & rent to buy • Grey Mare Lane Estate – One Manchester have started construction on the first two phases of the Estate Regeneration programme (Blackrock Street & Windermere Close). The redevelopment is set to deliver c.290 new affordable homes (incl. 124 of reprovision) and the retrofit of 150 homes over the next 5 years. A Master Plan was approved at the November meeting of the Executive. <p>There is growing evidence – including through feedback from MHPP - that problems with supply chains for products and materials are beginning to impact on delivery timescales and costs.</p>
<p>Transport and</p>	<p>GM Clean Air Plan (CAP) Update</p>	<p>Summary of transport activity for week ending 27 February (GM-wide)</p>

<p>Infrastructure e</p>	<p>Following evidence submitted by the GM Mayor and Leaders, Government has agreed to lift the legal direction requiring the ten GM Local Authorities to implement a Category C Clean Air Zone (CAZ) to deliver compliance with nitrogen dioxide legal limits on the local road network by 2024. The Government has issued a new direction which requires compliance in the shortest possible time and by no later than 2026. The GM CAZ, which had been due to go live on 30 May 2022, will not now go ahead. GM authorities will work with government to deliver, by July 2022. MCC Councillors and officers continue to work with GM colleagues to develop the new plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were an estimated 48m trips made in Greater Manchester – 5% above the previous week. • Compared to the equivalent week in 2020, trip levels were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total trips down 5% • No change in weekday trips • Weekend trips up 20% • Bus down 30% • Metrolink down 36% • Rail down 37% • Cycling down 41% • Walking up 8% • Highways down 3% • Growth in trip numbers last week was driven by increased activity over the weekend. • Improved weather conditions led to a significant rise in footfall and cycling activity. Pedestrian and cyclist movements captured at sensor locations were 61% up compared to the previous weekend (which was impacted by multiple storms). • Regional centre and Manchester: During the week ending 20 February, the Regional Centre saw an estimated 3.3 million total trips. This is 2.4% down on the previous week, and included 2.37 million trips from GM and 0.93 million from outside of GM. • Regional Centre trips were 69% of the pre-pandemic baseline (November 2019).
---	---	--

<p>Skills, Labour Market and Business Support</p>	<p>Furlough and Newly Unemployed Headlines include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the latest release (January 2021) there were 26,005 claimants of unemployment benefits in Manchester – up 0.2% from the revised December's figure of 25,960 claimants. Unemployment for women is continuing to fall much faster than it is for men (trend across GM). • While furlough came to an end in September, there is no evidence that formerly furloughed residents have moved onto UC. The number of claimants has shown a month by month decrease since April 2021 when there were 79,300 claimants. January's provisional figure shows 75,804 claimants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWP Way to Work offer is taking shape locally with continued engagement of Kickstart employers a key feature. Moseley St Jobcentre and Employer Suite in THX will be key delivery places. Event planned for 31 March • Continue to work with Government Departs looking to increase workforce in the City with sessions taking place in February/March to understand support needed. • Working with Health and Social Care sector to develop provider information sessions in March (internal and external) to improve recruitment outcomes by creating and strengthening relationships with employability organisations. • Working closely with MAG to support their recruitment aspirations. This includes promotion of opportunities through the Airport Academy alongside DWP and Wythenshawe Partners. In addition to planning for a careers events at the Forum on 11th and 24th March. • Working with Virgin Media to recruit to around 60 full and part time roles at their Wythenshawe Offices. Work is underway with partners to deliver pre-employment support to residents ahead of an open day in early March. Further recruitment anticipated in April/May.
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In January there were 32,705 job vacancies up 9% from the previous month. 					
	<p>Offer 16-19 Year Olds CCIS Update: January DfE Submission</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Known</td> <td>2.9% (increase from last update - 2.7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unknown</td> <td>3.0% (decrease from last update - 3.5%)</td> </tr> </table>	Known	2.9% (increase from last update - 2.7%)	Unknown	3.0% (decrease from last update - 3.5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-location review of Career Connect service has been completed with a report being produced with agreed adjustments. Additional outreach and out of hours activity also commenced. Post 16 Sufficiency research (to establish the capacity needed in FE) has been completed and shared with Exec Members and with the Post-16 Reference Group for actioning recommendations. Revised P16 Stat Pack has been developed and will be used to form actions via Education Access Board and Internal P16 Steering Group.
Known	2.9% (increase from last update - 2.7%)					
Unknown	3.0% (decrease from last update - 3.5%)					

<p>Combined</p>	<p>5.8% (decrease from last update - 6.2%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal Post-16 Steering Group Terms of Reference established and in-place following scoping activity on the purpose and influence of the group members. NEET Prevention Panel pilot launched in March 2022. NEET Locality Taskforce pilot to be launched in April 2022. NM SV Education Strategy consultation period has now ended. A final version will be completed for April 2022.
<p>Careers Connect update: February 16th</p>		
<p>Known</p>	<p>3.18% (increase from last update - 2.72%)</p>	
<p>Unknown</p>	<p>2.39% (decrease from last update - 3.46%)</p>	
<p>Combined</p>	<p>5.57% (decrease from last update - 6.18%)</p>	
<p>Youth unemployment</p> <p>Maximise the opportunities from and work with partners to roll out the Kickstart Scheme.</p> <p>Supporting youth employment programmes</p>		<p>MCC Kickstart opportunities – working with DWP to recruit to the final Kickstart roles ahead of March deadline.</p> <p>National Apprenticeship Week (7th February 2022). We delivered our most extensive campaign yet with case studies, promotion of opportunities, events and videos including the Leader and Cllr White.</p>

	<p>Developing a clear offer to support our graduates</p>	<p>Delivering an apprenticeships/career pathways event 11th March at Wythenshawe Forum as part of National Careers Week. The event is in partnership with Mike Kane’s Office, BW3, MAG and schools.</p> <p>Working with MMU to develop activities to support students to gain part time employment and work experience opportunities whilst learning. And the MMU SME support pilot programme to be evaluated and re-launched.</p>
	<p>Skills and employment support for adults</p> <p>Challenges -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to reflect on delivery of the Digital Inclusion Action Plan programme so far. The landscape looks very different to what it was 12 months ago. A number of review workshops and 1-1 conversations with funders to shape objectives and outputs for the new year. • CRF and Arcadis funded North Manchester and digital projects – need for the two to complement 	<p>Connect with Us digital roadshow will begin on 4th March with 10 events across North Manchester. Local community venues are being used to speak to residents to offer direct support to help them thrive online.</p> <p>In January MAES completed 3 Sector-based Work Academy Programmes in partnership with DWP – 2 for HMRC who have been recruiting for admin roles (1 in person and 1 online) - 18 participants....outcomes not known as yet. And one for WGC (hotel group) for housekeeping roles. - 8 participants and 3 secured jobs so far.</p> <p>MAES recruited 84.23% of their target for term 1 (5373/6379 learners) although they did see growth on Digital and Vocational courses and ESOL outperformed its target.</p>

	<p>each other without duplication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge with a place-based approach – how do we work better and smarter with neighborhoods services and community groups around them to better focus and reach more residents. • Digital Volunteer fatigue and drop off – how to reengage volunteers in 2022 to ensure the service is still effective. 	
	<p>Social Value and Local Benefit</p> <p>Challenge: Many residents are not connecting to opportunities created in the city – how can we use social value internally to maximise creation of employment/skills/training opportunities targeted at our residents and use our influence to do the same with organisations externally?</p>	<p>The annual MCC - CLES conference took place on 18 February which, despite Storm Eunice, was well attended (well over 100 had registered beforehand) and initial feedback was very positive. A debrief meeting with CLES will be taking place.</p> <p>The CLES analysis of social value delivered by the council's top 300 suppliers was also published alongside the conference.</p> <p>Trinity Island Local Labour Condition applied on planning approval. The condition will ringfence apprenticeship, employment, and training opportunities for Manchester residents.</p>

	<p>Ensure that MCC’s approach to SV reflects current economic circumstances and <i>Think</i> recommendations.</p> <p>Coordinate employment and skills related social value “offers” from across MCC’s largest suppliers and capital projects into a pipeline of opportunities that can be promoted to residents and employment/skills/training organisations.</p>	
	<p>Business Support, Sustainability and Growth</p> <p>Business Grants</p> <p>Latest spend position:</p> <p>Three New Business Grant programmes</p> <p>Following the announcement of the new grants available to the hospitality sector,</p>	<p>Business Grants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing date has now passed and currently there are c100 OARG applications to process. • MCC has so far awarded £363,114 leaving a balance of £635,903 plans are being developed to ensure financial spend is achieved by 31/3/22

guidance was released on 30 December.

1. [Omicron Hospitality and Leisure Grant scheme \(OHLG\)](#) -
2. [The third ARG top-up](#) – **now closed.**
3. [COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund \(CARF\) Business Rates Scheme](#) . **Now Closed**

Current position

Last week BEIS released national statistics for OHLG and ARG grants

schemes reflecting allocations to 30 January.

Nationally Manchester has outperformed other authorities in awarding the highest grant level

SMEs, District Centre and High Street Business support – Roadshows Go Live March 2022

- SME Business Support Roadshow Briefing note shared with Councillor White.
- First event will 'go live' **22 March** at the **Peace Garden, Moston Lane**
- A 12-month plan of locations is being drawn up to include North, South and Central District Centres
- Each Neighbourhood will have 1 planned business support event every quarter

	<p>of the 309 authorities; ranking 7th in % of grant allocation terms.</p> <p>In terms of ARG (including ARG Omicron) the Council has allocated 94.4% of its allocation, the highest across the 8 Core Cities and 3rd across GM.</p> <p>Payments 14th – 27th Feb = £1.186m:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OHLG Omicron - £498,015 (125 payments)• ARG (Omicron) - £194,250 (290 payments) <p>Growth Hub Monthly Business survey highlights to 31 January</p> <p>The latest findings from the GC Business Survey indicate business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Production of leaflets will be ready for distribution 1 week prior to each event to undertake initial business engagement- Led by the W&S team on the ground support and engagement will include - Neighbourhood teams, Business Growth Hub, Enterprising You, Cyber Resilience, Skills for Growth SME, BIPC and colleagues from Enviro Health will support each event on the day.
--	--	---

	<p>confidence remains fairly high. Some indicators which suggest economic headwinds lie ahead, in particular</p> <p>Rising costs and inflation and ongoing supply chain risks.</p> <p>Cashflow issues remain below early pandemic levels, there are tentative signs that this issue is showing more signs of stress.</p> <p>These findings are reflected in business support needs, which show that more businesses are needing support with financial advice, general business planning, sales and marketing and workforce development.</p> <p>Uncertainty most acutely felt by</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>businesses in the hospitality sector, these businesses continue to experience decreased sales and cashflow issues.</p> <p>Overall, results indicate that businesses remain resilient, with the percentage of businesses reporting increased sales rising on the levels seen last month (mostly due to the Christmas period), and businesses' financial reserves remaining stable, albeit slightly lower than reported previously.</p> <p>More importantly, appetite to invest in different areas has increased significantly, most notably in workforce and skills, and in innovation and digital transformation.</p> <p>Finally, the risk of redundancy remains</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>very low and the proportion of firms currently hiring has stayed broadly at the same level, following a period of record-breaking vacancy numbers nationally and locally in the run up to the end of December</p> <p>Inward investment</p> <p>£5bn Manchester construction pipeline of new commercial development and housing.</p> <p>In April 2020 March 2021 Manchester won 29 inward investment projects which will create 1,017 jobs in the following sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 152 jobs in Advanced manufacturing• 475 in the Creative and Digital sector• 204 in Finance, Professional and Business Services	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 186 in Life Sciences <p>Equalities/ Disadvantaged</p> <p>Ensure that disadvantaged and underrepresented groups are supported by activity included in Workstreams 1-6. This would include Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic groups, young people, over 50's, homeless, veterans, survivors of DV&A, ESA claimants, and those experiencing family poverty.</p> <p>Covid has worsened the situation for many already experiencing inequality – the challenge is to ensure support is targeted to reach the communities in most need.</p>	<p>Supporting Afghan arrivals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - W&S supporting DWP Proof of Concept project to explore whether the removal of non-employment barriers to work can help people to move into housing. - The project will work closely with the homelessness service to support a small group of people, in temporary accommodation. - Caseworkers recruited to provide 1:1 support and will link in with local employment support provision. - The project is due to launch in Feb and will run from 3 to 6 months. <p>Uncertain Futures Employment & Skills Sessions for over 50's women:</p> <p>Uncertain Futures - the Confident Language for Work event took place in the Tea Gallery at Manchester Art Gallery on 16th February. The interactive session was delivered by MAES to 10 participants who all gave very positive feedback. The next session will also be held at the Gallery on 23rd March on the topic of the menopause and work.</p> <p>A policy event is planned for the 24th March to bring forward key findings from the research and present a call for action to policy makers.</p> <p>Planning is underway for a specific over 50's campaign during National Apprenticeship week in February 2022.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>The W&S Race Equity group have reviewed objectives for 2022 to continue along the themes of (1) Supporting the wider team with peer support and training (2) Better understanding the make-up of our communities to deliver targeted support (3) Supporting structural change.</p>
<p>Funding</p>	<p>No specific known impacts on current external funding bids caused by C19 as yet. Known bids progressing through funding approval processes as expected.</p>	<p>Funding Announcements</p> <p>The levelling up white paper was released on Wednesday 2nd February.</p> <p>Prior to publishing the paper, a DLUHC press release (30 Jan) announced the following:</p> <p>Brownfield Funding Announcement</p> <p>“A total of £120 million of funding will be given to 7 Mayoral Combined Authorities to transform derelict brownfield sites into vibrant places where people want to live and work. Seven MCAs – West Midlands, Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire, Liverpool,</p>

		<p>South Yorkshire, North of Tyne, and Tees Valley stand to gain 7,800 homes.</p> <p>A further £30 million is being awarded to 3 Mayoral Combined Authorities in Greater Manchester, Tees Valley and West Midlands on disused brownfield land.”</p> <p>Levelling Up Home Building Fund</p> <p>“1.5 billion Levelling Up Home Building Fund next week, providing loans to small and medium sized builders and developers to deliver 42,000 homes, with the vast majority outside of London and the South East.”</p> <p>Details have not yet been confirmed however our understanding is that this funding is part of a previous announcement.</p> <p>UK Shared Prosperity Fund 3 year of funding announced. Pre-guidance notes were issued alongside the Levelling Up White Paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. £2.6 bn of new funding for local investment by March 2025, as part of a suite of complementary Levelling Up funding.2. Provide all areas of the UK with an allocation of revenue and capital funding - via a funding formula, not a competition.
--	--	--

		<p>3. Taper in from 2022-23, with funding reaching £1.5bn a year by 2025.</p> <p>2022-3 0.4 billion (revenue)</p> <p>2023-4 0.8 billion (0.7 revenue, 0.1 capital)</p> <p>2024-5 1.8 billion (1.5 revenue, 0.3 capital)</p> <p>4. Empower each place to identify and build on their own strengths and needs at a local level, focused on pride in place.</p> <p>5. Delegate delivery of the fund to local authorities, supported by local partners. In GM this will be GMCA, who will be funded via funding formula rather than a competition.</p> <p>6. A full prospectus will be available in “Spring 2022” and GMCA will have to submit an “Investment Plan” for approval by Government in Summer 2022.</p> <p>7. The fund will be led by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) with support from other government departments.</p> <p>8. Themes are: Communities and Place (2022-4), Supporting Local Business (2022-4) and People and Skills (2024-5).</p> <p>Community Ownership Fund – round 2 has been delayed until Spring 2022, when it will be relaunched with a new prospectus and additional support for applicants.</p> <p>Funding in Progress Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund Round 3 has been announced – MCC secured c.£19m from round 1 of the fund and delivery of that programme is our priority. A bid for £4.5 million to the latest round has been submitted.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Funding Approved</p> <p>Energy Savings Trust's (EST) eCargo Bike Grant Fund, Local Authority Scheme 2021/2022. Scheme was officially launched on 17th January with good press coverage. https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/news/article/8931/ebikes_come_to_manchester_as_ambitious_city-wide_scheme_launches</p>
External Lobbying	<p>Parliament returns from summer recess on 6 September 2021 with an announcement on the date of the 2021 Spending Review expected soon after. There is currently uncertainty surrounding the 2021 Spending Review period in relation to a 1 or 3 year settlement for local government. Direct lobbying of Government is needed as well as working via Greater Manchester and networks such as Core Cities UK, Convention of the North and the LGA.</p>	<p>We have been working with colleagues in GMCA and other organisations to understand the funding landscape with a particular focus on UKSPF, with the aim of making sure that Manchester's priorities are reflected. We are talking to relevant people about levelling up bids as well as our priorities for North Manchester.</p> <p>We have also been talking to DLUHC about an outcomes framework for the levelling up White Paper and feeding in some examples of outcomes, measures and systems that Manchester uses to track progress against our objectives.</p>

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Economy Scrutiny Committee – 10 March 2022

Subject: Overview Report

Report of: Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit

Summary

This report provides the following information:

- Recommendations Monitor
- Key Decisions
- Items for Information
- Work Programme

Recommendation

The Committee is invited to discuss and note the information provided.

Wards Affected: All

Contact Officers:

Name: Mike Williamson
Position: Governance and Scrutiny Support Manager
Telephone: 0161 234 3071
Email: m.williamson@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

None

1. Monitoring Previous Recommendations

This section of the report contains recommendations made by the Committee and responses to them indicating whether the recommendation will be implemented, and if it will be, how this will be done.

Date	Item	Recommendation	Response	Contact Officer
13 January 2022	ESC/22/02 Updates on Sub Strategies of the City Centre Transport Strategy	Request that the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) circulate a map to all Members of the Committee that highlights the existing active travel schemes and the planned projects that connect these.	Information to be circulated	Becca Heron Strategic Director (Growth and Development)
10 February 2022	ESC/22/07 Manchester Work and Skills Strategy Refresh	Recommend that a report on the delivery of work and skills through the Our Town Hall Project is included on the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.	This item will be added to the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.	Scrutiny Support Officer
10 February 2022	ESC/22/09 Manchester Adult Education Service	Recommends that a report on the MAES External Review is provided to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.	This item will be added to the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.	Scrutiny Support Officer
10 February 2022	ESC/22/09 Manchester Adult Education Service	Recommends that a report on the work delivered in partnership between MAES and the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector is provided to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.	This item will be added to the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.	Scrutiny Support Officer

2. Key Decisions

The Council is required to publish details of key decisions that will be taken at least 28 days before the decision is due to be taken. Details of key decisions that are due to be taken are published on a monthly basis in the Register of Key Decisions.

A key decision, as defined in the Council's Constitution is an executive decision, which is likely:

- To result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates, or
- To be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the city.

The Council Constitution defines 'significant' as being expenditure or savings (including the loss of income or capital receipts) in excess of £500k, providing that is not more than 10% of the gross operating expenditure for any budget heading in the in the Council's Revenue Budget Book, and subject to other defined exceptions.

An extract of the most recent Register of Key Decisions, published on **28 February 2022**, containing details of the decisions under the Committee's remit is included below. This is to keep members informed of what decisions are being taken and, where appropriate, include in the work programme of the Committee.

Development and Growth					
<p>Delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025 - Establishment of Strategic Partnership with Homes England (2019/09/05A)</p> <p>To negotiate and formalise a Strategic Partnership with Homes England to enable the delivery of Manchester Affordable Homes to 2025</p>	Strategic Director - (Growth and Development)	Not before 4th Oct 2019	In consultation with the Executive Members for Housing and Regeneration and Finance and HR	Report and Recommendation	Steve Sheen s.sheen@manchester.gov.uk
<p>Delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025 - Disposal of sites (2019/09/05B)</p>	City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive)	Not before 4th Oct 2019	In consultation with Strategic Director (Growth and Development)	Report and Recommendations	Steve Sheen s.sheen@manchester.gov.uk

To agree the disposal of sites in Council ownership for the provision of affordable homes			and Executive Members for Housing and Regeneration and Finance and HR		
<p>Delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025 - Establishment of Partnership arrangements with Registered Providers (2019/09/05C)</p> <p>To establish partnership arrangements with Registered Providers together with their partners/consortium for defined areas in the North, Central, South and Wythenshawe areas of the City.</p>	Strategic Director - (Growth and Development)	Not before 4th Oct 2019	In consultation with City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) and the Executive Members for Housing and Regeneration and Finance and HR	Report and recommendation	Steve Sheen s.sheen@manchester.gov.uk
<p>Delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025 -Agreement of legal terms (2019/09/05D)</p> <p>To enter into and complete all necessary legal documents and agreements to give effect to delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025</p>	City Solicitor	Not before 4th Oct 2019		Report and recommendations	Fiona Ledden, City Solicitor fiona.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

<p>Heron House General Letting Consent (2019/11/25A)</p> <p>To agree to the disposal by Leasehold of office accommodation at Heron House.</p>	Chief Executive	Not before 24th Dec 2019		Briefing Note & Heads of Terms	Mike Robertson m.robertson@manchester.gov.uk
<p>Disposal of site of former Chorlton Leisure Centre for residential development (21/05/13A)</p> <p>Approval to the terms for the leasehold disposal of the site of the former Chorlton Leisure Centre for residential development.</p>	Strategic Director - (Growth and Development)	Not before 13th Jun 2021		Report to the Strategic Director of Growth and Development	Mike Robertson m.robertson@manchester.gov.uk
<p>Disposal of Buglawton Hall (2021/05/27A)</p> <p>To approve the freehold disposal of Buglawton Hall, Buxton Road, Congleton, Cheshire</p>	Chief Executive	Not before 25th Jun 2021		Briefing Note	Thomas Pyatt, Development Surveyor Tel: 0161 234 5469 thomas.pyatt@manchester.gov.uk
<p>Disposal of Simon House, Wavell Road, Wythenshawe for use as a</p>	Strategic Director - (Growth and	Not before 4th Jan 2022		Report to the Strategic Director of Growth and	Joe Martin, Development Surveyor joe.martin@manchester.gov.uk

<p>data centre (2021/10/12A)</p> <p>Approval to the terms for the leasehold disposal of Simon House, Wavell Road, Wythenshawe for use as a data centre</p>	Development)			Development	
<p>Procurement of Property Services Framework Contract (2021/11/26A)</p> <p>To approve the evaluation and selection outcome of the procurement process for the property services framework.</p>	Strategic Director - (Growth and Development)	Not before 26th Dec 2021		Evaluation documents of tenders received	Mike Robertson m.robertson@manchester.gov.uk
<p>Land at New Smithfield Market (2021/12/23A)</p> <p>To dispose of land under two long leases to Barton & Redman in order to facilitate the expansion of their facility on site and the disposal of land under a long lease to Khanjra & Co for the development of a new warehouse on the site.</p>	Chief Executive	Not before 23rd Jan 2022		Briefing note, scheme plan and site plan	Gill Boyle g.boyle@manchester.gov.uk

3. Economy Scrutiny Work Programme – March 2022

Thursday 10 March 2022, 2.00pm (Report deadline Monday 28 February 2022)

Title	Purpose	Executive Member	Strategic Director/Lead Officer	Comments
Manchester Airport	<p>To receive a report on the current economic situation of Manchester Airport following the impact of COVID and the likely predictions for its economic future</p> <p>To include an update on Airport City North</p> <p>To include update on employment and recruitment opportunities at Manchester Airport</p>	Cllr Craig (Leader)	Pat Bartoli	
Manchester Housing Allocations policy	<p>To receive a report that provides details on the interim evaluation of Manchester’s Housing Allocations scheme.</p> <p>Manchester’s current statutory social housing allocations scheme was implemented in November 2020. In addition to the planned full evaluation after 24 months, it was agreed that an interim evaluation should be undertaken after 12 months on how the scheme was working, this report details that interim evaluation and its findings.</p>	Cllr White (Executive Member for Housing and Employment)	Alan Caddick	
HS2 Hybrid Bill Response	To receive a report that details the Council’s proposed response to the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill, covering the proposed response to the Bill’s Environmental Statement and the key issues that the Council plans to set out in our petition to the Bill.	Cllr Craig (Leader)	Pat Bartoli Hilary Sayers	

Economy COVID19 Sit Rep Report	To receive the most up to date Economy COVID19 Sit Rep report that details how the Council and the city is progressing with the recovery phase of COVID19 against the areas within the remit of this Committee.	Cllr Craig (Leader)	Angela Harrington Pat Bartoli Ruth Ashworth	
Overview Report	The monthly report includes the recommendations monitor, relevant key decisions, the Committee's work programme and any items for information.	N/A	Scrutiny Support	

**Themes identified at the Committee's 2021/22 Work Programme setting meeting
(Items highlighted in grey indicate that these have been included in the work plan of one of the above meetings)**

Previous Items identified by the Committee to be scheduled				
Theme – Strategic Regeneration				
Item	Purpose	Lead Executive Member	Lead Officer	Comments
Manchester's Housing Strategy update	To receive and consider the final draft version of Manchester's Housing Strategy prior to approval by the Executive	Cllr White (Executive Member for Housing and Employment)	Becca Heron Alan Caddick	
Theme – Transport and Connectivity				
Item	Purpose	Lead Executive Member	Lead Officer	Comments
Bus Franchising update	To receive a report on the Greater Manchester Mayor's proposals to	Cllr Craig (Leader)	Pat Bartoli	

	franchise the region's bus service and the impact this will have on the city's economy.			
Theme - Skills development for Manchester residents aged 16 and over.				
Item	Purpose	Lead Executive Member	Lead Officer	Comments
Delivery of work and skills through the Our Town Hall Project	Precise details to be confirmed	Cllr White (Executive Member for Housing and Employment)	Angela Harrington	
MAES External Review	To receive a report on MAES external review	Cllr White (Executive Member for Housing and Employment)	Brian Henry Angela Harrington	
MAES and the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector	To receive a report on the work delivered in partnership between MAES and the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector	Cllr White (Executive Member for Housing and Employment)	Brian Henry Angela Harrington	
Theme – Growing the Manchester Economy				
Item	Purpose	Lead Executive Member	Lead Officer	Comments
Business Survival rates and the impact on the economy	To receive a report that details the survival rate of new start up business within the city and the economic impact	Cllr Craig (Leader)	Mark Hughes (The Growth Company) Becca Heron	

	to the city when these businesses fail		Pat Bartoli Angela Harrington	
Theme - Miscellaneous				
Item	Purpose	Lead Executive Member	Lead Officer	Comments
Audit of Temporary Accommodation Costs	To receive a report for information that details the cost of Temporary Accommodation.	Councillor Rahman (Deputy Leader)	Mohamed Hussein	