Network licence condition 7 (land disposal): Red Bank Former Carriage Sidings, Collyhurst Road, Manchester

Decision
1. On 16 August 2018, Network Rail gave notice of the intention to dispose of land at Red Bank Former Carriage Sidings, Collyhurst Road, Manchester (the land), in accordance with paragraph 7.2 of condition 7 of Network Rail’s network licence. The land and disposal is described in more detail in the notice (copy attached).

2. We have considered the information supplied by Network Rail including the responses received from third parties consulted. For the purposes of condition 7 of Network Rail’s network licence, ORR consents to the disposal of the land in accordance with the particulars set out in the notice.

Network Rail’s proposals
3. The land which forms Network Rail’s proposals comprises three sites:
   - the ‘Red Bank’ former carriage sidings (shown as Area 1 on plan 6438292-1);
   - the ‘Red Bank’ land and railway arches (shown as Area 2 on plan 6438292-1) - both areas are to be sold to the Far East Consortium; and
   - the site adjacent to Area 1 (shown on plan 6438292-2) is to be acquired by Transport for Greater Manchester.

4. Network Rail’s stakeholder consultation showed that three objections remained unresolved: from First TransPennine Express (FTPE), Arriva Rail North and West Coast Railway Company. All three objections stemmed from a general expectation that increased stabling or depot facilities would be needed in the Manchester area and that existing sites with the potential to accommodate such facilities should not be sold until future requirements were known.
5. FTPE objected because it considered that the land could be identified for a potential land exchange to facilitate for the expansion of railway facilities on a better positioned site. It noted that this had not been proposed in local transport strategy plans. Network Rail subsequently responded stating land exchanges may be considered in certain circumstances, such as for the release of strategic freight sites, or where there are neighbouring land interests. However, Network Rail did not consider that this site met such circumstances.

6. Arriva Rail North considered that funds gained from any disposals in the Manchester area should be safeguarded to provide for additional stabling and accommodation requirements, but Network Rail thought that this would not be a correct application of the land disposal process. The Department for Transport (DfT) confirmed in its response to Arriva Rail North that HM Treasury’s funding settlement does not allow for such funding to be ring-fenced in this way.

7. A final objection by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) was withdrawn. We note that a key point for the withdrawal was that it would be able to acquire land (shown on plan 6438292-2) to safeguard the expansion of its Metrolink tram depot located off Queens Road.

8. Network Rail has stated that it has undertaken various studies, in addition to the DfT request for a report from Network Rail’s system operator team, to further review and advise on the suitability of the land for stabling/depot use. The studies concluded that the disposal land would not be suitable as a new light maintenance depot site, given its location, its unsuitable connection to Manchester Victoria station, and the extensive remodelling that would be required. The findings from the system operator study are shown at Appendix 3.

Prospects for future railway facilities

9. In the light of responses to Network Rail’s consultation, DfT convened a workshop on 12 June 2018, to consider alternative and better options for the development of additional depot and stabling facilities in the Manchester area. The conclusion was that land around the strategic freight site at Ardwick offered the potential for significant expansion and could address foreseeable requirements for railway stabling/depot facilities. However, FTPE also had concerns about this site as it stated a number of factors would need to be taken into account for this site to be considered. This included a possible relocation of the site, and addressing the effect HS2 tunnelling may have on the depot and siding in situ.

10. We note that no other affected parties had these concerns regarding Ardwick as an alternative site. Further, we understand that DfT is satisfied that this site could meet the reasonably foreseeable railway requirements without retention of the disposal site. Additionally, Network Rail’s submission evidence showed that DfT has agreed to develop the case for the Ardwick site to be included in its ‘enhancements pipeline’ to provide additional capacity aligned with anticipated growth and expansion over time.

Reasons for decision

11. We are satisfied that Network Rail has consulted relevant stakeholders with current information. In considering the proposed disposal, we note that:

- there is no evidence that current railway operations would be affected adversely;
there were no clear, feasible and funded plans put forward for the site for the future development of the railway network; 

evidence has been provided to show that the ‘Red Bank’ land does not need to be retained for the future development of the railway network; 

land at Ardwick has been identified as being suitable to accommodate requirements for railway depot and stabling facilities for the area, and DfT will take the lead in securing this; and 

TfGM is able to safeguard its interests regarding the expansion of its tram depot, located off Queens Road, through the acquisition of Network Rail’s land marked blue on plan 6438292-2.

12. Based on all the evidence we have received and taking into account all the material facts and views relevant to our consideration under licence condition 7, we are satisfied that there are no further issues for us to address.

13. We have had regard to our decision criteria in Land disposal by Network Rail: the regulatory arrangements, December 2013, and balanced our section 4 duties given to us under the Railways Act 1993. In doing so we have given particular weight to our duty to exercise our functions in a manner which we consider best calculated to “protect the interests of users of railway services”.

14. We have concluded that the proposed disposal is not against the interests of users of railway services. In light of that and our understanding of the transaction as set out above, we grant our consent to the proposed disposal of the land.

Les Waters
Duly authorised by the Office of Rail and Road

---

1 In line with the criterion of ORR’s land disposal regulatory arrangements
2 Available from www.rail-reg.gov.uk/server/show/nav.150
# Proposed Property Disposal

**Application by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited to dispose of land in accordance with the Land Disposal Condition of the Network Licence**

## 1. Site

| Site location and description | The site is situated off Red Bank & Collyhurst Road approximately 1km east of Manchester City Centre & Manchester Victoria Railway Station. The site extends to approximately 9.2 Hectares (22.6 Acres) and comprises land formerly used for sidings & railway line (now removed), a section of viaduct and commercial premises. The site (“the disposal property”) is more particularly delineated on the Site Plan attached to this application. The Site Plan details the disposal property as two areas. “Area 1” comprises Red Bank Former Carriage Sidings together with a commercially let warehouse accessed directly from Dantzic Street. The warehouse was acquired by Network Rail in March 2011 to improve access arrangements to this part of the disposal property thereby assisting with its sale and future commercial development. “Area 2” consists of a section of redundant viaduct running in a westerly direction from Roger Street and which incorporates commercially let railway arches and a warehouse on adjoining land. Network Rail’s retained freehold interest is shown coloured green. |
| Plans attached: (all site plans should be in JPEG format, numbered and should clearly show the sites location approximate to the railway) | The following plans are attached at Appendix 1. 1. Location Plan 2. Site Plans a. Plan Number 6438292-1 b. Plan Number 6438292-2 |
| Project No. | S01941 |
### Photographs (as required)

The following photos are available in attached Appendix 2;

1. Site Photograph - view looking west (towards Manchester City Centre)
2. Aerial photograph

### 2. Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of disposal</th>
<th>Sale of freehold, or long leasehold interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed party taking disposal</td>
<td>Far East Consortium (FEC) who are Manchester City Council's regeneration partner for the 'Northern Gateway' is to take the disposal of the property detailed on Plan Number 6438292-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) is to take the disposal of the property detailed on Plan Number 6438292-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The disposals are to be by way of separate legal agreements and transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed use / scheme</td>
<td>Disposal to FEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal relates to the regeneration of the Lower Irk Valley which necessitates the assembly of a number of derelict and underutilised land interests. Network Rail and Manchester City Council are the predominant land owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City Council’s aim is to assemble the necessary third party land interests by private treaty where possible so as to avoid the time and expense of promoting a CPO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City have partnered with FEC to deliver the regeneration of a wider area known as the 'Northern Gateway'; the resulting primary land use will comprise a mix of housing types (totaling circa. 15,000 homes) to appeal to both families and individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the assembled land interests will be phased over an estimated period of 10 - 15 years. The aim of the regeneration project is to secure the renewal of the physical landscape of the Lower Irk Valley and the development of new residential neighbourhoods with ancillary commercial, community, retail and leisure uses. The project will also include new infrastructure and environmental measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disposal to TfGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sale of the land to the east of the pedestrian footbridge will enable the expansion of TfGM’s existing Queens Road Metrolink depot. The additional area will accommodate additional capacity for the stabling of trams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Access arrangements to / from the disposal land | Pedestrian and vehicular access is available from Red Bank and Collyhurst Road.  
It is envisaged that improved vehicular access arrangements will need to be created via the existing road frontages, or from the adjoining assembled land interests to Area 1.  
No access over Network Rail retained land will be granted or implied. |
| Replacement rail facilities (if appropriate) | Not applicable as no rail facilities will be lost by the proposed disposal. |
| Anticipated Rail benefits | There will be no direct rail benefits created by the disposal.  
Network Rail will however lose the maintenance responsibility associated with the pedestrian footbridge (coloured orange) and also the rail over highway bridges (edged orange) namely, Faber Street and Roger Street. These structures will be transferred as part of the land disposal arrangements and with appropriate legal provision to ensure that Network Rail's liabilities for the structures are removed.  
The purchaser will also take responsibility for the future liability of the redundant Red Bank viaduct structure (hatched red) and may therefore decide to arrange for its demolition including appropriate works to ensure the continued structural integrity of Network Rail's retained infrastructure. This will rid Network Rail of liabilities relating to the future maintenance and management of the viaduct structure. The appropriate legal arrangements will be put in place to ensure Network Rail's future liabilities are extinguished.  
Benefits may also result from increased rail passenger journeys as a consequence of the construction activity and growth in the local population. |
| Anticipated Non-rail benefits | The regeneration will bring about benefits to the local environment, community and economy.  
Temporary construction jobs will be created during the construction works. These will be followed by permanent jobs within the non residential elements of the regeneration scheme.  
The main benefits will be the provision of new housing stock in this very deprived area of East Manchester.  
Environmental improvements will also result from the regeneration. The current overgrown and redundant land will be replaced by architecturally designed buildings incorporating elements of hard and soft landscaping. Such improvements will benefit local neighbourhoods and also the City Centre which is |
in very close proximity.

The proposals will also allow for the expansion of Metrolink’s Queens Road depot supporting the growth of the tram system.

### 3. Timescales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on timescales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The land is expected to be drawn down in a number of phases with legal completion of the first by 31st March 2019 and the last phase by no later than 31st March 2023, although the purchaser/s may elect to draw all the land down sooner. Regeneration of the Lower Irk Valley will follow detailed masterplanning and the grant of a detailed planning permission, it is envisaged that this will take place on a phased basis over a period of up to 15 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Railway Related Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History of railway related use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of the former carriage sidings ceased in 1990 after the opening of the Windsor Link in 1989, this resulted in the switch of many rail services from Manchester Victoria to Manchester Piccadilly. The Manchester loop line for rail services between Manchester Victoria and Rochdale remained in use for a few more years. The through line from Manchester Victoria however no longer exists and the former railway line immediately to the east of the disposal property now comprises part of the Queens Road Metrolink depot. The railway tracks and connections to the operational railway leading into Manchester Victoria Station were removed approximately 20 years ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When last used for railway related purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is understood that use of the former carriage sidings ceased in 1990 and that use of the Manchester loop line (passing over Red Bank Arches) came to an end approximately 5 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any railway proposals affecting the site since that last relative use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depot &amp; Stabling Proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1 was subject to an ORR land disposal consultation during December 2012/ January 2013. This consultation exercise resulted in one objection from train operator Transpennine Express (TPE).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this time, TPE were of the opinion that; “the land should be retained until the point at which the stabling strategy for the programmes has been finalised.” A study was undertaken in consultation with other rail industry stakeholders to investigate the suitability of a number of potential locations, including that of the subject site. The study reached the conclusion that the disposal property would not provide a suitable facility.
Area’s 1 & 2 were subject to an ORR land disposal consultation during May/June 2014. This consultation exercise resulted in unresolved objections from train operators TPE and Northern Rail.

At this time, TPE and Northern Rail were of the opinion that “the depot & stabling locations plus contingency planning facilities needed to be finalised and assured before there would be sufficient comfort for both Northern Rail & First Group to remove their objections to the disposal of the property. This assumes that adequate deliverable facilities would be identified without the requirement for the subject property”.

Area’s 1 & 2 were subject to a further ORR land disposal consultation during December 2016/January 2017. This consultation set out three material events aimed at removing the previous depot & stabling ground as a sustainable reason for objection, namely;

1. Renewal of the Northern and TPE franchises which came into effect on 1st April 2016. The new TOCs, Arriva Rail North Limited and First Trans Pennine Express Ltd did not identify any specific requirements for the subject site within their franchise bids. The site should have been identified if there was considered to be an operational requirement for running either franchise.

2. Secondly, the progress made with the identification and delivery of depot and siding facilities at other locations.

3. Thirdly and most significantly, any operational railway use of the disposal property raises significant issues from a planning perspective. Manchester City Council’s ambition for the disposal property is for comprehensive residential regeneration. The Lower Irk Valley Neighbourhood Development Framework for this location was approved by the City Council in February 2016. Any proposal to reintroduce a railway use would be in contradiction to this and would be subject to both legal and planning challenge. It’s also worth noting that the operational use was effectively abandoned 20 years ago and residential apartment buildings now neighbour Area 2. The approved Lower Irk Valley Neighbourhood Development Framework can be accessed here http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/6498/lower_irk_valley_ndf

Throughout 2017 TPE and Northern Rail maintained their previous objections although neither TEP nor Northern Rail has put forward any proposals in support of their objections.

In December 2017, DfT requested a report from Network Rail’s System Operator team to further review and advise on the suitability of the disposal property for stabling/depot use. The findings were reported to DfT in January 2018 which again ruled out the sites suitability for stabling/depot use and supported its release for residential development. A copy of the
Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR)

To align with the geographical position of Leeds and Sheffield a number of sub-surface curve alignments have been considered with varying potential impacts on the disposal property. This is one of a number of options that have been developed and even if selected it is not known whether the alignment would pass under the property and if it did what the tunnel depth would be as this requires further development. It should also be noted that sub-surface alignments in and out of Manchester would be dependent on the station solution being an underground box which is one of a number of station concepts being considered.

Disposing of the property could potentially therefore result in the NPR project having to buy back elements and pay compensation in future years which may result in added cost to the project and its promoters, TfN and DfT. The potential risks should be considered by TfN, the DfT, MCC and TfGM through this ORR land disposal consultation. Additionally, should the disposal take place, such parties may wish to make representations in response to house builders future planning applications regarding phasing of development to mitigate potential conflict with any emerging NPR requirements.

Given that any such requirement would be many years into the future, the present value of any such additional project cost is likely to be insignificant in comparison with the capital sum that can be realised today from the proposed disposal for investment in Britain’s Rail Infrastructure and NR’s contribution to the release of public sector land for housing.

Reserving tunnelling rights under the subject site has been considered but discounted as not being a viable option as it would prevent the proposed development due to the uncertain alignment, ground conditions and likely depth of foundations. Statutory acquisition is likely to be required in any event for the NPR scheme to ensure that there are no gaps in legal title and also to acquire the neighbouring interests. Statutory compensation payments for deep tunnelling rights are likely to be insignificant in comparison with the land value that could be lost reserving very general tunnelling rights.

There are no other known railway proposals affecting the disposal property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on current railway related proposals</th>
<th>Given the conclusions reached above, there are no known impacts on current railway related proposals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for future railway</td>
<td>Both the North West and Northern RUS have been reviewed and neither has revealed any strategic plans that require use of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
related use | the disposal property.
---|---
Other than what’s been set out above, there are no other known schemes which would require use of the disposal property; it has also been confirmed that it is not required in connection with the Northern Hub.

| Any closure or station change or network change related issues | No. The property is remote from Manchester Victoria Station and there is no physical track connection to the operational railway line. |

| Whether disposal affects any railway (including train operator) related access needs, and how these are to be addressed in future | The disposal property is remote from the nearest railway station (Manchester Victoria) and the operational railway infrastructure, there are therefore no future railway related access needs to be provided for. There will also be physical separation following the demolition of the Red Bank section of disused viaduct referred to in Section 2 above. |

| Position as regards safety / operational issues on severance of land from railway | 1. The disposal will include arrangements under which the purchaser will install and maintain fencing across the former branch line at the boundary with Network Rail’s retained infrastructure. This will be replaced by an appropriate parapet wall at the time the redundant section of viaduct is demolished. All works relating to this will be approved by Network Rail and will be undertaken with the appropriate engineering / asset protection measures in place. The disposal is on a basis under which Network Rail has had due regard (where applicable) to impact of the disposal on lineside works, including railway troughing, signalling and their maintenance. The disposal is without prejudice to Network Rail’s safety obligations, with which Network Rail will continue to comply. Network Rail’s network licence requires compliance with Railway Group Standards. These set out requirements for – amongst other things – fencing, access and signal sighting. In addition, the Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 require Network Rail to have a safety management system and safety authorisation in respect of its mainline railway system and its railway infrastructure. These, in turn, require Network Rail to comply with Railway Group Standards as well as its own internal standards; and also continually to monitor changes to the risks arising from its operations and to introduce new control measures as appropriate. |

5. Planning History and Land Contamination

| Planning permissions / Local Plan allocation (if applicable) | Future development proposals will be in accordance with the approved Lower Irk Valley Neighbourhood Development Framework. [http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/6498/lower_irk_valley_ndf](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/6498/lower_irk_valley_ndf) |
FEC are in the process of working with the City Council to produce a Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) which will be adopted by the Council to guide future planning applications. This approach will ensure that all planning applications are in keeping with the regeneration aspirations identified in the SRF.

| Contamination / Environmental Issues (if applicable) | No specific issues known relevant to this application. A desk top geo-environmental survey has been undertaken for Area 1. Given the past railway use of the site, the report details the need for intrusive site investigation works to identify remediation measures that will need to be put in place. All necessary geotechnical, contamination and buried site surveys will be undertaken by FEC or its contractor/s prior to commencement of any on site construction works. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Local Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names &amp; Email Addresses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Authorities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relevant Local Authorities:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Internal Approval to consult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposer’s name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 8. Consultations

| Internal consultation | Network Rail internal land clearance (Business & Technical) has been secured (reference numbers detailed in Section 1 of this consultation above).

Investigations have revealed nothing in the relevant long-term planning process strategies including LNW network Specification, LNW Route Specification, Freight Network Study, Freight Market study, Long Distance Market study, Long Term Planning Process and the Regional Urban Market study which would affect the proposed development scheme.

As noted in Section 4 above, two specific studies have now been undertaken in consultation with other rail industry stakeholders to investigate the suitability of a number of potential locations, including the subject site, for stabling rolling stock. The study concluded that the disposal property would not provide a suitable facility. |
Summary of position as regards external consultations

The four parties identified below submitted objections in response to the consultation;

- Transpennine Express (TPE)
- Northern
- West Coast Railways (WCR)
- Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)

Full details of the objections are contained within the consultation report – see numbers 6 (TPE), 11 (Northern), 22 (WCR) and 31 (TfGM).

No responses were received to the consultation from;

- GB Railfreight Ltd despite 5 email & telephone reminders
- Grand Central despite 5 email & telephone reminders
- RCL despite 5 email reminders

Despite having no comments from GBRF, Grand Central and RCL Network Rail is content that it is appropriate to proceed with the disposal. It’s also worth noting that these parties raised no objections at the time of the previous consultations in 2012, 2014 and 2016.

Transport for the North advised that they would leave DfT to deal with this consultation.

Analysis of any Network Rail resolved objections together with recommendation by Network Rail as regards a way forward

DfT convened a workshop at NR’s Manchester offices on 12 June 2018 to consider alternative, better, options in the Manchester area for the development of additional depot and stabling facilities (the requirement for additional depot and stabling facilities being the principal basis of TPE’s and Northern’s objections).

The workshop reached the conclusion that opportunity exists to create a suitable stabling / depot facility on land at an alternative location (Manchester Ardwick) and the rail industry partners, plus Manchester City Council (land owner of part), should work together to deliver this. Consequently DfT are satisfied that the reasonably foreseeable future requirements of the railway can adequately be met without retention and use of the disposal site for stabling thereby facilitating its release to deliver significant residential led regeneration as part of the Northern Gateway. The DfT’s position statement is included at no. 27 of the consultation report.

Status of objections post workshop;

Resolved objections

- Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) have agreed to remove their objection on the understanding that part of the site be transferred to them to facilitate expansion of their adjacent depot. The principle of this is agreed. (See Consultation Report - no. 31)
**Unresolved objections**

- **First Transpennine Express (FTPE)** have declined to remove their objection and have suggested that the disposal property be held as a ‘land swap’ site. This is considered inappropriate as such a representation is not a proper use of the ORR land disposal process and sites cannot simply be swapped for other unconnected sites. (See Consultation Report - no. 6)

- **Northern** have declined to remove their objection unless it is agreed that the proceeds from the disposal of the site be ringfenced to assist with the delivery of a future facility at Ardwick. DfT advised Northern that HMT’s funding settlement with Network Rail does not allow for funding to be ringfenced in this way. Northern’s request is considered inappropriate as such a representation is not a proper use of the ORR land disposal process. (See Consultation Report - no. 11)

- **West Coast Railways (WCR)** have declined to remove their objection even though they do not have an identified foreseeable transport related use requirement for the site. The objection is based on ‘general opinion’ and therefore considered to be too remote and vague to be worthy of material consideration. (See Consultation Report - no. 22)

It is Network Rail’s opinion that land disposal consent should be granted as the above objections do not demonstrate ‘reasonably foreseeable railway use’ for the property. Additionally, as noted in the comments at no. 27 of the consultation report, DfT have confirmed that they support this approach given the basis of the objections and the conclusions reached at the workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
<th>Based on the above, I recommend that Network Rail proceeds with the disposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration:</td>
<td>I have read and understood Network Rail’s code of Business Ethics and Policy on Interests in Transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposer’s name:</td>
<td>Proposer’s job title: Development Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>Date 27th July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised by (name):</td>
<td>Authoriser’s job title: Principal Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>Date 1st August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1

1. Location Plan

![Location Plan Diagram]
2. Site Plans (plans also attached as separate pdfs for added clarity)

Key
- Shaded blue, shaded blue hatched red, shaded blue edged red, shaded blue edged orange = disposal Area
- Shaded blue edged orange = Faber Street & Roger Street (rail over road) bridge structures
- Shaded blue hatched red = Red Bank Arches
- Shaded blue edged red = land adjoining Red Bank Arches
- Shaded orange = Pedestrian footbridge over disposal property
- Shaded green = Network Rail retained land & infrastructure

Area 1 – Red Bank former Carriage Sidings

Area 2 – Red Bank Land & Arches

Plan Number 6438292-1 – Sale to FEC
Plan Number 6438292-2 – Sale to TfGM
APPENDIX 2

1. Site photograph - view looking west (towards Manchester City Centre)

2. Aerial photograph
CONSULTATION REPORT

relating to

PROPOSED LAND DISPOSAL

This report is provided as a supplement to our forms for the proposed disposal of land at:

Site location and description: Manchester Collyhurst: Red Bank Former Carriage Sidings, Collyhurst Road, Manchester, M4 4JB

We have consulted in relation to this evaluation, and summarise the results of this as follows:

Summary of position regarding responses: Section 8 of the evaluation report identifies three objections that remain. It is however Network Rail's opinion that land disposal consent should be granted as these objections do not demonstrate 'reasonably foreseeable railway use' for the property.
The full list of external consultees is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>External party (name)</th>
<th>Contact name, email address and telephone</th>
<th>Whether response received (y/n)</th>
<th>Date of response</th>
<th>Details of response (e.g. “no comment”), with reference to any accompanying copy representation in annexes to this report</th>
<th>Comments (e.g. as regards endeavours to obtain response where none given)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arriva Trains Cross Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c2c Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/03/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiltern Railway Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>29/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Midlands Trains Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eurostar UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transpennine Express</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10/04/2018</td>
<td>See Comments in Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Great Western Railway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10/04/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grand Central / Grand Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails sent on 16th March 2018, 29th March 2018, 10th April 2018, 18th April 2018 and 23rd April 2018. Telephoned on 24.04.18 at 12:27 and left a message on the mobile number.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>London and South Eastern Railway</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Merseyrail Electrics 2002</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northern Rail</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21/03/2018</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Virgin West Coast Trains Limited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18/04/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alliance Rail Holdings</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Direct Rail Services Limited (DRS)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>03/04/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>COLAS Rail</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Contact Date</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DB Cargo UK Ltd (Formerly DBS)</td>
<td>Y 27/04/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Comments in Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td>Y 29/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freightliner Limited</td>
<td>Y 04/04/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>GB Railfreight Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails sent on 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018, 29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018, 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018, 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018 and 23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018. Telephoned on 24.04.2018 at 12:32 and left a message on the mobile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rail Freight Group</td>
<td>Y 16/03/2018</td>
<td>Ok with RFG</td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>West Coast Railway Company</td>
<td>Y 16/03/2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Comments in Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Roadways Container Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emails sent on 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018, 29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018, 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018, 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018 and 23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Association of Community Rail Partnerships</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>W. H. Malcolm</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Transport Focus (Rail Passenger Council)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23/03/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>British Transport Police</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>05/04/2018</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20/04/2018</td>
<td>No Objection See Comments in Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Transport for North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephoned on 24.04.2018 at 12:35 and spoke to Jim and he referred that they were going to let DfT make comment on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>HS2 Ltd.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>26/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Network Rail Media Relations</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/03/2018</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Annex 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Copies of responses are given in the annexes to this report, as indicated above.

Copies of the full consultee responses are given in Annex 1.

A copy of the consultation request (before customisation for any individuals) is given in Annex 2.

A copy of the application form showing amendments is given in Annex 3
Annex 1

1 Arriva Trains Cross Country

From: @crosscountrytrains.co.uk
Sent: 16 March 2018 15:27
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Hi

XC Trains Ltd has no comment on this proposed disposal.

Kind regards

Station Contracts Manager CrossCountry

Phone: Mobile: Fax:
Address: 5th Floor, Cannon House, 18 The Priory Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6BS

Buy train tickets online at crosscountrytrains.co.uk | Get our Train Tickets app for free from your app store or via our website
Good afternoon

No objection from c2c on the below proposal.

Regards

Property and Projects Manager
2nd Floor, Cutlers Court, 115 Houndsditch, London EC3A 7BR

W: www.c2c-online.co.uk
Hello,

Chiltern have no comments.

Regulatory Contracts Manager
Chiltern Railways

Great Central House, Marylebone Station, Melcombe Place, London, NW1 6JJ
@chilternrailways.co.uk
www.chilternrailways.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

East Midlands Trains Limited

From: @eastmidlandstrains.co.uk
Sent: 19 March 2018 09:25
To:
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018
Hello

No comment required from East Midlands Trains Ltd.

Head of Procurement

East Midlands Trains

T: M: W: eastmidlandstrains.co.uk
A:1 Prospect Place, Millennium Way, Pride Park, Derby, DE24 8HG

5 Eurostar UK First

From: @eurostar.com
Sent: 16 March 2018 17:26
To:
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

No comment from EIL,
Thanks

Sent from my iPhone
6 Transpennine (t/a TransPennine Express)

From: @FirstGroup.com
Sent: 29 June 2018 14:33
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Great.

Thanks for confirming

Have a good weekend.

From: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: 29 June 2018 14:00:39
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Hi

Thanks for your letter dated 28th June and to confirm that it will be included as part of NR’s application to ORR for land disposal consent.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
From: @FirstGroup.com
Sent: 28 June 2018 08:33
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Good Morning

Please find attached FTPEs latest position on the proposed disposal of this site.

As outlined in the attached letter, TPE is still unable to support this proposal.

Regards

Head of Commercial Contracts
First TransPennine Express

www.tpexpress.co.uk

Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/tpexpresstrains
Follow us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/TPExpressTrains

First Transpennine Limited
Registered in England & Wales number 09111801
Registered office: 50 Eastbourne Terrace, Paddington, London W2 6LG
Dear

Network Rail proposed land disposal consultation: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Further to correspondence in relation to this Land Disposal, this letter forms the First TransPennine Express (TPE) final formal response to this proposal.

TPE is still in a position where we cannot support the disposal of the land being proposed. Further to the points made in previous correspondence, the rationale for this is as per the following points:

Given the paucity of land availability in Manchester, TPE still believes that this site should be considered as a potential ‘land swap’ site for the expansion of railway facilities on a
better positioned site. As there is no proposal of a ‘land swap’ or development/ spatial strategy with Manchester City council (MCC) or the wider GMCA, we do not agree to dispose of this site. TPE notes that this site is a priority for development by MCC/GMCA and on this basis, it would seem a good opportunity for the rail industry to achieve a commitment to provision of land aligned to the rail network in the local plans.

Further to discussions at the recent Network Rail (NR) / Department for Transport (DfT) Workshop, TPE believes that the suggestion of a realigned Ardwick is the solution for the industry is concerning. With HS2 arriving at the depot in future, a reshaped site might only get us back to the capacity that is there now after the loss of the existing facility. We believe that NR and DfT should have a plan for growth. Ardwick itself presents a number of fairly sizeable issues that need to be resolved before it is confirmed as a future alternative stabling possibility. These include:

- The strategic freight site would need to moved / relocated elsewhere (and at some cost and associated compensation)
- The Siemens (TPE) depot is at risk from HS2 tunnel and a plan needs to be considered for this and how the depot and sidings would work;
- Local Authority owned land may well be required to accommodate all future required stabling and this is unconfirmed / unclear;
- Headshunts / connections and physical differential site levels would all need to be addressed along with potential power upgrades;
- Different projects requiring different stabling and depots will all need to be sequenced and timed correctly with no overarching plan in place to address this.

Overall, TPE is of the view that there is too much uncertainty (there were lots of ‘ifs’, ‘buts’, ‘maybes’ and “we think” language used at the recent workshop) around the future use of Ardwick as opposed to any concrete commitments, with no clear, overarching Depot and Stabling study relating to Ardwick being in place or in development.

As was discussed at the recent Workshop, it was clear that Guide Bridge as an alternative / complimentary site would be extremely challenging.
On this basis, TPE is again of the opinion that any land disposals are premature. Overall, TPE therefore cannot support this proposal and objects. This site should not be disposed of and sold until the industry has a robust future stabling strategy for the Manchester area. This applies to the short and longer terms, factoring in local and also nationally strategic infrastructure projects including HS2, TRU and Northern Powerhouse Rail.

Yours sincerely,

Head of Commercial Contracts
TransPennine Express

From:  
Sent: 27 June 2018 14:58  
To:  @FirstGroup.com  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Afternoon
A gentle reminder for you to provide confirmation of FTPE’s position in writing by Friday 29th June 2018, following this, the details will be collated into an application to ORR for land disposal consent.

Regards,

Development Manager

From: @FirstGroup.com
Sent: 20 June 2018 16:42
To: @FirstGroup.com
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Afternoon

Further to the reasoning set out in email of 19th June 2018 and supporting position paper (both attached for ease of reference), could you please advise whether First TransPennine Express is agreeable to lifting the objection detailed in your letter of 10th April 2018. It would be appreciated if you could confirm FTPE’s position in writing by Friday 29th June 2018.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: @FirstGroup.com
Sent: 10 April 2018 17:11
To: 
Cc:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Dear

Please find attached the First TransPennine Express response to the Network Rail land disposal proposal consultation at Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings (received 19/03/18).

Unfortunately, as outlined in the attached letter, TPE is unable to support this proposal.

Kind Regards

Head of Commercial Contracts
First TransPennine Express

www.tpexpress.co.uk

Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/tpexpresstrains
Follow us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/TPExpressTrains

First Transpennine Limited
Registered in England & Wales number 09111801
Registered office: 50 Eastbourne Terrace, Paddington, London W2 6LG
Dear

**Network Rail proposed land disposal consultation: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings**

Further to correspondence in relation to this Land Disposal, this letter forms First TransPennine’s formal response to this proposal.

First TransPennine cannot support the disposal of the land being proposed. The rationale for this is as per the following points:

TPE is aware that it is a current TransPennine Route Upgrade (TRU) Programme Delivery Group (that Network Rail Sponsor) commitment is that no site in the Manchester area adjacent to the line, suitable for a possible depot or sidings should be sold for development. We attach the TRU documents that reference this position as back up and directly attach an extract below from the TRU Programme Delivery Group:
On this basis, TPE is of the opinion that any land disposals are premature when Network Rail (NR) has not completed its route study into future requirements for depot and Stabling in LNW(N). TRU is clearly developing a strategy to support additional vehicles. Further, TPE is aware that spare land for expansion at Ardwick will be utilised to meet the near term (CP6) Arriva Rail Northern requirements and to relocate their existing depot when HS2 requirements demolish the existing depot in circa 5 years’ time.

TPE has previously indicated that it is for NR and Manchester City Council/ GM Combined authority to confirm where in the conurbation (adjacent to rail infrastructure) future Stabling / servicing capacity can be planned and to allocate this in the proposed spatial plan. In this context, it may be that this site is not suitable based on factors such as proximity to housing, gradients, noise, access but the principal of land swap or the Combined authority relaxing green belt planning restrictions for a future rail depot should be considered and agreed in principle first and prior to any land disposal.

Overall, TPE therefore cannot support this proposal and object. This site cannot be disposed of and sold until we have a robust stabling strategy in the Manchester area. This applies to the short and longer terms, factoring in nationally strategic infrastructure projects including HS2, TRU and Northern Powerhouse Rail.

Yours sincerely,

Head of Commercial Contracts
TransPennine Express

Programme Delivery Group is therefore requested to:-

1. **APPROVE** – the decision to protect all railway land on the immediate TRU route in case a requirement for depot / stabling facilities materialises.
7  Great Western Railway
From: @gwr.com
Sent: 10 April 2018 16:27
To: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

I'm very sorry

GWR has no objection thank you.

Network Access Manager | Great Western Railway
1 Milford Street | Swindon | SN1 1HL
@GWR.com

First Greater Western Limited | Registered in England and Wales number 05113733
Registered office: Milford House, 1 Milford Street, Swindon SN1 1HL.

8  Grand Central / Grand Union

NO RESPONSE

9  London and South Eastern Railway
From: @southeasternrailway.co.uk
Sent: 23 March 2018 08:45
To: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018
Good Morning

Thank you for the opportunity to review the below.

Southeastern has no comment on this proposal

Kind Regards

Access Contracts Business Partner
southeasternrailway.co.uk

southeastern
Friars Bridge Court
41-45 Blackfriars Road
London, SE1 8NZ
We have no objections,

Thanks
Thank you for your email, including your support for the future direction and scope of work focusing on the Ardwick site set out in the DfT position statement. You sought the reservation of funding from the sale of Collyhurst for application to future development of the Ardwick site. I am afraid that HMT’s funding settlement with Network Rail does not allow for funding to be ringfenced in this way; and in addition such an approach could well hinder the timely progression of early development work on the Ardwick options. The Secretary of State confirmed last October that the funding being made available for CP6 includes provision for early development of new enhancement schemes. The work we have agreed to commence will be seeking to develop the case for drawing from that funding in line with the new ‘pipeline’ approach to rail enhancements.

I note that, on this basis, Northern will not be withdrawing their objection. Notwithstanding this, Network Rail (NR) understands that Northern’s objection relates to the future ring fencing of funding to protect the Ardwick site (which is not part of the terms of this disposal) and that it has not identified a foreseeable railway related use for the disposal site in question. On this basis, I understand NR will now proceed to ask ORR for a decision on the Collyhurst proposal.

Kind regards,
Hi

Just to make sure you have the below response from Northern.

Thanks,

For info.
Thank you for your email and the draft position statement appended to it and apologies for not having responded by 18 June.

Your draft captures those factors for that will have to be taken into account when considering the options to provide for the stabling, servicing and maintenance of vehicles in the Manchester area to meet future requirements. Understandably, you bring out the point that DfT is not in a position to commit to investment in advance of a clear cost and benefit analysis being concluded.

However, the matter at issue here is not to seek a commitment to spend money on Ardwick at this stage. It is to ensure that any funding that might be realised from the disposal of railway-owned land (in the immediate Manchester area) is safe-guarded so that it can be applied to provide for stabling etc. facilities and accommodation (in the immediate Manchester area) once the requirements have been determined and confirmed.

There can be no question that there is already a pressing need for increased capacity in the Manchester area and ARN fully supports the approach outlined in your draft to set up a working group along the lines you have indicated. What is now required is the recognition of a clear conjunction between the release of land so that it can be used for non-railway purposes and a mechanism that establishes the means to allow for the stabling strategy to be developed and for the business case to follow on. (In principle, this is no different from agreeing a budget for expenditure and then subsequently authorising the outlay.)

Once that arrangement can be confirmed, it should be possible for ARN to withdraw its objection to the disposal of the former Red Bank Sidings and associated area.

With kind regards,

Senior Rail Advisor
Dear all,
Thank you very much for a productive and positive workshop yesterday. As discussed, I attach a draft position paper setting out what was agreed in terms of development of proposals for Ardwick. I plan to enclose this with the Department’s response to NR’s
consultation confirming no objection. Please could you let me have any comments on the draft statement by **18 June**.

–please could you forward to at AGMA as I don’t have her email address.

Thanks

Senior Planning and Investment Manager, Network Services North - Rail Group, Department for Transport 3/23 |

From: @networkrail.co.uk  
Sent: 08 June 2018 15:09  
To: @tfgm.com; @dft.gov.uk; @networkrail.co.uk; @manchester.gov.uk; @northernrailway.co.uk; @FirstGroup.com; @hs2.org.uk; @hs2.org.uk; @hs2.org.uk;  
Cc: @networkrail.co.uk  
Subject: RE: Manchester Colyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - DfT Workshop

Dear all,

This workshop was proposed by DfT in its response to NR’s Collyhurst Red Bank and Carriage Sidings land disposal consultation. The purpose of the workshop is to share and discuss on an informal and without prejudice basis available information about future demand and potential locations for additional stabling and depot capacity in the Manchester area to enable stakeholders to review their position on this proposed disposal. Agenda and papers for the meeting attached.

Please ask for or myself at NR reception.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
Hi

Apologies for the delay – I am just waiting for a final sign off for our response – I will send it across asap.

Thanks,

Afternoon

Following on from last Friday's telephone discussion are you able to let me have Northern's formal response please so I can finalise NR’s application to ORR?

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
Thanks

Morning

From recollection both and were present via speaker phone.

The wider representation at the workshop included those named in the distribution address of the attached email.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
Hi

We are collating a response to get across to you before tomorrow. Can I just check who from Northern attended the workshop?

Thanks,

---

From:  
Sent: 27 June 2018 14:58  
To: @northernrailway.co.uk  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Afternoon

A gentle reminder for you to provide confirmation of Northern’s position in writing by Friday 29th June 2018, following the details will be collated into an application to ORR for land disposal consent.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

---

From:  
Sent: 20 June 2018 16:37  
To: @northernrailway.co.uk
Further to the reasoning set out in email of 19th June 2018 and supporting position paper (both attached for ease of reference), could you please advise whether Northern is agreeable to lifting the objection detailed in your email of 21st March 2018. It would be appreciated if you could confirm Northern’s position in writing by Friday 29th June 2018.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: @northernrailway.co.uk
Sent: 21 March 2018 15:23
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Northern object to the proposal. As stated previously by Northern, this site cannot be sold until we have a robust stabling solution in the Manchester area. This applies to the short and longer terms, factoring in nationally strategic infrastructure projects including HS2, TRU and Northern Powerhouse Rail. We’d need complete confidence in the expansion of the Ardwick site before we could realistically consider to change our stance on this.

Thanks,
12 Virgin West Coast Trains Limited

From: @virgintrains.co.uk
Sent: 18 April 2018 15:15
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

We have no comment to make regarding this proposal.

Kind regards

Operations Director
Victoria Square House, Victoria Square, Birmingham B2 4AJ
t: m: e: @virgintrains.co.uk
P.A. m: e: @virgintrains.co.uk

13 Alliance Rail Holdings

From: @Alliancerail.co.uk
Sent: 16 March 2018 15:50
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Alliance has no comments
Regards
Good Morning

DRS have no comments.

Best Regards,

Procurement Apprentice

Direct Rail Services Ltd
Regents Court
Baron Way
Carlisle
CA6 4SJ
No comment on proposed disposal

Property & Estate Manager

Tel. Mob.
@colasrail.co.uk

________________________________________
________________________________________________

COLAS RAIL LTD
, West Goods Yard, Dundonald Road, Wimbledon, London, SW19 3QJ, United Kingdom
www.colasrail.co.uk
We have given further consideration to this issue and not the System Operator's lack of enthusiasm for the conversion of the "Collyhurst" or Oldham Road Strategic Freight Site to a carriage stabling depot. Given that the other sites being considered, including Red Bank do not have obvious freight terminal potential, DB Cargo has no particular stake in the matter, except to say that stabling locations close to the stations where services start and finish are preferable to more distant ones, on the grounds of consumption of track capacity which could otherwise be used by freight services. I can confirm that DB Cargo (UK) Limited is neutral in the matter of the proposed land disposal of the Red Bank Sidings site.

Yours,

Rail Network Manager
DB Cargo (UK) Limited
310 Goswell Road
London EC1V 7LW
Tel.

From December 2016 my e-mail address will be @deutschebahn.com and all previous addresses will cease to function.

Network Change and other consultations, e.g. land disposals, should be e-mailed to:
DBCargoConsultations@deutschebahn.com
17  Freight Transport Association

From: @fta.co.uk
Sent: 29 March 2018 18:11
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Apologies FTA has no comment.

Sent from my Windows 10 phone

18  Freightliner Limited

From: @Freightliner.co.uk
Sent: 04 April 2018 12:33
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Freightliner has no objection to the sale proposals.

Regards
19 GB Railfreight Limited
NO RESPONSE

20 Rail Freight Group
From: @rfg.org.uk
Sent: 16 March 2018 20:26
To: 
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Ok with RFG
Executive Director
Rail Freight Group
@rfg.org.uk

Sent from my IPad

21 West Coast Railway Company
From: @aol.com
Sent: 27 June 2018 15:40
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

As per previous, a lot of talk and no proper commitment to anything, at the meeting; therefore until there is a commitment of substance, I see no reason to change WCR's position.

Best
-----Original Message-----
From: @networkrail.co.uk
To: wotho@aol.com
CC: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: Wed, 27 Jun 2018 14:56
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Afternoon

A gentle reminder for you to provide any changes / updates to WCR’s position by Friday 29th June 2018, following this the details will be collated into an application to ORR for land disposal consent.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From:
Sent: 21 June 2018 10:12
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Morning

Thanks for your prompt reply. The intention going forward is for NR to reflect the final position / comments of any remaining objectors in an application to ORR for land disposal consent. ORR will be invited to make a decision on whether or not to grant land disposal consent based upon the evidence presented. With this in
mind, can I just check that you are comfortable for me to include your email of 20th June into the application to ORR as representing West Coast Railways' final position on this proposed land disposal?

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
M

From: @aol.com
Sent: 20 June 2018 16:44
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

To be honest, there are far too many vague statements and little commitment financially to convince me that there would be any change. I am also very wary of statements made by (having dealt with him before) to have any faith, either.

Sorry, must try harder.

T
M
E @aol.com

-----Original Message-----
From: @networkrail.co.uk
To: @aol.com
CC: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: Wed, 20 Jun 2018 16:37
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018
Afternoon

Further to the reasoning set out in email of 19th June 2018 and supporting position paper (both attached for ease of reference), could you please advise whether West Coast Railways is agreeable to lifting the objection detailed in your emails of 16th and 20th March 2018. It would be appreciated if you could confirm West Coast Railways’ position in writing by Friday 29th June 2018.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

---

From: @aol.com
Sent: 20 March 2018 10:00
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Thanks, I’ll ensure these further comments are also included.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

---

From: @aol.com
Sent: 20 March 2018 10:02
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Thanks, I’ll ensure these further comments are also included.

Regards,
Regrettably, under the terms of the disposal I can't add anything substantive, as you say. I do however wish it recorded that for the longer term, this is a retrograde move for rail purposes, as I see no benefit in such a disposal.

I would also point out, again, that whilst the franchised operators have not indicated any objection, their views could only be considered short-term, i.e. the period of their franchise involvement.

-----Original Message-----
From: @networkrail.co.uk
To: @aol.com
CC: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: Tue, 20 Mar 2018 9:44 am
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Morning

Thank you for your email of 16th March 2018 in response to the consultation issued on 16th March 2018. Your email states that the comments you made in reply to the Dec 2016 consultation still stand. For completeness therefore, I have set out our Dec 2016 email exchange below and will include this in my report to ORR in respect to this new consultation. I would also restate that it is noted that you do not have a definitive railway or transport related scheme for the disposal property to support the basis of your objection, however you do have the views set out in the email trail and wish them to be recorded as part of this consultation. It is also noted that you have made no new comments, or commented on the conclusions reached in the January 2018 study attached as Appendix 3 to the current consultation.
If you wish to add anything further please let me know before the 20th April 2018 closing date, otherwise I will conclude that you are comfortable that I report your position as set out above and below.

*************************** Start of Dec 2016 Email Exchange ***************************

From:  
Sent: 09 December 2016 17:37  
To: @aol.com  
Cc: 
Subject: RE: FW: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Ba...

Further to our telephone discussion this afternoon.

It is noted that you do not have a definitive railway or transport related scheme as the basis of your objection, however you do have the views set out in the email trail below and wish them to be recorded as part of this consultation. To confirm that this email trail will be included within my submission to ORR.

Regards,

Principal Development Manager | Property 
Network Rail 
Square One, 4 Travis Street | Manchester | M1 2NY 
E @networkrail.co.uk 
www.networkrail.co.uk/property

From: @aol.com  
Sent: 09 December 2016 17:10
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: Re: FW: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Ba...

Sorry, I disagree. I am looking at this from the wider railway perspective, as my knowledge of this area stretches rather further back than your assessment. The parameters you mention, in respect of the franchises, are far too narrow. Also, Manchester's planning considerations should be subsidiary to the potential needs of a statutory undertaking.

My objection remains.

E @aol.com

In a message dated 09/12/2016 16:58:25 GMT Standard Time, @networkrail.co.uk writes:

Thank you for your email of 5th December 2016.

Section 4 of the Evaluation Form details three recent material events which remove the previous depot and stabling ground as a sustainable reason for objection, it is this use that appears to be the basis for the views you have expressed. The three points are set out below for ease of reference;

- Firstly, the new Northern and TPE franchises came into effect on 1st April 2016. The new TOCs, Arriva Rail North Limited and First Trans Pennine Express Ltd did not identify any specific requirements for the subject site within their franchise bids. The site would have been identified if there was considered to be an operational requirement for running either franchise.

- Secondly, there has been progress with the identification and delivery of depot and siding facilities at other locations.
Thirdly and most importantly, any operational railway use of the subject property raises significant issues from a planning perspective. Manchester City Council’s ambition for the subject property is for comprehensive residential regeneration. The Lower Irk Valley Neighbourhood Development Framework for this location was approved by the City Council in February 2016. Any proposal to reintroduce a railway use would be in contradiction to this and would be subject to both legal and planning challenge. It’s also worth noting that the operational use was effectively abandoned 20 years ago and residential apartment buildings now neighbour Area 2. The approved Lower Irk Valley Neighbourhood Development Framework can be accessed here http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/6498/lower_irk_valley_ndf

Attached is a news article which was published earlier this week and details recent progress made by Manchester City Council finding a development partner for the Northern Gateway and which amplifies the significance of the project in terms of delivery of much needed housing in this part of the City Centre. The subject land interests would almost certainly be acquired by CPO if Network Rail were not to cooperate with the release of this disused site for the wider public benefit and regeneration of the Northern Gateway.

Additionally, as a public body Network Rail is required by Government to release surplus land for the provision of housing and for the generation of capital receipts for investment in Britain’s rail infrastructure, the subject proposal is in keeping with these requirements.

I would hope that you will now choose to withdraw your objection. If you decide not to, then I will include a copy of your email within my report to ORR, advising that it should be disregarded as it does not identify a definitive railway or transport related requirement for the subject site.

Regards,

Principal Development Manager | Property
Network Rail
Square One, 4 Travis Street | Manchester | M1 2NY
E @networkrail.co.uk
www.networkrail.co.uk/property
As per the previous consultation of 2014-15, I am again ’replying all’ to this consultation, because I do not see any change in circumstances since then. Although this is not operational railway, it is a significant part of former operational land, i.e. Red Bank Carriage Sidings, and its disposal should be considered carefully by a wider audience and opposed.

At a time when rail usage is at an all-time high and pressure is increasing on operational capacity, the disposal of land such as carriage stabling does not make sense, certainly strategically. Anybody with more than the slightest transient knowledge of the rail network will be aware of the significant reduction in stabling and siding space. The current Northern Hub proposals for Manchester, whilst probably beneficial to the flow of traffic in the North West, do not address this, especially as a rise in traffic and trains is the obvious and inevitable result.

Once it’s gone, it won’t be easy to get it back.

A reminder of what was there in the 80s:
Hi
See below comments from James.

Regards

---

I refer to previous correspondence on this site, the last time its proposal disposal came up for consultation.

My comments raised then, noting the wider points against disposal, still stand.

Best
Dear Consultee,

Property: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

We seek to consult you as regards your views, please, on our proposed disposal by freehold sale.

We attach a draft application form to the Office of Rail and Road which, with the related plan(s), explains the proposal in detail. Subject to the outcome of our consultation, we may make a formal application to ORR for consent to the disposal, as required under the terms of our network licence land disposal condition. We would expect to make an application based on this form, updated in the light of consultation responses. It is therefore important that we have your views, so that these may be considered in ORR’s decision.

Alternatively, if in the light of the consultation responses, the proposed disposal would qualify to be made under ORR’s general consent, we may complete it accordingly.
We request your comments, please, by 20th April 2018 (including any “no comment” response). It would be helpful if your response is provided by email. Should no response be received by 20th April 2018, and having made reasonable endeavours to obtain a response, we will proceed with our application to ORR or General Consent form on the basis that there is no objection.

We will make reasonable endeavours to resolve any objections raised within two months of the consultation closing date. Should resolution not be achieved within this period, or should a response to our request for supporting justification or a meeting not be received within one month of the request, we will proceed with the application to ORR seeking consent should we still believe that it is appropriate to pursue the land disposal. In seeking that consent, we will describe what we have done to seek to resolve any concerns and why we believe that the land disposal should proceed. We will inform you when we proceed with the application to ORR.

If you have any queries as regards this proposal, please direct them to, tel:, email: @networkrail.co.uk. If future consultations of this nature should be directed differently to your organisation, please advise us of the appropriate contact details, so we may amend our records.

Yours faithfully,

Technical Support Assistant, Property
Square One, 1st Floor
4 Travis Street, Manchester M1 2NY
T
E  @networkrail.co.uk
From: @aol.com
Sent: 16 March 2018 16:31
To: @crosscountrytrains.co.uk; @c2crail.net; @chilternrailways.co.uk; @eastmidlandstrains.co.uk; @eurostar.com; @firstgroup.com; @gwr.com; @grandcentralrail.com; @southeasternrailway.co.uk; @merseyrail.org; @northernrailway.co.uk; @alliancerail.co.uk; @drsl.co.uk; @colasrail.co.uk; @deutschebahn.com; @fta.co.uk; @freightliner.co.uk; @rfg.org.uk; @maritimetransport.com; @acorp.uk.com; @whm.co.uk; @Transportfocus.org.uk; @btp.pnn.police.uk; @dft.gsi.gov.uk; @railnorth.org; @hs2.org.uk; @tfgm.com; @manchester.gov.uk;
Cc: 
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

I refer to previous correspondence on this site, the last time its proposal disposal came up for consultation.

My comments raised then, noting the wider points against disposal, still stand.

Best

WCR

E: @aol.com

22 Roadways Container Logistics

NO RESPONSE
Association of Community Rail Partnerships

From: @acorp.uk.com
Sent: 31 March 2018 15:20
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

No comment

Senior Operations Manager

Web: acorp.uk.com
The Old Water Tower, Huddersfield Railway Station, St Georges Square, Huddersfield HD1 1JF

Note: This E-mail is confidential. It may also be legally privileged. If you are not the addressee you may not copy, forward, disclose or use any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please delete it and all copies from your system and notify the sender immediately by return E-mail. The sender does not accept liability for any errors or omissions.
No objections.

Regards
Thanks for forwarding this, which whilst noting specific matters relating to the proposal, is in its conclusion a ‘no objection’ response from Passenger Focus. I’m therefore comfortable that it be added into the consultation report with no further correspondence being required with Passenger Focus.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

See below for information.
Thank you for sending Transport Focus details of the proposed land disposal in Manchester. They note that:

It is a re-consultation of the proposed disposal originally issued in 2012 (o/r 1012b13) and re-issued in 2014 (o/r 1905d15) and again in December 2016 (o/r 0612a17);
the land is now to be sold, freehold or on a long lease, to the “Far East Consortium”, who is Manchester City Council’s regeneration partner;
it is to form part of the “Northern Gateway” regeneration, and used for c. 15,000 houses, as well as commercial, community, retail and leisure use;
new infrastructure and environmental works to the Lower Irk Valley will also be part of the plans;
disposal is likely to start in March 2019 and be staged until March 2023.

Transport Focus also notes:

1. the analysis in the paper System Operator: Use of Sites in Collyhurst as a Depot;
2. the potential impact of plans for “Northern Powerhouse Rail” (NPR).

1.1 the System Operator continues to support the disposal the former Red Bank Sidings site for residential development, but recommends that the Oldham Road Goods Branch remains in NR ownership for potential future requirements.

1.2 Although close to Manchester Victoria, there are, apart from those of Northern - who have their depot at Newton Heath - no originating/terminating trains that might require a depot on the site. It appears far more benefit would be created by developing the site in the way planned by Manchester City Council. Additional stabling/depot facilities are surely better located where they reduce empty running.

2. There are a number of places in Manchester where sub-surface alignments have been considered, not least at Piccadilly station. Their potential to impact on above-ground property will obviously have to be thoroughly investigated. It is clear that the disposal site and any route under it will have to accommodate each other. Given the proposed timescale
of the disposal Transport Focus would expect a solution to be devised, especially as the
development would be enhanced by the improved railway access NPR should create.

Transport Focus has no objection to the proposed disposal.

Regards,

__________________________

26 British Transport Police

From: @btp.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 05 April 2018 14:31
To:
Cc:
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Good afternoon

I have no objections to the proposed land disposal.

Thanks

Designing Out Crime Officer

Designing Out Crime Unit
British Transport Police, Rail House, Lord Nelson Street, Liverpool L1 1JF
email @btp.pnn.police.uk
www.btp.police.uk
Hi

SDD are pushing for a response. The CRU number was CRU-2018-0554

Kind regards,

Designing out Crime Coordinator

Designing out Crime Unit
British Transport Police
25 Camden Road
London
NW1 9LN
DX151960 CAMDEN 4
Email: @btp.pnn.police.uk
www.btp.police.uk

Good morning,

Please note the attached a response is required by the 20th April.
Regards

Business Support Manager

Strategy & Performance Department
6th Floor, FHQ
Camden
NW1 9LN
British Transport Police
Mobile

Email:
@btp.pnn.police.uk
www.btp.police.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

Unless otherwise stated above this e-mail is considered ‘OFFICIAL’
Morning

Please see DfT email below for addition into the report.

Thanks,

Network Rail / Property Development

Begin forwarded message:

From: @dft.gov.uk
Date: 10 July 2018 at 21:38:03 BST
To: @northernrailway.co.uk, @networkrail.co.uk, @tfgm.com, @networkrail.co.uk, @manchester.gov.uk, @hs2.org.uk, @tfgm.com, @aol.com, @firstgroup.com, @firstgroup.com, @tfgm.com, @northernrailway.co.uk
Cc: @hs2.org.uk, @FirstGroup.com, @northernrailway.co.uk, @tfgm.com, @dft.gov.uk, @dft.gov.uk, @hs2.org.uk, @hs2.org.uk, @transportforthenorth.com
Subject: RE: Manchester Colyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings proposed disposal

Dear

Thank you for your email, including your support for the future direction and scope of work focussing on the Ardwick site set out in the DfT position statement. You sought the reservation of funding from the sale of Collyhurst for application to future development of...
the Ardwick site. I am afraid that HMT’s funding settlement with Network Rail does not allow for funding to be ringfenced in this way; and in addition such an approach could well hinder the timely progression of early development work on the Ardwick options. The Secretary of State confirmed last October that the funding being made available for CP6 includes provision for early development of new enhancement schemes. The work we have agreed to commence will be seeking to develop the case for drawing from that funding in line with the new ‘pipeline’ approach to rail enhancements.

I note that, on this basis, Northern will not be withdrawing their objection. Notwithstanding this, Network Rail (NR) understands that Northern’s objection relates to the future ring fencing of funding to protect the Ardwick site (which is not part of the terms of this disposal) and that it has not identified a foreseeable railway related use for the disposal site in question. On this basis, I understand NR will now proceed to ask ORR for a decision on the Collyhurst proposal.

Kind regards,

Senior Planning and Investment Manager, Network Services North - Rail Group, Department for Transport
3/23

From: @northernrailway.co.uk
Sent: 05 July 2018 12:15
To: @dft.gov.uk; @networkrail.co.uk; @tfgm.com; @networkrail.co.uk; @manchester.gov.uk; @networkrail.co.uk; @manchester.gov.uk; @hs2.org.uk; @tfgm.com; @aol.com; @firstgroup.com; @tfgm.com; @northernrailway.co.uk
Cc: @hs2.org.uk; @FirstGroup.com; @northernrailway.co.uk; @tfgm.com; @dft.gov.uk; @dft.gov.uk; @hs2.org.uk; @transportforthennorth.com
Subject: RE: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings proposed disposal

Dear
Thank you for your email and the draft position statement appended to it and apologies for not having responded by 18 June.

Your draft captures those factors for that will have to be taken into account when considering the options to provide for the stabling, servicing and maintenance of vehicles in the Manchester area to meet future requirements. Understandably, you bring out the point that DfT is not in a position to commit to investment in advance of a clear cost and benefit analysis being concluded.

However, the matter at issue here is not to seek a commitment to spend money on Ardwick at this stage. It is to ensure that any funding that might be realised from the disposal of railway-owned land (in the immediate Manchester area) is safe-guarded so that it can be applied to provide for stabling etc. facilities and accommodation (in the immediate Manchester area) once the requirements have been determined and confirmed.

There can be no question that there is already a pressing need for increased capacity in the Manchester area and ARN fully supports the approach outlined in your draft to set up a working group along the lines you have indicated. What is now required is the recognition of a clear conjunction between the release of land so that it can be used for non-railway purposes and a mechanism that establishes the means to allow for the stabling strategy to be developed and for the business case to follow on. (In principle, this is no different from agreeing a budget for expenditure and then subsequently authorising the outlay.)

Once that arrangement can be confirmed, it should be possible for ARN to withdraw its objection to the disposal of the former Red Bank Sidings and associated area.

With kind regards,

Senior Rail Advisor

4th. Floor
Northern House
York
Dear all,
Thank you very much for a productive and positive workshop yesterday. As discussed, I attach a draft position paper setting out what was agreed in terms of development of proposals for Ardwick. I plan to enclose this with the Department’s response to NR’s consultation confirming no objection. Please could you let me have any comments on the draft statement by 18 June.

–please could you forward to at AGMA as I don’t have her email address.

Thanks
Dear all,

This workshop was proposed by DfT in its response to NR’s Collyhurst Red Bank and Carriage Sidings land disposal consultation. The purpose of the workshop is to share and discuss on an informal and without prejudice basis available information about future demand and potential locations for additional stabling and depot capacity in the Manchester area to enable stakeholders to review their position on this proposed disposal. Agenda and papers for the meeting attached.

Please ask for or myself at NR reception.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
Dear

Further to my email of 20 April, I am writing to confirm that DfT does not object to this proposed disposal. As set out in that email we have convened further discussions with key stakeholders and are now satisfied that the reasonably foreseeable future requirements of the railway can adequately be met without retention and use of this land for stabling, thereby facilitating a significant proposed housing development. In particular, stakeholders agree that the Ardwick depot area has very significant potential and have agreed to co-operate with DfT in developing the case for an enhancement to be included in the Rail Network Enhancements Pipeline. I attach the agreed position statement.

Yours,

Senior Planning and Investment Manager, Network Services North - Rail Group, Department for Transport
3/23
Position statement on the development of additional depot and stabling facilities at Ardwick

Following responses to Network Rail’s March 2018 consultation on the proposed disposal of land at Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank and Carriage Sidings which expressed concern about the availability of alternative sites for expansion of depot and stabling capacity to address forecast growth, DfT convened a workshop at NR’s Manchester offices on 12 June 2018 to consider alternative, better options in the Manchester area for the development of additional depot and stabling facilities.

Those attending the workshop (representatives from DfT, NR System Operator, Property and Freight Development, Manchester City Council (MCC), Association of Greater Manchester Authorities, TfGM, TPE, Northern, West Coast Railway and HS2 Ltd) concluded that land around the existing Ardwick depot, including some currently in MCC ownership, offered potential for very significant expansion of such facilities to address foreseeable future rail industry needs, in a manner that would be consistent with relevant regional spatial policies.

They agreed to work together, under DfT’s leadership, to develop the case for entry into the DfT’s Rail Network Enhancements Pipeline of an enhancement to provide additional capacity at Ardwick (over and above that currently being delivered for Northern by Summer 2019) aligned with anticipated growth in the size and composition of train operators’ fleets, with scaleability for further expansion and adaptation over time. It was confirmed that the progression of the enhancement scheme would be closely aligned with decision making on the train service capacity to be bought from current and future franchisees. This work would be additional to, and inform, other depot and stabling strategy work for the North of England planned by NR System Operator as part its Continuous Modular Strategic Planning process.
Some representatives wished to see a firmer commitment to Government funding of an enhancement at Ardwick, however DfT explained that this would not be possible under the new ‘pipeline’ approach which drew on the lessons from the CP5 programme where enhancements had been committed to before there was sufficient clarity about their benefits and costs.

Specifically, it was agreed that:

- DfT would, by September 2018, convene the first meeting of a working group with representation invited from those organisations represented at the workshop, TfL, and freight train operators to develop the strategic case for the enhancement, develop a project timeline taking account of developing HS2 Phase 2B plans, and agree and commission targeted work to validate feasibility and inform future option development.
- Issues to be considered in this work include:
  - Location and length of a headshunt
  - Suitable gradients
  - Capacity on the main line for on- and off-depot movements

\(^1\) See https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/rail-network-enhancements-pipeline
From: @dft.gov.uk
Sent: 24 April 2018 17:59
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Thank you.

Senior Planning and Investment Manager, Network Services North - Rail Group, Department for Transport
3/23

From: 
Sent: 24 April 2018 17:54
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Hi

Please see email attached to which should provide you with the details sought.

- Potential access to/from the Ardwick Branch, and electrification towards Manchester Victoria to provide an alternative routeing to that station
- Provision within the site of suitable alternative freight facilities to the current ‘B’ and ‘C’ Strategic Freight Sites, including consideration of land between the Ardwick Branch and Gorlon Rd
- Integration and alignment with developing HS2 Phase 2B plans

The working group will report on progress to, and seek further direction from, the DfT-NR North of England Programme Board² by the end of March 2019.
Dear

Thank you for seeking the Department’s views on this proposal.

The Department recognises the strong case for timely disposal of this site in line with Government and DfT targets to release public sector land for housing. We also note support from Manchester City Council for inclusion of this land in its Northern Gateway scheme which will bring significant housing and regeneration benefits to Manchester.

The Department also has a responsibility to assure itself that land disposals do not unreasonably impede delivery of the Government’s objectives for the rail industry as articulated in the Rail Vision, including the expansion of rail capacity to meet expected continued growth in demand — expansion which will in many places support and benefit housing and economic growth.
We note the objections and representations received from Northern and TPE regarding this proposed disposal. On the substantive issues, we share their concerns about a shortage of depot/stabling facilities in the region that require careful consideration of the possibility that Collyhurst will need to be brought back into operational use at some point in future. We note however that there is no evidence of clear plans to bring the site back into operational use, and it would go against the Department’s commitment to releasing public sector land to retain indefinitely a large, derelict site in a high housing demand area without evidence of a clear intention to use the site for transport purposes.

Decisions can only be made on the basis of information available at the time, and there are many uncertainties around the potential need for, and options for supply of, additional depot/stabling capacity in this area. We are grateful to Network Rail for their analysis of the potential use of sites in the Collyhurst area (which concluded that Red Bank sidings would be an expensive solution with significant operational constraints) and some initial investigation of alternatives.

In order to resolve the concerns of various stakeholders, the Department considers there is a limited window in which further effort to pool available knowledge from all relevant parties would be constructive, and lead to a better informed, but still timely, decision on this proposed disposal.

We therefore propose that the Department:

- Convenes one or more workshops with relevant parties (to include NR Property, NR System Operator, HS2 Ltd (given developing plans for land acquisition at Ardwick to facilitate construction of a tunnel portal as part of Phase 2b), TPE, Northern, WCR (subject to clarifying the nature of their objection), TfN/DfT Partnership Team, TfGM and Manchester CC)
- The objective of the workshops, and agreed follow up actions, will be to consolidate available evidence about future stabling and depot demand in the Manchester area, and consolidate available knowledge about potential sites (including any in MCC
ownership), capacity for expansion and potential constraints, with a view to the
shared output providing the assurance the Department and objectors are seeking
that the reasonably foreseeable future requirements of the railway can adequately
be met without retention and use of this land for such purposes.

We also note the representations made by TPE on the policies and processes endorsed by
Network Rail at the November 2017 meeting of the Transpennine Rail Upgrade (TRU)
Project Development Group it chaired regarding proposed land disposals along the core
TRU route, to which this site is adjacent. In parallel, we would therefore welcome
confirmation from Network Rail that it is united in its organisational position on this disposal.

The Department commits to making a decision by 20th June 2018 on whether it supports or
objects to this disposal.

Yours sincerely,

Hi

During Friday’s conference call I mentioned that an objection had also been received from with James
Shuttleworth of West Coast Railways. Please find below the relevant email trail which is substantially a
reiteration of WCR’s Dec 2016 objection and is based on opinion as oppose a definitive railway or transport related requirement.

Additionally, here is a summary of what WCR do “…West Coast Railways is an independent Train Operating Company and since 1998 has specialised in operating charter trains, both in its own right, in partnership with and on behalf of tour operators, along some of the UKs most famous and scenic routes and to many beautiful destination. The Company’s main base is at Carnforth, Lancashire and in 2018 it will be operating more services than ever, including timetabled services and special one day and weekend rail tours across thousands of miles of the UK rail network, using classic and modern diesels and historic steam locomotives…”
https://www.westcoastrailways.co.uk/about-westcoast-railways.cfm

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: @dft.gov.uk
Sent: 24 April 2018 11:03
To: 24 April 2018 12:09
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Hi

Are you able to go back to

Regards
Subject: FW: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Dear
Are you able to let us know the nature of WCR’s objection please so we can decide whether/how they are included in the work proposed below.
Thanks

Senior Planning and Investment Manager, Network Services North - Rail Group, Department for Transport
3/23

From: @dft.gsi.gov.uk
Sent: 20 April 2018 14:40
To:
Cc: @firstgroup.com; @hs2.org.uk; @transportforthenorth.com; @northernrailway.co.uk; @tfgm.com; @manchester.gov.uk;
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Dear
Thank you for seeking the Department’s views on this proposal.

The Department recognises the strong case for timely disposal of this site in line with Government and DfT targets to release public sector land for housing. We also note support from Manchester City Council for inclusion of this land in its Northern Gateway scheme which will bring significant housing and regeneration benefits to Manchester.

The Department also has a responsibility to assure itself that land disposals do not unreasonably impede delivery of the Government’s objectives for the rail industry as articulated in the Rail Vision, including the expansion of rail capacity to meet expected continued growth in demand –expansion which will in many places support and benefit housing and economic growth.
We note the objections and representations received from Northern and TPE regarding this proposed disposal. On the substantive issues, we share their concerns about a shortage of depot/stabling facilities in the region that require careful consideration of the possibility that Collyhurst will need to be brought back into operational use at some point in future. We note however that there is no evidence of clear plans to bring the site back into operational use, and it would go against the Department’s commitment to releasing public sector land to retain indefinitely a large, derelict site in a high housing demand area without evidence of a clear intention to use the site for transport purposes.

Decisions can only be made on the basis of information available at the time, and there are many uncertainties around the potential need for, and options for supply of, additional depot/stabling capacity in this area. We are grateful to Network Rail for their analysis of the potential use of sites in the Collyhurst area (which concluded that Red Bank sidings would be an expensive solution with significant operational constraints) and some initial investigation of alternatives.

In order to resolve the concerns of various stakeholders, the Department considers there is a limited window in which further effort to pool available knowledge from all relevant parties would be constructive, and lead to a better informed, but still timely, decision on this proposed disposal.

We note that Network Rail has proposed a period of two months to resolve objections to this proposal. We therefore propose that the Department:

- Convenes one or more workshops with relevant parties (to include NR Property, NR System Operator, HS2 Ltd (given developing plans for land acquisition at Ardwick to facilitate construction of a tunnel portal as part of Phase 2b), TPE, Northern, WCR (subject to clarifying the nature of their objection), TfN/DfT Partnership Team, TfGM and Manchester CC)
- The objective of the workshops, and agreed follow up actions, will be to consolidate available evidence about future stabling and depot demand in the Manchester area, and consolidate available knowledge about potential sites (including any in MCC
ownership), capacity for expansion and potential constraints, with a view to the
shared output providing the assurance the Department and objectors are seeking
that the reasonably foreseeable future requirements of the railway can adequately
be met without retention and use of this land for such purposes.

We also note the representations made by TPE on the policies and processes endorsed by
Network Rail at the November 2017 meeting of the Transpennine Rail Upgrade (TRU)
Project Development Group it chaired regarding proposed land disposals along the core
TRU route, to which this site is adjacent. In parallel, we would therefore welcome
confirmation from Network Rail that it is united in its organisational position on this disposal.

The Department commits to making a decision by 20\textsuperscript{th} June 2018 on whether it supports or
objects to this disposal.

Yours sincerely,

Senior Planning and Investment Manager, Network Services North - Rail Group, Department for Transport
3/23

28 Transport for North

NO RESPONSE. Advised that they would leave DfT to deal with this consultation.

29 HS2 Ltd
From: @hs2.org.uk
Sent: 14 May 2018 09:27
To:
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Our ref: HS2-MCC-PE-008

Dear

Thank you for consulting HS2 Ltd on the above land disposal consultation.

I can confirm that HS2 Ltd have no specific comments to make on this disposal.

Kind regards,

Town Planning Advisor – Phase Two | HS2 Ltd

Tel: M: | @hs2.org.uk | Facebook | Twitter | LinkedIn

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited, Two Snow Hill, Queensway, Birmingham B4 6GA | www.gov.uk/hs2

From: @hs2.org.uk
Sent: 26 March 2018 10:21
To: Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Dear

Thank you for consulting HS2 Ltd on the above matter as there are no implications for the HS2 programme we have no comments to make on the proposals.

Kind regards,

Safeguarding Planning Manager | HS2 Ltd
No comment

Senior Media Relations Manager

Mobile: | Press Office: | Email: @networkrail.co.uk

---

Dear

Following our recent discussions please find attached our response to this consultation.

Kind Regards,

Rail Services Development Manager
Rail Programme Team
Dear

Property: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Thank you for your email and subsequent discussion on Friday 8th June.

Our previous consultation response in April 2018 highlighted our request that Network Rail work with TfGM and other rail industry partners to identify and safeguard alternative sites for heavy rail depot and stabling facilities. In addition, we requested that the land east of the pedestrian footbridge in the Area 1 plan (marked as 'X' plan number 45486-3C) was safeguarded for Metrolink related purposes by TfGM.
We are pleased to note that Network Rail have agreed to our request to safeguard the land in question for Metrolink and understand that this will be achieved by transferring the land direct to TfGM as explained in your email on 28th June.

TfGM also notes that there has been recent progress with regards to agreeing a way forward on the wider heavy rail stabling / sidings issue. It is pleasing to note that this has attracted involvement from the Department for Transport and we trust that this process will continue until an appropriate quantity of sites are identified and safeguarded for future use.

Provided that the commitments outlined above are met TfGM does not object to the proposal to dispose of the remainder of Areas 1 and 2, as detailed on the plan below.

Yours sincerely,

Rail Services Development Officer
@tfgm.com

Transport for Greater Manchester is an executive body of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority
From: @tfgm.com  
Sent: 05 July 2018 13:51  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Hi

First of all apologies for the delay in coming back to you regarding this. I am waiting for a response back from our Rapid Transit Development Team but my understanding is that provided that Network Rail are happy to dispose of the portion of land east of the footbridge direct to TfGM then we are happy to remove the objection.

I will get you an answer regarding the proposed timescales for transfer of the land along with a formal letter as soon as I can.

Kind Regards,
From: 04 July 2018 13:20
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Afternoon

Are you able to let me have TfGM’s formal response please so I can finalise NR’s application to ORR?

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: 28 June 2018 17:04
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: Re: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Hi

To confirm that FEC are comfortable with the principle of NR disposing of the subject area direct to TfGM.

Regards,

Network Rail / Property Development
Hi

I’m just checking that this doesn’t raise any complications given that it would be a departure from what has previously been discussed with FEC/MCC.

Assuming matters were to progress in this way, what timescales do you envisage for TfGM drawing the land down from NR? Transfer arrangements are due to be in place with FEC later this calendar year, it would make sense for transfer arrangements with TfGM to be put in place in parallel assuming this was to be the agreed way forward.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: @tfgm.com
Sent: 27 June 2018 16:39
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Dear

Thank you for your email. We note your request to confirm the withdrawal of TfGM’s objection to this proposed land disposal on the understanding that the parcel of land to the east of the pedestrian footbridge, (marked as ‘X’ on the plan above) is safeguarded to assist with the future expansion of the Queens Road Metrolink depot.
We are however concerned about this section of land being transferred as part of the wider site to Manchester City Council’s development partner Far East Consortium (FEC) due to the potential complexity and cost when this land transfers from FEC to TfGM ownership in future. We therefore request that Network Rail transfers the portion of land east of the footbridge direct to TfGM and to retain the transport uses and potentially, the operational status of the land. Once this is agreed we can agree to remove the objection.

Kind Regards,
From: @networkrail.co.uk
Sent: 27 June 2018 15:00
To: @tfgm.com
Cc: @tfgm.com ; @networkrail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Afternoon

A gentle reminder for you to provide confirmation of TfGM’s position in writing by Friday 29th June 2018, following this the details will be collated into an application to ORR for land disposal consent.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property
M

From: Ingham Antony
Sent: 21 June 2018 12:17
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Hi

Further to this morning’s telephone discussion, it is noted that you are in the process of arranging for a letter to confirm the withdrawal of TfGM’s objection to this proposed land disposal on the understanding that the parcel of land to the east of the pedestrian footbridge, as referred to in my email of 8th June below, is safeguarded to assist with the future expansion of the Queens Road Metrolink depot.

I understand that the preferred approach to safeguarding this land is for NR to include it within the transfer of the wider land interests (i.e. the whole area subject to the ORR land disposal pre-application) to MCC’s development partner, Far East Consortium (FEC), with a restriction on title that the area to the east of the
pedestrian footbridge can only be used for transport related purposes unless otherwise agreed with both Manchester City Council and Transport for Greater Manchester. It would be helpful if your letter to me could confirm this as being the agreed way forward.

Also to let you know that I have separately written to Northern, First TransPennine Express and West Coast Railways seeking confirmation as to whether they are agreeable to lifting their previous objections having regard to the reasoning set out in email of 19\textsuperscript{th} June 2018 and supporting position paper (both attached for ease of reference). I have requested responses by Friday 29\textsuperscript{th} June 2018, with the aim of submitting the formal application to ORR for land disposal consent during July 2018.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: 
Sent: 08 June 2018 17:38 
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: FW: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Hi

Following on from this afternoon’s telephone discussion re TfGM’s requirement for the land to the east of the pedestrian footbridge (as referred to in your letter of 23\textsuperscript{rd} April 2018).

It is noted that the principle of safeguarding the subject area for transport use is accepted by MCC in terms of the master planning of the Northern Gateway. In addition, I have spoken to MCC’s development partner, Far East Consortium (FEC), who have also confirmed this acceptance. Whilst we will need to discuss and agree the mechanism for formalising this, the principle is also accepted by Network Rail.

There has also been progress in agreeing a way forward on the wider heavy rail stabling / sidings issue which will hopefully confirmed at Tuesday’s workshop.
It would be helpful if in recognition of the above you could provide an updated letter ahead of Tuesday’s workshop to confirm that TfGM do not object to the land disposal as the parties agree to the principle of working together to safeguard the area between the pedestrian footbridge and the Queens Road Metrolink depot for transport use.

I’ll be on the mobile number on Monday should there be anything that you wish to discuss ahead of Tuesday’s meeting.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

From: @tfgm.com
Sent: 23 April 2018 16:25
To:
Cc: @railnorth.org;
Subject: Manchester Collyhurst Red Bank Arches and Carriage Sidings Consultation

Dear

As discussed on Friday, please find attached TfGM’s response to this consultation.

Kind Regards,

Rail Services Development Officer
Rail Programme Team
Transport for Greater Manchester
7th Floor, 2 Piccadilly Place, Manchester, M1 3BG
Direct Line:
Dear

Property: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

Thank you for offering the opportunity to comment on these land disposal proposals.

Our previous response in January 2017 highlighted that generally in these cases TfGM acknowledges the importance of protecting former railway land close to Manchester City Centre in case that it should be required sometime in the future for railway purposes. However, in this case we are aware of the wider regeneration benefits which are on offer to both the city centre and Collyhurst area from this redevelopment, plus the major difficulties and cost of redeveloping the site for railway purposes.
We believe that identifying suitable alternative sites in and around central Manchester for depot and stabling facilities is a key future priority. This is especially important in order to provide for the expected growth which will occur on all corridors in Greater Manchester in future years. We are uncertain whether any of the sites, which Network Rail has identified in Appendix 3, are suitable for rail depot/stabling facilities of even a modest size and it is a concern that the Collyhurst site entirely conflicts with our own plans to expand Queens Road Metrolink Depot.

It should be noted that previous work commissioned by TfGM, with regards to expanding Queens Road Metrolink Depot, has revealed that all of the land east of the pedestrian footbridge in Area 1 (highlighted on Network Rail’s Proposed Land Disposal Evaluation Form) would be required for future depot expansion and we are happy to share these proposals with Network Rail on request. If the disposal of the

land at Collyhurst has the potential to impact on the proposed future expansion of the Queens Road Depot, then TfGM would object to these on that basis.

We would request that Network Rail work with TfGM and other rail industry partners to identify and safeguard alternative sites for heavy rail depot and stabling facilities. In addition, we would request that the land east of the pedestrian footbridge in the Area 1 plan (plan number 45486-3C) is safeguarded for future transport related purposes by TfGM. Provided that these two conditions are met we are happy to give our support and endorsement to the proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Rail Services Development Officer
@tfgm.com
2. Site Plan (Plan Number 45486-3C)

PLAN ATTACHED AS SEPARATE PDF ALSO FOR ADDED CLARITY

Key
- Shaded blue, shaded blue hatched red, shaded blue edged red, shaded blue edged orange = disposal Area
- Shaded blue edged orange= Faber Street & Roger Street (rail over road) bridge structures
- Shaded blue hatched red = Red Bank Arches
- Shaded blue edged red = land adjoining Red Bank Arches
- Shaded orange= Pedestrian footbridge over disposal property
- Shaded green= Network Rail retained land & infrastructure

Area 1 – Red Bank former Carriage Sidings
Area 2 - Red Bank Land & Arches

From:
Sent: 29 March 2018 17:09
To: @tfgm.com
Cc:
Subject: Fwd: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Hi

We are having to reconult due to the time that has passed since the previous consultation. Further information has been added with regards to the 2018 report, otherwise it is largely unchanged.

Comfortable for you to respond on the basis that your previous comments remain unchanged assuming that to be the case.

Regards,

Network Rail / Property Development

From: @tfgm.com
Sent: 29 March 2018 14:40
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Dear

Could you please explain how this consultation differs from that which took place 05/12/16 to 12/01/17? The response we provided then may still be relevant.

Kind Regards,
Many thanks for your response confirming that Manchester City Council has no objection to Network Rail disposing of the land. A copy of your email will be included in NR’s submission to ORR.

Regards,

Development Manager | Network Rail Property

Hi

See below comments from Richard.

Regards
Subject: Re: Consultation on proposed land disposal: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings - closing date Friday 20th April 2018

Dear [Name],

Thank you for consulting Manchester City Council on the proposed land disposal at Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings referred to in your e-mail.

As you may be aware the Council has been engaged in productive discussions with Network Rail and other partners over plans to transform the Lower Irk Valley. We are looking to publish a Strategic Regeneration Framework shortly in conjunction with our Joint Venture partner - targeting the June meeting of the Council's Executive for the submission of a draft version for public consultation purposes.

Therefore I can confirm that the Council has no objection to Network Rail disposing of the land in question and we look forward to continuing to work with Network Rail as plans for the wider area are further developed.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this response to the consultation.

Yours sincerely,
Dear Consultee,

Property: Manchester Collyhurst, Red Bank Arches & Former Carriage Sidings

We seek to consult you as regards your views, please, on our proposed disposal by freehold sale.

We attach a draft application form to the Office of Rail and Road which, with the related plan(s), explains the proposal in detail. Subject to the outcome of our consultation, we may make a formal application to ORR for consent to the disposal, as required under the terms of our network licence land disposal condition. We would expect to make an application based on this form, updated in the light of consultation responses. It is therefore important that we have your views, so that these may be considered in ORR’s decision.

Alternatively, if in the light of the consultation responses, the proposed disposal would qualify to be made under ORR’s general consent, we may complete it accordingly.

We request your comments, please, by 20th April 2018 (including any “no comment” response). It would be helpful if your response is provided by email. Should no response be received by 20th April 2018, and having
made reasonable endeavours to obtain a response, we will proceed with our application to ORR or General Consent form on the basis that there is no objection.

We will make reasonable endeavours to resolve any objections raised within two months of the consultation closing date. Should resolution not be achieved within this period, or should a response to our request for supporting justification or a meeting not be received within one month of the request, we will proceed with the application to ORR seeking consent should we still believe that it is appropriate to pursue the land disposal. In seeking that consent, we will describe what we have done to seek to resolve any concerns and why we believe that the land disposal should proceed. We will inform you when we proceed with the application to ORR.

If you have any queries as regards this proposal, please direct them to, tel: email: @networkrail.co.uk. If future consultations of this nature should be directed differently to your organisation, please advise us of the appropriate contact details, so we may amend our records.

Yours faithfully,

NetworkRail

Technical Support Assistant, Property
Square One, 1st Floor
4 Travis Street, Manchester M1 2NY
T E @networkrail.co.uk
www.networkrail.co.uk/property
See attached evaluation form originally circulated on 16th March 2018.

Annex 3

This is also the evaluation form included in Annex 2. The comments relating to external consultations included in sections 8 represent the changes to the original application circulated on 16th March 2018.
Appendix 3  

**System Operator: Use of Sites in Collyhurst as a Depot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Name of Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Potential to Use of Sites in Collyhurst as a Passenger Rolling Stock depot and stabling location for Central Manchester</em></td>
<td>Simon Taylor, Senior Strategic Planner, System Operator.</td>
<td>05/01/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to stimulate a discussion about the suitability of sites in the Collyhurst area to be developed for the use as a depot of the NW franchised fleet serving Manchester Piccadilly and Victoria. If there is considered to be a case for progressing or declining this initiative, the outcome could potentially help remove an objection to the release of land at Red Bank for residential development by Manchester City Council’s development partner and for a more suitable location to be developed for depot use.

This document aims to outline the key areas previously referred to as “Collyhusrt” in order to narrow down specific locations as well as understanding the potential of the area in general and its suitability as a depot or stabling location.

**Background**

In 2014 NR undertook a GRIP feasibility study to consider location options for a depot and stabling location to serve central Manchester based on anticipated CP4 likely increased levels of rolling stock. Subsequently, the Northern Hub and North West Electrification programmes – now collectively termed the Great North Rail Project, also considered a need for an increased fleet in the north west which would include recognition of the increase in electric traction stock and the more modern fleet.

Options developed in terms of a suitable location identified Collyhurst Sidings (also known as Oldham Road Goods Branch) as a potential site for development into a stabling facility due to its good location and connections. The sidings at the time of the study (and currently) are not in regular use and have partly overgrown. The costs would be significant due to a complete remodelling of the site and some major junction remodelling required at the Miles Platting Jn. As part of the same study in 2014 former Red Bank Sidings was not assessed as it had been filtered out.

A recent communication from the Department for Transport has indicated there is an aspiration to sell the former Red Bank Sidings for development but have received objections due to the site having previously been identified as a potential location for a depot or stabling facility. This paper aims to summarise the previous works on the suitability of the site to sift it in or out of any future planning. This could aid a decision to remove any objections to release the former Red Bank Sidings.
System Operator: Use of Sites in Collyhurst as a Depot

- Collyhurst (outside NR ownership, incorporates part of TfGM's Queens Rd Metrolink depot)
- Brewery Sidings (outside NR ownership (sold by BRB 1991))
- Redbank
- Oldham Road Goods Branch
- Man Victoria Stn

System Operator Planning a better network for you
**Former Red Bank Sidings**

The Former Red Bank Sidings were effectively discounted as a potential new LMD site during an initial sift of potential sites during GRIP stage 2. Reasons for discounting this site as a viable option for a new LMD in the Central Manchester area for the following reasons;

- Extensive works will be required to make the site suitable, including works to the derelict viaduct which would carry the reinstated main line connection. GRIP stage 2 development work identifies anticipated high associated costs and no existing access to the main line.
- A new rail access is considered to be only possible into Victoria platforms 5 and 6, unless extensive remodelling works were also carried out at Victoria on the MVL1 lines. Train movements to/from Piccadilly would therefore need to make a complex move to access/egress the depot. It is noted that the NR depot development progress document provided at the start of GRIP stage 2 states ‘no further action required’ for this site.
- There are other alternative sites in central Manchester which have been investigated and which currently have main line connections. These sites are deemed to be a better match to the overall requirements (e.g. land at Newton Heath).

**Oldham Road Goods Branch (Collyhurst Sidings)**

This study commissioned by the governance groups of the then North of England Programme to address the anticipated shortfall in stabling accommodation as a consequence of the increased fleet which would result from the enhancements being delivered. It identified some significant drawbacks with the site as a potential location, including;

- The site is not long enough to allow the ideal layout of an 8 car Arrival Line, leading to an 8 car Reception with direct access into servicing sidings via a train wash. The layout is constrained by the fact that the arriving units have to be split into 4 car sets on he Reception Road, to enable access into a servicing siding via a shunt neck which is only long enough for 4 cars. Further, the position of the train wash is not ideal, as the preference is to achieve a depot flow such that entry to the wash is made/forced as part of the routine flow cycle. Trains could easily bypass the carriage washing activity altogether, if time constraints dictate.
- Reliance on NWEP Phase 5 programme is likely to impact on the possible staging options available for EMUs at the site for the 2016 scenario.
- Requirement to upgrade the road access into the site, suitable for access by HGV deliveries and emergency vehicles, this is likely to require significant works. Due to spacial constraints resulting from recent land disposal, full road access to the main parts of the servicing sidings/depot would be severely restricted, even with the access road works indicated on the concept layout drawing.
- Train movements into and out of the site would not be ideal, given the proposed works at Miles Platting Jn will impact on access to Rochdale and moves from Victoria would require a turn back move on the running lines.
For Consideration:
PB020: Paper to Project Board – July 2014

Adobe Acrobat Document

This paper to update the Project Board for the then north of England Programme Board, used the GRIP 2 output (previous) to notify at high level the fleet and functionality which could be achieved by location. The Collyhurst area in general, the Former Red Bank Sidings or Oldham Road Goods Branch sidings were not identified within this report as a potential site. It is assumed that they had been discontinued as options based on the drawbacks to the sites.

Observation:

Oldham Road Goods Branch (Collyhurst Sidings)
The GRIP 2 report considered that the location of Oldham Road Goods Branch would be a credible location operationally for a depot serving central Manchester. It was noted that this site was at the time considered the least preferable of all the viable central Manchester sites identified.

It is also worthy of noting that previous reports have identified that approximately 50% of the main part of the former sidings land to the West of Collyhurst St has in recent years been sold off for development. Additionally a general assessment on the amount of works required in order to make Oldham Road Goods Branch a workable location is high in comparison to other locations considered which are currently in operational use in some form. NWEP Phase 5 was originally planned to electrify between Manchester Victoria and Miles Platting Jn onwards towards Ashburys. However the SCOPE of Phase 5 has since reduced and therefore this may impact on a potential staging strategy if Oldham Road Goods Branch was to be developed.

Former Red Bank Sidings
Use of the land for depot and stabling would be contrary to the Collyhurst Neighbourhood Plan and would be resisted by Manchester City Council. Former Red Bank Sidings only opens up into Manchester Victoria platforms 5 & 6. Previous historical use allowed the site to extend in to other platforms which have since been removed and now houses the Manchester arena on the site. Additionally the transit from Red Bank to Manchester Piccadilly would transit over the Ordsall Chord resulting in the approach to Piccadilly being from the north. This in turn results in the restriction of only utilising platforms 13 & 14 at Piccadilly. The best approach to Piccadilly is from the south where all platform may then be utilised.
## System Operator: Use of Sites in Collyhurst as a Depot

### Observation cont:

**Brewery Sidings**
Potential acquisition opportunity as could potentially have the space to facilitate a depot or stabling facility. However given the location in relation to the wider Manchester area the location is not suitable to serve both Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Victoria.

**Collyhurst area in general**
The Collyhurst area in general (Red Bank Former Sidings and Oldham Road Goods Branch) does not lend itself to a suitable location to serve Manchester stations. The Collyhurst area would be suitable to serve Manchester Victoria solely but would be restricted to Manchester Piccadilly. The approach to Piccadilly would be from the north moving across the Ordsall Chord and through the Castlefield Corridor. Current planning for the May 18 timetable has the Castlefield Corridor moving at 15tph along the corridor in both peak and off peak periods working at maximum capacity throughout.

### Recommendation 1:
Noting the content of the previous studies which considered Red Bank Former Sidings as unsuitable of serving Manchester given the location and unsuitable connection into Manchester Victoria, System Operator still supports the release of Red Bank Former Sidings for residential development.

### Recommendation 2:
Oldham Road Goods Branch remains a credible location but not a preferred. Therefore System Operator supports the decision not to develop this site into a depot or stabling capacity, more viable locations identified from the previous reports completed are advanced in order to meet the rolling stock capacity requirements required in the Manchester area. System Operator recommends that this site remains in NR possession for potential future requirements.