## EXHIBIT LIST

Reference No: AP2/00026  
Petitioner: Rail Freight Group  
Published to Collaboration Area: Tuesday 14-May-2019  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Exhibit Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R555 P2A-000116 Petition.pdf (R555)</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R556 P2A-000116 PRD.pdf (R556)</td>
<td>8 - 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hybrid Bill Petition

House of Commons
Session 2017-19
High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill

Do not include any images or graphics in your petition. There will be an opportunity to present these later if you give evidence to the committee.

Your bill petition does not need to be signed.
Expand the size of the text boxes as you need.

1. Petitioner information

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

The Rail Freight Group
7 Bury Place
London
WC1A 2LA

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

The Rail Freight Group (the RFG) is the representative body for rail freight in the UK, and aims to increase the volume of goods moved by rail. As a membership organisation the RFG represents the interests of around 120 companies active in rail freight, including train operators, ports, end customers, suppliers and support services.

2. Objections to the Bill

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

Only objections outlined in this petition can be presented when giving evidence to the committee. You will not be entitled to be heard on new matters.

1. The RFG and the rail freight industry are strongly supportive of HS2 and the High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill (the Bill).

2. However, there are some aspects of the development of the new railway which continue to raise concerns. Many of the RFG’s members are specially and directly
affected by the Bill due in particular to the issues arising from the interface between HS2 services and freight services on those parts of the rail network where HS2 trains will run on conventional tracks. In addition our members’ rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill. As our members have largely common concerns, it is appropriate and efficient that the RFG rather than their members individually object to the Bill for the reasons set out below.

Implement HS2 Phase One and Phase 2a Concurrently

3. The RFG strongly supports the early development and construction of the section of the HS2 railway that the Bill seeks to authorise (Phase 2a). Accelerating the progress of Phase 2a serves to resolve potential rail network conflicts that may arise between Birmingham and Crewe, which could severely impact on freight capacity. If there is a delay between completion of HS2 Phase One and Phase 2a, HS2 trains will be required to rejoin the West Coast Main Line at the Handsacre Junction creating a significant bottleneck. The West Coast Main Line is a key artery for freight traffic with an average of over three freight trains per hour operating along this part of the line in both directions, and it is crucial that this traffic is protected. Forecasts indicate significant growth over this section, with an additional three paths per hour required to satisfy demand by 2033.

4. To resolve this potential conflict between HS2 trains and rail freight on the West Coast Main Line, the Promoter should make a binding commitment that both Phase One and Phase 2a will be developed and constructed concurrently, so that HS2 trains do not operate beyond Birmingham until Phase 2a is constructed.

Crewe Station Area

5. The RFG has concerns regarding the changes to rail infrastructure at and around Crewe Station that are proposed as part of the Bill. The proposals for Crewe station include implementing a new passenger platform on the ‘Manchester Independent’ lines which are currently used for freight trains. These tracks are presently used to regulate freight trains on the network, allowing freight paths to be matched together on the busy parts of the West Coast Main Line north and south of Crewe. The loss of this facility would restrict the ability to regulate freight trains, affecting capacity for freight services on the network, and impacting performance by importing delays between different train services.

6. To resolve this issue the Bill should be amended with an alternative design for Crewe Station that does not require the use of the “Independent Lines” for passenger services.

Capacity for Freight between Crewe and Manchester

7. The RFG has serious concerns regarding the inadequate provision of rail freight capacity for existing services and growth on the line between Crewe and Manchester. HS2’s proposed service pattern after the completion of Phase 2a will increase the passenger services on the West Coast Main Line to Manchester. The RFG has been advised that only one path per hour will be retained in the timetable for freight. This is a reduction of the capacity currently available for freight on the same lines, where in some hours four freight trains operate. By way of example,
the table below shows the freight trains that are currently timetabled on the line between Crewe and Manchester between 17:00 and 18:00 from Tuesday to Friday:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train ID</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Time at Sandbach</th>
<th>Days Operated</th>
<th>Freight Operator</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4H17</td>
<td>Wembley</td>
<td>Manchester Trafford Park</td>
<td>17:08</td>
<td>Tuesday - Friday</td>
<td>DB Cargo</td>
<td>Intermodal containers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6H50</td>
<td>Willesden</td>
<td>Tunstead or Brigg</td>
<td>17:20/17:21</td>
<td>Tuesday - Friday</td>
<td>DB Cargo</td>
<td>Aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0E53</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>Midland Road</td>
<td>17:44</td>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Freightliner</td>
<td>Light engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H58</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>Manchester Trafford Park</td>
<td>17:52</td>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Freightliner</td>
<td>Intermodal containers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In order to preserve existing freight capacity between Crewe and Manchester the promoter should provide a binding commitment that they will not seek additional services for HS2 trains where they would restrict the ability to operate existing freight services or reduce existing freight capacity, prior to the opening of HS2 Phase 2B.

Congestion on the Rail Network North of Crewe

9. The RFG is concerned regarding the impact of HS2 passenger services on the congested West Coast Main Line north of Crewe, where freight services currently operate to Liverpool and Scotland. The addition of HS2 services to the rail network means that capacity between Crewe and Weaver Junction (for Liverpool) will be severely restricted. Although the RFG has not been provided with the timetable analysis it is understood that, even at existing traffic levels for non HS2 trains, the network would be critically constrained. The RFG understands that this could be resolved through resignalling and capacity improvements (mentioned in para 3.53 of The Strategic Case for HS2 Phase Two published in July 2017 (the Strategic Case)), however there is no commitment for this to be funded.

10. Similar issues exist north of Preston where HS2’s timetabling suggests that freight capacity on the network would be significantly reduced in consequence of HS2 trains, and that remaining freight services would be shorter and hence less economically viable. There are key rail freight transportation routes that currently operate over this route including domestic intermodal services between the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal in Northamptonshire and central Scotland, deep-sea services, automotive trains, aggregates trains and Royal Mail trains north of Preston on the West Coast Main Line. The RFG understand that some consideration of the issues has been undertaken, but no information has been published and no solution has been forthcoming to safeguard freight capacity.

11. Consideration of measures to ameliorate these problems that will be caused by the HS2 railway north of Crewe to Liverpool and Scotland requires urgent attention. Mitigation proposals need to be prepared and formally published in consultation with the rail freight industry, in order that the impacts can be minimised. Any formal mitigation plans and proposals should consider protection of freight capacity, including additional capacity for freight growth.
Consideration of Future Rail Freight Capacity

12. The Strategic Case suggests that freight benefits could arise from spare capacity on the West Coast Main Line released from Phase 2a. Information paper F5: Future Train Service Patterns on the West Coast Main Line Corridor outlines the approach to re-designing the future train service patterns when Phase One and Phase 2a of HS2 are operational. The paper explains that the Department for Transport has announced its intention to include requirements for the next West Coast Train Operator (West Coast Partnership) to undertake the train service development work and contribute to timetable planning. However the F5 Information paper does not contain a specific requirement or assumption that West Coast Partnership will be required to consider freight capacity as part of the timetable planning. In order to realise the potential rail freight benefits referred to in the Strategic Case an explicit commitment that rail freight will be considered and analysed by the West Coast Partnership when timetable planning work is undertaken is required.

Possessions Regime

13. The RFG has reviewed Information Paper F6: Rail Freight Operators and notes that paragraph 4.2 and 4.3 contain the same assurances given and added to the Register of Undertakings and Assurances for Phase One. Although the RFG considers the wording in the information paper is appropriate, the Promoter should also give an assurance with the same wording that can be added to the Register of Undertakings and Assurances for Phase 2a.

3. What do you want to be done in response?

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

The committee cannot reject the Bill outright or propose amendments which conflict with the principle of the Bill. But it can require changes to the Government's plans in response to petitioners' concerns, which can take the form of amendments to the Bill or commitments by HS2 Ltd.

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

14. A summary of what the RFG considers should be done to address concerns regarding the Bill (as fully described in box 2 above) is set out below:

   a. The Promoter should make a binding commitment that both Phase One and Phase 2a will be developed and constructed concurrently, so that the HS2 services beyond Birmingham do not begin until Phase 2a is constructed.

   b. The Bill should be amended with an alternative design for Crewe Station that does not require the use of the "Manchester Independent" Lines.

   c. The Promoter should provide a binding commitment that they will not seek
additional services for HS2 trains between Crewe and Manchester where they would restrict the ability to operate existing freight services or reduce existing freight capacity, prior to the opening of HS2 Phase 2B.

d. Binding mitigation proposals to secure existing freight capacity and provide for growth on the rail network north of Crewe should to be prepared and formally published in consultation with the rail freight industry.

e. An explicit commitment that rail freight will be considered and taken into account by the West Coast Partnership when timetabling work is undertaken is required.

f. The Promoter should give the same assurances regarding possessions that were given for HS2 Phase One so that they can be added to the Register of Undertakings and Assurances for Phase 2a.

15. If any of the measures set out in paragraph 14 cannot be achieved, the Promoter should formulate alternative binding measures and commitments in consultation with the RFG and the freight industry to address and fully mitigate the issues that are set out in box 2.

**Next steps**

Once you have completed your petition template please save it and go to our website to submit it during the petitioning period.
April 2019

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

Petition No. HS2-P2A-116: The Rail Freight Group

Promoter’s Response Document
INTRODUCTION

This Promoter's Response Document (PRD) forms the Promoter's response to Petition No. HS2-P2A-116, from the Rail Freight Group.

In this PRD, ‘the Promoter’ means the Secretary of State and HS2 Ltd acting on his behalf.

The purpose of the PRD is to advise you and the Select Committee of the Promoter’s position in relation to the petitioning points raised. It is intended that the PRD will alleviate many of the concerns raised in the petition.

The Table of Contents overleaf lists the page number, petitioning points in the order they appear in the petition, and a summary statement of the issue(s) contained in the petition for quick reference. Other supporting material (e.g. reports, drawings and photographs) referred to in the response are attached where applicable.


Department for Transport
High Speed Two (HS2) Limited

BACKGROUND

The Rail Freight Group (the RFG) is the representative body for rail freight in the UK, and aims to increase the volume of goods moved by rail. As a membership organisation the RFG represents the interests of around 120 companies active in rail freight, including train operators, ports, end customers, suppliers and support services.

In February 2018 the RFG submitted Petition No. HS2-P2A-116 against the Bill. The Petitioner did not appear before the House of Commons Select Committee as the hearing was deferred. In March 2019 the RFG submitted Petition No. HS2-AP2-026 against Additional Provision 2 to the Bill (AP2). This document responds to Petition No. HS2-P2A-116. There is a separate Promoter's Response Document for Petition No. HS2-AP2-026.
**PETITION NO. HS2-P2A-116**

**THE RAIL FREIGHT GROUP**
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PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-116

PARAGRAPH NO: 3, 4

ISSUE RAISED: Implementation of HS2 Phase One and Phase 2A concurrently

PETITION PARAGRAPH:

3. The RFG strongly supports the early development and construction of the section of the HS2 railway that the Bill seeks to authorise (Phase 2a). Accelerating the progress of Phase 2a serves to resolve potential rail network conflicts that may arise between Birmingham and Crewe, which could severely impact on freight capacity. If there is a delay between completion of HS2 Phase One and Phase 2a, HS2 trains will be required to re-join the West Coast Main Line at the Handsacre Junction creating a significant bottleneck. The West Coast Main Line is a key artery for freight traffic with an average of over three freight trains per hour operating along this part of the line in both directions, and it is crucial that this traffic is protected. Forecasts indicate significant growth over this section, with an additional three paths per hour required to satisfy demand by 2033.

4. To resolve this potential conflict between HS2 trains and rail freight on the West Coast Main Line, the Promoter should make a binding commitment that both Phase One and Phase 2a will be developed and constructed concurrently, so that HS2 trains do not operate beyond Birmingham until Phase 2a is constructed.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

1. At present, it is not possible to concurrently develop Phase One and Phase 2A as Phase One has already secured Royal Assent, unlike Phase 2A, and has therefore reached a greater level of maturity and design development. The Promoter is unable to bring Phase 2A to the same level of development until after the Phase 2A Bill has secured Royal Assent.
2. However, once Phase 2A secures Royal Assent, it is expected that Phase One and Phase 2A would become more aligned and that the construction timetables for both phases would significantly overlap. The Promoter would consider opportunities to take forward the further development and construction of the two phases concurrently once the Bill for Phase 2A has received Royal Assent.

3. Final decisions regarding the Train Service Specification that would operate on the HS2 network, and relevant parts of the existing rail network, would be made once the Department for Transport has received advice following the outcome of the West Coast Partnership competition.

4. The West Coast Partnership would advise on an HS2 service mobilisation between London and the West Midlands, North West and Scotland.

5. Any decisions around pathing available for freight would be subject to established industry statutory, regulatory and administrative processes.
PETITION PARAGRAPH:
5. The RFG has concerns regarding the changes to rail infrastructure at and around Crewe Station that are proposed as part of the Bill. The proposals for Crewe station include implementing a new passenger platform on the ‘Manchester Independent’ lines which are currently used for freight trains. These tracks are presently used to regulate freight trains on the network, allowing freight paths to be matched together on the busy parts of the West Coast Main Line north and south of Crewe. The loss of this facility would restrict the ability to regulate freight trains, affecting capacity for freight services on the network, and impacting performance by importing delays between different train services.

6. To resolve this issue the Bill should be amended with an alternative design for Crewe Station that does not require the use of the “Independent Lines” for passenger services.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

1. The 2015 Command Paper “High Speed Two: East and West, the Next Steps to Crewe and Beyond” (see https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/480712/hs2-east-and-west.pdf) made clear that the Government recognises the critically important role of Crewe for national rail freight operations, with much of the freight traffic on the West Coast Main Line routed through Basford Hall Yard immediately south of Crewe.

2. From July – October 2017 the Government carried out a consultation on the Crewe Hub: options for building on existing connectivity (see https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/crewe-hub-options-for-building-on-
The Promoter actively sought the views of freight operators throughout the Crewe Hub consultation.


4. Network Rail continues to work on an option to adjust the track layout at Crewe station and reinstate platform 13 as an alternative to the Independent Line platform. In that event, the impact on freight would be contained to the period of Network Rail re-signalling, and potentially, the use of the Independent Lines as a diversionary route during construction of Phase 2A, and as a permanent operational diversion during times of perturbation. This option, to reinstate platform 13, is currently under active consideration.


“If the Crewe Hub proposals are developed by Network Rail so to include works to revise the existing railway layout at Crewe Station then, subject to such revised railway layout works being consented and funded, the Promoter will review the proposals in the Proposed Scheme for passenger train services to serve Crewe Station through the use of the Independent Lines.

In this assurance:-

“the Independent Lines” means the existing railway lines at Crewe Station known as the Independent Lines; and
“the Proposed Scheme” means Phase 2a of HS2 as defined further in the Bill.”

6. The Government response to the Crewe Hub consultation also confirmed that plans for HS2 Phase 2A would be modified so that HS2 joins (and takes over) the central two lines on the existing network. This would give better operational performance in Phase 2A, and reduce the impact on freight services on the West Coast Main Line.

7. Although the Crewe Hub scheme is not in the scope of the HS2 Phase 2A Bill, the rail infrastructure at Crewe station proposed in the Phase 2A Bill does not preclude a Crewe Hub scheme being progressed by the Department for Transport and Network Rail. The Promoter has worked collaboratively with Network Rail and the Department for Transport to facilitate the Crewe Hub aspirations within the design proposals.
contained in Additional Provision 2 to the Bill. The West Coast Main Line connection from HS2, which would connect to the reconfigured central lines at Crewe, anticipates the Crewe Hub layout proposals from Network Rail.

8. Network Rail has indicated that the current level of freight services would still be able to operate with a Crewe Hub, although there could be issues in realising significant growth north of Basford Hall after Phase 2A opens and before Phase 2B becomes operational in 2033.

9. The resignalling of Crewe station including the Independent Lines is included within plans for Network Rail's Control Period 6 (CP6) which covers the period 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2024. This resignalling is expected to affect the way the Independent Lines are used in any case, irrespective of HS2. Network Rail continues work to assess what operational flexibility would be possible following the automation provided by resignalling.

10. The Independent Lines have always been designated as mixed passenger and freight use, though in recent years freight companies have enjoyed sole use of the lines. As such Network Rail would remain with its rights to run passenger services on the Independent Lines.
HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: The Rail Freight Group

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-116

PARAGRAPH NO: 7, 8

ISSUE RAISED: Capacity for freight between Crewe and Manchester

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 7. The RFG has serious concerns regarding the inadequate provision of rail freight capacity for existing services and growth on the line between Crewe and Manchester. HS2’s proposed service pattern after the completion of Phase 2a will increase the passenger services on the West Coast Main Line to Manchester. The RFG has been advised that only one path per hour will be retained in the timetable for freight. This is a reduction of the capacity currently available for freight on the same lines, where in some hours four freight trains operate.

8. In order to preserve existing freight capacity between Crewe and Manchester the Promoter should provide a binding commitment that they will not seek additional services for HS2 trains where they would restrict the ability to operate existing freight services or reduce existing freight capacity, prior to the opening of HS2 Phase 2B.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

1. The Promoter acknowledges that rail freight offers real benefits for the environment, helps reduce congestion and is extremely important for UK businesses. The Promoter is committed to working with the rail freight industry to support its continued success.

2. Any decisions around pathing available for freight would be subject to established industry statutory, regulatory and administrative processes.

3. Detailed timetable analysis would need to take place in order to understand the potential capacity challenges between Crewe and Manchester. The Promoter is therefore unable to make any binding commitment until this analysis is complete. It is
important to note that HS2 trains would only operate on this infrastructure between the opening of Phase 2A and the opening of Phase 2B.

4. Final decisions about the Train Service Specification that would operate on the HS2 network, and relevant parts of the existing rail network, would be made once the Department for Transport has received advice following the outcome of the West Coast Partnership (WCP) competition.

5. Once the Government has received options from the next operator of West Coast intercity services, that operator would then prepare for the introduction of HS2 train services. This would be subject to established industry statutory, regulatory and administrative processes including the impartial function of the Network Rail System Operator.


7. The West Coast Partnership ITT requires a franchisee who would collaborate and engage with stakeholders to deliver improved strategic planning at industry level between passenger service and freight operators.

8. In relation to the development of Train Service Specification options, bidders responses to the ITT must include a description of their approach to working with industry partners, including Network Rail, HS2 Ltd, passenger and freight operators, and how integrated train service options for high speed and conventional services, including impacts beyond the franchise, would be developed and assessed on a whole-industry business case basis.

9. Bidders for the West Coast Partnership must maintain paths for all freight operator services as they appear in the May 2018 timetable. Bidders may flex existing services, subject to full compliance with freight access rights, including departure and arrival windows and minimum turnaround times, where stated.
9. The RFG is concerned regarding the impact of HS2 passenger services on the congested West Coast Main Line north of Crewe, where freight services currently operate to Liverpool and Scotland. The addition of HS2 services to the rail network means that capacity between Crewe and Weaver Junction (for Liverpool) will be severely restricted. Although the RFG has not been provided with the timetable analysis it is understood that, even at existing traffic levels for non HS2 trains, the network would be critically constrained. The RFG understands that this could be resolved through resignalling and capacity improvements (mentioned in para 3.53 of The Strategic Case for HS2 Phase Two published in July 2017 (the Strategic Case)), however there is no commitment for this to be funded.

10. Similar issues exist north of Preston where HS2’s timetabling suggests that freight capacity on the network would be significantly reduced in consequence of HS2 trains, and that remaining freight services would be shorter and hence less economically viable. There are key rail freight transportation routes that currently operate over this route including domestic intermodal services between the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal in Northamptonshire and central Scotland, deep-sea services, automotive trains, aggregates trains and Royal Mail trains north of Preston on the West Coast Main Line. The RFG understand that some consideration of the issues has been undertaken, but no information has been published and no solution has been forthcoming to safeguard freight capacity.

11. Consideration of measures to ameliorate these problems that will be caused by the HS2 railway north of Crewe to Liverpool and Scotland requires urgent attention. Mitigation
proposals need to be prepared and formally published in consultation with the rail freight industry, in order that the impacts can be minimised. Any formal mitigation plans and proposals should consider protection of freight capacity, including additional capacity for freight growth.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. The Promoter acknowledges that rail freight offers real benefits for the environment, helps reduce congestion and is extremely important for UK businesses. The Promoter is committed to working with the rail freight industry to support its continued success.

2. Any decisions around pathing available for freight would be subject to established industry statutory, regulatory and administrative processes.

3. The capacity available on the West Coast Main Line north of Crewe would be determined by a number of factors, including the acceleration/deceleration characteristics of the traffic operating on the line. Freight Operating Companies may find that better quality paths can be secured through the use of certain traction.

4. While the rail network north of Crewe is outside the scope of Phase 2A of HS2, recent analysis has indicated that, once this section of the network is operational, there would be capacity for existing passenger and freight services, planned HS2 services as well as some capacity for freight growth.
12. The Strategic Case suggests that freight benefits could arise from spare capacity on the West Coast Main Line released from Phase 2a. Information paper F5: Future Train Service Patterns on the West Coast Main Line Corridor outlines the approach to re-designing the future train service patterns when Phase One and Phase 2a of HS2 are operational. The paper explains that the Department for Transport has announced its intention to include requirements for the next West Coast Train Operator (West Coast Partnership) to undertake the train service development work and contribute to timetable planning. However the F5 Information paper does not contain a specific requirement or assumption that West Coast Partnership will be required to consider freight capacity as part of the timetabling work. In order to realise the potential rail freight benefits referred to in the Strategic Case an explicit commitment that rail freight will be considered and analysed by the West Coast Partnership when timetabling work is undertaken is required.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:


2. The West Coast Partnership ITT requires a franchisee who would collaborate and engage with stakeholders to deliver improved strategic planning at industry level between passenger service and freight operators.

3. In relation to the development of Train Service Specification options, bidders responses to the ITT must include a description of their approach to working with industry partners, including Network Rail, HS2 Ltd, passenger and freight operators, and how integrated train service options for high speed and conventional services,
including impacts beyond the franchise, would be developed and assessed on a whole-industry business case basis.

4. Bidders for the West Coast Partnership must maintain paths for all freight operator services as they appear in the May 2018 timetable. Bidders may flex existing services, subject to full compliance with freight access rights, including departure and arrival windows and minimum turnaround times, where stated.
HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: The Rail Freight Group

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-116

PARAGRAPH NO: 13

ISSUE RAISED: Possessions regime

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 13. The RFG has reviewed Information Paper F6: Rail Freight Operators and notes that paragraph 4.2 and 4.3 contain the same assurances given and added to the Register of Undertakings and Assurances for Phase One. Although the RFG considers the wording in the information paper is appropriate, the Promoter should also give an assurance with the same wording that can be added to the Register of Undertakings and Assurances for Phase 2a.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

1. The Promoter is considering the form of appropriate assurances to be put forward for consideration.