HS2 fails the Cost Challenge

The cost of constructing the HS2 'Y', extending as far north as Leeds and Manchester, is currently estimated at around £56 billion. With Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) and the putative Scottish extension taken into account, the cost of the entire national high speed rail project seems likely to rise to around £100 billion.

The HS2 proposals have come under sustained criticism for their excessive costs – much higher per mile than comparable projects in France. So far it has proved impossible to determine whether these costs stem from natural differences between France and the UK, or from fundamental inefficiencies in the HS2 design.

The emergence of High Speed UK now allows this issue to be resolved. HSUK's detailed route design – with horizontal and vertical alignments defined for over 1,000km of new railway – enables the size of structures and earthworks to be determined, and this allows detailed cost comparisons to be drawn with HS2.

The calculated comparative costs indicate that HSUK's baseline cost is around **£21 billion** (or 30%) less than the equivalent cost of the HS2 'Y' and NPR combined. This huge cost difference can be simply explained through the following 5 key comparisons:

- HSUK requires 227km less new railway than HS2 and NPR combined;
- HSUK requires 74km less tunnel than HS2 and NPR combined;
- HSUK requires 6 fewer new stations than HS2;
- HSUK is generally built in more accessible, less sensitive and easier terrain, with less costly earthworks and structures;
- HSUK needs no further development to achieve full integration with local networks.

HSUK is of course not just cheaper to construct than HS2; it also delivers significantly greater benefit, which might conservatively be estimated to be 50% more. Together, these two gains will transform HS2's very questionable Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of 2.2 into a much more bankable figure of 4.6.



