JOINT GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 11 NOVEMBER 2016
AT MANCHESTER TOWN HALL

PRESENT

Bolton MBC          Cllr Debbie Newall
Bury MBC            Cllr Roy Walker
Manchester CC       Cllr Ahmed Ali
                   Cllr Zahara Alijah
                   Cllr James Wilson
Oldham MBC          Cllr Colin McLaren
Rochdale MBC        Cllr Neil Butterworth
                   Cllr Michael Holly
                   Cllr Sarah Rowbotham
Salford CC          Cllr David Jolley
Stockport MBC       Cllr Yvonne Guariento
                   Cllr John McGahan
Tameside MBC        Cllr Kevin Welsh
                   Cllr John Bell
                   Cllr Gillian Peet
Trafford MBC        Cllr Barry Brotherton
                   Cllr Pam Dixon
                   Cllr Michael Young
Wigan Council       Cllr John O’Brien (Chair)
                   Cllr Pam Stewart
**IN ATTENDANCE**

| Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) | Cllr Richard Farnell  
| Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) | Chris Findley  
| Transport for Greater Manchester Committee (TfGMC) | Gareth Bruff  
| Greater Manchester Integrated Support Team (GMIST) | Simon Warburton  
| | Cllr Andrew Fender  
| | Susan Ford  
| | Jenny Hollamby |
16/36 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Cherryl Brock (Oldham), Cllr Gillian Collinson (Salford), Cllr Kevan McKeon (Bolton) and Cllr Iain Roberts (Stockport).

16/37 CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business introduced by the Chair.

16/38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received at the meeting.

16/39 MINUTES OF THE GMCA AND AGMA SCRUTINY POOL MEETING HELD ON 14 OCTOBER 2016

The minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 14 October 2016 were submitted for consideration.

RESOLVED/-

To approve the minutes of the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool meeting held on 14 October 2016.

16/40 GMCA/AGMA SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD PLAN

Members considered the report of the Head of GMIST, which asked Members to review and update the Work Programme for the GMCA and AGMA Scrutiny Pool for 2016/17.

The item was introduced by the Policy Manager (GMIST) who asked Members specifically for items for consideration in January, February and March 2017. The officer also provided Members with a brief update on the Task and Finish Groups. It was noted that a full update on the Education and Skills Task and Finish Group would be provided at the next meeting. In addition, work was continuing behind the scenes on the Communications Task and Finish Group where significant progress had been made. It was explained that the Chair of the Energy Task and Finish Group had been working hard to progress the review and the Chair was thanked for taking an active role and lead.

Members asked that the following items to be added to the Work Programme:

- An initial report from the Energy Task and Finish Group to be considered in March 2017.
A report updating the Pool on the health and social care devolution to GM be considered in December 2016. GMCA officers agreed to additionally provide a note to Members, which would set out the differences between the GM Joint Health Scrutiny Committee and the GMCA/AGMA Scrutiny Pool before the next meeting.

A full update on the Education and Skills Task and Finish Group be considered at the next meeting.

The Chair advised that should Members have any further items for the Work Programme outside of the meeting, they could e-mail them to n.ward@AGMA.GOV.UK or s.ford@AGMA.GOV.UK.

RESOLVED/-

1. That the items noted above be added to the 2016/17 Work Programme.

2. That GMIST officers provide Members with a note, which set out the differences between the GM Joint Health and Scrutiny Committee and the GMCA/AGMA Scrutiny Pool.

3. To note the progress with Scrutiny’s Task and Finish work as set out in section 2 of the report.

16/41 BREXIT MONITOR

Members noted the report of the Leader (Manchester CC), the GM Police and Crime Commissioner and Interim Mayor of GM and the Chief Executive (Manchester CC) that provided an update on work to understand the full implications of Brexit on GM and develop an appropriate policy response. It was noted that the latest edition of the monthly GM Brexit Monitor was attached to the report to provide a real-time snapshot of the economic and policy impact of Brexit.

A Member raised a question in relation to issues around Brexit and GM projects especially funding around science and technology. In response, the Chair advised that this was considered at the September 2016 meeting and discussions were noted within those minutes. The Member requested a further update and it was agreed that a note on the impact to science and technology innovation funding post Brexit be provided to Members.

RESOLVED/-

1. Note the report.

2. That a further Brexit update be provided at the next meeting.

3. That a note on the impact to science and technology innovation funding post Brexit be brought to the next meeting.
Consideration was given to the report of the GMCA Portfolio Lead for Planning and Housing and GM Lead Chief Executive for Planning and Housing. The draft GMSF was approved for consultation by the Joint GMCA/AGMA Executive Board at their meeting on 28 October 2016 and a public consultation exercise is running from 31 October 2016 to 23 December 2016.

Cllr Farnell, GM Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, introduced the item and thanked the Scrutiny Pool for the invitation. The GMSF is an ambitious plan to identify the new homes, jobs and green space we need across the city region over the next 20 years. Local authorities are required by the Government to produce statutory development plans and keep them up to date. Recent changes to national planning guidance makes it difficult to deal with key strategic issues at the local level so the GMSF is a means by which the ten GM districts can plan collectively to deal with cross boundary planning issues.

The GMSF supports long term prosperity as well as meeting short term needs and seeks to ensure all residents share the benefits of the growth of the city region. The vision builds on the Greater Manchester Strategy and sets out how GM is planning to meet the levels of growth to 2035. Included in the plan are a suite of policies addressing economic, social and environmental issues which help to ensure that the GMSF contributes to the wider ambitions for Greater Manchester.

Members were reminded that this was a plan for the next 20 years and would include a series of stages before it is completed - the current consultation will be followed by a formal publication of the plan in summer 2017, followed by submission to the Secretary of State and an examination in public before the plan is adopted in 2018. There will be consultations at each stage. Specific planning applications still continue to be considered by planning committees at the local level and the GMSF sets the strategic policy framework for these decisions to be made.

Chris Findley, GM Planning Lead, then provided Members with a presentation, which covered:

- A summary of the spatial framework including the draft vision,
- thematic policies,
- proposed new employment land and housing allocations;
- policies for greener growth and defining the green infrastructure network;
- green belt;
- evidence base and supporting information;
- the future timetable; and
- consultation arrangements.

Members raised a number of issues and question, including:

Q1 Members raised a number of questions regarding the length of the consultation period, target audiences and the way that hard to reach groups could be engaged.
A1 Officers acknowledged Members’ concerns on the length of the consultation, especially with the holiday period approaching. The statutory period is six weeks, but the GMSF consultation will cover eight weeks to give people more time to respond. As a statutory Plan, the GMSF will also go through a number of stages ensuring that people have future opportunities to engage at later stages in the process.

The consultation is open to everybody and is envisaged that a broad range of responses will be received from individual residents, community groups, landowners and developers, utilities and public agencies. To date over 9000 users had accessed GMSF consultation website and comments are already being received.

Engagement of different communities or groups is being carried out in accordance with each LA’s statement of community involvement. Districts are leading the consultation in their area and drop in sessions are being held across many, attracting large numbers in many areas. There is also a core team of officers available for advice and information, and a “tool kit” of resources available for local teams to use at events or though online social networking, etc.

The Chair asked that all Members help to publicise the GMSF and the current consultation, including to other Members within their LA. Support would be available from local planning teams and any Member with concerns or questions should contact planning officers.

Q2 A member recognised the complexity of the process and highlighted the need for a clear timeline for the GMSF to be set out in a straightforward way so that the public understand what it means for individual sites that are being proposed for housing or employment.

A2 This is the first stage of the process and sites are being proposed in the GMSF for discussion and consultation. Officers reported that further work will be required across all the sites before any decisions are made on the final plan and so it is feasible that not all sites identified will necessarily go forward to the future stages. This will be decided in light of the consultation and further work. Development on any site in the GMSF will also require more detailed master planning and application for planning permission through local planning committees.

The communications tool kit and local planning officers can provide information on the plan process, which can assist Members with the dissemination of information.

Q3 Members asked whether Members of local planning committees could have a conflict of interest if they comment on the GMSF or became engaged in the consultation process.

A3 Officers confirmed that Members can (and should) comment on the GMSF, as long as committee members demonstrate they have an open mind when assessing future planning applications, they would not be excluded from future
planning committee decisions.

Q4 Members raised the importance of infrastructure and concerns local people will have about roads, the provision of schools and doctors surgeries as well as other key services.

A4 The draft GMSF includes policies on delivery, requiring appropriate infrastructure to be in place as part of future developments, ensuring that it is the responsibility of the developer to contribute to this infrastructure especially on green field sites. Further work is required to agree the full range of infrastructure in some areas and this will be the focus of future work, including more detailed master planning of sites that go forward into the next stage of the GMSF.

Q5 A member commented that there needs to be a balance between the needs/aims of developers and moreover that the priority for focusing new homes around town centres with effective links to suburban areas as well as to re-use brownfield land like disused mills.

A5 Members were asked to take into account the number of new houses needed up to 2035. At the moment around two thirds of the land identified for housing is in existing built areas, including brown field sites. The plan does propose some new allocations on green field land, representing about one third of new homes. But these have been carefully identified to try and minimise environmental impacts and ensure that infrastructure can be provided.

Q6 Members sought clarification regarding the type of housing that was in demand across GM and how this is identified in the GMSF.

A6 The GMSF proposes the balance between houses and apartments that would be needed, but the different type and tenure of housing would be a matter for local decisions and local plans shaped, by local needs.

Q7 A member raised the issues of land banking by developers and asked how this could be addressed.

A7 There would be a masterplan prepared for larger sites, identifying phasing and timing of development. In terms of land banking, local authorities cannot force land owners to build, but many developers argue that it is currently unaffordable to land bank because of their cash flow issues.

Q8 A member asked whether the GM Mayor would be able to determine any GM planning decisions through Mayoral Development Corporations.

A8 Mayoral development corporations are a new power obtained through devolution agreements and would only be used in special and particular circumstances to add capability to what GM was trying to achieve. Any new Mayoral Development Corporation would require the agreement of Leaders in all the local authority areas involved.

Q9 Members raised concerns regarding the pressure for development on new green
belt sites and risk of these coming forward before many brown field sites, and whether there are mechanisms in place to prevent this.

A9 These are legitimate concerns. From a GM point of view the GMSF is only one tool to ensure the brown field land was brought forward. Other programmes are being developed and GM is discussing the need for Government funding to address this issue as part of wider negotiations.

The GMSF is a plan for 20 years and all opportunities would be investigated. LAs were already carrying out work in this area and had been very successful in bringing the sites forward over previous years.

Resolved/-

1. To note the report.
2. That officers would circulate district planning contacts to GMCA Scrutiny Pool members and web links to online information or resources.
3. To bring a note on the GVA of GM over the past 20 years and how this had informed the growth targets for GMSF.

The Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Planning and Housing, the GM Planning Lead and withdrew from the meeting at this juncture.

The meeting adjourned to allow for a short comfort break.

16/43 TRANSPORT STRATEGY AND DELIVERY PLAN UPDATE

Consideration was given to the report of the Interim Transport Strategy Director (TfGM) that summarised feedback received during the 12-week consultation (July to September 2016) on the ‘Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040: Consultation Draft’ and highlighted the next steps in finalising the strategy.

The Chair of TfGMC introduced the item and advised that the report was a progress report, a good news story and an item for noting. TfGM were gratified about the level of response to the consultation in comparison with other TfGM consultations. Members were informed that the GM Transport Strategy 2040 and the GMSF sat side by side and would move forward together.

The Chair of TfGMC asked Members for questions, which were noted as follows:

Q1 A Member thanked the TfGM for the Tameside/Manchester Airport bus that was recently introduced, which was a positive move forward for residents.
A1 The comment was noted.

Q2 A Member expressed that there were extremely limited and sometimes ineffective public transport options in areas of Rochdale to support the elderly getting to hospital etc.
A2 Officers explained that they were aware of this issue and discussions were taking place. Under the present deregulated provision of public transport, it was a challenge. TfGM was being asked to reduce their call on Council Tax funding. However, they would try their best to address the problem and maintain their budget in this area. In the longer term, it was envisaged that the necessary powers would be introduced and a Bill was on track for royal ascent in January/February 2017, which would allow the Mayor greater flexibility with provision of services.

Q3 A Member expressed their disappointment in the lack of engagement with young people and was worried that by 2040 they would be directly affected by the Strategy. The Member also raised concerns about the under use of cycle paths in their LA.

A3 Work would continue to challenge the youth base. In terms of encouraging people to cycle, it was reported that it was a blend of measures such as provision, storage – hubs, cycle training and recycled bikes for job seekers.

Q4 A Member commented that whilst bus provision on the Oxford Road corridor was timely and affordable, there did seem an oversupply of some services.

A4 It was reported that bus services in student areas were regulated by operators. The GM Mayor may choose to address these issues once the Buses Bill is passed.

Q5 A Member challenged the terminology used on page 4 of the report and officers were asked to think of another word rather than ‘driving’.

A5 Officers agreed to amend the wording.

Q6 In terms of security for the digital first approach, a Member enquired if TfGM was prepared.

A6 Members were reassured that TfGM was prepared for any security issues that might arise.

Q7 A Member asked for further clarification around the Medium Term Business Plan.

A7 TfGM was looking to analyse the future transport market and links between neighbouring towns. It was suggested that franchising would work and could potentially reverse the decline in bus travel.

Q8 Members asked for a smart ticketing update. The Member suggested that a system like the ‘Oyster’ system was needed.

A8 Officers explained that until the introduction of a regulated system that an integrated smart ticket system was not possible.

Q9 A Member asked if consideration had been given to a publically owned bus company.

A9 It was explained that because a significant investment would be required this was not an option. The potential changes that could be introduced by the Mayor would result in significant improvements in GM’s bus service provision.

Resolved/-
1. To note the range and nature of responses received on the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 Consultation Draft.

2. To note the next steps in finalising the Strategy by the end of 2016.

**16/44 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2016**

9 December 2016       10 March 2017
13 January 2017       7 April 2017
10 February 2017

It was noted that all meetings would be held 1.00 pm – 3.00 pm at Manchester Town Hall unless otherwise advertised.

The meeting opened at 1.00 pm and closed at 3.10 pm.