

**DRAFT GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY (GMCA)
HOUSING, PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
5 JUNE 2018 AT 10.30 AM AT THE GMCA OFFICES**

Present: Councillor Lisa Smart (Stockport) (in the Chair)

Bolton Councillor Shamim Abdullah
Councillor Andrew Morgan
Manchester Councillor Paula Sadler
Oldham Councillor Hazel Gloster (Substitute)
Rochdale Councillor Linda Robinson
Salford Councillor Stuart Dickman
Stockport Councillor Laura Booth
Tameside Councillor Mike Glover
Trafford Councillor Bernard Sharp
Wigan Councillor Lynne Holland
Councillor Fred Walker (Substitute)
Councillor Michael Winstanley

In attendance:

GMCA Salford City Mayor Paul Dennett (Portfolio Lead for Planning, Housing and Homelessness)
Councillor Alex Ganotis (Portfolio Lead Green City Region)
Andy Burnham (Mayor of Greater Manchester)
TfGM Gareth Turner (Head of Fares and Ticketing, TfGM)
Stephen Rhodes (Customer Director, TfGM)
GMCA Simon Nokes (Executive Director of Policy and Strategy)
Steve Rumbelow (Lead Chief Executive for Planning and Housing)
Steve Fyfe (Head of Housing Strategy)
Kevin Lee (Director of the Mayor's Office)
Julie Connor (Assistant Director, Governance and Scrutiny)
Sarah Mellor (Head of Corporate Services, Waste and Resources Team)
Michelle Lynch (Waste and Resources Team)
Susan Ford (Statutory Scrutiny Officer)
Jenny Hollamby (Governance and Scrutiny)

Apologies: Councillors: Dorothy Gunther (Bury), Catherine Preston (Bury), James Larkin (Oldham), Graham Whitham (Trafford) and James Wilson (Manchester)

Officers: David Taylor (Executive Director, Waste and Resources Team, GMCA), and Dr Carolyn Wilkins (Lead Chief Executive for Green City Region)

The Assistant Director, Governance and Scrutiny opened the meeting and welcomed all those present.

M56/HPE MEMBERSHIP- FOR THE 2018/19 MUNICIPAL YEAR

The Committee noted its membership for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

RESOLVED: That the Committee note its membership for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

M57/HPE APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR 2018/2019

The Assistant Director, Governance and Scrutiny invited nominations from Members for the role of Chair for the 2018/19 Municipal Year. Councillor Andrew Morgan (Bolton) was proposed by Councillor Laura Booth and seconded by Councillor Linda Robinson (Rochdale). However, Councillor Andrew Morgan (Bolton) declined the nomination and instead proposed Councillor Lisa Smart (Stockport) and the proposal was seconded by Councillor Lynne Holland (Wigan). It was agreed that Councillor Lisa Smart be appointed as Chair of the Housing, Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year. Councillor Lisa Smart took the role of Chair, thanked Members for the appointment and welcomed new Members to the meeting.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Lisa Smart (Stockport) be appointed as Chair of the Housing, Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

M58/HPE APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR 2018/2019

The Chair invited nominations from Members for the role of Vice-Chair for the 2018/19 Municipal Year. The Chair proposed Councillor Andrew Morgan (Bolton) and seconded by Councillor Michael Winstanley (Wigan).

RESOLVED: That Councillor Andrew Morgan (Bolton) be appointed as Vice-Chair of the Housing, Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

M59/PHE MEMBER'S CODE OF CONDUCT AND ANNUAL DECLARATION OF INTEREST FORM

Members noted the code of conduct. Members were reminded to complete the annual declaration of interest form contained within the agenda and return it to the Governance and Scrutiny Officer within 28 days of their appointment onto the Committee.

RESOLVED:

1. That Members noted the code of conduct.
2. That Members complete the annual declaration of interest form and return it to the Governance and Scrutiny Officer within 28 days of their appointment onto the Committee.

M60/HPE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members noted the terms of reference contained within the agenda and agreed the dates of future meetings. A discussion took place about timings of meetings, which covered appropriateness, working arrangements, cost/savings and transport issues for evening meetings. It was agreed that future day time meetings would commence at 11.00 am and evening travel arrangements would be discussed with Members outside of the meeting.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the Committee's terms of reference be noted
 2. That the Committee's proposed dates and times of future meetings (all meetings to be held in central Manchester) be agreed:
 - 12 July 2018 (6.00 pm)
 - 16 August 2018 (11.00 am)
 - 13 September 2018 (11.00)
 - 11 October 2018 (11.00 am)
 - 15 November 2018 (6.00 pm)
 - 13 December 2018 (11.00 am)
 - 10 January 2019 (6.00 pm)
 - 14 February 2019 (11.00 am)
 - 14 March 2019 (6.00 pm)
 - 11 April 2019 (11.00 am)
 - 16 May 2019 (6.00 pm)
 - 13 June 2019 (11.00 am)
 - 11 July 2019 (6.00 pm)
 3. That travel arrangements for evening meetings would be discussed with Members outside of the meeting.

M61/HPE CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

M62/HPE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Lynne Holland (Wigan) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 13 – Introduction of a Zonal Fare Structure on the Metrolink Network by virtue of her being a Member of Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM). Should there be a vote on any matter during consideration of the item then Councillor Lynne Holland would leave the meeting at the appropriate juncture.

M63/HPE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING DATED 13 MARCH 2018

The minutes of the last meeting dated 13 March 2018 were submitted for approval.

There was one outstanding action arising from previous minutes and it was explained that further information on the reduction of the number of trips that would be required to achieve the necessary improvements in air quality would be available around 30 July 2018.

RESOLVED: That the Committee approved the minutes of the last meeting on 13 March 2018 as a correct record.

M64/HPE WASTE AND RESOURCE STRATEGY

A report was presented that updated the Committee on the work being carried out in relation to the review of the Waste and Resource Strategy.

The Leader of Stockport Council (Green City Region Portfolio Lead) explained how stronger links could be forged between the waste agenda and the wider Greater Manchester agenda especially in terms of the waste and resource strategy, which needed to be reviewed every five years. Whilst the review would have been undertaken in 2017, it had been delayed to obtain further clarity in both European Union (EU) and national policy. Since the EU released waste targets and the government published its 25 year environmental plan, the review had commenced and was being undertaken by the waste and resources team. Strategy consultation with all key stakeholders would take place over the next three months and the Committee was asked to consider the draft strategy again in September 2018. The strategy would then be implemented at the end of April 2019.

The Head of Corporate Services and Principal Corporate Services Officer provided Members with a presentation, which explained zero waste, the technical solution, the partnership, 2016/17 performance, interim arrangements, the new waste management contract (from April 2019) and next steps.

Officers expanded on the performance achieved contained within the presentation and advised that overall recycling rate for 2016/17 was 46.7%. However, that had dropped by 3% in 2017/18 due to a fire at the Bolton thermal recovery facility and further unsatisfactory facility performance. It was a good news story for waste collection authorities (WCAs) as they were delivering 50% into the contract. The diversion rate was 85% for this year and the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) recycling rate was 40%. Through the interim contract, facilities were being modified to increase performance and provide further savings

In discussion, the main points raised were as follows:

- Bin contamination and the cost efficiency of the new three pronged procurement approach was discussed. Contamination was a problem at the kerbside and for facilities. Not many loads were rejected as operatives did sort the waste when it was delivered and to allow the maximum amount of product to be recycled. To combat the problem, there was a considerable amount of Greater Manchester communications work to be undertaken to address these challenges. In terms of the Asian markets, it was a complication and districts would need to look at the way they were collecting material for these markets. The PFI contract had been terminated as it was not cost efficient. However, under the new interim arrangements, the mechanical and biological treatment (MBT) plants would be modified to simplify the process and bring costs down over the next 12 months. It was envisaged that the new three pronged procurement approach would make further significant savings.
- National and local best practice, the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) partnership work, and up to date research informed the waste team's work. New ideas generated were piloted and benchmarking across waste disposal authorities (WDAs) and districts was undertaken. As Greater Manchester was the biggest WDA, it often led the way with innovation and it was the first WDA to drive down the residual waste capacity.
- Disposal of plastics (not just plastic bottles) was a big issue. WRAP was undertaking work in this area with the industry to standardise and minimise plastic waste. It was a

complicated issue and relevant recycling messages for the public and retail industry were needed. Incentives across the market needed to be aligned about using cheap plastic items and the cost of recycling them. China was banning the import of plastics for recycling, which had added a further pressure. How plastics were disposed of was part of a wider challenge for the UK and was part of the 25 year plan. Technology was available to recycle plastics like yoghurt pots however, there was no end market for low grade plastics and so recycling was not cost effective.

- Influencing retailers about their excessive plastic packaging was an issue. End producer responsibility legislation and EU targets through the circular economy would see a step change but it would be slow. To raise awareness more quickly, it was suggested that consumer opinions on excessive packaging would have a greater impact rather than government legislation. Consumers had the most influence.
- Members agreed that the zero waste was the right strategy. However, residents were recycling in good faith as per the packaging. If the packaging said it could be recycled then residents often recycled it. However, Councils could potentially penalise them for recycling incorrectly or for bin contamination. It was extremely confusing. Customer messages in this area were crucial. It was a journey for residents. A concern was raised about common policy, stronger powers (penalties) and whether this was counterproductive.
- It was explained that the diversion rate was material that was not sent to landfill, which was anything on the waste hierarchy from recovery and above such as low grade wood and residual waste being delivered to the centres. It was any material that could not go to the combined heat and power (CHP) facility in Runcorn.
- It was agreed that the waste and resources team would provide Members with recycling statistics in each district. A Member suggested that leaving packaging at the retailers/supermarkets would give them a clear consumer message that excessive packaging would not be tolerated. Officers advised that similar campaign had happened in Bristol. A circular economy with consumer power as the driving force was needed to drive change. The top recyclers were Trafford and Stockport. Each district was monitored and if a contamination problem was identified behavioural change work in targeted areas was undertaken.
- Education and behavioural change work with residents was needed before penalties were applied. Recycling needed to be as easy as possible for residents four bin system was not used properly it could cause contamination. However, it was mentioned that some councils had up to 12 receptacles per household for recycling.
- The GMCA at its April 2018 meeting, agreed to constitute a Committee that considered waste matters and to bring back terms of reference for that Committee in June 2018. The GMCA had made a request for the nine Councils who were part of the waste contract to nominate a person to sit on that Committee. This would then be formally constituted at the end of June 2018.
- It was agreed that an update on the procurement would be considered by the Committee at its meeting on 13 December 2018.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the report be noted.
 2. That the work being undertaken by the waste and resources team be endorsed.
 3. That the draft Waste and Resource draft strategy would be considered by the Committee again on 13 September 2018.
 4. That the Committee would be provided with a procurement update in December 2018.

M65/HPE GREATER MANCHESTER HOUSING PACKAGE

Consideration was given to a report that updated the Committee on the announcement and the implementation of a Greater Manchester Housing Package including Greater Manchester's commitments and the support the government had agreed to provide.

The Salford City Mayor advised that the Housing Package had recently been agreed with government. Four bids for further funding had also been agreed. In addition, government had announced the provision of £10.25m of funding to Manchester City Council for a scheme in Collyhurst. Greater Manchester had committed to deliver 227,000 homes between 2015/16 and 2034/35, accelerated delivery rates to 12,375 homes per annum. It was crucial to demonstrate GM's ability to deliver. Conversations were underway with government about the level of Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) to be applied to the fund, and whether this should be 1.5 across the whole package or 1.5 for each scheme. To date some districts' housing fund schemes had not been successful but discussions were taking place with government and Homes England to see how these might be progressed. It was noted that further government funding may not be released if Greater Manchester could not deliver.

Member's raised the following questions:

- Members suggested that more emphasis was needed on delivering appropriate/inclusive housing for those with additional support needs or for GM's aging population. It was noted that there had been housing impacts arising from the welfare reform. Work was underway evaluating health and social care schemes with a view to them being rolled-out. In terms of the housing need, it was a matter for local core plans and strategies and the responsibility for this sat with districts.
- A discussion took place about ceasing the housing market when it was buoyant. Never before had so much government funding been received to deliver. Government knew there was a desire to build. The additional funding would prioritise brownfield land.
- Having a pipeline of schemes ready to go was important and would show that the public sector was capable of delivering. However, there was need for the 10 districts to act strategically and this was a role for GM. Funding had been received for a team that would support this work.
- £350m had been received to unlock difficult sites and it was important to deliver these outputs otherwise future funding could be jeopardised.

- Members wanted assurance about the deliverability of this ambitious programme. Members were reassured that proposed schemes were deliverable and that this would be helped by a central team who would provide support to districts.
- Members were keen to understand how social housing could be supported by this work. A paper on this issue would be considered by the Housing and Planning Commission, and it was planned that a letter would be written to the Secretary of State about working with Greater Manchester on this agenda.
- A Member asked for further clarity about the £2bn of national government funding available to help councils and housing associations build, how the package would help the homeless and would there be quality homes for rent. It was explained that there had been no further details about this funding but Officers would make enquiries with the Secretary of State. Rented/home ownership allocations and were unknown.
- A Member was concerned that on mixed tenure schemes affordable homes to buy and rent were only available on less desirable parts of developments. In response it was suggested that there should not be a difference in quality. These types of issues would be dealt within districts through their plans and their planning committee, but there was a recognised need for high quality mixed tenure housing within any development.
- There were concerns raised about the implementation of the asylum contract in areas of the country with lower housing costs. Work with government to address these concerns was taking place.
- The Chair was concerned that the delay of the publication of the draft GMSF and progress of districts' local plans might impact on the delivery of homes on these schemes. The Committee was assured that districts were under enormous pressure to deliver housing and it was envisaged that this would happen within three years of this programme. It was also noted that Salford was over delivering on their objectively assessed housing need and were in the top five nationally for building homes. Ways to mitigate impact on green belt through the GMSF were the town centre challenge and urban density. Brownfield sites needed to be considered first. The strategic approach to this was extremely important. District collaboration was crucial to delivery.
- To inform the Committee's work programme, the following areas of activity would be added for consideration, 10 year homelessness strategy and ending rough sleeping by 2020. The City Mayor was happy to work with the Committee and his portfolio work programme.
- Information on the Planning and Housing Commission would be circulated to Members with a view to Members attending meetings and appointing a lead Member in this area.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the Committee welcomed the announcement of the outline of the Greater Manchester housing package.
 2. Discussed and commented (see M65/HPE) the issues outlined in the report to inform the final agreement and implementation of the package.

M66/HPE UPDATE ON TOWN CENTRE CHALLENGE

The GM Mayor presented a report that updated the Committee on the progress with the town centre challenge. The report contained information on the work that had been carried out since the start of the year and the outcomes of a number of meetings and events in different town centres across Greater Manchester.

The report focussed on the progress made and the approach, which was focused on the whole town centre offer and addressing the wider issues of towns outside Greater Manchester. The Land Fund, GMSF and Mayoral powers around intervention could be used as tools to help achieve the desired results. A move to the delivery phase was now required. The GM Mayor had accepted Royton as Oldham's nomination. Thus far the most developed schemes so far were Prestwich, Stockport and Stalybridge. Stockport town centre would be given a considerable boost by the interchange scheme would be signed off by the GMCA in June 2018. If a district council asked, a Mayoral Development Area could be established to stimulate developments including housing. There was a huge appetite for the town centre challenge. The GM Mayor wished to remind districts that this initiative would continue for as long as necessary and no town centre would be left behind.

Members raised a number of questions, which were noted as follows:

- Members agreed that retail opportunities had decreased and so the approach focused on town centre living was welcomed, but wished to know about timescales, delivery plans, district input and plans to mitigate any slippage. The GM Mayor advised that pressure was on the GMCA to deliver on this initiative but timescales were often dependent on the market and private developers. Schemes would move at different times. Stockport was a good example of what the town centre challenge could achieve. Members' attention was also drawn to the work of the Walking and Cycling Commissioner and his team, who had worked quickly with the transforming cities fund and would present the outline of their proposal very soon. In every town centre challenge event, public realm and the improving the quality of life agenda was prominent and would provide the right context for further investment in housing development.
- Members hoped that the Stockport interchange scheme would stimulate the night time economy but that the increased attractiveness of the area could also result in gentrification. It was acknowledged that this was a real challenge but the GMSF would address some of the issues along with ambitions around affordability with policies to support. There was a danger of lifting an area economically, but putting it out of reach of the people who lived there. These impacts would be monitored moving forward.
- A Member welcomed the move from a retail to a leisure and residential focus and asked what support was available for independent bars, shops and the development of cultural offer. The Mayor explained that it was about making town centres attractive place and then housing providers and retailers would want to invest. At the recent district events, organisations who might be able to support the broader regeneration of town centres such as the Arts Council, Canal Trust and National Lottery had been represented.

- A discussion took place about the unforeseen consequences of the town centre challenge, in particular converting old buildings into inadequate, shoddy accommodation and the challenge of strategic sites having multiple ownership. Compulsory purchase orders powers could be used in these circumstances to make the heart of the town attractive. However, this was a matter districts to determine.
- Finally, the Chair advised the GM Mayor that the Committee's remit included transport and suggested that Northern and Network Rail representatives be invited to the next meeting to understand the current issues with the May 2018 timetable disruption. The GM Mayor encouraged the Chair to invite them to the meeting.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the contents of the report be noted.
 2. That the Committee be kept informed of further work and further announcements over the summer.

M67/HPE INTRODUCTION OF A ZONAL FARE STRUCTURE ON THE METROLINK NETWORK

Members considered a report presented by TfMG's Customer Director and the Interim Head of Fares & Ticketing, about the proposed introduction of a zonal fare structure on the Metrolink network that had been considered and agreed by the GMCA on 25 May 2018 (Annex A of the report) and provided an opportunity for Members to be involved in this work. A further report would be considered by the Committee on 12 July 2018 prior to it being considered by the GMCA.

The idea was to bring about a simpler, more convenient and a better value for money charging system. It was highlighted that Metrolink did not receive public subsidy on an operational basis, it had to entirely cover its costs. Income from fares had to operational cover costs and borrowings to fund system improvements. .

Members asked the following questions:

- Members queried if the short public engagement period was enough and if the website allowed passengers to check how much their fare would increase for a route they would typically take. Members were advised that all the proposed fares under the proposed zonal system were available on TfGM's website to allow the customer's to compare the impact of these changes. However, the fares that would be charged under the current pricing system (ie. if the zonal proposal was not adopted) were not available. These fares would increase under the agreed formula which includes using the retail price index (RPI) which would not be known until July 2018. This formula, agreed by the GMCA in September 2017, is $RPI+1\%+1.33\%$. Members were also advised that TfGM was restricted to 20p increments as child fares were set at 50% of the adult fare and ticket machines did not accept any denomination of less than 10p.
- A Member asked why the consultation period was only two and a half weeks. There were two reasons, the GM Mayor was keen there was a public engagement and secondly, was to allow the implementation of contactless payments to be made at the same time. A longer formal consultation would not allow all changes including

contactless to be made in early 2019. It was recognised that the proposed customer engagement activity was compressed, however it made sense to make all changes together in early 2019. The Chair encouraged more public engagement when changes were planned.

- It was confirmed that the national concessionary pass would continue to give free travel on all parts of the Metrolink after 9.30 am. It was noted that TfGM received national funding for use of that pass only on buses. The extension of the pass for use on rail and tram within Greater Manchester was locally funded. Concessionary fares would increase in line with other fare increases.
- A Member asked about full access to Bury Metrolink station and when it would be fully operational as there had been problems for over two years. Officers acknowledged that it was not good enough but repairs were taking place in July 2018.
- What assurances could TfGM give Members that the transition to the new system would go smoothly and that mitigation plans were in place to tackle any potential issues? Members were advised that the work to implement contactless systems had started six months ago. TfGM had learned from previous projects to move to a more agile approach to delivery. TfGM was piloting contactless implementation to make sure the software was functional followed by a beta phase then finally a launch period at the end of this year.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the contents of the report be noted.
 2. That the Committee's comments be noted.
 3. That the Committee be kept updated on any progress.
 4. That members are updated on the work to restore full access to Bury Metrolink station.

M68/HPE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/2019

Members considered the work programme for the 2018/2019 Municipal Year. The following items were agreed for consideration at the next meeting on Tuesday 12 July 2018:

1. Cycling and walking update.
2. Green summit springboard report (for information).
3. The performance of Northern and the implementation of the May 2018 timetable improvements.
4. GMSF plans for public consultation.

Members were asked to contact the Statutory Scrutiny Officer with any suggested items for inclusion in the work programme.

- RESOLVED:** That the above (see M68/HPE) items be considered at the next meeting.

M69/HPE DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting would take place on Tuesday 12 July 2018 at 6:00 pm at the GMCA offices.