

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2017

Present:

Councillor Richards– in the Chair

Councillors Davies, Hacking, H Priest, Raikes, Razaq Shilton Godwin and A Simcock

Councillor Leese, Leader

Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment

ESC/17/32 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2017.

ESC/17/33 Economy Dashboard – Quarter 1 2017/18

The Committee received the Quarterly Economy Dashboard, a report of the Core Performance and Intelligence Team. The Performance Analyst and Governance Lead presented the report to the Committee.

ESC/17/34 Overview of Greater Manchester Arrangements

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Development), presented by the Policy and Strategy Manager, which provided an overview of the powers and responsibilities of the Greater Manchester Mayor and the Combined Authority and of the governance and delivery arrangements in place to discharge those responsibilities.

The Mayoral model had been developed to build on the 'bottom up' governance arrangements that had evolved in Greater Manchester since the county authority was disestablished in 1986, and rather than adding an additional tier of governance, the Mayor acted as an 11th member of the GMCA, supported by a Cabinet involving all Leaders with clear portfolio responsibilities.

The report outlined the broad functions of the GMCA along with its future priorities. It was reported that the election of a Mayor for the GMCA marked an important stage in the evolution of Greater Manchester's governance arrangements. New structures and governance arrangements would take time to bed in but the additional powers that Government had devolved and the resources that Greater Manchester had been able to secure in return for the introduction of a GM Mayor would better position Greater Manchester to deliver the strategic ambitions of the city region, with Manchester continuing to play a vital role in setting that strategic course.

A Member asked how could GMCA Cabinet members influence the GM Mayor to take a particular course of action.

The Leader advised that the vast majority of decisions taken by the Combined Authority were agreed by a consensus of the Cabinet and it was very rare where for a vote to be taken to determine a particular course of action.

A Member asked for further elaboration on what work was being done to draw down all components of the current devolution settlement in full.

The Leader advised that there had been a hiatus following the general election and change of government in relation to progressing devolution. There was now a lot more indication from Government that there was unfinished business around devolution, especially where devolution deals had yet to be delivered. He advised that there were some important areas for Greater Manchester that would pave the way for further devolution arrangements and made reference to a forthcoming White Paper on an Industrial Strategy. The Leader also commented that there were positive signs that Government were willing to extend the devolution agenda where there were Mayoral Combined Authorities in operation.

A Member enquired as to whether the deputy/assistant portfolio holders had been appointed. The Member also asked what checks and balances were in place to monitor the functions that were only exercisable by the Mayor. The Member asked a further question on whether transport and planning policy was being effectively aligned.

The Leader advised that the new deputy/assistant arrangements had not yet been confirmed. He also advised that there was a relatively small number of functions that were executive functions of the Mayor which the Combined Authority could not make the Mayor exercise. It was to be noted however, for all except the police budgeting, all of the Mayor's executive functions could be amended. In relation to transport, the Leader advised that the GMCA was currently undertaking a review, which would include consideration as to whether Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) should continue to operate as an arms length organisation or whether it should be wholly integrated into the Combined Authority. The review was also looking at what the optimum arrangements were for ensuring the most effective integration of transport, spatial planning and the housing agenda.

The Chair asked if the membership of the newly established GMCA Scrutiny Committees had been agreed yet.

The Leader advised that each of the three Manchester City Council representatives that were previously members of the GMCA Scrutiny Pool had been re-appointed to a seat on one of the new scrutiny committees and further appointments would be made at the end of September.

A Member enquired whether the election of the GM Mayor, on reflection, had, on reflection, led to unexpected outcomes.

The Leader commented that since the election of the Mayor, a lot of people now thought that he was responsible for everything. In practice, the Mayor's office re-

directed any queries or enquiries that did not fall within the Mayors remit to the relevant Local Authority for responding to.

Decision

1. To note the report;
2. To request that Officers provide information to Members on the assistant portfolio holder positions when this becomes available; and
3. To request that Officers circulate the report to all Members for information

ESC/17/35 The Refreshed Greater Manchester Strategy

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Development), presented by the Policy and Strategy Manager, which provided Members with the refreshed Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) for consideration and summarised the priorities set out within that strategy.

The Committee was advised that the previous GMS had set the strategic framework for policy development across Greater Manchester (GM) and had helped to place Greater Manchester at the forefront of the national debate on devolution. However, the context in which GM operated had changed significantly since the GMS was last refreshed in 2013, and the Greater Manchester agenda had moved on considerably. Following a thorough consultation period, a new draft strategy had been produced which built on GM's priorities around 'Growth and Reform' and 'People and Place' and reflected the things that GM residents, businesses and partners said were important to them.

In line with GM's response to the Government's Industrial Strategy Green Paper, the refreshed GMS had also been designed to provide the framework for a local Industrial Strategy at GM level and was intended to demonstrate how national and local strategies could complement and reinforce each other, backed up with investment, and emphasise the importance of "place-based" settlements that would enable local leaders to drive inclusive growth in their areas.

The refreshed Greater Manchester Strategy also provided a helpful framework at Greater Manchester level to support the implementation of the Our Manchester Strategy (OMS), with the two strategies being complementary and mutually reinforcing. The OMS "we wills" had been developed to specifically address priorities within the city and were, in many cases, more detailed than those set out in the GMS. However, the refreshed GMS provides a strategic framework at city region level that would support delivery of the 64 "we wills" within the city

A Member commented that the GMS appeared to be have different approach compared to the asset based approach which the OMS had adopted and asked whether this was as a result of explicit conversations taking place between those who had worked on the OMS asset based approach and the GMS, in particular in terms of Inclusive Growth. The Member also commented that it would have been good to see more focus on the need for improved public transport and walking and

cycling opportunities. The Member also raised concern that the GMS did not seem ambitious enough in terms of a modal shift. There also appeared to be no acknowledgement as to what opportunities existed to improve energy efficiency in properties that residents currently lived.

The Leader advised that the wording of the Our Manchester was specifically written to outline how the Council intended to deliver its strategy, whereas the GMS had been written in a way that identified the key headlines across the region that the strategy aimed to address. The Leader agreed with the points that the Member had raised but commented that the details of how specific issues would be addressed would be covered in subsequent sub-strategies and implementation plans (e.g. the Transport 2040 strategy).

A Member asked whether as part of the consultation undertaken, it was clear whether residents were aware of the concept of being part of Greater Manchester and did they perceive themselves as residents of Greater Manchester or did they view themselves as residents of the local area they lived in? The Member also asked how the strategy intended to address inequalities across the region, with specific reference to health and life outcomes. The Member also commented that it would have been pleasing to see more detail around the objective of improving transport connectivity across the region within the strategy.

The Leader advised that he would need to come back with details around the outcome of the consultation that had taken place. He noted that the level of response varied between all 10 of the local authorities, with Manchester having the largest response rate. In terms of addressing health inequalities, the Leader advised that each local authority had produced a locality plan which outlined how each authority intended to address the inequalities around health within their areas, which all fed into the GMS.

A Member queried whether the target around addressing rough sleeping within Greater Manchester was accurate as the target of 180 for the region appeared very low.

The Leader advised that tackling homelessness was a local function and agreed that the number for GM was based on the annual count data which wasn't an accurate representation. Within the City, the number of people homeless/rough sleeping was counted on a monthly basis to gain a more accurate figure. In ending rough sleeping, the Leader commented that the issue that required addressing was not only related to housing, but involved tackling a range of complex issues including mental health issues and associated drug and alcohol abuse.

A Member asked whether it was possible to have specific inclusive growth targets for improvements in deprived wards within Greater Manchester and whether it was possible to include the hospitality and retail economies within the Industrial Strategy, linked to Inclusive Growth. The Member also suggested that the strategy clearly referenced the aspiration that 100,000 more residents would earn the real living wage by 2020, rather than the national living wage, as there was a difference between these.

Officers advised that the draft strategy had not included quantitative measures/targets as this was very difficult to do and come up with a measure that was not influenced by outside economic events and movement of populations. In terms of the Industrial Strategy, it was the intention to produce a local strategy that addressed productivity, pay and quality of jobs in the foundation economies, such as hospitality and retail. Officers also agreed to revise the wording relating to the national living wage.

A Member asked whether it was possible to have an update on the progress made against the 64 'We Wills' contained within the OMS.

The Leader advised that the Council produced an annual State of the City report which contained updates against the 64 'We Will's', with the next report due to be published at the end of September which would be the first report on the new OMS.

Decision

1. To note the report; and
2. To request that Officers submit a further report detailing the implementation plan of the Strategy to a future meeting of the Committee

ESC/17/36 Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and Manchester Local Plan review – update

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Development), presented by the Policy and Strategy Manager, which provided Members with a summary of progress on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF), and set out the proposed timetable for the review of the Manchester Local Plan.

Following the consultation on growth options, an initial draft GMSF document was produced. This was prepared on the basis of meeting the City Region's assessed level of need for housing and commercial development, taking account of Greater Manchester's growth ambitions, which in order to fully meet identified development needs, required some development in the Green Belt. Although there was support for many policies within the GMSF, the consultation process highlighted localised concern over elements of the plan's proposals, particularly for the proposed Green Belt release and from residents living close to the affected locations.

The next stages of the GMSF involved publication of the responses received through the consultation on the draft GMSF, which would happen in September 2017. This would be followed later in 2017 by publication of data and associated sources of information that sat behind the strategy. Once the assessments of districts' land supply had been updated, and the implications of new population projections and the new national housing methodology analysed, a revised draft of the GMSF would be prepared. The intention was that this would be published for a 12-week consultation in beginning in June 2018.

In terms of Manchester' Local Plan, since the Core Strategy was adopted in 2012, there had been significant changes to national planning policy as well as changes to

economic conditions affecting the delivery of development, and severe pressures caused by still ongoing national austerity policies. A review of the Local Plan provided an opportunity to ensure that local planning policies were up-to-date, reflecting national planning policy, the GMSF and current priorities for the city. . It was important that the Manchester Local Plan took full account of the GMSF as it emerged in June 2018, and therefore the Council would not be in a position to consult on draft Local Plan policies until this time, at the earliest. However, there were preliminary actions in the production of a Local Plan that did not depend heavily on the GMSF, and the intention was that these would be progressed sooner, so that there was nothing to delay progress with the Local Plan when the next draft GMSF emerged.

A Member asked for clarification as to what the difference was between the GMSF being prepared as a joint Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Mayoral Spatial Development Strategy (MSDS).

Officers from the GMCA advised that the GMSF was being prepared as a joint Development Plan Document as this was the only route available to Greater Manchester when the GMSF process commenced three years ago. The GM Mayor's election had given the opportunity to change this approach if the GMCA was minded to. The difference between the two approaches was that the DPD allowed for the release of land from greenbelt for allocation of sites for development, whereas the MSDS could only identify locations which could potentially be developed with local plans being the mechanism for any releases of green belt to be agreed. There was now a need for the Leaders of the GM authorities to discuss which direction and approach to proceed with.

A Member asked whether there was any conflicts anticipated between the GMSF and Manchester's Local Plan.

Officers advised that Manchester had had a consistent strategy for a number of years to bring more activity to the core of the conurbation in order to repopulate areas that had previously lost population and economic activity, in particular in those places that were well connected to public transport. The GMSF represented a continuation of this broad strategy, with 24% of new housing being delivered within the City from sites already identified for development. It would not be possible however to deliver all the growth needed on brownfield sites and this was why there was proposals for limited release of peripheral sites.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment commented that it was an appropriate time to review Manchester's Local Plan and that it would be important to develop the Plan in collaboration with Manchester residents.

A Member asked for clarification in respect to Green Belt land in terms of what did it look like and how much existed within Greater Manchester.

Officers from the GMCA advised that there was a lot of misunderstanding around what constituted Green Belt land. Within Greater Manchester 47% of land was designated as Green Belt and if all of the allocations identified in the initial GMSF

draft were to be allocated, this would have equated to reducing the Green Belt to 43%. Officers also advised that there were five statutory purposes to Green Belt land and not all land designated as Green Belt was of high environmental quality and a lot of this land had little public access. In terms of City of Manchester, there had not been a high percentage of Green Belt Land put forward for development compared to other GM authorities

A Member commented that it was important to improve communication to the public in relation to the role of Green Belt land, to help explain why GM was considering some Green Belt release. The level of population and household growth in Greater Manchester meant that it would not be possible to accommodate all of the new homes needed on brownfield sites, even with a significant increase in housing densities, which could have detrimental impacts on other services such as schools doctors, dentists etc. as well as increased congestion and pressures around transport. The Chair added that there was also a role for Elected Members to communicate this message to their constituents

Decision

1. To not the report
2. To place an item on the Committee's work programme in relation to the proposed consultation on the first draft of the Local Plan

ESC/17/37 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme. The Committee was asked to agree the work programme.

Decision:

1. To note the report; and
2. To agree the work programme.