

Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2016

Present:

Councillor Peel – In the Chair

Councillors Chohan, Hughes, Kirkpatrick, Leech, Noor, Paul, Rawson, Sadler and Sheikh

Councillor Leese, Leader of the Council

Councillor Chappell, Executive Member for Environment

Councillor Davies, City Centre Ward Councillor

Councillor Reid, Gorton South Ward Councillor

Councillor Strong, Chorlton Ward Councillor

Helen Smith, Head of Environment and Logistics, Transport for Greater Manchester

Pete Abel, Manchester Friends of the Earth

Jeremy Hoad, Levenshulme Neighbourhood Planning Forum

Matthew Dixon, Castlefield Forum

Apologies: Councillors Azra Ali, S Judge, Longsden and Ludford

NESC/16/09 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2016 as a correct record.

NESC/16/10 Manchester City Council Policy Framework for Neighbourhood Planning

The Committee considered the report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods). The report explained that the concept of Neighbourhood Planning was introduced by the Coalition Government through the Localism Act 2011. It enabled local community organisations, comprising at least 21 individuals to initiate and produce Neighbourhood Development Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders. The report described the approach to be adopted, if approved to Neighbourhood Planning. The Committee was invited to comment upon this Policy Framework prior to its submission to the Executive.

The Leader of the Council introduced the report across its broad themes. He said that it was his opinion that Neighbourhood Planning legislation is limited in what it can offer residents in dense urban areas where there exists active regeneration at a strategic level. The Leader said that the Council is committed to real engagement with residents on a broad range of issues affecting local communities.

The Deputy Chief Executive said the 'Our Manchester' is an approach to listen and engage in a conversation with neighbourhoods and residents to understand the issues, concerns and aspirations of communities. She said that this approach has

already started describing the resident engagement exercise already undertaken in Benchill to understand the priorities of the community.

The Committee welcomed Matthew Dixon, representing the Castlefield Forum. He said that the Policy as presented was negative in tone and was not in the spirit of the Localism Act. He said that he recognised and welcomed the regeneration undertaken by the Local Authority and said that Neighbourhood Planning can further complement and support this activity as community engagement is at the centre of Neighbourhood Planning. Mr Dixon further said that funding is available to support Neighbourhood Planning activity.

The Committee welcomed Councillor Davies, City Centre Ward Councillor. Councillor Davies said that Neighbourhood Planning was required in dense urban areas as Planning process is often complex and Neighbourhood Planning would support residents and manage their expectations in this process. Councillor Davies said that she welcomed the development of the 'Our Manchester' approach to resident engagement and said that Neighbourhood Planning would complement this approach. She further said that before the Neighbourhood Planning Policy is adopted further consultation should be undertaken with Councillors.

A member commented that Neighbourhood Planning should be encouraged as it encourages resident engagement. A member commented that Neighbourhood Planning as described within the Localism Act had been adopted and was appropriate for smaller rural areas, whereas Manchester had established strategic core polices and residents can engage in the planning process. Another member commented that the Policy presented was not appropriate for all areas of the city.

In response to members questions the Leader said that the number of Neighbourhood Forums across the city would be dependent on the number of applications made and that the list of assessment criteria used when considering any application is for guidance puproses only.

In response to a members question regarding comparisons with the existing Wythenshawe Area Committee the Leader said that the difference is that the Wythenshawe Area Committee does not have the power to refuse strategic planning decisions.

In response to a members question regarding the Northenden Neighbourhood Forum the Head of Policy, Partnership and Research informed the Committee that following the designation on an area in 2013 no submission of a Neighbourhood Plan had been made.

The Committee acknowledged the requirement to establish a Policy Framework for Neighbourhood Planning, however were of the opinion that further work was required on the proposed document to ensure it is suitable and robust. A member said that the Committee is unable to endorse the proposed policy and requested that officers look again at this policy. The Committee supported this recommendation.

Decision

1. The Committee did not endorse the recommendation that Executive approves the policy framework set out in the report in section 4 of this report.
2. The Committee recommended that further consultation be undertaken on the proposed policy.
3. That an update report is submitted to the October meeting for consideration by the Committee.

NESC/16/11 Neighbourhood Planning in Castlefield

The Committee considered the report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods). The report described that the Council had received an application to designate a Neighbourhood Area in Castlefield. This report made recommendations regarding the determination of this application. The Committee were reminded that this application should be read alongside the Council's general approach to Neighbourhood Planning, as discussed in the previous agenda item. The Head of Policy, Partnership and Research Council introduced the report across its broad themes. The Committee was invited to comment upon this report prior to its submission to the Executive.

The Head of Policy, Partnership and Research said that the rationale for changing the designated area that was submitted as part of the application was due to the fact that a number of existing planning frameworks exist in the area and a large number of planning applications had already been approved. The Head of Policy, Partnership and Research said the alternative area proposed by officers as described within the report would be more appropriate.

The Committee welcomed Matthew Dixon, representing the Castlefield Forum. He said that the Castlefield Forum is a voluntary community group with over 500 members with the ambition to improve the area for residents, visitors and businesses in the area. He said that the decision to submit the application had been reached following an extensive consultation exercise with both residents and local business which received unanimous support. He said that this demonstrates that this is a community driven application and as in the spirit of the Localism Act. Mr Dixon challenged the reasons presented within the report for changing the designated area as submitted by the Neighbourhood Forum. He said that the membership of the Forum is significant and would greatly support and contribute to the continued development of the area.

The Committee welcomed Councillor Davies, City Centre Ward Councillor. Councillor Davies welcomed the positive responses to the consultation exercise undertaken by the Forum. She said that the area has a strong identity and the report does not describe the positive contribution to the city the Castlefield Forum had made over the years.

Members thanked local residents and the Forum for the work undertaken to support, promote and develop a strong, inclusive community identity across two wards that has benefited all of the area. A member commented that ward boundaries are not an

accurate reflection of community boundaries and should not be used as a reason to reduce an area applied for. The Leader acknowledged this comment.

The Leader said that he acknowledged the valuable work and support of local residents in Castlefield on behalf of the city. He said that the Castlefield Forum is free to identify with the areas as they felt appropriate, however the consideration of the designate area as described within the report is for the purposes of spatial planning and statutory engagement, not broader community engagement. He said that the area that has been removed from the application is an area that is already covered by a statutory plan where there is little or no opportunity to vary this.

A member commented that the views of local Councillors should have been included within the report and that the maps provided should be clearer.

Members commented that they did not support the proposed alternative designation as presented by officers and recommended that further consultation be undertaken with residents.

Decision

1. The Committee did not endorse the recommendation that Executive refuse the area specified in the application and instead designate the area shown on the attached map in Appendix 1 as the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area and agrees that the designated area should not be designated as a business area.
2. The Committee recommend that officers, in consultation with the Castlefield Forum review the area to be designated as the Castlefield Neighbourhood Area.
3. That an update report is submitted to the October meeting for consideration by the Committee.

NESC/16/12 Neighbourhood Planning in Levenshulme

The Committee considered the report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods). The report described that the Council had received an application to designate a Neighbourhood Area in Levenshulme. The report made recommendations regarding the determination of this application. The Leader of the Council introduced the report across its broad themes and reminded the Committee that this application should be read alongside the Council's general approach to Neighbourhood Planning, as discussed in the previous agenda item. The Committee was invited to comment upon this report prior to its submission to the Executive.

The Committee welcomed Jeremy Hoad, Levenshulme Neighbourhood Planning Forum. Mr Hoad said that Levenshulme is a vibrant and diverse community where residents have a sense of place and identity. He said that the Forum had consulted extensively with residents and businesses prior to submitting their application. Mr Hoad said that the suggested alternative area for designation offered by officers within the report is not appropriate. He also said that he felt that there had been no discussions with the Forum representatives when proposing this alternative area.

The Committee welcomed Councillor Reid, Gorton South Ward Councillor who informed the Committee that she supported the views presented by Mr Hoad. She said that further discussions with the representatives of the Forum were required to progress this application. The Committee supported this recommendation with members commenting that the area proposed by officers reflected a commercial district centre rather than a neighbourhood area.

Decision

1. The Committee did not endorse the recommendation that Executive designates the area shown in blue on the attached map at Appendix 1 as the Levenshulme Neighbourhood Area.
2. The Committee recommend that officers, in consultation with the Levenshulme Neighbourhood Planning Forum review the area to be designated as the Levenshulme Neighbourhood Area.
3. That an update report is submitted to the October meeting for consideration by the Committee.

NESC/16/13 Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan and Emissions Report

The Committee considered the report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (People, Policy and Reform). The report described that Manchester: A Certain Future (MACF) is the citywide plan to reduce carbon emissions in the period from 2010 to 2020. It sets out the aim for Manchester to be a leading city for action on climate change and to have reduced its carbon emissions (CO₂) by 41% by 2020.

The Executive Member for the Environment introduced the report across its broad themes. She said that the current reduction in emissions from 2009/10 to the present was 18.1% and acknowledged there was further work to be done. She said she anticipated that the 2020 target will be achieved and that the implementation of LED street lighting will deliver a further 12% reduction. The Executive Member for the Environment said that the calculation used to determine emissions is prescribed by Government and that the majority of the reductions reported are as a result of the changes in this calculation. She said the level of carbon emitted from Council buildings as a result of electricity consumption is zero as the Council purchases renewable electricity for all of its buildings but Government published emission factors do not enable us to report emissions on this basis.

The Head of Client Relationships addressed the Committee to discuss the work that is being undertaken with the Council buildings estate to reduce emissions. She said that CO₂ emission savings have been achieved by moving out of Wenlock Tower and further savings will be achieved by staff moving out of the Chorlton District Office. In addition to these wider plans are being developed to further improve building efficiency and use technology to further reduce emissions. The Executive Member for the Environment said that this rationalisation of buildings will help reduce the levels of fuel consumed across the estate.

In response to five questions submitted by a member of the public to all members of the Committee in advance of the meeting, the following responses were provided by the Executive Member for the Environment.

1. The street lighting LED replacement programme has not been delivered to schedule and there has been limited progress in reducing emission from our building estate. As such our emissions haven't reduced as quickly as originally forecast. The Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2016-20 clearly outlines the key actions that we will focus on to reduce our emissions to 2020 specifically focused on the street lighting LED replacement programme, our building estate and the civic quarter heat network.

2. Manchester: A Certain Future (MACF) is a separate organisation to the City Council. The MCC CCAP 2016-20 focuses on the Council's direct emissions but includes some citywide actions to reduce emissions where the Council has a key role to support or enable the actions. As such not all citywide climate change activity carried out by partners and third sector organisations across the city is reported in the CCAP. MACF has its own action plan and reporting process which outlines how the organisation will engage all individuals, neighbourhoods and organisations in a process of cultural change that embeds low carbon thinking into the lifestyles and operations of the city. Nearly 1000 members of MCC staff have received Carbon Literacy training. Behavioural Change activities will continue to be embedded within the buildings carbon reduction activity and not be limited to carbon literacy.

3. The Green Leaders and MACF ran pilot ward level environmental audits as part of the wider Eco Neighbourhood Programme. External funding was sought to continue this wider programme but the bid was not successful. As highlighted in our response to question 2 above, not all citywide actions are actions in the CCAP and as such this action is no longer included in the plan. No report has been produced regarding the audits.

4. As actions in the CCAP are developed and implemented they often become embedded in Council processes as 'business as usual'. As such they are not dropped from the plan but successfully incorporated in to our activities. The CCAP 2016-20 outlines key actions that we will undertake to enable us to reduce our emissions by 41% by 2020. The CCAP 2016-20 outlines at section 3.3 of the report that all but one of the actions and activities we were required to undertake to achieve the World Wildlife Fund Timber Pledge were successfully carried out. Unfortunately, we were unable to meet the criteria for the paper recycling element of the award. However, opportunities to address this will be considered during future procurement activity.

5. Building emissions change due to a variety of reasons including annual changes in the government provided emission factors, changes in building usage and occupancy and the weather. We are currently in the process of developing an internal Buildings Carbon Reduction work stream which will review individual buildings and develop a range of actions to reduce emissions from these.

The Executive Member for the Environment said that she is seeking to review how

best to deliver carbon literacy training to maximise wider participation and involvement. She described that a recent public exhibition, delivered in collaboration between Manchester: A Certain Future and Manchester University had attracted 45,000 visitors. She said that consideration will be given to explore similar methods of delivery to engage with and educate people across the city. The Chair commented that he had attended the exhibition and had found it to be very interesting and informative. The Committee noted the difficulties experienced in the past with the delivery of Carbon Literacy training and welcomed this review of training and requested an update on this at their November meeting

A member requested that environmental issues and mitigation against the impact of climate change is included as regular item to be discussed at ward coordination meetings. The Executive Member for the Environment said that guidance had previously been circulated and members already undertake a lot of activity around this issue, such as activities around parks, trees and the building of resident networks to embed and support resilience amongst residents.

In response to a question from a member regarding the purchasing of recycled paper the Executive Member from the Environment said she will be speaking with the Executive Member with responsibility for procurement to progress this. The Committee welcomed this undertaking.

Members welcomed the report and requested that an update report is submitted to the Committee every six months. The Committee recommended that future update reports includes information on air travel; benchmarking performance against other comparative cities; that energy rating information is provided for buildings referred to and information regarding the wider activity undertaken, such as engagement with schools and housing providers.

The Committee requested that further information is circulated to all members regarding the reported increase in emissions from domestic air travel, The Head of Policy, Partnership and Research said that this would be circulated to members.

The Executive Member for the Environment acknowledged the comments from members regarding the scope and content of the report submitted and responded by saying the report for the Committee is delivered in a consistent manner so that the reporting of performance is consistent and transparent. She said that in addition to the actions described within the report a range activities are undertaken with partners, such as schools and housing providers where the Council has influence to address the issue of climate change.

Decisions

1. The Committee noted recent progress to achieve a reduction in Manchester City Council's direct emissions along with the level of Manchester City Council's annual emissions for 2015/16.
2. The Committee noted the attached Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan for the period 2016/17 to 2019/20.

3. The Committee recommended that a report describing the alternative options considered to deliver Carbon Literacy training is submitted to the November meeting.
4. The Committee recommended that further information regarding the levels of air travel is circulated to members.
5. The Committee will receive a progress report on the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan and Emissions Report every six months. This report will include information on performance against other comparative cities; green procurement policies and information describing the wider activity such as engagement with schools and housing providers.
6. The next report will be submitted to the January 2017 meeting for consideration by the Committee.
7. The Committee recommended that information on how Climate Change is addressed at a ward level is included in the report entitled Place Plans and Ward Coordination to be submitted to the September meeting.
8. The Committee expressed their continued support of the World Wildlife Fund Timber Pledge Award.
9. The Committee supported the procurement and use of recycled paper across all Manchester City Council Departments.

**NESC/16/14 Draft Greater Manchester Low Emissions Strategy and
Air Quality Action Plan**

The Committee considered the report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (People, Policy and Reform). The report described the legislative framework and the Government Standards, the Greater Manchester approach and the developing action plan. The Head of Policy, Partnership and Research introduced the report across its broad themes.

The Committee welcomed the report and requested that the Air Quality Action Plan is circulated to members of the Committee.

The Committee welcomed Helen Smith, Head of Environment and Logistics, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM). Ms Smith described that the plan had been developed across Greater Manchester in consultation with stakeholders. She described that the Air Quality Action Plan is structured around three themes; Reducing Traffic, Increasing Efficiency and Improving Vehicles. She described the many actions that are being developed to support this programme such as developing planning guidance, bus priority programmes, improving cycling conditions, promotion of car clubs and the production of information. She said that the ambition is to encourage a move away from the reliance on cars which currently represent 70% of all modes of travel. Members welcomed the activity to support changes to sustainable modes of travel.

The Committee welcomed Pete Abel, Manchester Friends of the Earth. Mr Abel said Friends of the Earth had campaigned around this issue for many years and submitted a detailed response to the Air Strategy Consultation. In response to a comment from the Chair he said that he would circulate the detailed response to members of the Committee for information.

Mr Abel said that Friends of the Earth agreed with the analysis of the problem however felt the actions identified are not sufficient to address the scale of the problem. He described that further work needed to be done to reduce the emissions of the Greater Manchester bus fleet. He further commented that there is little mention of the emissions created by Manchester Airport and the impact of any increase in passenger numbers.

Mr Abel said Friends of the Earth campaign nationally for the introduction of a diesel car scrappage scheme and the establishment of clean air zones in all towns. Mr Abel said that the reliance on electric vehicles will further add to particulate pollution and congestion and supported the promotion of alternative methods of transport such as walking and cycling with the associated health benefits. He said that more should be done to invest and promote this activity as it will benefit the environment and help address public health issues. Mr Able also said that consideration should be given to a work place parking levy, as adopted in Nottingham that was used to finance the tram system.

Mr Abel said that it is estimated that 40,000 people nationally die each year as a result of air pollution with 5.2% of deaths in Manchester being a direct result of particulate pollution. He said this has been described as a public health emergency. He said that children and older people are affected by respiratory issues such as asthma. He said that schools, nurseries and older people's homes should not be built near pollution hot spots.

Mr Abel said that the major contributors to air pollution are cars. He said that the Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) data that is collected locally should be published and made publicly available. Ms Smith said there is a 12 month delay in drawing down this data and informed the Committee they are seeking to review how to report real time data.

The Committee welcomed Councillor Strong, Chorlton Ward Councillor. Cllr Strong said that he supported the comments made by Mr Abel. Councillor Strong asked what the implications of the Referendum outcome were, to which the Head of Policy, Partnership and Research responded that it was too early to comment on the long term implications of the result for the UK's current framework of environmental legislation. Ms Smith said that the future of any fines that might be levied by the EU is again unknown at this time.

Councillor Strong asked that the Committee consider two recommendations. That the Interim Mayor for Greater Manchester and the Leader of the City Council write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer asking him to introduce a diesel car scrappage scheme, and secondly that a Task and Finish Group be established to progress this activity. A member commented that the scope of a Task and Finish Group should be extended to look at a variety of issues, such as housing, health, the environment and air quality

that impact on the residents of Manchester. He further suggested that the group be extended to include members of other Scrutiny Committees.

A member asked if consideration had been given to the introduction of a car free day, similar to the one that had been introduced in Paris. A member commented that the issue of particulate emissions from vehicles is very important and this has been addressed in other countries by adopting a programme of washing the roads. Ms Smith advised that TfGM are working at a national level to establish both a national clean air day and a clean air action day. The Head of Policy, Partnership and Research said that any car free day would need to be progressed in a meaningful way with the support and collaboration with providers of public transport.

A member commented that consideration needs to be given to imposing planning conditions and developing standards to mitigate the impact of any developments and providing adequate electric charging points in car parks. Ms Smith responded stating that the Action Plan will provide a platform to influence planning policy and activity across GM.

Decisions

1. The Committee noted and endorsed the Draft Greater Manchester Low Emissions Strategy and the Air Quality Action Plan.
2. The Committee recommended that the Interim Mayor for Greater Manchester and the Leader of Manchester City Council write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to encourage him to introduce a diesel car scrappage scheme.
3. The Committee recommended the establishment of a Task and Finish group to monitor local action. The Terms of Reference are to be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee for approval.
4. The Committee recommended local real time data on the levels of Nitrogen Dioxide is included in the Climate Change Update report to be considered at the January 2017 meeting.

NESC/16/15 Tree Strategy and Action Plan

The Committee considered the report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (People, Policy and Reform). The report described the approach to refreshing the Manchester Tree Action Plan, in the context of the adopted Green and Blue Infrastructure (G&BI) Strategy that was agreed at Neighbourhood Scrutiny Committee in September 2015. This report set out the draft Tree Action Plan and highlighted the key actions contained within it. It provided a summary of engagement with partners to date and how public consultation will further help to shape the Action Plan before its final approval later this year.

A member asked if consideration can be given to granting Tree Preservation Orders on those sites that are identified for future building developments. The Environmental Strategy Lead, Green infrastructure and Biodiversity said that trees are considered by the planning department as part of all development proposals. He further

commented that work is underway with Neighbourhood Teams to promote the awareness of Tree Preservation Orders and how they can be applied. The Committee requested that the guidance regarding Tree Preservation Orders is provided to ward coordination officers to be shared with all members.

Members commented that they often received complaints from residents about the management of trees and asked what is being done to address this issue. The Environmental Strategy Lead, Green infrastructure and Biodiversity said that a tree management guide is currently being developed to ensure consistency of approach across city to the issue of tree management.

In response to a further question regarding the tree replacement policy the Environmental Strategy Lead, Green infrastructure and Biodiversity said that the ratio for highways it is 1:1 and in the city centre it is 3:1. He further described that consideration is always given to ensure that the replacement tree is appropriate for the location.

Decisions

1. The Committee noted the report and the draft Tree Action Plan for the purposes of on-line public consultation.
2. The Committee requested that the guidance regarding Tree Preservation Orders is provided to ward coordination officers to be shared with all members.

NESC/16/16 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decision

To note the report.