

## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 July 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Johns (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Bell, Good, Noor, Raikes, I Robinson, Shilton Godwin and Taylor

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council

Councillor Holt

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport

**Apologies:** Councillor Moran

#### **ESC/22/27 Urgent Business**

None.

#### **ESC/22/28 Appeals**

None.

#### **ESC/22/29 Interests**

None.

#### **ESC/22/30 Minutes**

In moving the minutes, the Chair took the opportunity to commend the Council on being awarded Council of the Year at the recent Local Government Chronicle (LGC) Awards.

The Chair also advised that Councillors Holt and Wright were in attendance at the meeting in an observational capacity.

#### **Decision**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2022 be approved as a correct record.

#### **ESC/22/31 Update on Manchester Active Travel Strategy and Investment Plan**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided an update on the production of an Active Travel Strategy and Investment Plan (MATsip) for Manchester City Centre.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The proposed vision and objectives for the MATsip;

- The planned work programme and investment plans to develop strategy and to continue improving walking and cycling for all pedestrian users;
- A collaborative approach between the Council and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to deliver schemes to implement the Bee Network vision;
- Some of the £325,000 received from the 2021-22 DfT Active Travel Capability Fund was directed to produce the strategy and investment plans. Expert analysis and advice had been commissioned from transport and urban design consultants Sweco;
- How the MATSIP would recommend investment priorities and schemes for the immediate and medium terms with a long-term horizon of 2040 to match the GM2040 Strategy and the City Centre Transport Strategy;
- Five place-based workshops in each area of focus (North, Central, East, South and Wythenshawe) and digital engagement would be undertaken to facilitate stakeholder and resident engagement.

Some of the key points and queries that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- A need to ensure active travel routes are accessible and safe to encourage usage;
- Routes needed to be well-connected, particularly to schools, hospitals and district centres;
- Clarification about revenue and capital expenditure;
- Whether stakeholder and resident engagement would be organised by consultants and if the scoping of this had already been undertaken;
- Concern over a lack of docking stations for Beryl Bikes in Wythenshawe;
- Parking on pavements and overgrown hedges and the safety issues these cause;
- How the MATSIP will tie in with public transport;
- Welcomed recent consultation outcomes being used to inform the strategy; and
- Could feedback from consultation on Beelines be incorporated into the strategy;

The Principal Policy Officer acknowledged the need for safe junctions to ensure that the active travel network is accessible, and this would be addressed through the development of the strategy. It was hoped that the MATSIP would tie together the different Council initiatives and early engagement was underway between partners in Neighbourhoods and Manchester Active.

The Principal Policy Officer reiterated the importance of the split between capital and revenue expenditure and further assessment of this was required to understand funding requirements. He explained that increased revenue allocation in the DfT Active Travel Capability Fund was anticipated, although the detail of this had not been confirmed.

In response to a query regarding the engagement programme, it was explained that this would be delivered by the Council with an intention to utilise the expertise of Neighbourhood Officers and Sweco consultants. Stakeholder mapping was ongoing and the wider details on consultation and engagement were not yet finalised.

With regards to Beryl bikes and the Greater Manchester Cycle Hire scheme, the Principal Policy Officer advised that funding for the initiative from the Mayor's Challenge Fund (MCF) was limited but the Council was working with TfGM to identify areas to extend the scheme to, although there was no exact timescale for this.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reiterated the need for the active travel network to be accessible for all residents and to encourage a modal shift to alternative transport methods. She also commented that member engagement in the scheme was key.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport explained that the Growth and Development directorate could create a flowchart for the public to demonstrate how the MATSIP and national policy fit together and what will be delivered.

Concern over on-pavement parking was reiterated by the Executive Member and she explained that the Council was considering what powers it had to address the issue, with the possibility of launching pilot programmes.

The Interim Head of Infrastructure and Environment confirmed that outcomes from the Beelines consultation were available and could be used in a place-based way to look at land use and trip trends.

### **Decision:**

That the Committee

- (1) notes the report and
- (2) notes that a further report setting out progress would be brought to a future Committee for consideration.

### **ESC/22/32 HS2 Update and Petition**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided an update on the progress of the High Speed (Crewe – Manchester) Bill (known as 'HS2 Phase 2b') in Parliament and outlined the key issues which the Council intended to petition against.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The Bill for Phase 2b would secure powers to implement new HS2 stations at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport, and a railway tunnel from Davenport Green to Ardwick with ventilation shafts at Junction 3A of the M56, Withington Golf Club (Palatine Road), a site near the Christie Hospital (Wilmslow Road), and Fallowfield retail park (Birchfield Road) in addition to more specific powers;
- The different stages that the Bill had been through in Parliament, including an Independent Assessors Report on consultations, a second reading of the Bill in

the House of Commons and an Additional Provision 1 which made amendments outside of Manchester;

- The most commonly raised issues, as summarised by the Independent Assessors Report, related to matters such as traffic and transport, ecology and biodiversity and community;
- A possibility of a second Additional Provision being deposited to make changes within and the city, which the Council may need to petition against;
- The Council's petition against the proposed scheme must be submitted to Parliament on or before 4th August 2022;
- The Council was reviewing the first Additional Provision to identify whether it should also submit a petition on that and would appear before the Select Committee once the petition is submitted;
- It was expected that HS2 Ltd may negotiate with the Council during the petitioning process, and the Council would seek measures to remedy the concerns and issues outlined.

Some of the key points and queries that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- The Committee welcomed the report and Council's position;
- HS2 was an integral part of levelling-up in the North;
- Closing the Ashton Metrolink line to enable the construction of a HS2 station at Piccadilly would create significant transport issues, particularly once the Co-op Live arena is open;
- Had any feedback been received regarding the suggestion of constructing a Metrolink depot at Ashton Moss to enable the existing Ashton Metrolink line to remain open during construction of the station at Piccadilly;
- Concern over plans to construct a 2000-space car park at Piccadilly station and the impact this would have on congestion and carbon neutral targets;
- What the potential funding mechanism would be for Manchester Airport should the government be unable to provide funding;
- The tram turnback facility should be located at Velopark instead of New Islington as proposed by the Bill; and
- The importance and history of rail travel in Manchester.

The Leader of the Council provided assurances that the Council had a strong case with their petition and that the Council would continue to make its case for significant investment in the rail network. She also confirmed that there was no clarity on the funding mechanism for the Airport station, which was currently the only unfunded proposition, despite having suggested the possibility of private equity investment to government.

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure explained that specific analysis on the economic impact of closing the Ashton Metrolink line had not yet been undertaken but would be assessed. The government had noted the Council's position on this.

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure commented that the government were continuing with the proposal to build a 2000-space car park at Piccadilly despite the Council's argument that this contradicts the policy position on climate change, sustainable transport, and carbon neutrality.

It was advised that the Ashton Metrolink line would need to be closed as the construction of HS2 required severing the track and inserting a pile.

Members' view that the tram turnback facility should be located at Velopark was reiterated by officers, who explained that this would improve network efficiency particularly when events were scheduled at the Etihad Stadium or the Co-op Live arena.

**Decision:**

That the Committee

- (1) noted the report and
- (2) endorse the recommendations for the Executive.

**ESC/22/33 Northern Powerhouse Rail**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**ESC/22/34 Moving Traffic Offences Enforcement**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Highways which provided an overview of changes in legislation which allowed local highways authorities to enforce moving traffic offences such as no entry, yellow boxes, banned turns, traffic restrictions and environmental weight limits.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The benefits of enforcement of moving traffic offences such as
  - Improved road safety including pedestrian and cyclist safety, supporting modal shift to sustainable transport options
  - Reduced highway congestion
  - Improved journey times for public transport and emergency service vehicles
  - Improved air quality, reduction in transport related emissions contributing to carbon net zero targets
  - Reallocation and saving of police time
- Local authorities have power to take on civil enforcement of certain moving traffic and parking contraventions by decriminalising the offences;
- Enforcement by CCTV cameras has proven to improve levels of compliance with road traffic regulations;
- The initial implementation programme and trial sites from January 2023;

- A future proposal for enforcement of parking on school Keep Clear markings.

Some of the key points and queries that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Welcomed the changes to regulations;
- Why a trial period was necessary;
- What did moving traffic offences and the acronym CEA refer to;
- The future proposal for enforcement of parking on school Keep Clear markings understated the benefit this would have on road safety;
- A speedy roll out of measures following the trial period was encouraged;
- Whether enforcement would apply to right-turning vehicles in a yellow box where oncoming traffic is congested;
- Could the Council ask developers to partially fund ANPR cameras in future schemes; and
- The possibility of including other contraventions and sites in the trial;

The Director of Highways clarified that moving traffic offences referred to any offence against signs or traffic regulations and that CEA was an acronym for civil enforcement area, which was the whole of city in this instance.

It was explained that a trial period was necessary to ascertain what the level of adherence may be and exactly how much enforcement would be required. It would also allow the Council to learn lessons before imposing regulations city-wide. The Director of Highways advised that each yellow box would have between 2 and 4 ANPR cameras, which would record all types of contraventions within the box and that the measures were intended to reduce the likelihood of congestion in yellow boxes. The Director of Highways confirmed that the Council could ask would developers for contributions to fund ANPR cameras as part of the approval process for development schemes. He stated that he would ask the Development Control team in the Highways department to consider the suggestion further.

In response to a query as to why enforcement for parking on zigzags was not included in the trial, the Director of Highways explained that there was an ongoing shortage of mobile cameras typically used to enforce this and the Council was trying to find a solution which can be located at various school sites across the city. Enforcement Officers will continue to patrol and monitor sites where zigzags are in use.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reiterated the Committee's comment that the future proposal for enforcement of parking on school Keep Clear markings needed to emphasise the benefit this would have on road safety and that this would be a key message when communicating the new powers. This would be shared with the Council's Communications team.

The Director of Highways noted the Committee's suggestion of including other contraventions and sites in the trial and stated that he would discuss the possibility of including an additional site in the trial with the Executive Member, depending on availability of funding. The expenditure involved with running the trial period had been taken from the parking reserves, which was acknowledged as a valid use of funds,

and the income generated from enforcement would be repositied into the parking budget for future activity and investment.

**Decision:**

That the Committee notes the report.

**ESC/22/35 Overview Report**

The 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.

**Decision**

That the Committee note the report.