

## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 5 March 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Abdullatif, Green, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader

Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration

Councillor Lovecy (Minute ESC/20/18) only

**Apologies:** Councillor Hacking and K Simcock

#### **ESC/20/16 Minutes**

#### **Decisions**

- (1) To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020 as a correct record.
- (2) To receive the minutes of the District Centre Subgroup meeting of the 19 February 2020.

#### **ESC/20/17 District Centres**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that summarised the work of the Subgroup that had commenced their enquiry in March 2016 and presented their final recommendations.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Welcoming the report and enquired how was this work was being shared with other local authorities;
- Noting that an evidence based approach was useful to share good practice, promote growth and stimulate activity in other areas of the city;
- Acknowledging that appropriate levels of staff resourcing remained a challenge and welcomed the comment from the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration that this would be explored further;
- Were residents engaged in the identity branding of district centres; and
- Had consideration been given to using other sources of data, other than footfall to measure activity in district centres.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration paid tribute to the Chair of the Subgroup and all of the Members who had participated in the work of the group. She also expressed her gratitude to the Institute of Place Management for the support provided to the work of the group. She acknowledged the quick wins that had been delivered in the pilot areas and noted the importance of these to engage local

stakeholders in with this work. She commented that the challenge would be in resourcing this activity going forward, however the importance of district centres to delivering the zero carbon city ambition was recognised and adequate consideration needed to be given to this when developing the Local Plan.

Dr Steve Millington endorsed the comments from the Executive Member and thanked the Members for engaging with the Institute of Place Management to deliver this work.

The Chair of the District Centres Subgroup stated that she wished to thank all of the Members and officers who had engaged with the Subgroup. She advised that the rationale for establishing the Subgroup was in recognition of the importance of district centres, both as a catalyst for economic activity and to promote and deliver a sense of place and identity for local residents, whilst recognising the changing nature of the high street. She described that an Our Manchester approach had been used to deliver this work and the group recognised the importance of partnership working.

The Chair of the District Centres Subgroup stated that it was important to ensure the basics were right, such as ensuring district centres were free of litter, pavements were maintained and signage was appropriate, stating that this would all contribute to delivering a sense of place and identity.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) informed the Committee that options were being considered for building additional capacity within the Growth & Development Directorate to deliver the ambitions described within the report. He stated that this work would be delivered in conjunction with local stakeholders, noting that this approach would also inform local branding campaigns for individual district or neighbourhood centres. Dr Millington stated that it was recommended that place branding should be informed and designed by local communities through participation and consensus, rather than being imposed and he provided an example of where this had been delivered successfully. In regard to the comment raised regarding footfall, he described that this had been used as it provided a universal measure, however other sources of data were captured and utilised.

Officers reported that they would continue to work with colleagues across Greater Manchester to promote this work and share good practice. Dr Millington stated that the Withington Project had been shared as an example of good practice with European networks and this had been well received. He advised that a conference would take place in Manchester in September 2020 that would bring together European partners and enable for the sharing of good practice.

## **Decisions**

The Committee;

- (1) Note the report and recommendations made by the Institute of Place Management (IPM) summarised in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.5 of the report.
- (2) Whilst taking note of the need for additional staff capacity, endorse the District Centres Subgroup's recommendations set out in Section 3 with a

recommendation that the Executive be asked to endorse the policy recommendations arising from this sub group's work.

- (3) Recommend that an update report on the implementation of the recommendations is submitted to the Committee for consideration in six months' time.

### **ESC/20/18 High Speed North (High Speed 2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail) update**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that provided Members with an update on High Speed 2 (HS2) and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) following the publication of the independent review of HS2 by Douglas Oakervee and the recent announcement on HS2 by the Prime Minister on 11 February 2020.

The Leader introduced the report and added that the Prime Minister had recently announced that HS2 and NPR would be delivered in full and that a new delivery body had been established to oversee the integration of HS2 into NPR. He further stated that the terms of reference for the commission to review infrastructure had also been released and the draft report for the options for Piccadilly station would allow for an appraisal and evaluation of these, noting that the report had recommended a review of the entire rail network in and around the city. He stated this was a rapidly changing and positive development.

The Deputy Head of City Centre Growth and Regeneration stated that since the Committee report had been written, the Department for Transport had announced that they would be publishing a response to the independent review of HS2 and they were currently preparing a timetable for the delivery of the Crewe to Manchester section of Phase 2.

Councillor Lovecy, Ward Councillor for Rusholme stated that the Council position was to oppose the proposed location of Vent Shaft 4. She stated that the Committee should recommend that the Council urgently request that the Minister for Transport should publish the findings of consultation undertaken last year on the proposed location of the fourth vent shaft and autotransformer station, adding that it was her opinion that the exercise had been flawed. She further stated that the Committee should also recommend that the Minister for Transport instruct HS2 to investigate alternative sites for this vent, adding that the current location was inappropriate and there was widespread opposition to this.

The Leader stated that he supported the recommendation to urge the Minister to release the findings of the consultation. He stated that the position of the Council was to oppose the current proposed location for fourth vent shaft and said that if the preferred option for Piccadilly station was accepted the tunnel required would not be travelling along the current proposed route and the number of vent shafts required could be reviewed. He further informed the Committee that it would be himself who made any request to the Secretary of State to release the findings of the consultation exercise and it would be the Chief Executive who would submit any representations

regarding the location of vents, inclusion of social value and training to the National Infrastructure Commission.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Supporting the comments of Councillor Lovecy;
- Seeking an assurance that Manchester would benefit from the creation of new jobs and the building of new houses;
- Following the recent decision regarding the expansion of Heathrow, consideration needed to be given to potential legal challenges to the HS2 project;
- Calling for the project to commence as soon as possible in the North, with decisions taken locally to deliver the described benefits to Manchester and the wider region;
- Recognising the importance of connectivity;
- What consideration had been given to communications and the branding of this project;
- Would social value be delivered as part of this significant investment;
- Recognising the need to train and equip residents with the necessary skills to deliver the HS2 project and the resulting benefits, such as housing construction; and
- How would any redesign of Piccadilly train station impact on Metrolink.

The Leader acknowledged the comments regarding the legal challenge to the expansion of Heathrow and described that his understanding was that the grounds for that challenge were specific to that decision making process. He described that following the decision to integrate NPR into HS2 it was likely that this work would progress in a timely manner in the North to deliver the required upgrade of the Trans Pennine line. He acknowledged the comment regarding the use of the term High Speed and stated that it had existed for ten years so it was unlikely that this would be changed and reiterated that the project would increase capacity, not was not solely focused on speed. He further supported the call for local decision making and stated that he had recommended that an additional body, in addition to the three proposed delivery bodies (Euston Station, HS2 Ltd and High Speed North including NPR) be established to consider the development of Piccadilly station and the surrounding area and this would include options for increasing Metrolink capacity at the station.

The Leader further commented that a commitment had been given by Government to deliver the Eastern leg of the project, nothing that this important as this would contribute to the delivery of an improved and connected rail network for the UK. He stated that representations would be made to the National Infrastructure Commission to ensure that the maximum social value and training and apprenticeship opportunities were delivered through this national project. Commenting further that the Manchester College in consultation with industry partners were already considering and planning for the delivery of future skills requirements and delivered a career led curriculum.

The Deputy Head of City Centre Growth and Regeneration commented that the Greater Manchester Growth Strategy had identified the number of homes and jobs that could be delivered across Greater Manchester as a benefit of the project. The

Leader added that discussion would continue be had with Government as to how the training would be delivered and maximised so people could access these new employment opportunities.

## **Decisions**

The Committee: -

- (1) Recommend that the Chief Executive, or a nominated officer write to the National Infrastructure Commission to recommend that social value, training and apprenticeship opportunities are delivered through the establishment of the various project delivery bodies; and to request that an update on the proposals for the location of Vent Shaft 4 and the autotransformer station be provided and this to be circulated to local Members.
- (2) Recommend that the Leader write to the Secretary of State for Transport to request that the results of the public consultation exercise on the proposals for the location of Vent Shaft 4 be published.

## **ESC/20/19 Withington Village Draft Development Plan**

This item was withdrawn

## **ESC/20/20 Economy Dashboard Quarter 3 2019/20**

The Committee considered the Economy Dashboard for Quarter 3 2019/20.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Welcoming the inclusion of Marmot indicators and requesting that life expectancy data at a Neighbourhood level be included;
- Recommended that comparative data and analysis against other core cities in relation to living wage activity be included;
- Noting the importance of wellbeing and these metrics should be prominent in future reporting;
- Clarification was sought on how Manchester wellbeing data was captured and recorded;
- Recommending that consideration should be given to reporting metrics as trends over time in addition to presenting snap shots of data;
- Consideration needed to be given to how the Council engaged with, and used all available levers with a range of organisations and business sectors across the city to maximise the number of residents in receipt of the Real Living Wage;
- Members may wish to consider a report on Living Hours at a future meeting of the Committee; and
- Comparisons between the outcomes for Manchester residents and other comparable European cities should be reported.

Officers acknowledged the comments from Members and stated that life expectancy data was being analysed, however expressed caution against drawing comparisons with other core cities as it was important to compare against areas with similar factors

and social dynamics. He further stated that the importance of health and wellbeing was understood and would continue to be reported against, noting the emphasis the Industrial Strategy placed on health and wellbeing. He informed the Committee of how surveys were undertaken in Manchester to capture a range of information, including wellbeing. He stated that the Council consulted with residents on a range of issues throughout the year and consideration would be given as to how this information could inform and be used when reporting against these metrics, however currently there was no specific Manchester wellbeing survey. The Leader stated that further consideration would be given to this area.

Officers reported that the format for presenting the wealth of data was constantly being reviewed to ensure it was appropriate and accessible, and further noted the comment regarding comparisons and benchmarking against European cities.

The Chair recommended that a report on the Living Wage and Living Hours would be scheduled as an item for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee. The scope of this report would be discussed with officers and scheduled for an appropriate date.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ESC/20/21 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. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

A Member recommended that consideration needed to be given to scheduling a future meeting dedicated to skills and the world of work, with the Manchester College invited and this could include contributions from young people. The Chair commented that Members would be holding a Work Programming session in May to inform the Committee's work programme for the new municipal year and this would present an opportunity to scope this and other items further.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme, noting the above comments and those of the Chair relating to the Living Wage and Living Hours discussed under the previous item of business.