

**DRAFT GMCA HOUSING, PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE
10 JANUARY 2019 AT 6.00PM AT THE GMCA OFFICES**

Present:	Councillor Lisa Smart (Stockport) (in the Chair)
Bolton:	Councillor Shamim Abdullah
Bolton:	Councillor Andrew Morgan
Bury:	Councillor Dorothy Gunther
Manchester:	Councillor Paula Sadler
Manchester:	Councillor John Leech (Substitute)
Rochdale:	Councillor Linda Robinson
Trafford:	Councillor Bernard Sharp (substitute)
Trafford:	Councillor Graham Whitham
Wigan:	Councillor Michael Winstanley

In attendance

Stockport Council Councillor Alexander Ganotis

GM Cycling and Walking Commissioner Chris Boardman

GMCA Officers Julie Connor (Assistant Director Governance and Scrutiny)
Amy Foots (Strategy Principal)
Anne Morgan (Head of Planning Strategy)
Mark Atherton (Assistant Director Environment)
Jamie Fallon (Governance and Scrutiny Officer)

TfGM Officers Bob Morris (Chief Operating Officer)
Michael Renshaw (Executive Director)
Simon Warburton (Transport Strategy Director)
Rod Fawcett (Head of Policy)
Martin Key (Senior Transport Adviser)

M121/HPE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Catherine Preston (Bury), James Wilson (Manchester), Steven Bashforth (Oldham), Laura Booth (Stockport), Mike Glover (Tameside), Stuart Dickman (Salford) and Lynne Holland (Wigan).

M122/HPE CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

Members were informed that the next draft of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) had been published, and was due to be discussed at the GMCA meeting on Friday 11th

January. It was confirmed that the GMSF and the TfGM 2040 Transport Strategy would be considered by the Committee in February.

M123/HPE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

M124/HPE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2018 were submitted for approval.

The Chair requested that the Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) Implementation Plan and Performance Dashboard Update (M116/HPE) be updated to reflect the fact that Mayor had acknowledged that his manifesto commitment to end rough sleeping had not been included as a dashboard objective.

Amended Minute of the meeting held on 15 November 2018, Item M116/HPE:

That the Mayoral Manifesto commitment to end the need for rough sleeping by 2020 was not included as one of the aims in the dashboard. The Mayor stated that the dashboard objectives were around initiatives which contributed to reducing rough sleeping. The Mayor stated that he had been advised that ending rough sleeping as an absolute is technically not possible due to a number of factors such as some rough sleepers not accepting available help / support and choosing to sleep rough, but he still stands by his manifesto pledge to end rough sleeping defined as a substantial shift of improvement in this area. The Mayor also highlighted entrenched rough sleeping and the challenges associated with engaging and supporting a small cohort of rough sleepers.

RESOLVED/-

That the minutes of the meeting held 15 November 2018 be approved as a correct record.

M125/HPE WALKING AND CYCLING UPDATE

Chris Boardman, GM Cycling and Walking Commissioner, introduced a report which provided Members with an update on progress since the approval of the recommendations contained in Made to Move, approved by the GMCA in December 2017.

Members received a presentation which contextualised the ongoing work and its purpose, and the following key points were highlighted:

- In Greater Manchester, 30% of trips under 1km are made by car, that's just 15 minutes on foot or a five minute bike ride.
- Initial research had suggested that the health impacts resulting from inactivity were costing the NHS from £500,000 per week to NHS, totalling £3.75 billion per year.
- The Made to Move report (December 2017) sets out a goal: 'To double and then double again cycling in Greater Manchester and make walking the natural choice for as many short trips as possible.'

- The report recommends 15 steps to achieve the goals, including the development of a detailed infrastructure plan, a ten year £1.5 billion fund, a total highways design guide, ensuring new transport and housing developments have walking and cycling at their heart, making cycling and walking the first choice on the school run, reducing the risk of road casualties and delivering greater access to public bikes.
- The GMCA had agreed to allocate £160 million of the Transforming Cities Fund to develop a Mayor's Cycling and Walking Challenge Fund (MCF). The fund would be used to kick start the delivery of Greater Manchester's cycling and walking infrastructure as part of a GM 'Streets for All' highways improvement programme. The Beelines proposal contains principles around the types of infrastructure that would meet the Commissioners standard as set out in Made to Move and the initial plan covering 1,000 miles across every community in Greater Manchester. These included the 'usable by a competent 12-year-old' and 'usable by someone with a double buggy' test in terms of traffic flow.
- The network plans were subsequently made public to gather feedback over a 3 month period. Over 4,000 comments were received on the plan and these are now being processed with an aim of publishing an update of the plan in early 2019.
- To date, 24 cycling and walking schemes had been approved, with a forecast total funding requirement from the MCF of around £39 million.
- One of the key enablers to unlocking walking and cycling's potential across Greater Manchester would be building safe, attractive spaces alongside high quality footways. Some of the proposed solutions to the highlighted severance/highways barriers involved simple cost effective interventions such as side road crossings with paint. The Chorlton cycle way (Chapel Street) was highlighted as a scheme which was out for consultation.
- Work was underway to develop a sustainable and effective bike hire scheme in Greater Manchester to provide people with the tools to enable them to cycle.

Members welcomed the update and raised the following questions and comments:

- A Member requested more information on the role of the GM Cycling & Walking Commissioner.

It was confirmed that originally the role had been focussed on defining GM's mission but was now concentrating on holding GM accountable, so that we do not slip on achieving the 15 objectives.

- One Member sought clarity on how the additional funding to achieve the goal of developing a 10 year £1.5 billion fund would be sourced, and how local authorities would feature.

It was confirmed that the first 3-4 years would be funded by the Mayoral Challenge Fund (MCF) (£160 million), on the premise that it is match funded. It was confirmed that £40 million of the MCF had been approved with another third, from local funding provided by districts. Work was also being done on existing Growth Deal schemes. In terms of future funding streams, conversations were ongoing with Government, and the Transport Fund was being considered. It was highlighted that the ultimate goal was for the approach to become normal and 'how we do streets' without the requirement for a specific fund.

- A Member queried why scheme promoters were allowed to claim delivery costs prior to full approval (paragraph 3.1)?

It was confirmed that scheme promoters were approved to claim scheme development and design to remove the financial constraints on scheme delivery. However, no funds were released if the schemes do not meet agreed the criteria; usable by a competent 12-year-old' and 'usable by someone with a double buggy' test in terms of traffic flow. In terms of accountability, it was confirmed that there were weekly Delivery Board, which reports into the Cycling Board, TfGM and GMCA governance structures.

- A Member highlighted that a major concern for parents would be the safety of their child. Had this aspect been considered?

It was confirmed that GMP were represented on the Board which meets every two weeks, notwithstanding this, this was not within the Commissioners gift. Work was underway to develop a Road Danger Strategy noting that further information would be provided when appropriate.

- Had metrics been developed which would help us measure the impact of the schemes?

It was confirmed that the success measures were being developed and baseline studies would be conducted on all the schemes. The measures would include health, pollution reduction and happiness. A proportion of the MCF had been allocated to monitoring and evaluation through TfGM's strategy team.

- How are we going to change the perception, that drivers are being forced off the road?

It was confirmed that it was the district's responsibility to agree to the extent in terms of how much they want to adopt the changes and it is expected that the different districts will make progress at different rates. In order to change the perception of some car users, there will be a need to create successful working examples that are local as a reference.

- Was there a commitment to ensuring that developers incorporate walkways and cycle paths in to their development plans?

It was confirmed that this was for districts to decide, however, the 2040 Transport Strategy and the GMSF would consider what policies could be established at city region level.

- A Member requested clarity in relation to who was responsible for the schemes and the knock on financial impacts once developed?

It was confirmed that the schemes must belong to districts. Did this also apply to maintenance? This was also a commitment of districts when developing the schemes.

- How are you working with those who are unable to walk/cycle?

The Disability Reference Group and wider groups were engaged. It was clarified that the aim of project was not to replace all car journeys, it was to reduce/ irradiate the unnecessary short journeys that could be made by walking/cycling.

- When can we expect the first plan to be published?

It was confirmed that it is envisaged that this would be published in March 2019.

RESOLVED/-

That the report be noted.

M126/HPE TRANSPORT CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Bob Morris, Chief Operating Officer presented a report which provided Members with an overview of the Capital Programme which TfGM is currently responsible, together with details of the current Member-led oversight and governance arrangements that are in place for the various elements of the programme.

The following key points were highlighted:

- The Capital Programme started 10 years ago, following the failed Tif bid which became the transport Fund.
- This has led to the successful delivery of £3 billion pounds worth of transport infrastructure (delivered on time and under budget).
- The Programme is also involved in wider GMCA delivery such as digital, broadband and helping to deliver the clean air Programme.
- In terms of TfGM taking the underlying schemes to this group, such as transport interchanges, bus priority, rail and Metrolink, it was suggested reporting on these individual issues separately at future meetings.

Members posed questions to the Chief Operating Officer, and Simon Warburton, Transport Strategy Director who was also in attendance:

- When was the outcome of the Access for All bid expected?

It was confirmed that bids had been submitted in relation to ten stations, noting that the outcome was expected to be received in March 2019.

- Members asked for clarification on the role and composition of the GM Transport Strategy group.

TfGM confirmed that the Group was chaired by the Transport Strategy Director, and attended by the 10 responsible directing officers from the 10 GM Boroughs. The role of the group was to manage and develop Local Transport Plan (2040 Strategy) and give stewardship to the management and periodic reporting of the approved smaller Growth Deal Programmes.

- A Member asked for clarification on where the overall management and oversight of schemes takes place?

It was stated that a complete list of schemes and their budgetary progress is submitted to the GMCA on a quarterly basis.

- How are schemes selected in terms of addressing transport needs?

It was confirmed that TfGM's Strategy Team prioritise schemes by considering a full range of options with the best most viable option selected, which was supported by a business case, which addresses the specific transport needs or to future proof an existing asset.

The meeting was advised that the delivery plan was measured against the 2040 Transport Strategy. Planning was conducted by mapping what had been already delivered, what is being proposed, and what longer term elements may be brought forward. Once the plan was agreed, it would inform the Capital Programme that comes forward as funding becomes available. TfGM confirmed that they were continually working with colleagues from the 10 local authorities to develop an efficient process for obtaining funding.

- One Member asked how knock-on impacts of revisions/ restrictions to the highways were managed to mitigate and manage expectations?

It was clarified that this was done via running modelling, putting in place mitigation, and early and thorough consultation and engagement with stakeholders and the local community to manage expectations.

- A Member requested a breakdown of how the new Wigan bus station had been funded by TfGM, Wigan Council and HM Government?

TfGM confirmed that had been included in a quarterly report to the GMCA and also TfGM's Capital and Policy Sub-committee.

It was agreed that the figures would be circulated to the Committee.

- Why had Bury not received investment to develop a new bus station?

TfGM confirmed that Bury would receive funding for a new interchange, noting that plans were being developed.

- Members queried whether commissioning arrangements could improve the standard of trains?

It was clarified that TfGM do not have any contractual influence of rail resources but it was noted that Northern and Transpennine should be introducing new stock post May 2019. This was largely also reflected with buses however, TfGM do have contracts for 20% of bus services and set standards as a minimum for GM, noting that every operator was scored and ranked through performance.

- Members sought clarity regarding the process for members to raise complaints on behalf of constituents. There was also confusion in relation to the governance arrangements and accountability mechanisms for TfGM.

TfGM acknowledged the feedback and advised that they would welcome suggestions which would enable them to improve their interaction with Members. It was agreed that the Committee would receive the TfGM Member Induction pack.

RESOLVED/-

1. That the Committee note the TfGM Capital Programme.
2. That the Committee receive an overview of the schemes to be submitted to the GMCA.
3. That TfGM review and clearly articulate how Members should raise enquiries.
4. That the Committee receive further information regarding governance arrangements and accountability mechanisms for TfGM.
5. That TfGM circulate elected member briefing materials (induction pack) and the councillor enquiry service for comment.

M127/HPE

GM CLEAN AIR PLAN UPDATE

Councillor Alex Ganotis, Portfolio Lead for Green City Region, introduced a report which provided an update on progress in the preparation of a GM feasibility study into the options available, subject to full funding by Government, to address NO2 exceedances, and to outline a broad direction of travel in relation to next steps and decision making. The following key points were highlighted:

- Greater Manchester has a long standing track record in taking a balanced approach to policy development to promote sustainability, inclusion and growth. Therefore, whilst respecting the strategic importance of addressing pollution and attendant impact on public health to better understand all the implications, further work in relation to the feasibility study is required. This work has been requested to ensure in developing our plans to deliver air quality improvements we understand the impacts on growth and inclusion across the city region.
- Undertaking this further work means that GM will be unable to submit its Outline Business Case (OBC) to government by the agreed deadline of 31 January 2019.
- Submission of the OBC after the 31 January 2019 does not meet the ministerial direction which has been issued to seven of the ten GM local authorities. This could lead to a potential legal challenge against one or more of the GM local authorities under a direction.
- It is anticipated that a report about the OBC will be brought forward in Spring 2019 to the GMCA and all ten councils.
- A non-statutory public conversation will follow the completion of the OBC to seek wide ranging feedback on the options for achieving compliance in GM and the identified 'preferred option' whilst at a formative stage. The outputs from this initial engagement activity will be used to inform the ongoing detailed design of any scheme, and build an understanding around the potential impacts of the 'preferred option' from a public and stakeholder perspective.
- The outputs of this would inform the development of the scheme in the Full Business Case.

In discussion, Member raised the following questions and comments:

- A Member queried whether the deferment of the draft OBC would delay implementation and delivery of improved air quality presenting a failure in moral obligation?

It was clarified that this work would not delay the submission of the full business case. It was noted that the OBC was crucial as it would also include our asks of Government. There were existing Air Quality Plans and strategies in place currently, which had resulted in some improvements to air quality. It was estimated that 1200 people die prematurely directly/indirectly because of poor air quality.

It was highlighted that other cities including Birmingham had also rescheduled their delivery milestones.

- Was there any disagreement amongst Leaders which had contributed to the delays?

It was confirmed that GM were at one in the view that we should avoid charging individual motorists if possible, but to do that it required a lot more work to see if a Caz C model would be sufficient. GM was also committed to undertaking the socio economic work.

- Would extra infrastructure be required to support the selected charging model?

It was highlighted that Government had offered to fund capital costs for any required physical infrastructure to monitor vehicles for compliance (if this was required). However, we would have to provide assurance that it would not be used for other purposes. It was confirmed that the test would be meeting the legal limits set out and be demonstrated by us bringing down the air quality to the legal limit into the shortest amount of time. It was advised that Government had put joint planning arrangements in place where this system was required.

- Members raised concerns regarding the lack of focus on reducing particulates?

It was clarified that the specific duties in regards to clean air reside with specific local authorities. It was not within remit of GMCA to apply a regime in regards to reducing particulates. It was highlighted that particulates would still be present even if all vehicles were electric cars (because of tyres). With the strategy focussing on 152 roads, it is inevitable that particulates would reduce, however, this was not within the remit in terms of reduction targets.

- Following discussion, the Committee agreed that a recommendation be submitted to the GMCA to consider whether the 10 local authorities should work collectively to reduce particulate matter, and update the existing Clean Air Strategy.

- Members asked around how Governments expectations would be managed in terms of GMs approach to tackling air quality?

It was clarified that it was possible to scientifically test whether an approach was sufficient, and it was confirmed that Government officials were being engaged in GM's approach.

It was clarified that a public conversation had taken place in late October as part of the launch of the GM Clean Air website which acted as a contemporary portal. This had also

enabled TfGM to have shared communication activity with Public Health England which had also led to additional engagement with specific business communities, and work with the bus industry to understand their views on how we can achieve a clean fleet quickly. Work was also underway with the small business community including taxis, and light goods vehicles.

At the point that firm proposals were ready, a clear plan for fuller public consultation around proposals would be scheduled. If any penalty regimes were required, then a statutory consultation would be undertaken.

RESOLVED/-

1. That the Committee note the report, setting out the implications of work so far led by the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan Senior Leadership Steering Group.
2. That the Committee note the further work that was now proposed to be undertaken to ensure that the future Clean Air Plan was agreed against a clear understanding of the impacts on growth and the inclusion across the city region.
3. That the Committee note the changes to the plan development schedule that this will bring.
4. That the GMCA be recommended to consider whether the 10 local authorities should work collectively to reduce particulate matter, by updating the Clean Air Strategy.

M128/HPE WORK PROGRAMME

Julie Connor, Assistant Director, Governance & Scrutiny, GMCA, introduced the Work Programme. Members were asked to contact the Governance & Scrutiny Officer with any suggested items for inclusion in the work programme or with any comments about scheduled items.

Members were informed that the February 2019 meeting would focus on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) and 2040 Transport Strategy.

RESOLVED:

That the Work Programme be noted.

M129/HPE FUTURE OF GREATER MANCHESTER

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

M130/HPE STOCKPORT MAYORAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

M131/HPE REGISTER OF KEY DECISIONS

Members received the register of Key Decisions for information only.

RESOLVED:

That the Register of Key Decisions be noted.

M132/HPE DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 14th February 2019 at 10.30am, GMCA Offices, Churchgate House

DRAFT