

HIGH PEAK BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to The Executive

14 February 2019

TITLE:	Greater Manchester Spatial Framework
EXECUTIVE COUNCILLOR:	Councillor Tony Ashton - Leader
CONTACT OFFICER:	Sarah Porru – Interim Regeneration Manager
WARDS INVOLVED:	All

Appendices Attached – None

1. Reason for the Report

- 1.1 To notify Councillors of the consultation on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and to seek approval for the Council's approach in terms of a response and ongoing engagement.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That Councillors note the proposals of the consultation.
- 2.2 That Councillors support the proposed approach to respond to the consultation as set out in Section 5.1 and Chapter 7.

3. Executive Summary

- 3.1 A revised version of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework is subject to public consultation until 18th March. The plan sets out the quantum and distribution of housing and employment land requirements across Greater Manchester. Strategic policies and allocations are also set along with the identification of necessary supporting infrastructure. The level of housing and Green Belt release has been reduced from the 2016 consultation.
- 3.2 The implications of the plan for migration and commuting between High Peak and Greater Manchester are currently unclear. However, there is a risk that plan could lead to further pressure for housing growth in High Peak and exacerbate transport infrastructure constraints. These issues will be explored with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority on 30th January.
- 3.3 It is proposed that the Council submits a joint response to the consultation with

Derbyshire County Council and continues to engage with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority on the plans and associated infrastructure works as they evolve. A Statement of Common Ground is also likely to be prepared which will identify shared strategic planning issues and areas of co-operation as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. **How this report links to Corporate Priorities**

4.1 The cross boundary impacts arising the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework will have implications for:

- Aim One: To help create a safer and healthier environment for our residents to live
- Aim Three: To support economic development and regeneration
- Aim Four: To protect and improve the environment

5. **Alternative Options**

5.1 Option 1 (recommended) – that Councillors note the details of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and support the proposed approach for the Council to respond.

5.2 Option 2 (not recommended) – that Councillors decide not to respond with the consultation. This option would not allow the Council to influence the emerging strategy.

Dai Lerner
Executive Director (Place)

Web Links and Background Papers

Consultation website:
<https://www.gmconsult.org/communication-s-and-engagement-team/gmsf/>

Location

Contact details

Sarah Porru

sarah.porru@highpeak.gov.uk

HPBC / DCC
response to 2016
consultation:
http://gmsf-consult.objective.co.uk/common/search/advanced_search.jsp?id=1048785&eventId=29624&sortMode=response_date&looking

6. **Detail**

Background

- 6.1 In 2014, the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) agreed to prepare a joint Development Plan to set out strategic housing and employment growth plans across Greater Manchester over the next 20 years. In 2016, an early draft of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) was subject to consultation. This plan included ambitious proposals for growth which were dependant on Green Belt release. This generated a significant response with concerns raised by various groups regarding loss of Green Belt in particular. In 2017, Andy Burnham was elected mayor of Greater Manchester under a devolution agreement which granted the Mayor powers to produce a Spatial Strategy. However, the constituent authorities have all committed to seeking full Council approval for the plan as it moves forward.
- 6.2 High Peak Borough Council submitted a joint response with Derbyshire County Council to the 2016 consultation. Issues raised included the need for co-operation on transport infrastructure delivery and concerns regarding a potential imbalance between the proposed level of housing employment growth which may lead to an unsustainable pattern of development.
- 6.3 Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as inserted by section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 introduced a duty to co-operate in relation to the preparation of Local Plan and Spatial Development Strategies. In order to demonstrate compliance with this requirement, the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in 2018 sets out that Statements of Common Ground should be prepared between relevant planning authorities in order to set out issues for co-operation and any agreements. This should include consideration of whether identified needs for development should be met in neighbouring areas or vice versa.
- 6.4 At the time of writing, officers are scheduled to attend a meeting with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and other authorities that share a boundary with the GMSF on 30th January. This will provide a briefing on the content of the GMSF and provide an opportunity to discuss potential duty to co-operate matters for a future Statement of Common Ground.

Next steps

- 6.5 The consultation on the revised GMSF will run until 18th March 2019. Subject to approval by all ten Greater Manchester authorities, a further consultation on

the GMSF will take place in September 2019. The plan will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in early 2020. Adoption is currently scheduled for late 2020 / early 2021. Upon adoption the GMSF will provide the overarching strategy to shape individual Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans to be prepared by the local planning authorities and local communities to provide additional detail and non-strategic allocations where necessary.

Draft GMSF

- 6.6 The GMSF sets out strategic policies and strategic site allocations for Greater Manchester up to the year 2037. It sets out the level of housing and employment development that will be required across each of the 10 districts and broad locations where this will be achieved. Associated key infrastructure projects and Green Belt boundary changes are also identified.
- 6.7 To address concerns raised in response to the 2016 consultation by residents and other groups, the revised GMSF proposes a number of changes. They include:
- More efficient use of land – there is a greater focus on developing brownfield sites within the urban area (87% within the urban area). Higher densities for housing are also proposed in accessible locations such as town centres.
 - Reduction in Green Belt loss – 50% less Green Belt land is proposed to be released
 - Enhanced proposals for Green Infrastructure and environmental improvements to support health and wellbeing
 - Closer consideration of the appropriate mix of housing, including a definition of affordable housing for Greater Manchester.
 - Preparation of an Infrastructure Strategy over the next 12 months to set out how infrastructure required to support growth will be delivered
- 6.8 A summary of pertinent proposals is provided below:

Spatial Strategy and Strategic Policies

- 6.9 The Spatial Strategy seeks to focus growth in the urban centre and in areas in need of regeneration. A Core Growth Area comprising of central Manchester, south-east Salford, and north Trafford is identified to accommodate economic and housing growth. The Inner Area Regeneration (surrounding inner parts of Manchester, Salford and Trafford) will be the focus for urban regeneration, growth and improvements to enhance the quality of life. In order to address the relative under investment in the north of Greater Manchester (including Tameside and Oldham), the focus here will be to Boost Northern Competitiveness. The broad approach to the south (including Stockport and south Manchester) which is relatively affluent is to Sustain Southern Competitiveness.
- 6.10 The continued operation and growth of Manchester Airport is also supported alongside associated transport improvements - HS2 station, improved rail services to other city regions, Metrolink extension to HS2 station and bus services. This will support significant employment and housing growth in the

vicinity of the Airport - 500,000 sq m of office, logistics, hotel and advanced manufacturing space at "Airport City", further development of areas around Wythenshawe Hospital as a health and bio-tech cluster, 60,000 sq m of office floorspace around the new HS2 station and 2400 homes.

- 6.11 Town Centres, including Stockport and Ashton-under-Lyne, will continue to be the primary focus for primary focus for office, retail, leisure and cultural activity in their immediate vicinities. The plan also aspires to significantly increase the population in Town Centres with new housing.
- 6.12 Other strategic policies provide a framework for the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure corridors and the provision of a sustainable and integrated transport network. This includes an ambitious aim to enable half of all daily trips to be made by public transport, walking or cycling.

A Sustainable and Resilient Greater Manchester

- 6.13 This Chapter provides policies which prioritise brownfield developments, support the aim of making Greater Manchester carbon neutral by 2038, supporting decentralised heat and energy networks, managing and mitigating flood risk, ensuring developments are resilient to disasters, including terrorism and planning for minerals and waste.
- 6.14 A Clean Air Policy is also proposed which sets out how air pollutions concerns will be addressed with a focus on location where people live, where children learn and play and where air quality targets are not being met. Measures include; requiring applications that are likely to have an adverse effect on air quality to submit pollution data and require future monitoring, ensuring the design and location of development is appropriate, expanding the network of public and private electric vehicle charging points through new developments, controlling traffic and parking around schools and supporting green infrastructure, including the use of building materials which capture air pollutants.

A Prosperous Greater Manchester

- 6.15 Policies in this chapter seek to support the emerging Local Industrial Strategy for Greater Manchester which aims to create a "digital enabled, green city region". High value clusters in the advanced manufacturing, business, financial and professional services, digital, health innovation and logistics sections will be facilitated. At least 2,460,000 sq m of new office floorspace and 4,220,000 sq m of new industrial and warehousing floorspace will be provided in over the period 2018-2037. Whilst the level of office provision appears to be a continuation of past trends, planned growth in industrial and warehousing will represent a 25% uplift on past trends.
- 6.16 Key locations for economic growth include the core area stretching from the

Etihad Campus in the east through the City Centre to Salford Quays and Trafford Park in the west. The Manchester Airport Enterprise Zone and Stockport and Ashton-under-Lyne Town Centres are also identified amongst other locations of lesser significance to High Peak.

Homes for Greater Manchester

- 6.17 The GMSF states that planned housing growth is driven by demographic changes and proposed scale of economic growth. Policy GM-H 1 (Scale of New Housing Development) states that a minimum of 201,000 net additional dwellings will be delivered in Greater Manchester over the period 2018-37 (annual average of around 10,580). This requirement follows the Government's new standard methodology for assessing housing need which takes household projections published by the Office for National Statistics and applies an uplift to reflect market signals which suggest affordability is an issue.
- 6.18 The level of housing growth is 7% less than that included in the 2016 version of the GMSF. It isn't clear from the new GMSF or supporting documents if an appropriate balance between housing and employment growth is planned. Unlike the past Government guidance under which the 2016 GMSF was drafted, the Government's new standard methodology for calculating Local Housing Need does not include an expectation that economic factors are included in the assessment. The new approach leaves the consideration of economic factors to the discretion of the plan making authority.
- 6.19 In line with the proposed Spatial Strategy, housing is planned to be distributed amongst the 10 Districts based on policy aspirations rather than their individual needs. Of the total housing planned across Greater Manchester only 4.4% is earmarked for Tameside (466 per year – the lowest of all GM Districts) and 7.2% in Stockport (764 per year). In contrast, 27% of the total housing growth will come forward within the boundary of the City of Manchester and 16.4% in Salford.
- 6.20 A range of housing types and sizes to meet local needs is supported but details requirements on this issue will be set in the Local Plans of the respective Districts. Minimum densities for housing development are also set in terms of the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport.

A Greener Greater Manchester

- 6.21 This Chapter sets out overarching policies for biodiversity, geodiversity, landscapes, rivers and waterways, green spaces, green infrastructure and Green Belt. In relation to green infrastructure, Policy GM-G 8 (Green Infrastructure Opportunity Areas) defines areas with scope for improvements which connect to green infrastructure in High Peak, namely; South Pennine Moors and Mersey Valley.
- 6.22 Green Belt policy is also provided which establishes a revised boundary for the Greater Manchester Green Belt. This releases land for allow for development in locations including High Lane (considered later in this report)

with come compensatory new Green Belt elsewhere.

A Connected Greater Manchester

- 6.23 The plan aims to improve the transport network so that half of all daily trips in Greater Manchester can be made by public transport, cycling and walking by 2040. The “Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040” which sits alongside the GMSF outlines how significant investment will be essential to achieving this vision. The Strategy is supported by a 5 year Delivery Plan which sets out the immediate and longer term programme for transport schemes needed to support growth. Funding from central Government as well as investment via developments will be required to deliver the schemes.
- 6.24 The Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 identifies the following schemes of relevance to High Peak. In some cases, the strategy reflects existing initiatives and funding commitments.
- Scheme delivery within next 5 years:
 - Mottram Moor and A57(T) to A57 Link Roads (committed scheme)
 - Hope Valley line upgrade (committed scheme)
 - Complete business case within next 5 years for early delivery:
 - South Stockport rail infrastructure improvements for National Rail / HS2 / potential Metro/tram-train services
 - Develop options within the next 5 years for¹:
 - A6 – M60 Relief Road from SEMMMS² (Hazel Grove – Bredbury)
 - Metro/tram-train services on the Marple, Glossop and Hazel Grove lines
 - Tintwistle and Hollingworth: further highway interventions
- 6.25 In addition to the above, the GMSF itself also identifies the potential new station at Gamesley as part of the proposals for Tameside.

Site Allocations

- 6.26 Strategic allocations are proposed for housing and employment development across Greater Manchester. Smaller sites will be allocated in future Local Plans of the ten individual Districts. In response to feedback to the 2016 consultation, including significant concerns regarding Green Belt release, Green Belt proposals have been reduced by 50%. Allocations in the vicinity of High Peak include:

¹ Some projects could be delivered by 2025 but most would be delivered in later years

² South East Manchester Multi Modal Strategy Refresh

Stockport

- High Lane – 500 homes on an allocation that straddles the A6 to the west of High Lane. This site requires Green Belt release. Improvements to highways infrastructure are identified as a necessity in the policy.

Tameside

- Godley Green Garden Village – 2350 homes adjacent to Godley and Hattersley with a design and layout to reflect garden village principles. Village hubs with community facilities and retail will be developed. Flexible workspace is also proposed around Hattersley Train Station.

6.27 The High Lane allocation is a significant reduction from the allocation of 4000 homes in the 2016 GMSF. A strategic allocation put forward at the end of the M67 at Mottram for 167 homes and 70,000 m² of B1(c) and B2 employment floorspace has been removed from the plan entirely. Both amendments help to retain Green Belt.

Key issues for High Peak

6.28 Based on current analysis of the GMSF and supporting documents, the following issues for High Peak have been identified. They primarily focus on the relationship between High Peak and Greater Manchester in terms of housing and employment growth, migration and commuting patterns and subsequent implications for transport infrastructure.

6.29 It is not clear if the level of housing proposed across Greater Manchester is sufficient to support planned economic growth. Evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) for High Peak (2014) and Greater Manchester (2019) highlights the clear relationship between High Peak, Stockport and Tameside in terms of migration³ and commuting⁴ patterns with migration into High Peak and commuting back into Greater Manchester. The High Peak SHMA states:

“...both Tameside and Stockport have significant housing market relationships with High Peak and therefore cannot be considered as entirely independent Housing Market Areas, but as Local Authorities with overlapping housing markets.” (2014 SHMA, para. 2.34)

6.30 If a sufficient quantum of housing (and therefore labour supply) is not provided within Greater Manchester (Stockport and Tameside in particular) to support jobs growth, this could potentially increase the pressure for housing in neighbouring authorities which are likely to be attractive locations for commuters in to Greater Manchester.

³ Absolute migration flows into and out of Stockport with High Peak = 334. Absolute migration flows into and out of Tameside with High Peak = 301 (2011 Census)

⁴ Flow of commuters, High Peak to Stockport = 3342. Flow of commuters, High Peak to Tameside = 2735 (2011 Census). Glossopdale, New Mills, Hayfield and Whaley Bridge lie within the Greater Manchester Travel to Work Area as defined by the Office for National Statistics.

- 6.31 Furthermore, the location and type of housing provided within Greater Manchester will also have potential implications for future in-migration to High Peak. The GMSF's re-focus on higher density development within the city and town centres may not be as attractive to families who may choose to search for properties in more rural locations, further away from the main centres of employment as a result. This may encourage an increase in commuting from High Peak into Greater Manchester. This could impact on the need for housing allocations in a future review of the High Peak Local Plan and exacerbate transport constraints on the A6, A57/A628 and public transport links.
- 6.32 This may undermine also the GMSF's aspiration to enable half of all daily trips in Greater Manchester to be made by public transport, cycling and walking by 2040. The delivery of the identified transport improvements will therefore be paramount.
- 6.33 Many of the transport schemes are welcomed and reflect existing plans, including; the Mottram Moor and A57(T) to A57 Link Roads (committed scheme), Hope Valley line upgrade as well as further consideration of consideration of highways improvements at Tintwistle and the provision of Gamesley Station. It is recommended that the Council continues to work with partners to inform and shape options as they develop.
- 6.34 The implications of proposed tram/train services lines will need further consideration to determine their implications for existing services for High Peak residents. In line with the Council's response to the SEMMMS Refresh consultation in 2018, the impact of the A6 - M60 Relief Road on the A6 through Newtown, Furness Vale and Bridgemont in particular will need close scrutiny and potential mitigation to address increases in traffic which may arise due to the new scheme. This should include consideration of air quality.
- 6.35 The delivery of transport infrastructure beyond the Greater Manchester boundary into High Peak was also raised by the Council in the response to SEMMMS. Funding opportunities for infrastructure available within Greater Manchester are often not available on the Derbyshire side of the border and further co-operation on cross boundary delivery may be required. It is recommended that this issue is re-iterated.
- 6.36 In terms of the strategic allocations at High Lane and Godley, it is considered that development in such locations may help to encourage commuters and families who do not want a city or town centre lifestyle to reside closer to the main centres of employment. This may alleviate pressure for housing growth in High Peak in the future. Policies associated the development of these sites appear to address the need to ensure that the necessary transport improvements will come forward with development.
- 6.37 Proposals for business growth in the GMSF can be cautiously welcomed, on the proviso that transport improvements will be delivered and growth in the GMSF will not lead to unsustainable patterns of development. Measures to improve air quality and to enhance Green Infrastructure connections with High

Peak are also supported and could be a matter for co-operation moving forward.

Proposed response

- 6.38 Officers are scheduled to meet with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) on 30th January to discuss the GMSF and explore the issues raised above. This meeting may provide some of the clarity called for regarding the balance between housing and employment growth and infrastructure delivery. A verbal update will be provided on the outcome of this at the Growth and Economy Select Committee meeting.
- 6.39 Derbyshire County Council has indicated a willingness to prepare a joint response with the Borough Council. This has particular merit given the County Council's transport and highways remit. Subject to further information obtained from the GMCA and feedback from the Economy and Growth Committee it is proposed that a joint response to the consultation is submitted which highlights the above matters. The Council will also need to continue to engage with the GMCA and neighbouring authorities on the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground. This may reflect the themes set out in the Council's response.