

**MEETING OF THE GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY (GMCA)
ECONOMY, BUSINESS GROWTH AND
SKILLS OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
FRIDAY 13 SEPTEMBER AT 2.00 PM AT GMCA OFFICES, CHURCHGATE HOUSE**

Present: Councillor Michael Holly (in the Chair)

Bolton: Councillor Susan Haworth

Bury: Councillor Mary Whitby

Manchester: Councillor June Hitchen

Councillor Greg Stanton (substitute)

Oldham: Councillor George Hulme

Rochdale: Councillor Daniel Meredith

Salford: Councillor Jim King

Trafford: Councillor Barry Brotherton

Wigan: Councillor Charles Rigby

Councillor Michael Winstanley

In attendance

GMCA Marie-Clare Daly, Principal – Cultural Policy

GMCA Nick Fairclough, Strategy & Policy Officer

GMCA Alison Gordon, Assistant Director of Business Innovation & Enterprise

Bolton Councillor David Greenhalgh, Portfolio Holder for Culture

GMCA Joanne Heron, Statutory Scrutiny Officer

GMCA John Holden, Assistant Director of Research & Strategy

Wigan Alison McKenzie-Folan, Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Culture

GMCA Kathryn Oldham, Chief Resilience Officer

Salford Jim Taylor, Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Economy

GMCA Lee Teasdale, Governance & Scrutiny Officer

E73/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Musadir Dean (Bolton), Luke Raikes (Manchester), Kerry Waters (Stockport) and Stephen Homer (Tameside)

E74/19 CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair thanked Cllr Winstanley for having stepped in to cover the last meeting in the chair.

The Chair reminded Committee Members that some of their registered interest forms remained outstanding.

E75/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

E76/19 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 JULY 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2019 were submitted for approval.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2019 be approved as a correct record.

E77/19 CRICKET IN GREATER MANCHESTER

Jim Taylor (Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Economy) introduced a report to the Committee which provided them with an overview of the proposed Cricket Strategy for Greater Manchester, the action plan that sat beneath it, and the funding requirements for taking the strategy forward.

It was advised that the Combined Authority had been approached by the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB), Lancashire Cricket Club (LCC) and other cricketing bodies to agree a long-term partnership to deliver the sport in Greater Manchester (GM) and use it as a tool for delivery of the sport's long-term ambitions in the city region. The ECB, LCC, Chance to Shine (a cricketing charity), Cheshire Cricket Board and GreaterSport had proposed a partnership and action plan that would use cricket to improve young people's lives and create stronger, healthier communities in GM. This long-term partnership would allow for the leveraging of expertise, resources and influence of each partner to deliver outcomes that would make cricket flourish within GM's communities for the next generation.

The action plan focussed on creating a network of community run cricket facilities that would provide access to cricket in urban, non-traditional settings, and also deliver a range of cricket programmes that were focussed upon providing wide ranging benefits to communities across GM.

Over the three years of the partnership, it was proposed that the Strategy would promote the following:

- The installation of 100 new non-turf pitches to reduce inequality in access to sports facilities
- The building of three urban cricket centres that would become sporting and social community hubs
- The delivery of 14 new Chance to Shine street projects to provide the opportunity for disadvantaged young people to play sport
- Growing the South Asian Female Activators programme to engage socially isolated women in volunteering
- The delivery of Chance to Shine to 200 new primary schools to teach young children physical and social skills through cricket
- Growing the Healthy Hearts schools programme to teach children the importance of healthy lifestyles
- The delivery of Chance to Shine in 20 new secondary schools to improve resilience and leadership skills in teenage girls
- The delivery of a suite of employability programmes, including 30 "Volunteer It Yourself" projects at cricket clubs, to support young NEETs through education, training and into employment

- The provision of 5,000 tickets per year as part of Our Pass to mobilise the next generation into sport
- The piloting and launching of “The Hundred” clubs and schools programme to give people the opportunity to play a new, exciting format of cricket.

In order to achieve these aims, the programme would require a £600,000 contribution (over three years) from the GMCA, with an additional financial contribution towards the three urban cricket centres from host districts. Together, this funding commitment would unlock over £3 million of investment from the cricketing organisations.

The three urban cricket centres would each repurpose an existing site into a cricket focused community centre with indoor cricket facilities alongside further spaces that could be used for sport, education, community organisations, health services and any other community service. The partners were looking to accelerate the roll out of these centres in the city region by committing to building the three centres over the next three years. More than three GM districts had expressed an interest in hosting a centre, so the ECB would shortly conduct an exercise to identify the optimum three sites across those districts.

Comments and Questions from Members

Members welcomed the proposal but expressed concern that it could prove to be a ‘vanity project’ without a long-term commitment. Therefore, what was expected to happen once the three years of initial funding had ceased?

It was advised that the action plan included notes on the ‘legacy’ of the Strategy and its sustainability going forward. Each of the urban cricket centres for example would be permanent additions, but there would be a need for each locality to decide how they would continue to sustain them in the long-term. There would of course be a need to keep the ECB’s “feet to the fire” on the legacy going forward.

Members welcomed the comments but stated that given the many constraints in place on local government finances – this may be yet another thing that the authorities find they cannot afford and eventually remove funding to manage budgets.

Nick Fairclough (Strategy & Policy Officer) advised that this had been discussed with the ECB. The intention was for the centres to work towards becoming self-sustaining during the three years by bringing in commercial businesses and looking towards private sponsorship opportunities. It was clear currently from all involved that there was a real desire being shown for a legacy through these opportunities. It was also expected through the bidding process that the bidding authorities were able to show their ability to sustain the projects going forward.

Members referenced the intention to provide Chance to Shine to teenage girls. Whilst this was very encouraging – why was the same offer not being made to younger, primary school aged girls?

It was advised that the focus on teenage girls had come through the ECB, as they had previously initiated a project with primary school aged girls, and now wanted to link that work onto secondary aged girls and not face a ‘cliff edge’ where girls stopped playing.

Members noted that whilst the proposal for new facilities was good – was there anything proposed to support some of the strong existing cricketing infrastructure in the region?

It was advised that the ECB needed to talk to each individual district about their current offer. It was possible that the urban cricket centres would form part of existing club infrastructures – again this was something that would need to be developed in conjunction with the ECB.

Members welcomed the intention to work with young people who were Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs) as this could reap very wide life enhancing benefits if properly implemented.

Members asked if there was a criteria in place for the bidding process for the urban cricket centres, and would these criteria in-turn have a knock-on effect in regards to the 100 non-turf pitch locations?

It was suggested that whilst the location of the 100 non-turf pitches would ultimately be the decision of the ECB, the Combined Authority should still have some input into that decision making process. With regards to the urban cricket centres – at the current initial stage there was no set criteria in place, but rather an open process, which still remained open for all ten GM boroughs (six had made submissions to date).

Members sought assurances that when the locations of the three urban cricket centres had been finalised and agreed – that the benefits arising from these would be spread throughout the entire GM region.

It was advised that when the ECB did get to the stage of setting its criteria for funding – this would include the ability to ensure that the benefits were spread much wider than the immediate locality.

The Chair then drew the item to a close with Members expressing broad support for the Strategy and wishing officers every success with taking it forward.

RESOLVED:

1. That the discussions taking place between cricketing organisations, districts and the Combined Authority be noted by the Committee.
2. That the action plan, proposing what would be achieved by the Greater Manchester wide partnership with the ECB, Lancashire Cricket Club and other partners, be noted by the Committee.
3. That the request for £600,000 of funding over three years to support the actions, to be sourced from retained business rates, subject to an agreement between three districts and the ECB to develop three urban cricket centres across Greater Manchester, be noted by the Committee.
4. That Committee Members be asked to engage their own local authorities in the development and delivery of the strategy, including the development of the urban cricket centres.

Jim Taylor (Portfolio Lead Chief Executive for Economy), together with John Holden (Assistant Director of Research & Strategy) and Kathy Oldham (Chief Resilience Officer), introduced a report that provided Committee Members with an update on the preparations underway across GM for Brexit, and considered possible mitigating actions to minimise the impact should the UK exit the EU without a deal.

A small amount of funding had been awarded to local authorities, the Local Resilience Forum and the Combined Authority to support Brexit readiness. Agencies from across GM had been meeting on a monthly basis to consider possible impacts and to ensure that appropriate preparatory actions were being taken. The meetings of the GM Brexit Preparedness Group had now been increased in frequency to fortnightly as the 'Brexit day' neared. The membership of this group included the GMCA; local authority representatives; the AGMA Resilience Unit; Greater Manchester Police; the Growth Company; Transport for Greater Manchester; the NHS; the Greater Manchester Centre for Voluntary Organisation and Manchester Airport.

In addition, a multi-agency Economic Resilience Taskforce had been established, which brought together key GM bodies to try and ensure a coherent and comprehensive package of support to businesses and individuals facing any threat of redundancy should the UK exit under a no-deal scenario, or should an economic downturn occur. To support this work, a dashboard of leading indicators was being developed, to track how the national and GM economy was performing, in order to identify and possible economic shocks as early as possible.

Further preparatory arrangements were provided regarding the following areas:

- **Borders** – Manchester Airport was liaising directly with government. Assurances had been received regarding ongoing operations. Port Salford and City Airport were not considered UK entry points.
- **Transport & Infrastructure** – Assessments were ongoing to ensure transport and infrastructure projects continued, with a register of major infrastructure projects (over £10m) across GM was being compiled to assess the risks to their delivery.
- **Health & Social Care** – Preparations for the health sector were being led nationally by NHS England and the Department for Health. There had been no requirement set for the local NHS to stockpile any medicines or medical supplies. The reliance on EU workers in the health and social care sector was a particular risk, and work was being undertaken to support them to complete the EU settlement scheme.
- **Food, Water & Energy** – Activity would be led by the Local Resilience Forum, liaising with national government as required. There was no anticipation of a food shortage, but there may be some reduction in 'choice' depending on arrangements at borders and ports.
- **Business & Economy** – Activity was ongoing to support GM businesses and raise awareness of the need to ensure preparations were underway for the changes resulting from Brexit. It had been difficult to hold events for preparedness so far as not many had been receptive. This was a risk, as in the Small to Medium Enterprise sector, around 1/3 to half were estimated to have no preparedness planning in place.
- **Engagement with Government** – Regular reporting requirements were expected to increase in volume and frequency as Brexit day neared.
- **Civil Contingencies** – Work had been undertaken to understand possible impacts on current and future risk scenarios, in both the short and medium term.

- **Higher Education Sector** – Work had been undertaken to understand the possible impacts on the numbers of EU students and lecturers.
- **Organisational Readiness & Impacts** – Public sector organisations had been considering the possible impacts on their own operations arising from Brexit, including workforce and legal implications.
- **Data** – Under a no-deal scenario, the flow and transfer of personal data could be impacted. Information had been shared with public sector agencies to ensure all were undertaking the necessary preparations and that advice was being passed onto businesses to ensure they could put in place any necessary mitigating actions.

Comments and Questions from Members

Members referred to the part release of the government ‘Yellowhammer’ document. If the government were not willing to provide all the information needed to prepare, then a true resilience package could not be put together. For example, a degree of panic around shortages was already beginning to be seen in pharmacies and health centres.

It was advised that there had been some ‘bottom up’ approaches from government, where they had asked regional leaders what their primary issues were likely to be at the local level. Liverpool was acting as the lead for the North West region and putting all views forward to government. The pharmacy concerns would be added to the local level issues.

Reference was made to how large employers were helping staff to register collectively. Could the ten GM authorities also take a lead role on this?

It was understood that all the GM authorities had been through their employee databases to establish who might need support. There had also been communications around GM to increase publicity around the need to do this.

Members raised data sharing concerns and the possibility of being cut off from the EU databases. What sort of an impact could this have on cross-border policing?

It was advised that the data scenario implications had been known for over a year now. A government led communications campaign had commenced on 1 September. 90% of the actions that would be required before Brexit took place would be companies clarifying how their data was stored and handled. Greater Manchester Police formed a key part of this conversation and were working hard on it.

Members asked if there had been any updates around the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. It was advised that unfortunately at present there was little extra information to provide on this.

Members asked if plans were in place, should there be food or fuel shortages, for the most at risk, such as those reliant on food banks, or care workers who needed fuel to be able to visit their clients.

It was advised that a number of authorities had discretionary funds in place year round for those who may have problems in meeting basic and necessary needs. Unfortunately an element of the planning around food and fuel shortages was ‘crystal ball gazing’ and could not be fully planned for. The food sector in general was used to dealing with resilience issues, such as crop failures

and disruptions in the supply chain. A close liaison would be kept with the food banks and a map of food banks and potential gaps in provision had been established.

Members stated that some of the regeneration projects taking place were due to take 10 years or longer, and the lack of clarity on future prosperity made this an issue. Had the potential impacts upon ongoing regeneration projects been considered?

It was advised that a significant project was underway to get the last of the funding required at present under contact as the government would be looking to utilise any underspend themselves if an economic shock took place. A Manchester focussed paper on prosperity fund positioning had been prepared in 2017 and this would be shared with the Committee.

Members asked if the Combined Authority had a register detailing how much each of the 10 individual boroughs may be prepared or not, in facing the consequences of a no-deal exit.

It was advised that each the individual boroughs were engaged fully in the structural, engagement and dialogue work taking place. Each borough had undertaken a 'preparedness audit' and this was considered to be good practice. As with a lot of the positioning right now, there was just not the detail available to know which areas may be worst hit.

Members felt that it was important for the city region Mayor to take a lead in the communications around preparedness. Members felt that at present, with increasing disconnect from Westminster, that the public sought reassurances at a more local level and perspective.

Members referenced road haulage firms that worked internationally. Had GM been working with the locally based ones? It was confirmed that the Growth Company had taken the lead on interactions with local road haulage firms.

RESOLVED:

1. That the update on Brexit preparatory work underway across Greater Manchester be noted by the Committee.
2. That the paper on prosperity fund positioning from 2017 be fed back to the Committee.
3. That the Mayor be asked to take a lead role in GM's communications around Brexit preparedness.

E79/19 GMCA CULTURE FUNDING 2020 ONWARDS

Councillor David Greenhalgh (Portfolio Holder for Culture), together with Alison McKenzie-Folan (Lead Chief Executive for Culture), Alison Gordon (Assistant Director for Business Innovation and Enterprise) and Marie-Claire Daly (Principal Culture and Creative Policy) – presented a report outlining the proposed Greater Manchester Culture Investment Fund process from 2020 to 2022.

The GMCA Culture and Social Impact Fund (CSIF) had been launched in 2017 and began funding from April 2018, building upon the success of AGMA's Section 48 scheme. This resulted in an investment of over £7m over two years going to 28 organisations – 11 of which had not received GM Culture Funding previously. The first year had been a particular success with an increase of

39% being seen in engagement with GMCA funded cultural organisations as a result of this new investment approach.

The current programme was due to conclude its funding in April 2020, therefore GMCA needed to explore how best to support and invest in culture from this date onwards. A series of proposed amendments had been made to the investment policy to be implemented from April 2020 onwards, these included:

- Ensuring balance across art forms and geography in GM and the overall resources available, by limiting the amount of funding any single cultural organisation could receive to no more than 15% of the Greater Manchester Cultural Fund.
- To top-slice into a separate budget, at the current percentage, non-cultural activity funding that was currently funded via the GM Cultural and Social Impact Fund.
- The ring-fencing of up to £270,000 of the GM Cultural Fund per annum to GM Culture Strategy priorities where they could not be delivered by a single organisation, but would work through the delivery of multiple cultural organisations and partners, and would increase cultural activity and resident engagement.

Comments and Questions from Committee Members

Members commented that whilst the Culture Investment Fund had been a success – two of GM’s boroughs had seen little or no money from this Fund. How was it ensured that they benefitted going forward?

It was advised that where there was not direct investment into a borough, there were often still benefits to be had through cross-border events. The start of the process saw an open call for applications, and some boroughs did not submit entries for funding. The funding process was also very competitive with 98 submissions made, but only 28 receiving funding. Parity was sought however to try and ensure fair distribution and to make sure that distribution was of sufficient quality.

Members asked if the GMCA worked directly with the local authorities throughout the bidding process. It was advised that during the last application round, officers went out to districts to speak with the local arts officers, who then in turn disseminated the information to their local contacts.

Members stated that the 39% increase in engagement was a fantastic figure – had there been any auditing or verification of these figures to ensure their validity.

Officers agreed that the figure was surprisingly high, and that this level of increase had not been expected until later years. An internal audit had taken place at the beginning of the year – the audit had been passed subject to some recommendations around monitoring, which were now being taken forward. These included writing guides to the monitoring process, and the data collection process, to ensure that both conformed to a formalised approach.

Members asked if there were any difficulties in moving towards a 15% cap on funding for single organisations.

It was agreed that the move may cause a few issues, however the wording of “we are minded” reflected this – meaning that the 15% was not an absolute.

Members asked about the measures in place to study the potential longer term benefits arising from the funding of these projects – and would future funding streams take into account past performance?

It was advised that the cultural funding had significant longer term impacts in areas such as the health and wellbeing of residents – increasing community cohesion and reducing isolation. A range of outcomes were also considered to ensure that value for money was provided going forward.

Members were pleased to see that all age groups and levels of ability were being included within the fund. Some of the projects had taken place in some of the most deprived wards in GM, and it helped to show that these residents were valued.

RESOLVED:

1. That the impact of the first twelve months of the Greater Manchester Cultural and Social Investment Fund be noted by the Committee.
2. That the support of the Committee for the proposed revised approach to the Investment in Culture from 2020 be noted.
3. That officers be asked to note the views of the Committee on the proposed 2020-2022 Investment Fund structure and process.

E80/19 GM TOWN OF CULTURE

Councillor David Greenhalgh (Portfolio Holder for Culture) and Alison McKenzie-Folan (Lead Chief Executive for Culture) introduced a report outlining the process for establishing a Greater Manchester Town of Culture from 2020 onwards.

The GM Town of Culture programme arose from a manifesto pledge made by the Mayor. It would provide an opportunity to spotlight and celebrate the distinctive culture of GM towns as well as raising local ambitions for cultural provision, a night-time economy, increasing pride in places and where relevant align with the GM Town Centre Challenge.

There was a full understanding of constrained budgets when it came to entering submissions for this, therefore local authorities would only be expected to submit a single short proposal of no more than five pages – identifying their proposed Town of Culture and the proposed programme of activity by the deadline date Friday 1 November 2019.

An independent panel made up of non-LA members nor representatives from the GM Culture and Heritage Steering Group would select the winning bid by the end of November 2019 – the panel would be co-chaired by Lisa Nandy (MP, Centre for Towns) and Fiona Gibson (GM LEP, Interim Chief Executive of Liverpool Everyman and Playhouse). Subject to GMCA agreement, the £50,000 programming budget would be granted to the relevant LA in April 2020. It was expected that this amount would be matched either in cash or kind with the support of the relevant LA.

Places would also be encouraged to approach local businesses and organisations to support the activity.

Comments and Questions from Committee Members

Members expressed confusion over the definition of a 'town' within the remit of the programme. Could this include large, almost city sized conurbations such as Bolton, alongside small 10k population towns in direct competition? Could individual areas of Manchester, such as Didsbury or Wythenshawe be included despite not being towns, but rather areas or places within a larger city?

It was advised that the term 'town' was not prescriptive, and that the size of a place would not form part of the proposal criteria. All that would be sought was an identifiable distinction of place.

Members still expressed concern that the naming of the award to include 'town' would lead to a sense of identity crisis in some cases, with areas feeling that they cannot be involved, and a possible issue of resentment if an area not considered to traditionally be a 'town' were to win the award.

Officers stated that a 'town of culture' was a well-established naming convention that people identified with. There had been a lot of talk of "left behind towns" in recent years and this would play a key part in the decision making process. The programme was about highlighting the undiscovered and raising profiles in areas that might otherwise be overlooked, redressing the balance from existing areas of culture.

Members asked about the degree of community involvement in the programme. Could a community group put a bid in themselves?

Officers stated that the key aim of the programme was to develop a front and centre celebration of local communities and it would be expected that the communities would be at the heart of any bids.

Members expressed concern about the chairing of the independent panel. If it was expected to be a de-politicised independent panel – was it wise to have an MP who directly represented one of the potential bidding towns as the co-chair?

It was advised that Lisa Nandy had been chosen based on her position as the MP for the Centre for Towns and politics would not be an issue. However, this concern would be raised with the Mayor.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report outlining the process for establishing a Greater Manchester Town of Culture from 2020 onwards be noted.
2. That the Committee ask that their views on the process and concerns around the naming be taken away for further consideration.

3. That the Committee be kept updated on the progress of the programme and be provided with an evaluation report following its conclusion.

E81/19 WORK PROGRAMME

Joanne Heron (Statutory Scrutiny Officer) advised that, as per the terms of the Committee, the Mayor would attend the November 2019 and March 2020 meetings. The Chair of the Local Enterprise Partnership would also be attending the November 2019 meeting.

Committee Members sought a site visit to Manchester Airport and arrangements were being put in place for this.

Committee members discussed potential future items for consideration, these included:

- Progress of the 'Northern Powerhouse'
- Implementation of the Local Industrial Strategy (including an outside of meeting briefing session)
- Brexit updates as and when required
- A detailed item on social and economic outcomes arising from GMCA's cultural programmes – such as social prescribing of cultural activity to combat mental health issues.

The Chair thanked Members for their input and advised that he and the Committee Vice-Chair would discuss the suggestions further outside of the meeting with the Statutory Scrutiny Officer.

RESOLVED:

1. That the updated work programme be noted.
2. That the Chair and Statutory Scrutiny Officer work together to consider how the suggested items for consideration could be added to the future work programme.

E82/19 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

There were none.

E83/19 REGISTER OF KEY DECISIONS

Received by the Committee.

E83/19 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Friday 11th October 2.00 – 4.00pm, GMCA Offices