1 Purpose of the report

1.1 At the AGMA Executive Board meeting of the 28 November 2014, the Board considered a report (attached at Annex 1) which provided detail on the preparation and scope of a proposed statutory planning document, initially to be known as the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (the GMSF) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure to support economic growth across the Greater Manchester conurbation. The report also outlined amendments required to the AGMA constitution to take it forward in advance of the revised arrangements incoming as a result of the Greater Manchester Agreement, and identified the decisions to be requested from individual Districts to initiate this process.

1.2 This report summarises the key elements of that report and identifies a number of approvals that are asked of Full Council and Cabinet as a result.

2 Recommendations

That Full Council

2.1 Approve the making of an agreement with the other 9 Greater Manchester Councils to prepare jointly the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (‘GMSF’) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure across Greater Manchester (as set out in Appendix 1 of the attached AGMA Executive Board report of the 28 November 2014) as a joint development plan document on terms to be approved by the Council’s Chief Executive

2.2 Note that the Cabinet will be asked to delegate the formulation and preparation of the
GMSF to AGMA Executive Board as detailed in paragraph 2.6 below.

2.3 Note that there will be further reports to full Council in respect of matters which are within the remit of full Council including approval of the GMSF

2.4 Approve the amendment of paragraph 13.2 of Schedule 1 to the AGMA Constitution by deleting the works ‘(initially in terms of Waste and Minerals Planning)’ and authorise the updating of the AGMA Constitution to reflect this.

That Cabinet:

2.5 Note that full Council has approved the making of an agreement with the other 9 Greater Manchester councils to prepare jointly the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (‘GMSF’) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure across Greater Manchester (as set out in Appendix 1 of the attached AGMA Executive Board report of the 28 November 2014) as a joint development plan document.

2.6 Delegate to AGMA Executive Board the formulation and preparation of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (‘GMSF’) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure across Greater Manchester (as set out in Appendix 1 of the attached AGMA Executive Board report of the 28 November 2014) insofar as such matters are executive functions.

2.7 Note that the following are the sole responsibility of full Council:

- Responsibility for giving of instructions to the executive to reconsider the draft plan submitted by the executive for the authority’s consideration.
- The amendment of the draft GMSF plan document submitted by the executive for the full Council’s consideration.
- The approval for the purpose of its submission to the Secretary of State or Minister of the Crown for his approval of the GMSF if required.
- The approval of the GMSF document for the purposes of submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
- The adoption of the GMSF.

2.8 Approve the amendment of paragraph 13.2 of Schedule 1 to the AGMA constitution by deleting the words ‘( initially in terms of Waste and Minerals Planning)’ and authorise the updating of the AGMA Constitution to reflect this.

3 Background

3.1 On the 29 August 2014 the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA)/AGMA Executive Board agreed that the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) should be progressed as a joint Development Plan Document (DPD).

3.2 The GMSF will provide an important strategic framework towards the successful planning of the sub-region and the districts within it. It will provide the basis for an informed and integrated approach to spatial planning across the city region, through a clear understanding of the role of our places and the relationships and connections between them. The decision to progress the document as a joint Development Plan Document, rather than an informal framework, formalises the production process and gives it greater weight in the planning process as a statutory planning document. It is
expected that the GMSF will plan for the future economic growth of the Greater Manchester region over a 20 year period.

3.3 At their meeting of the 28 November 2014 the AGMA Executive Board considered a report (attached at Annex 1) which provided further detail on the proposed scope of the GMSF, outlined amendments required to the AGMA constitution, and identified the decisions to be requested from individual local authorities to initiate this process. The AGMA Executive Board resolved to take forward the recommendations outlined in the report.

3.4 This report provides a summary of the key elements of the AGMA Executive Report of the 28 November and identifies a number of subsequent recommendations to Full Council and the Cabinet to enable work to progress on the preparation of this GM wide spatial planning document.

Greater Manchester Agreement

3.5 The announcement on the 3 November 2014 of the Greater Manchester Agreement and the move to directly elected leadership for Greater Manchester has implications for both the preparation and content of the GMSF. The GM Agreement provides for a directly elected mayor with powers over strategic planning, including the power to create a statutory spatial framework for GM. This will act as “the framework for managing planning across Greater Manchester and will need to be approved by unanimous vote of the Mayor’s cabinet.” Legislation is required to enable these changes and it is anticipated that the first city region Mayoral election will take place in early 2017.

3.6 Until this time AGMA and the GMCA will continue to operate under existing constitutional arrangements. If work is to progress on the GMSF prior to the election of a city region mayor, it is the AGMA Executive Board (rather than the GMCA itself) which will need to oversee its development.

3.7 The remit of the AGMA Executive Board is currently limited to the preparation of joint waste and minerals Development Plan Documents (DPD’s) only. Members will be aware that these planning documents have jointly been prepared and have been adopted for planning purposes in recent years. In order to similarly take forward the GMSF as a DPD, the AGMA Executive Board will need to amend its constitution so that a plan covering housing and employment can be prepared jointly by the 10 local planning authorities. Such an amendment requires approval from each local authority’s Executive (in Rochdale’s case the Cabinet) and full Council.

District arrangements

3.8 In addition, in order for the GMSF to be progressed in this way, each local authority is requested to obtain full Council approval to prepare a new joint DPD on terms to be agreed with the 9 local authority’s Chief Executives, and in respect of Salford, its City Mayor

3.9 Approval from each authority’s Cabinet (Executive) is also requested to delegate the preparation of the GMSF as a joint DPD to the AGMA Executive Board.
3.10 The delegation to the AGMA Executive Board to prepare the GMSF will help to ensure timely progress in developing the GMSF, whilst retaining full Council approval at key stages.

3.11 Full council approval by all 10 GM authorities will be required prior to the submission of the draft plan to the Secretary of State and further full Council approval will be required to adopt the final plan once it has been through the required Examination in Public.

Conclusion

3.12 The GMSF will provide an important over-arching strategy for the successful planning of the sub-region and the individual Districts within it. It will play an important role in guiding and supporting development plan documents produced at the local District level.

3.13 Progress on a number of local DPDs over the coming years, including the preparation of a Rochdale Allocations Plan Document to sit alongside the Core Strategy, or a future Rochdale Borough Local Plan is likely to be reliant on the adoption of a GM framework and it is therefore important that work continues in this regard and in advance of the revised arrangements as a result of the GM Agreement. In order to facilitate this process, Full Council and Cabinet are therefore asked to approve the recommendations at the start of this report.

4 Financial Implications

4.1 It is not possible to identify any specific financial implications from the joint preparation of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework aside from the estimated cost of £33.5k as identified by the report to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority in respect of initial legal and project costs. It has been proposed that this expenditure is to be met by existing AGMA budget arrangements. It should be noted that there will be a more detailed report on the overall GMSF budget to AGMA Executive Board at a later date – any financial implications for the Council will need to be considered at that point. Any recommendations that flow from the strategy with resource implications for the Council will need to be considered as the strategy is taken forward.

5 Legal Implications

5.1 AGMA Executive Board has previously agreed to prepare the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework as a joint Development Plan Document between the 10 AGMA authorities. This report sets out the reasons for that decision, as well as the legal requirements to ensure that AGMA has the required legal authority to prepare the GMSF as a joint DPD on behalf of the 10 AGMA authorities. The report explains that each Council is being asked to make decisions in relation to the approval of the proposal for a joint DPD, necessary amendments to the AGMA constitution and the delegation of functions to the AGMA Executive Board to enable the joint DPD to be prepared. The report also sets out the appropriate current constitutional arrangements of the AGMA Executive Board and where future legislative changes will be required.
5.2 The production of local plans is governed principally by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the appropriate secondary legislation being the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) as well as any associated guidance that authorities are required to have regard to. The report outlines to some extent those functions that must, by law, be retained by the ten individual AGMA authorities in relation to a proposed joint DPD.

6 Personnel Implications

6.1 These will be the subject of further reports to the AGMA Executive Board and will be reported to Members as necessary. It is clear that the preparation of the GMSF will require a dedicated staffing resource above that which presently sits within the GM Planning Team. However, the scale of this has still to be quantified. This will be informed by the legislation being drafted to support the GM agreement and consequential timescale within which it will become necessary to have an adopted GMSF in place.

6.2 Initial work to prepare and consult on an appropriate evidence base to inform a future housing and employment land requirement was undertaken during the autumn of 2014. This Stage 1 work has been met from existing AGMA and District resources. However, all Districts, including Rochdale, are now being requested to identify an experienced staffing resource from each District which can be deployed into the GM Planning and Housing Team for the next 6 months to support the next stage of GMSF work. This will allow progress to be maintained whilst a more considered review of the scale of resources needed to take forward the GMSF as a statutory planning document can be made.

7 Corporate Priorities

7.1 The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework will inform the Council’s future spatial, environmental, land use and infrastructure policy framework for delivering its corporate and strategic priorities as set out in Aiming High and Vision and Blueprint for prosperity, people and place, together with those within the Greater Manchester agreement.

8. Risk Assessment Implications

8.1 The preparation of a strategic spatial planning document forms part of the Greater Manchester agreement and previously agreed with the 10 Council Leaders in November 2014. There are no specific risks arising from this report. There is a statutory duty to cooperate and work collaboratively with adjoining Local Planning Authority on strategic planning matters as set out within national planning advice. These include those matters falling within the scope of the Greater Manchester Framework. Any risks arising from the later preparation of the GMSF will be reported to Members of the various Committees at that time.

9. Equalities Impacts

9.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

There are no (significant) workforce equality issues arising specifically from this report.
9.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

There are no significant equality/community issues arising specifically from this report.
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Appendix 1

Report to the Joint Greater Manchester Combined Authority & AGMA Executive Board Meeting 28 November 2014 – Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

JOINT GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY
& AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

Date: 28 November 2014

Subject: Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

Report of: Eamonn Boylan, Planning & Housing Lead Chief Executive

PURPOSE OF REPORT

AGMA Executive Board agreed to produce the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework as a joint DPD on 29 August and asked officers to report back on the implications of this. The recent announcement of the Greater Manchester Agreement and the move to directly elected leadership for Greater Manchester also has implications for both the preparation and content of the GMSF. In light of these developments, this report provides further information on the proposed scope of the plan as well as the required amendments to the AGMA constitution and decisions by individual Districts to initiate this process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The AGMA Executive Board is requested to ask:

Each full council to:

1. Approve the making of an agreement with the other 9 Greater Manchester councils to prepare jointly the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (‘GMSF’) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure across Greater Manchester (as set out in Appendix 1 to this report) as a joint development plan document on terms to be approved by the Council’s Chief Executive.

2. Note that the [Council’s Executive / Cabinet/ City Mayor] will be asked to delegate the formulating and preparing of the GMSF to AGMA Executive Board

3. Note that there will be further reports to full Council in respect of, matters, which are within the remit of full Council including approval of the GMSF

4. Approve the amendment of paragraph 13.2 of Schedule 1 to the AGMA constitution by deleting the words ‘(initially in terms of Waste and Minerals Planning)’ and authorise the updating of the AGMA Constitution to reflect this
Each Executive / cabinet/ leader/ the City Mayor (depending on each Council’s own arrangements and in the event that the Councils have approved the above recommendations):

(a). Note that full Council has approved the making of an agreement with the other 9 Greater Manchester councils to prepare jointly the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (‘GMSF’) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure across Greater Manchester (as set out in Appendix 1 to this report) as a joint development plan document.

(b) Delegate to AGMA Executive Board the formulating and preparing of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (‘GMSF’) to cover housing and employment land requirements and associated infrastructure across Greater Manchester (as set out in Appendix 1 to this report) insofar as such matters are executive functions.

(c) Note that the following are the sole responsibility of full Council:

- Responsibility for giving of instructions to the executive to reconsider the draft plan submitted by the executive for the authority’s consideration.
- The amendment of the draft GMSF plan document submitted by the executive for the full Council’s consideration.
- The approval for the purpose of its submission to the Secretary of State or Minister of the Crown for his approval of the GMSF if required.
- The approval of the GMSF document for the purposes of submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
- The adoption of the GMSF.

(d). Approve the amendment of paragraph 13.2 of Schedule 1 to the AGMA constitution by deleting the words ‘(initially in terms of Waste and Minerals Planning)’ and authorise the updating of the AGMA Constitution to reflect this.

In addition, the AGMA Executive Board is asked to:

(i). Request a further report outlining the implications of the Devolution Agreement for the preparation of the GMSF (as set out in paragraph 1.2) and setting out future steps in the event that the above delegations are approved.

(ii). Agree an interim approach to budget commitments in 2014/15, as set out in paragraphs 4.4 - 4.5 with Manchester acting as lead authority for the GMSF budget.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Chris Findley (chris.findley@salford.gov.uk)
Anne Morgan (a.morgan@agma.gov.uk)
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 GMCA/ the AGMA Executive Board agreed on the 29 August 2014 that the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) should be progressed as a joint Development Plan Document (DPD). This would focus on future housing and employment land requirements and provide the basis for an informed and integrated approach to spatial planning across the city region, through a clear understanding of the role of our places and the relationships and connections between them.

1.2 The announcement on the 3 November 2014 of the Greater Manchester Agreement and the move to directly elected leadership for Greater Manchester has implications for both the preparation and content of the GMSF. The GM Agreement provides for a directly elected mayor with powers over strategic planning, including the power to create a statutory spatial framework for GM. This will act as “the framework for managing planning across Greater Manchester and will need to be approved by unanimous vote of the Mayor’s cabinet.” Legislation is required to enable these changes and it is anticipated that the first city region Mayoral election will take place in early 2017. We need to obtain further legal advice on how to design GM’s constitutional arrangements to allow a seamless transition from the preparation of a joint Development Plan document by AGMA Executive Board to the GMSF produced by GM Mayor, otherwise we run the risk of having to begin the process again.

1.3 Until this time however AGMA and the GMCA will continue to operate under existing constitutional arrangements. If we are to progress work on the GMSF prior to the election of a city region mayor, it is the AGMA Executive Board (rather than the GMCA itself) which will need to oversee its development.

1.4 The AGMA Executive Board was established, separate from the GMCA, as a Joint Arrangements Committee (known as the AGMA Executive Board) under Section 101(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 as well as section 20 of the LGA 2000 and regulations 4, 11 and 12 of the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2012. The Constitution of the AGMA Executive Board as amended, with effect from 1 April 2011 sets out the functions in Schedule 1. These include, under the heading, “Planning & Housing”, the following:

13.1 Developing and coordinating the operation of a Greater Manchester Spatial Strategy as a framework for underpinning and linking partners Local Development Frameworks and Core Spatial Strategies

13.2 To coordinate and manage joint Local Development Framework activity across the combined administrative area on behalf of the 10 local planning authorities, in circumstance where this is agreed as appropriate (initially in terms of Waste and Minerals Planning)

13.3 To develop and coordinate the operation of a Greater Manchester Housing Strategy

13.4 To determine the future allocation of any pooled public sector housing resources across the combined administrative area and provide a sub-regional context for managing the scale, distribution and mix of new housing development.
1.5 The remit of the AGMA Executive Board (para 13.2 above) is currently limited to the preparation of joint waste and minerals DPDs only. In order to address this, the AGMA Executive Board will need to amend its constitution so that the a plan covering housing and employment can be prepared jointly by the 10 local planning authorities.

1.6 It is proposed that Schedule 1, paragraph 13.2 of the AGMA constitution is amended as follows (changes shown in italics):

“13.2 To coordinate and manage joint Development Plan activity across the combined administrative area on behalf of the 10 local planning authorities, in circumstance where this is agreed as appropriate (initially in terms of Waste and Minerals Planning)”

2 DISTRICT ARRANGEMENTS

2.1 In addition, each Local Authority is required to obtain full council approval to prepare a new joint development plan as well as the approval of its executive (whether that is the Cabinet, Leader or City Mayor) to delegate the preparation of the GMSF as a joint DPD to AGMA Executive Board. Full council approval by all 10 will also be required prior to submission of the draft plan to the secretary of state and to adopt the final plan once it has been through the examination in public.

2.2 The preparation of the GMSF as a DPD will need to be reflected in each District’s Local Development Scheme (LDS), which sets out the three-year project plan identifying which local development documents will be produced, in what order, and when. A report will be brought back to AGMA Executive Board outlining a proposed approach to this.

2.3 Further work is required to ensure that individual district Statements of Community Involvement (SCI) reference the joint DPD appropriately. This will ensure that relevant planning regulations are adhered to and help to provide a consistent approach to consultation and engagement across GM. A consultation strategy has been prepared which sets out our approach (Appendix 2).

3 SCOPE OF THE GMSF

3.1 The GMSF will express the long term spatial vision for Greater Manchester and be a pro-active tool for managing growth, providing the ‘roadmap’ for the type of place(s) we want to create. There is a balance between what is needed at the Greater Manchester scale to support our growth and reform objectives and those matters that require a finer granularity and are best addressed at the individual district scale.

3.2 The scope of the document may now be set by legislation rather than agreement between the ten local authorities. The Greater London Act 1999 sets out the powers of the London Mayor, with sections 334-350 covering planning. Section 334(5) states that the Mayor’s spatial development strategy (i.e. The London Plan) "must deal only with matters which are of strategic importance to Greater London”. The use of the word “only” is important and it is reasonable to expect something similar in the legislation devolving powers to Greater Manchester so as to ensure that the existing powers of local authorities are protected. The devolution agreement is clear that the planning powers are “new” and the agreement is not about taking existing powers from local authorities.
3.3 Notwithstanding the above, following discussion with senior officers in each district and a recent consultation on the GMSF initial evidence base, it is proposed that the GMSF should focus on the overall spatial strategy, that is, the amount of housing and employment floorspace development that should be provided in each district, and the key locations for delivering this (opportunity areas).

3.4 Distribution within districts would be set out in district Local Plans, but would clearly be informed by the opportunity areas identified in the GMSF. Comprehensive site allocations, including the boundaries of the opportunity areas and the requirements for individual sites, would be included in district Local Plans. In terms of infrastructure, the GMSF would focus on identifying the broad location of strategically significant schemes required to deliver the overall scale and distribution of development, with district Local Plans then providing more detail on the delivery of those schemes as well as identifying other, locally important infrastructure requirements.

3.5 This approach means that the scope of the GMSF would be reasonably broad, but not fully comprehensive. Further detail is set out in (Appendix 1).

3.6 The consultation exercise which has recently ended has generated discussion around the scope. Once the responses have been fully considered a more detailed report will be brought back to the AGMA Executive Board for further consideration.

4. RESOURCES

4.1 Budget estimates for developing the GMSF were originally prepared on the basis that it would be a non statutory plan and work could be completed within two years. A Sustainability Appraisal (‘SA’) was commissioned and work was begun on that basis in order to meet the tight timescales originally envisaged.

4.2 When AGMA Executive Board made the decision in August to progress the GMSF as a statutory development plan, officers were requested to report back on the full implications of the decision, factoring in the additional tasks and extended timescales required to deliver the GMSF as a statutory plan. Work to clarify the scope of the GMSF is set out in more detail in section 4 of this report. Ongoing discussions are underway between districts around their own capacity and workload demand. The aim is to identify which tasks can be delivered ‘in-house’ by officers within districts and which would need to be procured externally, based on capacity or skills required.

4.3 Initial scoping work on the sustainability appraisal has continued, but it is likely that the range of the Sustainability Appraisal will need to extend to reflect the full scope of the GMSF and that costs will therefore increase. The timescales for production of the SA have also increased, in line with the extended process for producing the GMSF as a statutory plan.

4.4 Whilst a budget for the GMSF has not been approved by AGMA Executive Board, some expenditure for independent legal advice (£8.5k), project assurance (£1.2k) and scoping the sustainability appraisal (£13.8k) has been incurred. As such, it is requested that this expenditure (23.5k) with an additional budget of £10k (for the further legal advice referred to in paragraph 1.2 above), amounting to £33.5k in total, be approved by AGMA Executive Board, subject to a more detailed report on the overall GMSF budget to AGMA Executive Board at a later date.

4.5 As AGMA is not an incorporated body in its own right it is unable to commission (or pay for) external work in support of the GMSF. As such, and whilst the plan comes
under the auspices of AGMA, contracts or payments would need to be agreed and carried out on AGMA’s behalf through one of the ten GM authorities. Given the role of Manchester City Council in providing financial management and legal advice to AGMA and the GMCA, it is recommended that Manchester could act as lead authority for the GMSF budget during the current phase of work.

5. TIMETABLE

5.1 The timetable will partly depend on the scope of the document and the resources available for its production. The initial stage of consultation on the ‘objectively assessed GM housing / employment land need’ is relatively narrow and so it is considered advisable to consult on a more comprehensive evidence base and options around key issues before publishing a full draft GMSF. A further report will be prepared setting out the proposed timetable once there is more clarity around the implications of the devolution agreement.
### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>GMSF</th>
<th>Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision and Strategy</td>
<td>• A spatial vision for Greater Manchester’s (GM) development</td>
<td>• Implications of the GMSF vision, how the district will contribute to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The role of different places and their contribution to this overall vision</td>
<td>achievement of the GM vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any large opportunity areas (based on an agreed size threshold) that will deliver major levels of development and their general location (not precise boundaries)</td>
<td>• Likely to cover a range of issues outside of the GMSF scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A general description of the key infrastructure that opportunity areas will require</td>
<td>• Detail on the delivery of the GMSF opportunity areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any other key opportunities important for the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>• Gross floorspace requirement for GM and each District in terms of offices, industry and warehousing district informed by overall spatial strategy</td>
<td>• Distribution of floorspace within the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any key locations (not boundaries) for office, industry and warehousing development, including an approximate level of provision</td>
<td>• Allocate sites for development, including any key locations identified in the GMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Any key locations for tourism development</td>
<td>• Sites for tourism development, including in key locations identified in the GMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential to identify a small number of existing areas that are strategically significant</td>
<td>• The approach to existing employment areas, including protection and redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>• Overall GM requirement to meet demographic/economic demands</td>
<td>• Distribution of housing within the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Net figure for each district informed by overall spatial strategy</td>
<td>• Detailed phasing for the district, potentially including the role of strategic sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General phasing for GM as a whole, taking sub-regional delivery issues into account</td>
<td>• Mix of housing in different parts of the district and mix on allocated sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broad mix of housing required to meet GM requirement</td>
<td>• Appropriate densities in different areas and suitable densities on site allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spatial implications of demographic/economic drivers</td>
<td>• Proportion of new housing that should be affordable, including the tenure split – may vary by area and site allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of gypsy and traveller pitches required in each district and travelling showpeople plots</td>
<td>• Details of how the needs of older age groups will be accommodated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proportion of household growth that will be in the 65+ age group</td>
<td>• Criteria for new Gypsy, traveller sites and site allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very broad locations that could meet particular types of demand, such as 'aspirational' housing</td>
<td>• More detailed identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>GMSF</td>
<td>Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of any market segments that could be met, including through site allocations</td>
<td>• Any other issues not covered in the GMSF (e.g., student housing, housing for people with disabilities, service families, etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Town Centres**    | • Hierarchy of larger town centres and a brief explanation of the role and opportunities  
                      • Role of the key out of town centres | • Boundaries of centres in the GMSF hierarchy (including boundaries of shopping areas and frontages, etc), and investment proposals  
                      • Identification of smaller centres  
                      • Scale and distribution of retail and leisure developments, etc, and site allocations |
| **Transport**       | • Broad location of strategic schemes required to deliver the proposed scale and distribution of development  
                      • Explain essential role of key transport infrastructure such as Manchester Airport | • More detail on the delivery of GMSF strategic schemes  
                      • Identify other, more local transport schemes  
                      • Protection of existing transport routes  
                      • Other issues not covered in GMSF (e.g., Parking and accessibility standards, etc) |
| **Other infrastructure** | • Broad location of strategic schemes for water, waste water, gas and electricity to deliver the proposed scale and distribution of development  
                             • Overall strategy for delivering low carbon energy and any GM wide significant opportunities  
                             • Overall strategy for managing flood risk and broad location of any strategic infrastructure required  
                             • Role of social infrastructure and implications of ‘opportunity areas’ on current infrastructure (e.g., health or education).  
                             • Strategically or internationally important facilities, e.g. for sports and leisure | • Detail on the delivery of any GMSF strategic schemes  
                      • Local infrastructure schemes  
                      • Opportunities for renewable and decentralised energy  
                      • Policies on managing flood risk and site allocations  
                      • Site allocations for social infrastructure and criteria for new facilities or redevelopment of existing sites  
                      • Local standards for recreation provision and site allocations as well as protection of existing facilities. |
| **Environment**     | • Climate change will be part of the overall spatial strategy, and a consistent theme through the GMSF, with a broad approach to maximising economic opportunities whilst reducing emissions and enhancing resilience/adaptation  
                      • Overall strategy for GMs green and | • Local policies on climate change mitigation and adaptation  
                      • Identify precise boundaries of both the strategic and local green infrastructure network  
                      • Set out how gaps in the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>GMSF</th>
<th>Local Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blue assets and the role of a quality environment in meeting the vision for GM</td>
<td>strategic and local networks will be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The strategic green and blue infrastructure network in GM and any key gaps in it that need to be addressed (broad locations)</td>
<td>• Identify local green infrastructure standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall strategy for addressing poor air quality and reducing air quality management areas</td>
<td>• Local Green Space designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local policies on reducing, and mitigating the impacts of, air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection and enhancement of heritage assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development management</td>
<td>• Any strategic development management policies required to clarify how key aspects of the GMSF are delivered, eg on high quality of places</td>
<td>• Comprehensive suite of local development management policies covering many of the issues above as well as others beyond the remit of GMSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Each district may also provide further guidance in supplementary planning documents as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>