

Cabinet Member for Strategic Communities

Agenda

Date: Monday, 22nd July, 2013
Time: 3.30 pm
Venue: Committee Suite 1 & 2, Westfields, Middlewich Road,
Sandbach CW11 1HZ

The agenda is divided into 2 parts. Part 1 is taken in the presence of the public and press. Part 2 items will be considered in the absence of the public and press for the reasons indicated on the agenda and at the foot of each report.

PART 1 – MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS PRESENT

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Declarations of Interest**

To provide an opportunity for Members and Officers to declare any disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests in any item on the agenda.

3. **Public Speaking Time/Open Session**

In accordance with Procedure Rules Nos.11 and 35 a period of 10 minutes is allocated for members of the public to address the meeting on any matter relating to the work of the body in question. Individual members of the public may speak for up to 5 minutes but the Chairman or person presiding will decide how the period of time allocated for public speaking will be apportioned where there are a number of speakers. Members of the public are not required to give notice to use this facility. However, as a matter of courtesy, a period of 24 hours' notice is encouraged.

Members of the public wishing to ask a question at the meeting should provide at least three clear working days' notice in writing and should include the question with that notice. This will enable an informed answer to be given.

For requests for further information

Contact: Cherry Foreman

Tel: 01270 686463

E-Mail: cherry.foreman@cheshireeast.gov.uk with any apologies

4. **The Allocation of Community Grants** (Pages 1 - 8)

To approve the second round of grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations for 2013/14.

5. **Response to Greater Manchester Strategy for 2013 - 2020** (Pages 9 - 18)

To approve the Council's response to the Greater Manchester Strategy for 2013-2020.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Cabinet Member for Strategic Communities

Date of Meeting: 22nd July 2013
Report of: Partnerships Manager
Subject/Title: Policy for the Allocation of Grants
Portfolio Holder: Councillor D Brown

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 To determine the award of Community Grants to Voluntary and Community Organisations which meet the criteria approved by Cheshire East Council. The Council recognises the valuable input that the Voluntary and Community Sector brings to the quality of life in the community. Funding is focussed on those organisations that complement the aims and objectives of the Corporate Plan.
- 1.2 The report covers the second round of grants for 2013/14 and makes recommendations totalling £15,542 in line with Cheshire East Council's Policy for the Allocation of Grants.

2.0 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 That the following Community Grants be awarded/declined/deferred as indicated:

Events

Congleton Musical Theatre	Awarded £250
Disley Parish Plan Implementation Group	Awarded £250
Macclesfield Art Group	Awarded £210
Open Space, Congleton Creates	Awarded £250
Poynton Jemmers North West Morris Dancers	Awarded £250
Willaston Fete Committee	Declined

Activities

Community Spirit	Declined
Crewe Amateur Boxing Club	Awarded £350
Haslington Methodist Church, Open Door Project	Awarded £250
Matrix Cheer Squad	Awarded £300
Middlewich Community Church Archers	Awarded £250
Must See Musicals	Awarded £500
Poynton Parish Plan Group	Deferred
Triton Hockey Club	Awarded £400

Facilities

38 th South West Cheshire Scouts	Awarded £1,000
Age UK Cheshire East	Deferred
Alsager Gardens Association	Deferred
Bollington Arts Centre	Awarded £2,000
Bollington Initiative Trust	Declined
Chelford Parish Village Hall	Awarded £1,750
Community Performance Arts Centre	Declined
Go-lo Macclesfield	Withdrawn by group
Good Champions Bowling Club	Declined
Middlewich Cricket Club	Awarded £1,500
New Life Church	Declined
Prestbury Tennis Club	Deferred
Sandbach Park Bowling Club	Awarded £1,000
The Wingate Special Children's Trust	Awarded £2,000
Via Dance	Declined
Weston Parish Church	Awarded £1,282
Wilmslow Bowling Club	Awarded £1,750

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations (details of Grants)

3.1 Events:

Congleton Musical Theatre-

Total Cost of Project - £19,219 Amount Requested - £250

Congleton Musical Theatre requires funding towards stage lighting and a sound system for their annual show. Funding has also been requested from the Town Council. It is recommended that they are awarded £250.

Disley Parish Plan Implementation Group-

Total Cost of Project - £1,055 Amount Requested - £250

Disley Parish Plan Implementation Group requires funding towards their village festival which is due to take place at the end of August. They are contributing themselves and have other contributions. It is recommended that they are awarded £250.

Macclesfield Art Group-

Total Cost of Project - £615 Amount Requested - £250

Macclesfield Art Group requires funding towards their annual art exhibition. Part of their project costs are for room hire and for refreshments, which cannot be funded, as stated in the grant guidelines. It is recommended that they are awarded £210 towards the remaining costs of printing, advertising and sundry consumables.

Open Space, Congleton Creates -

Total Cost of Project - £12,700 Amount Requested - £250

Open Space, Congleton Creates require funding towards the publicity of their 3 day arts festival in September. Lots of other contributions are being made, including one from themselves. It is recommended that they are awarded £250.

Poynton Jemmers North West Morris Dancers -

Total Cost of Project - £500 Amount Requested - £250

Poynton Jemmers require funding towards holding a 'Meet the Team' awareness raising and recruitment event. Money is required for display boards and publicity. It is recommended that they are awarded £250 and seek support from the Town Council.

Willaston Fete Committee -

Total Cost of Project - £1,360 Amount Requested - £250

Willaston Village Fete is due to take place on 13th July which is before grants decisions have been confirmed. As retrospective funding cannot be awarded it is recommended that the application is declined.

Activities:

Community Spirit-

Total Cost of Project - £480 Amount Requested - £480

Community Spirit is requesting funding to enable 12 local young people to attend a MMU football academy. Community Spirit received funding in April 2013 and is therefore not eligible to receive more funding from the community grant scheme within this financial year. It is recommended that the application is declined.

Crewe Amateur Boxing Club-

Total Cost of Project - £599 Amount Requested - £500

Crewe Amateur Boxing Club is requesting funding towards the purchase of a serviceable treadmill for use within the club for training. They are making a small contribution themselves but do not have contributions from elsewhere it is recommended that they are awarded £350.

Haslington Methodist Church, Open Door Project-

Total Cost of Project - £500 Amount Requested - £500

The Open Door Project at Haslington Methodist Church has seen their workload treble since CAB lost funding to support Oakhanger/Haslington/Crewe Green. Due to increased workload the project now requires another laptop and boards to advertise when they are in session. The group have little funds to contribute to the project themselves, and do not have contributions from elsewhere. It is recommended that they are awarded £250 and seek assistance from the Parish Council or other funding organisations.

Matrix Cheer Squad-

Total Cost of Project - £600 Amount Requested - £500

Matrix Cheer Squad has recently introduced a new Polish team with a Polish coach. Funding is required for costume items for this team and for the training of the new coach with basic coaching skills, first aid and safeguarding. They are making a small contribution themselves. It is recommended that they are awarded £300 towards the coach training costs and that once basic skills are achieved, groups become mixed to encourage social integration.

Middlewich Community Church Archers-

Total Cost of Project - £500 Amount Requested - £500

Middlewich Community Church Archers require funding to purchase a new 'boss' and various other equipment to support the increased numbers at the club. The club are not contributing themselves but have little reserves. No applications have

been made elsewhere. It is recommended that they are awarded £250 and also seek assistance from other funding organisations.

Must See Musicals-

Total Cost of Project - £9,279 Amount Requested - £500

Must See Musicals require funding towards the purchase of sound and lighting equipment for their annual show. By purchasing the equipment the group will save on hire costs each time they perform which will increase sustainability. They have contributions from elsewhere. It is recommended that they are awarded £500.

Poynton Parish Plan Group-

Total Cost of Project - £700 Amount Requested - £500

Poynton Parish Plan Group has requested funding for on-going sports activities within the Poynton area. Events will be held to showcase and promote services of local sports groups. It is recommended that the application is deferred pending further information upon the groups that will be involved with the project and how closely the project is linked with the work of the Town Council.

Triton Hockey Club-

Total Cost of Project - £1,131 Amount Requested - £500

Triton Hockey club wish to introduce a 4th men's team for those juniors starting to make the transition into senior hockey. In order to start the new team, they need to purchase a new goalkeepers kit. They are contributing over half of the cost themselves, and have not applied elsewhere. It is recommended that they are awarded £400 and seek assistance from Alsager Town Council.

Facilities:

38th South West Cheshire Scouts-

Total Cost of Project - £1,725 Amount Requested - £1,500

38th South West Cheshire Scout Group requires funding in order to refurbish their kitchen which is very outdated and now unsuitable. Approximately 110 members use the building, making the need for the refurbishment a priority. A small contribution is being made by the group but funding has not been sought from elsewhere. It is recommended that they are awarded £1,000 and seek assistance from the Town Council, fund raising or from their reserves.

Age UK Cheshire East-

Total Cost of Project - £4,680 Amount Requested - £3,000

Age UK CE is requesting funding to refurbish, increase accessibility and decorate the toilet area in their new centre based in Congleton. They are contributing themselves, but have not applied elsewhere. The group have considerable reserves. It is recommended that the application is deferred pending information regarding their current contract with Cheshire East.

Alsager Gardens Association-

Total Cost of Project - £8,019 Amount Requested - £3,000

Alsager Gardens Association is requesting funding for a new boundary fence due to the erosion of the existing fence, which has started to collapse into the stream. This has raised safety concerns at the site and the new fence is urgently needed. The group are contributing themselves as well as seeking contributions from the Town Council and other grant sources. It is recommended that the application is

deferred pending information upon the allotment site transfer conditions to Alsager Town Council.

Bollington Arts Centre-

Total Cost of Project - £6,883 Amount Requested - £3,000

Bollington Arts Centre requires funding to purchase a new set of acoustic curtains for their auditorium. Bollington Arts centre currently occupies an Edwardian building with very large windows which are currently covered by elderly blackout curtains. New acoustic curtains will also include a backdrop for the platform which will help to enhance acoustics. The group are contributing themselves and have a small donation. They have some reserves but made quite a large loss last year. It is recommended that they are awarded £2,000 and apply to the town council and other funding organisations.

Bollington Initiative Trust -

Total Cost of Project - £12,444 Amount Requested - £3,000

Bollington Initiative Trust is working with a number of partners to renovate a disused toilet block into a green deal showroom which will enable the promotion of the green deal to local residents. The project is to promote the green deal and will not create community activity. It is recommended that the application is declined and they seek funding available for green deal promotions.

Chelford Parish Village Hall -

Total Cost of Project - £5,279 Amount Requested - £3,000

Chelford Village Hall requires funding to replace the windows and increase the energy efficiency of the hall that is used by a large variety of people and groups. They are contributing the rest of the costs themselves, but have not applied elsewhere it is recommended that they are awarded £1,750 and apply to the parish council/ other funding organisations.

Community Performance Arts Centre -

Total Cost of Project - £50,000 Amount Requested - £3,000

This group wish to transform a warehouse into a community hub in Congleton, mainly for community arts activities. The application was deferred from April pending further information upon other funding sources towards the project. Since the decision, the group have set up a Community Arts Space outside of Cheshire East and this application is no longer relevant. It is recommended that the application is declined.

Go-lo Macclesfield -

Total Cost of Project - £12,444 Amount Requested - £3,000

Go-lo Macclesfield are working in partnership with Bollington Initiative trust to renovate a disused toilet block into a green deal show room. This application was deferred from April pending further details; however it has since been withdrawn by the group.

Good Champions Bowling Club -

Total Cost of Project - £40,000 Amount Requested - £3,000

Good Champions are in the process of rebuilding their pavilion and have encountered delays. Funding will help complete long ongoing project. Several other contributions have been made. It is recommended that the application is declined due to significant funding already being given for this project by the predecessor authority of Congleton Borough Council.

Middlewich Cricket Club -

Total Cost of Project - £4,000 Amount Requested - £3,000

Middlewich Cricket Club are requesting grant funding towards a replacement outfield mower due to the current one be worn out and unreliable. The group are contributing themselves and do have reserves but made a small loss last year. It is recommended that they are awarded £1,500 and seek assistance from other funding organisations.

New Life Church -

Total Cost of Project - £18,000 Amount Requested - £3,000

New Life Church is requesting funding to refurbish a 2nd set of toilets. Funding was granted in 2012 for the refurbishment of the 1st set of toilets. Applications are being made elsewhere and they are contributing themselves however, as the church received funding for the refurbishment of toilets last year, and have had a substantial amount of funding in the past, it is recommended that the application is declined.

Prestbury Tennis Club -

Total Cost of Project - £12,000 Amount Requested - £3,000

Prestbury Tennis Club is requesting funding to resurface their kid zone area which is currently rough tarmac, with Astroturf. This would mean it can be used in all weather conditions. The group are contributing the remainder of costs themselves and do have considerable reserves. It is recommended that the application is deferred pending further information upon the use of the reserves.

Sandbach Park Bowling Club -

Total Cost of Project - £2,000 Amount Requested - £1,000

Sandbach Park Bowling Club requires funding to install an electronically powered awning on the front of the pavilion. Their pavilion is not big enough to accommodate both home and away team and by having an awning, it will provide additional shelter. The group have a contribution from the Town Council as well as making a contribution themselves. It is recommended that they are awarded £1,000.

The Wingate Special Children's Trust -

Total Cost of Project - £6,316 Amount Requested - £3,000

The Wingate Special Children's Trust is requesting funding towards converting what is currently a storage area into a calming sensory area for children and young adults that use the centre with both physical and learning disabilities. They are contributing the rest of the funds themselves. The group were awarded £3,000 in 2012. It is recommended that they are awarded £2,000 and seek assistance from the Parish Council/other funding sources.

Via Dance -

Total Cost of Project - £3,083 Amount Requested - £2,223

Via Dance require funding to refurbish a room to accommodate additional dance classes which are currently oversubscribed. Via Dance applied for and received funding for the same purpose in July 2012. Repeat funding cannot be awarded, as stated in the guidelines. It is recommended that the application is declined.

Weston Parish Church -

Total Cost of Project - £2,564 Amount Requested - £1,282

Weston Parish Church wishes to replace the boiler in their church hall due to the current boiler being old, unreliable and costly to run. Varied groups use the hall such as mums and tots and pensioners groups. The church does not have contributions from elsewhere but will be contributing the remainder of the costs themselves. It is recommended that they are awarded £1282.

Wilmslow Bowling Club -

Total Cost of Project - £7,044 Amount Requested - £3,000

Wilmslow Bowling Club requires funding to replace rotting wooden window frames, doors and panels with upvc of their clubhouse. This will stop the leaks they are currently experiencing and improve the appearance of the clubhouse. The club are making a contribution and have support from Manchester Airport. It is recommended that they are awarded £1,750 and seek support from the Town Council.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 The recommendations relate to all wards within Cheshire East

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 All Ward members

6.0 Policy Implications (including carbon reduction and health)

- 6.1 All of the applications contained in this report have been considered in the light of the Council's Policy for the Allocation of Grants, and the recommendations on each one conform to that Policy.

7.0 Financial Implications (authorised by Director of Finance and Business Services)

- 7.1 All of the proposed grants can be funded from within existing budgets approved as part of the Council's Budget for 2013/14

8.0 Legal Implications (authorised by Borough Solicitor)

- 8.1 In awarding grants, the Council must ensure that in each case it has the legal power to fund the proposed scheme. In all cases there is a condition requiring a report back to the Council on the expenditure of the grant. Consideration should also be given in each case to the imposition of other appropriate conditions.

The Council's legal power to award these grants is contained in area specific statutes and by exercising its general power of competence in section 1 of the Localism Act 2011. The Council's decision to award a grant is subject to judicial review and this means that it must satisfy public law principles, be free from bias and not be made for improper purposes or motives. It should take into account all relevant considerations and not be otherwise irrational. In awarding or declining to award a grant the Council should also have regard to

its public sector equality duties. The existence of a grant policy with a clear statement of the criteria that the Council will apply is essential if the Council is to defend a challenge that its decision making has not been transparent or has been improper.

9.0 Risk Management Implications

- 9.1 The risk of not agreeing an approach to funding the community and voluntary sector is that some organisations may be unable to continue their activities, resulting in a loss of community benefit. This is a particular issue during an economic downturn when other funding sources may not be available.

10.0 Background and Options

- 10.1 Applications received and allocated in accordance with Cheshire East Council's Policy for the Allocation of Community Grants.

11.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Lynsey Cooper
Designation: Partnerships Officer
Tel No: 01270 685809
Email: lynsey.cooper@cheshireeast.gov.uk

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Cabinet: Strategic Communities Portfolio Holder Meeting

Date of Meeting:	22 July 2013
Report of:	Jez Goodman
Subject/Title:	Response to Greater Manchester 2013-20 Strategy
Portfolio Holder:	David Brown

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The Combined Greater Manchester Authority recently launched a consultation on the Greater Manchester Strategy for 2013-20. The Strategy set out what Greater Manchester will do to achieve economic growth and fulfil its economic potential. The consultation is open until 17 June.
- 1.2 Cheshire East Council's response to this consultation has been agreed at Director level, but requires Portfolio Holder sign-off as well.
- 1.3 A key point made in the Cheshire East response is that it is important for the Strategy to acknowledge Greater Manchester's geographical neighbours, their relevance to the Strategy and the contributions they can make towards realising the Strategy's aspirations. (The Strategy currently makes no reference to the Cheshire & Warrington Authorities, or to Merseyside or Lancashire.) In Cheshire East's case, there are particularly strong economic linkages and shared interests with Greater Manchester, as shown by data on commuting flows, migration flows, industrial composition and research/ HE activity. The response also emphasises the two-way nature of the relationship - Greater Manchester supports Cheshire East's economy, as well as vice-versa – and the role that transport networks and infrastructure can play in supporting both areas' economies.
- 1.4 Other points in the Cheshire East response relate to: the constraints on the support that Greater Manchester public sector partners can offer to businesses and investors; increasing the Strategy's focus on climate change and explicitly acknowledging the relationship between climate change and economic growth; the key export markets the Strategy identifies; the need for additional information about some of the proposed performance targets; and the use of up-to-date statistics.
- 1.5 As well as producing its own response, Cheshire East has drafted a joint submission on behalf of Cheshire & Warrington sub-regional partners. This joint response has already been shared with Directors at

the three Authorities, and with the Cheshire & Warrington LEP and the sub-regional Programme Office.

2.0 Decision Requested

- 2.1 That the Portfolio Holder approves the Cheshire East response to the Greater Manchester 2013-20 Strategy.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 To ensure that the Strategy takes more account of the views and interests of Cheshire East. To ensure that Greater Manchester partners recognise the key role that Cheshire East can play in helping to realise Greater Manchester's ambitions.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 No direct impact on Cheshire East Wards. However, Cheshire East's comments about economic linkages with Greater Manchester are of most relevance to the northern parts of the Borough, i.e. those that are close to Greater Manchester. Similarly, the Strategy is likely to have much more impact on the Borough's northern Wards than on southern Wards.

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Not applicable.

6.0 Policy Implications

- 6.1 None.

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 None.

8.0 Legal Implications

- 8.1 Notwithstanding any other legal power available to the Council to respond to the consultation on the Greater Manchester Strategy, Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 provides such a power.

9.0 Risk Management

- 9.1 No risk management issues.

10.0 Background and Options

- 10.1 Background: The Combined Greater Manchester Authority recently launched a consultation on the Greater Manchester Strategy for 2013-20 (published at http://www.agma.gov.uk/gmca/gms_2013/index.html). The Strategy's vision is

to “secure long-term economic growth and enable the city region to fulfil its economic potential, whilst ensuring that our residents are able to contribute to and share in that prosperity.” The consultation is open until 17 June. The Strategy and other consultation papers are available from the above web page, or can be provided on request. The Cheshire East draft response (3-4 sides of A4) can also be provided on request.

- 10.2 Options: The Portfolio Holder is invited to approve the existing draft response, or to request further changes.

11.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name:	>	Jez Goodman
Designation:	>	Economic Development & Regeneration Manager
Tel No:	>	01270 685906
Email:	>	jez.goodman@cheshireeast.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Greater Manchester 2013-20 Strategy
(http://www.agma.gov.uk/gmca/gms_2013/index.html):
Response from Cheshire East Council

Opening statement: the significance of Cheshire East to the Greater Manchester Strategy

As a Greater Manchester Combined Authority/ AGMA document, the Strategy rightly focuses on the administrative area of Greater Manchester. However, we feel it is important to acknowledge Greater Manchester's geographical neighbours, their relevance to the Strategy and the contributions they can make towards realising the Strategy's aspirations. (We note that the Strategy currently makes no reference to "Cheshire" or "Cheshire East", to the other two Cheshire & Warrington authorities, or to Merseyside or Lancashire.)

Of all these neighbours, Cheshire East has particularly strong economic links with Greater Manchester. For example, Census data show that, in 2001, 23,800 of Greater Manchester's inward commuters came from Cheshire East – almost double the number travelling into Greater Manchester from any other unitary or district authority in the North West. The data also indicate that Cheshire East supplied 7,200 of Greater Manchester's professional and managerial workers – more than Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside or Wigan.

Housing market linkages are similarly strong: of all the net migration flows between Cheshire East and other local authorities during 2000-2008, the three largest involved Stockport (a net inflow into Cheshire East of more than 4,500 migrants), Manchester (over 1,500) and Trafford (1,500).

Cheshire East therefore has a key role to play in improving Greater Manchester's economic prosperity and social wellbeing. However, the relationship is not one way and we feel the Strategy should recognise this: it is not simply a case of Cheshire East providing good quality housing for professional and managerial people working in Greater Manchester. For example, Greater Manchester's outward commuters are more likely to travel to Cheshire East (16,600 did in 2001) than to any other unitary or district authority in the region. Hence Greater Manchester is an important factor in Cheshire East's current and future economic success.

In addition, Cheshire East and Greater Manchester share strengths in particular industries and sectors. For example, the 2009 Manchester Independent Economic Review highlighted the growth of creative, digital and media sector businesses and employment around Manchester, Trafford, Stockport and the former Macclesfield District area.

HE, research and advanced scientific activities are another important bond between Greater Manchester and Cheshire East. Jodrell Bank's Centre for Astrophysics has sites in both central Manchester and Cheshire East. Waters Corporation – currently building its new global mass spectrometry HQ in Wilmslow - has collaborated closely with the University of Manchester (and formerly UMIST) over the last four decades. Another of Greater Manchester's universities, MMU, has a campus in Crewe.

Given these strong demographic and socioeconomic connections, there is a clear need to improve transport links between Cheshire East and Greater Manchester, so that both areas can make best use of their residents' skills and their businesses' industrial strengths, and so they can support each other's economies more effectively.

Making best use of scarce resources

As the 2013-20 Strategy recognises, there are limits on public sector organisations' budgets, and future spending cuts will constrain services further. We welcome Greater Manchester's proposal to mitigate the impact of these financial constraints through initiatives to help residents into work, improve their skills, reduce unplanned admissions to hospitals and so on.

These financial constraints – together with the finite nature of other resources, such as housing and employment land – also place a limit on the support that Greater Manchester public sector partners can offer to businesses and investors. A further constraint is the need to consider the interests of local residents, community groups and visitors, as well as those of businesses and investors: in some cases, these interests may coincide, but in others they will conflict.

These constraints need to be acknowledged explicitly, so that businesses and investors have a clear understanding of what Greater Manchester partners can offer - and we feel that some of the Strategy's statements about business and investor support should be reworded accordingly. One example is the statement on page 13 that "To be competitive, Greater Manchester must ensure that land is available in locations that are attractive to the market. Failure to provide appropriate sites in areas where the market wants to invest, both in housing and employment uses, risks GM losing development and investment to other areas."

More generally, both the public and private sectors need to make best use of scarce resources – and in doing so, they can help to achieve the greater competitiveness that page 13 also (rightly) aspires to.

Economic and social linkages with Cheshire East and other neighbours

As noted in our opening statement, the Strategy would benefit from greater recognition of the role that adjacent areas, particularly Cheshire East, can play in strengthening Greater Manchester's economy and in improving the social wellbeing of the people who live in Greater Manchester and neighbouring areas. Similarly, it should recognise the role that Greater Manchester can play in strengthening the economies and social wellbeing of Cheshire East and other neighbours.

Cheshire East is a popular residential location of choice for many of those who work in Greater Manchester (and vice-versa). Many northern parts of Cheshire East function as part of the same labour market and as part of the same sub-regional economy as parts of Greater Manchester. For example, Census data show that, in 2001, 23,800 of Greater Manchester's inward commuters were Cheshire East residents: this was almost double the number travelling into Greater Manchester from any other North West district or unitary authority (Warrington accounted for the next largest inflow: 12,800). Of those people who worked in Greater Manchester and

were in one of the two highest NS-SeC categories (“Large employers and higher managerial occupations” and “Higher professional occupations”), 7,200 lived in Cheshire East: on this measure, Cheshire East is the region’s sixth largest contributor to Greater Manchester’s high-skill employment (after Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Stockport and Trafford).

Besides this, the Census data showed that, as of 2001, Greater Manchester’s outward commuters were more likely to work in Cheshire East (16,600 did) than in any other North West district or unitary authority.¹

Housing market linkages are similarly strong: of all the net migration flows between Cheshire East and other local authorities during 2000-2008, the three largest were to Stockport (a net inflow into Cheshire East of more than 4,500 migrants), Manchester (net inflow of over 1,500) and Trafford (net inflow of 1,500).² The 2010 Cheshire East Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)³ provides even more recent evidence of these links: it found that, of those households that had moved into Cheshire East during the previous five years, 30% had relocated from Greater Manchester. For Cheshire East’s northern towns, these housing market linkages are particularly strong: for example, of all those Disley households that had moved during 2005-10, 44% had come from Greater Manchester. Even in towns that are further south, such as Macclesfield and Middlewich, in-migration from Greater Manchester accounts for about one in ten recent (2005-10) home moves.

Cheshire East and Greater Manchester share strengths in particular industries and sectors – and it is likely that these involve some significant supply chain linkages. For example, the 2009 Manchester Independent Economic Review (MIER) noted that knowledge-intensive employment is relatively concentrated (and growing) in both the southern part of Greater Manchester and in Warrington/ North Cheshire, with knowledge-intensive manufacturing employment being particularly strong in Macclesfield and its neighbour Stockport (as well as Oldham and Tameside). The MIER also highlighted the growth of creative, digital and media sector businesses and employment around Manchester, Trafford, Stockport and the former Macclesfield district.

HE, research and advanced scientific activities are another important bond between Greater Manchester and Cheshire East. Jodrell Bank is part of University of Manchester and its Centre for Astrophysics has sites in both Cheshire East (the Jodrell Bank Observatory) and central Manchester. Waters Corporation – currently building its new global mass spectrometry HQ in Wilmslow - has collaborated closely with the University of Manchester (and formerly UMIST) over the last four decades. Another of Greater Manchester’s universities, MMU, has a campus in Crewe.

Consequently, there are particular opportunities for Greater Manchester in Cheshire East: for example, providing employment land in locations that will benefit Greater Manchester’s economy and its residents, and in creating places where people want to live by delivering high quality housing. Similarly, Greater Manchester can provide

¹ Source for all the commuting flows statistics quoted above: 2001 Census. ONS Crown Copyright.

² Source: ONS National Health Service Central Register Migration data for July 2000 to June 2008 (reported in the Cheshire East 2010 SHMA, September 2010).

³ Cheshire East 2010 SHMA, September 2010.

employment and housing land in locations that benefit Cheshire East residents who work in Greater Manchester, as well as those Greater Manchester residents who work in Cheshire East.

Given these strong socioeconomic connections, there is a clear need to improve transport links between Cheshire East and Greater Manchester, so that both areas can support and improve each other's economies and their residents' well-being more effectively. In particular, there are benefits in looking outside of the Greater Manchester administrative boundary when developing transport schemes – and the Strategy should recognise this. For example, cross-boundary public transport smart-ticketing would enable Cheshire East residents to access the Greater Manchester jobs market more easily; conversely, it would assist the large numbers of Greater Manchester residents who have found work in Cheshire East.

Increasing the focus on climate change

We welcome the Strategy's frequent references to the low carbon economy, and to the opportunities that the low carbon sector presents. We agree that the low carbon sector has a key role to play in stimulating economic growth. We also welcome the aspiration on page 9 that "We will be known for...our low carbon economy and our commitment to sustainable development."

However, there are fewer references to climate change per se: we feel that these references need to be strengthened, by emphasising the relationship between economic growth, the low carbon sector and climate change. In particular, we believe the Strategy should explicitly acknowledge the relationship between economic growth and climate change, and the challenge of ensuring that the scale and nature of economic growth does not compromise climate change targets. We feel it should also acknowledge the role of the low carbon sector in helping to slow the rate of climate change: the current wording alludes to this role, but it should be stated explicitly.

The Strategy needs to add qualifications to statements such as those on page 13 (quoted earlier), so it is clear how businesses, investors and the economic prosperity can be supported without jeopardising the page 9 aspirations or climate change objectives.

We also feel that some of the current references to climate change focus on adaptation to climate change, rather than on slowing down climate change. For example, page 7 refers to the "failure to adapt" and to "the extreme weather events that are now unavoidable". It is right to acknowledge that some climate change has occurred and that some future change will occur (as page 7 does), but we think the Strategy should also highlight the fact that there is much that can be done to slow the pace of change.

We welcome the inclusion of a carbon emissions target (first bullet point on page 22, which is referred to again in the performance measures on page 36). However, given that the base year for this target is far in the past (1990), the Strategy needs to include information on progress to date towards this target. Without this information, it is difficult to assess the scale of the challenge Greater Manchester faces in achieving its target, or the likelihood that it can. (Page 36 does, of course, refer to an

aspiration that, by 2020, Greater Manchester will have “doubled the rate of reduction of [its] carbon emissions so that annual direct emissions are less than 11,000kt of CO₂”, but it is not possible to infer what current emissions levels are from this information alone.)

Key export markets

The BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) are large and growing economies, with China particularly renowned for its fast economic growth rate. Given this, it is clear why some of the BRICS, along with other large economies that are already major trading partners for the UK (the US and Europe) are identified as priority markets for Greater Manchester’s exporters (page 21 of the Strategy). But the rationale for including the United Arab Emirates (UAE) is less clear.

It is likely that any trade with the UAE will pose greater risks than trade with larger economies such as the BRICS. In particular, the smaller an export market is, the fewer the numbers of exporters, importers and industries that are likely to be involved, and the greater the risk that the market will not generate the hoped-for export sales. For example, if Greater Manchester-UAE trade relies heavily on contracts with a single UAE client, a change in that client’s fortunes or its strategy could result in these contracts not being renewed.

In addition, if there are relatively few organisations and industries involved in the Greater Manchester-UAE trade, then there is likely to be more potential for such trade to be developed by the industries or the individual companies concerned, rather than through public sector intervention.

Given this, we believe that the Strategy should justify its identification of the UAE as a priority market.

Performance targets

It is difficult to comment on the feasibility of the performance targets (page 36) because of the absence in many (but not all) cases of base year figures, past trends and data for the geographical area that the Strategy target seeks to match or overtake (and, more generally, the lack of information about the methodology used for setting the targets).

For example, it is difficult to comment on the feasibility of the Greater Manchester FTE jobs share target (4.3%) without knowing what the current share is. Similarly, it is difficult to judge what chance Greater Manchester has of matching SE England’s growth rate without knowing what the base year SE England rate is (and what time period it has been averaged over). Likewise, it is not stated how big the Level 2 qualifications gap between Greater Manchester and the UK is at present, so it is hard to assess how difficult it might be to close that gap by 2020. With median salary levels, there is clearly an assumption that UK earnings will increase (which is reasonable enough), but it is difficult to assess the target without knowing what this assumed UK growth is. Another target is for 35% of all peak-time journeys to avoid using private cars, but we cannot assess the scale of this task without knowing what the base year percentage share is. It would be useful if the Strategy included these missing details.

As implied by our comments on the climate change, we feel that base year figures (or figures showing progress to date) should be quoted for a recent year, so that it is clear what the scale of the challenge is. The Strategy should also make it clear what the base year is for each measure: i.e. it should include base year dates, not just base year statistics.

Two other (minor) points on the performance targets:

- It looks like “number of children” (the “early years” target) should be “% of children”.
- We think “accelerated” (the opening word in the business start-up/ survival target text) should say “increased”.

Updating key statistics

We appreciate that there is a limit on how frequently Greater Manchester can or should update the statistics quoted in the Strategy. However, it is worth updating the 2012 and 2013 GDP figures (last paragraph of page 3) in the wake of the 2013 Budget (Office for Budget Responsibility) forecasts and the Office for National Statistics’ latest GDP estimates (http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_309646.pdf), given that the ONS GDP figures now suggest 0.3% growth (not 0.1% contraction) in 2012.