

ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MANCHESTER AUTHORITIES

DECISIONS MADE BY THE AGMA EXECUTIVE BOARD AT ITS MEETING ON 18 DECEMBER 2009 AT BURY TOWN HALL

Decisions published on 22 December 2009 and will come into force from 4 January 2010 subject to Call-in, except for any urgent decisions.

The process for call in of decisions is set out as an Appendix to this note, extracted from AGMA's constitution. The address for the purposes of the schedule is that of the AGMA Secretary, c/o Wigan Investment Centre, Waterside Drive, off Swan Meadow Road, Wigan WN3 5BA; or by contacting j.gaskell@agma.gov.uk.

The reports detailed in this note can be accessed at the AGMA website via the following link:-

http://www.agma.gov.uk/executive_board/executive_board_meeting_papers/index.html

1 THE MANCHESTER STATUTORY CITY REGION PILOT

The Executive Board agreed, unanimously, to endorse the preliminary agreement which had been reached between the Government and the Board. The agreement was then signed by the Chair of the Executive Board, Councillor Peter Smith, and the Minister for the North West, Phil Woolas.

2. CITY REGION GOVERNANCE

The Executive Board considered a further report on the issue of City Region Governance. The report provided a response to the Executive Board's decision on 29 November to request a further report on a detailed scheme for future AGMA governance, including transport. The report was for consideration and approval of a draft detailed scheme, for consultation purposes, as part of a review of governance under the Local Transport Act, 2008 and the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act, 2009.

In presenting the report Howard Bernstein also explained that:-

- (a) resolution 4 in the report would be amended to include the words 'work to facilitate' after 'authorise officers to commission'. This was in order to make it clear that any final scheme could only be prepared and published following the review and consultation.
- (b) Paragraph 24(g) in the report and paragraph 33 of Appendix 2 (the draft scheme) would be amended so that the 3rd bullet point in the list of functions to be referred for recommendation to the proposed new Joint Committee would read "major and strategic transport policies".

- (c) as far as the proposed Scrutiny arrangements in paragraph 24 (j) were concerned it was envisaged that the scrutiny process would operate at a higher level in relation to Greater Manchester wide and major strategic issues, such as those referred for recommendation to the proposed new Joint Committee for Transport.

On behalf of Trafford Council, Councillor Colledge drew the Board's attention to a statement that had been submitted to the Chair. This would be circulated to all Board members. The statement, and accompanying report to Trafford's Executive, set out the decision made on this issue by Trafford's Executive at its meeting on 15th December and the key issues of concern that would need to be addressed during the consultation process to the satisfaction of Trafford's Executive.

The Leader of Stockport Council, Councillor Goddard, made it clear that his vote on this issue did not constitute his Council's agreement to participate in the preparation of a scheme under section 109 of the 2009 Act.

The Executive Board then agreed

- 1 to note the progress on the City Region Pilot;
- 2 that the work which had been undertaken so far on the AGMA/GMITA governance review supported the establishment of a Combined Authority on the basis set out in the report as this would be likely to improve:
 - (a) the exercise of statutory functions related to economic development, regeneration and transport in the area
 - (b) the effectiveness and efficiency of transport in the area
 - (c) economic conditions in the area

On this resolution (number 2 above) Councillor Goddard recorded his abstention.

3. to approve the draft scheme in the report as a basis for consultation with district councils, GMITA and other stakeholders as part of a review under the Local Transport Act, 2008 and the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act, 2009;
4. to authorise officers to commission work to facilitate the preparation of any final scheme including a business case examining in detail the relative benefits of a Combined Authority compared to other options and including the costs associated with the proposals;
5. to note that a further report would be submitted to the Executive Board in February with the results of the consultation and the outcome of further work undertaken in relation to the review and;

6. to agree that the costs involved in undertaking the review and preparation of any scheme should be shared between the authorities in proportion to their populations as provided for in the AGMA Constitution.

3. LARGE DOMESTIC BUSINESSES

The Executive Board considered a report and presentation from John Early, Chair of the Business Leadership Council and Martin Douglas, a member of the Council and General Manager (UK and Ireland) at Cargill PLC. This was a study of the performance of Greater Manchester as a business environment for "large domestic" businesses, a comparison with competitive alternative locations and identification of areas of competitive advantages or weaknesses.

The report and presentation contained 14 recommendations for the Executive Board to consider. The Board agreed that each of these recommendations should be referred to the appropriate Commission and that a combined proposed response to the report from the Executive Board be considered at its meeting on 26 February 2010.

4. FUTURE JOBS FUND – GREATER MANCHESTER PROGRAMME

The Board considered a progress report on The AGMA Future Jobs Fund which was now 'live'. The board agreed to

1. Note the immense progress made to date by all involved
2. Re-affirm their commitments to the agreed number of jobs pledged, and to
3. convert these commitments to vacancies as an urgent priority

5. REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE HEALTH COMMISSION ON HEALTHY WEIGHT

The board considered a report which set out the work to date of the Commission on this issue and agreed to

1. Note the development of a number of proposals for future work on this issue and commit to receiving a further update on them from the GM Health Commission
2. Endorse the adoption of the NW Healthy Catering Guidelines to inform AGMA sponsored events and to promote these within all boroughs in Greater Manchester.

6. HEALTH COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

The Board considered and agreed the proposed work programme for the Commission for 2010. They also agreed that only those items related to the

Commission's own Organization Development Implementation Plan would be exempt from the process of potential referral back to the Executive Board

7. PLANNING & HOUSING COMMISSION WORK PROGRAMME

The Board considered and agreed the proposed work programme for the Commission for 2010. No items were identified which would be exempt from the process of potential referral back to the Executive Board

8. GREATER MANCHESTER HOUSING STRATEGY

The board considered and agreed a Greater Manchester Housing Strategy for ratification by individual Districts in early 2010.

9. AGMA UNIT BUDGETS 2010/11

The board considered a report from the AGMA Treasurer on AGMA Unit budgets for 2010/11. All Units who responded had proposed a cash standstill budget based on 2009/10 levels. However in line with agreements reached in November 2008 the Executive Board agreed an increase in line with inflation for the annual grant to the Halle Concerts Society. It was noted that as yet the Treasurer had not received a detailed budget proposal for the Specialist Trading Standards Unit for 2010/11.

10. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE COMMISSION FOR THE NEW ECONOMY LIMITED

The Board agreed an addendum to the Minutes of the Executive Board meeting held on 30 October 2009 in order to record that the three resolutions at the AGM of The Commission For The New Economy Limited had been agreed unanimously.

AGMA Secretariat, Wigan Investment Centre Wigan. WN3 5BA Tel: 01942 705725
E-mail: info@agma.gov.uk

Appendix

EXTRACT FROM SCHEDULE 4 OF NEW AGMA CONSTITUTION

- 5.1 Members of the scrutiny pool appointed under these arrangements will have the power to call in any decision of the Board.
- 5.2 When a decision is made by the Board the decision shall be published, including where possible by electronic means, and shall be available from the address specified in Paragraph 24.1 of this operating agreement normally within 2 days of being made. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary to send electronic copies of the records of all such decisions to all members of the pool within the same timescale.
- 5.3 That notice will bear the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of 5 working days after the publication of the decision, unless 5 members the scrutiny pool object to it and call it in.
- 5.4 During that period, the Secretary shall call-in a decision for scrutiny by a joint meeting of pool members if so requested by any five members from the pool, and shall then notify members of the Board of the call-in. The Secretary shall call a joint meeting of pool members on such date as he/she may determine, where possible after consultation with the Chair of the pool, and in any case within 15 working days of the decision to call-in.
- 5.5 If, having considered the decision, the joint meeting of pool members is still concerned about it, then it may refer it back to the Board for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns. If referred to the Board they shall then reconsider within a further 15 working days, amending the decision or not, before adopting a final decision.
- 5.6 The call-in procedure set out above shall not apply where the decision being taken by the Board is urgent. A decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the call in process would seriously prejudice the Board's or the public's or an individual's interests. The record of the decision, and notice by which it is made public shall state whether in the opinion of the decision making person or body, the decision is an urgent one, and therefore not subject to call-in. The Board must agree both that the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances and to it being treated as a matter of urgency.