An independent public engagement programme, by and for citizens and civil society of Greater Manchester
Greater Manchester (GM) is at an important moment of change in matters of government. ‘Devo Manc’ devolution deals have been done and structural changes, including an elected metro-mayor, are reshaping who decides what and how for the 2.8 million people in GM.

What kind of city-region, with its ten constituent local council areas, do citizens want to build? Alarmingly, many people across GM are unaware of the changes already underway and how their lives might be affected; the turnout for the mayoral election on 4th May will reflect this.

GM requires official priorities, strategies and policies, mechanisms for decision-making, scrutiny, democratic representation and accountability, and delivery models. To what extent are the existing frameworks fit for purpose or in need of upgrading and strengthening or more radical reform? Will everybody be included amongst the winners, or will some groups and localities lose out? What roles are citizens and civil society to play in the journey before us? These are just some of the crucial questions that need to be posed and require thoughtful work to try and answer.

But answers are difficult due to the large gap that exists between deal-makers and citizens and between official narratives and the perceptions and lived experiences of many in GM – a gap that has been breeding a combination of indifference, mistrust, fears and even anger.

The People’s Plan is an independent initiative of citizens and civil society in GM, to begin bridging this gap and to address some of the crucial questions at this important moment of change. The objectives were to provide GM citizens and civil society with opportunities to have a meaningful say on GM devolution and a constructive challenge and improvement of GM strategy and delivery, for social, environmental, economic and democratic progress.

The approach taken has been unusual and experimental in GM. It is not the work of one organisation or committee, but of a broad alliance of willing volunteers - citizens, groups and networks from civil society and communities, experts from think-tanks and academia, business people and trade union members, activists and artists, technology and media professionals and more. With very limited financial resources, the potential and capacity of this approach to deliver was unknown and the risks have required a certain amount of courage; but the many challenges have also strengthened belief in the need for, and value of, this collaborative approach.

From October to December 2016 volunteers organised a programme of varied public meetings; alongside this the People’s Plan website provided an online survey, with prepared questions and open inputs covering six major themes - homes, health and care, transport, democracy, environment, jobs and economy.

The range of inputs have since been carefully processed and analysed, quantitatively and qualitatively. The formulated outputs are summarised in this report, where they highlight a series of constructive challenges and pointers towards areas of priority action.

In having met the defined objectives in good measure, the People’s Plan has added some valuable learning and strengthened relationships and trust amongst those involved. It is hoped that more people will be encouraged and energised to both challenge and support those seeking to improve the lives of people in GM.

With grateful thanks to everyone who helped.
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What kind of city?

Democratic participation In Greater Manchester (GM) is low on all standard measures. In 2012 council elections, the turnout across the Manchester City borough was only 25% and an elected mayor is unlikely to generate much higher turnouts. No political party has a more than very thin membership base; in the locally dominant Labour party in 2010, the average size of Labour membership in North West parliamentary constituencies where Labour held the seat was less than 0.5% of the electorate.

Local government and health services consultation exercises are too often an opportunity merely to comment on the detail of near finalised plans. This mode of consultation cannot be justified when much of what these bodies do is increasingly controversial. The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) provoked around 25,000 replies often objecting to plans to build on the green belt (which tells us little about the objectors’ positive vision).

The People’s Plan initiative is not a statistically representative sample of all the GM population demographic segments, however well over a thousand people got involved by responding to the online survey and or participating in public events of various flavours. Helpfully, 80% of all the 800 online survey respondents provided demographic information and those represented all the boroughs, age groups and employment statuses, with broader ethnicity reasonably represented with 13% not from white British backgrounds. The balance of male and female respondents was pleasingly 50/50; of those, 19% were under 34 years old, 56% aged 35-64 and 24% aged 65 and over. The combination of students, part/full-time workers, unemployed and retired provided a broad range of perspectives.

A large proportion of the survey respondents and event participants are active citizens and politically engaged to some degree: for example, 48% of all survey respondents had met with or written to their local councillor in the last 12 months and 43% had responded to a local public consultation; an even larger 74% intended to vote in the GM mayoral election. The views of these well informed citizens should carry some weight - if the elected GM mayor, councillors and officials cannot connect effectively with this seam of engaged citizens, increased democratic participation is unlikely.

The range of themes addressed in the events listed in the appendices was broader than the themes of this summary report – it has not been possible to include all of them.

In this summary report the survey responses and feedback from the events are organised around six major themes: housing, health and care, transport, democracy, environment, jobs and economy. The survey questions are reproduced in the appendices; each theme ended with an open question about “what else is important to you?”.
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Over the past twenty years, Manchester and Salford have been transformed by the building of some 40,000 one and two bedroom flats. Over the next twenty years, the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) envisages a doubling in the number of privately rented city centre flats and the large-scale construction of more than 100,000 homes mainly for owner occupancy on the edge of the city. New homes are to be built in the format and location determined by private developers’ expectations of profit per unit, which are greatest on lift-served, small flats in the centre and on greenfield housing developments around the M60. This approach increases renting amongst the young, neglects most of the city-region in between edge and centre and makes no new provision for low-income families with children so that 80,000 people are left on the waiting list for social housing.

**Challenge 1** How to expand the stock of social housing provided by not-for-profit landlords, so as to replace stock that has been sold off and to lock in low rents and secure tenancies

Official documents like the GMSF do not use the term social housing but assume housing, which is an asset for owner-occupiers and landlords, can also be affordable housing. This is challenged by the survey respondents and event participants, who instead prioritise the stock of social housing which they believe should be defended and expanded as a matter of social right.

As one survey respondent put it “Housing should be considered a basic human right, to be provided for by the appropriate local authority and should not be provided for by the private sector”. In an event at Wythenshawe, a participant argued that “social homes are not just housing” but public assets, which could be “a bedrock for rebuilding democracy, place and belonging” - and this theme about social housing as the basis for community cohesion was reinforced by participants in the GM Older People’s Network.

- **Pointers on what to do**
- **Invest to build more.**
  Survey respondents had an overwhelming preference for using public borrowing to build more social housing, thereby also creating public assets of ongoing value: 74% of all survey respondents agreed that ‘GM should seek to lift the cap on local public sector borrowing, in order to build more social housing for lower income households to rent’.

- **Deliver solutions to homelessness and rough sleeping.**
  Survey respondents and housing event participants highlighted homelessness as an urgent priority in the context of a visibly worsening situation, alongside large numbers of empty properties. At the Vision for Housing in GM event, participants’ concrete proposals included, for example, “Emergency, no barrier hostels for everyone” and using “empty property levy to fund quality homeless services”. Open responses drew attention to the “amount of empty buildings and homeless people” and one respondent expressed the shared concern: “We should provide social housing for the homeless - safe, secure, and a good standard, with medical support available”.
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Define affordability.
The term ‘affordability’ is mentioned less often than ‘social housing’ in the survey open responses; several respondents argued it was very loosely used by government and should be more restrictively defined; for example, in relation to “average incomes across the region”.

Insist on genuinely affordable or social housing in all new developments.
Respondents were concerned that affordable housing requirements were being waived in new housing developments and, in the words of one respondent: “new developments over a certain size MUST contain a proportion of social housing”.

Abandon right to buy.
When asked to rank several ways of improving housing in Greater Manchester (GM), 43% of rankers rated abandonment of right to buy as the most important improvement action - well ahead of other options like changing the mix of houses and flats or spreading locations across the boroughs.

Challenge 2 How to rebalance the rights and responsibilities of landlords and tenants so that those who rent have more rights, crucially to security of tenure

The promotion of housing as private asset, not social right, has expanded the size of the private-rented sector. The undisclosed effects include a large income leakage to Southern English buy-to-let landlords and, more obviously, a pervasive insecurity of tenure that weighs heavily on older tenants with families. This is likely to get worse given the current government’s approach, when rising asset prices are putting owner occupancy out of reach.

One survey respondent articulated the social priorities of many about “reducing the imbalance of power between tenants and landlords by ensuring tenants have a right to longer term tenancies and the right to expect property repairs in a timely fashion”. Some respondents also favoured rent controls.

Pointers on what to do

Introduce a compulsory landlord licensing scheme.
The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) could mobilise public support for landlord licensing as a practical step towards better tenants rights. 82% of all survey respondents agreed that a compulsory landlord licensing scheme should be introduced.

Legislate for more secure, longer term tenancies.
Tenants rights in GM, like much else, exist within a framework defined by national government in Westminster that could legislate to allow or mandate longer tenancies. On this point GM Housing Action and individual respondents argued that the GM mayor and other GM politicians should lobby for change, rather than accept the existing framework.
Challenge 3  How to protect our environment by building sustainably and sensitively, so that we have a low carbon housing stock on appropriate sites

More diffuse than the other challenges, but threaded through many of the open survey responses and comments of event participants, was the theme of environmental underperformance. In GM housing, this represents a sad retreat from the aspirations represented by the garden city layout of Wythenshawe, or realised in the national Parker Morris standards on room size that applied before 1980.

All this has become more of a high profile issue with GM Spatial Framework proposals to build on the greenbelt. But participants at the environment event added a broader perspective about these issues and the limits of a planning process that does not encourage and enable input from local groups. An open response to the survey criticised new city centre apartment blocks, built close to main roads and often without central heating; another respondent lamented that GM new-build falls short of ‘Passivhaus’ standards for energy performance.

➢ Pointers on what to do

➢ Improve regulatory standards for new build.
Several open responses were clear about the need for higher regulatory standards, especially in the fields of sustainability, overall energy consumption and room sizes.

➢ Retrofit existing housing stock to reduce energy consumption.
Several open respondents thought this was an urgent priority for housing, with multiple benefits: “Retrofitting existing housing stock to reduce energy costs, improve health and reduce carbon”. This measure was also strongly supported by respondents to the environment theme option of ‘Grants to improve energy efficiency for homes and public buildings’.
Yes 82%

Should Greater Manchester introduce a compulsory landlord licencing scheme to protect tenant's rights?

Yes 74%

Should Greater Manchester lift the cap on local public sector borrowing to build more social housing?

- Spread new developments across boroughs 21%
- How should housing be improved?
- Explore land value taxes to fund social housing 15%
- More houses fewer 1 and 2 bed apartments 21%
- Abandon right to buy for social housing 25%

- Don't know 6%
- Didn't say 8%
- Don't know 11%
- No 8%
- Didn't say 8%
HEALTH and CARE

Since 2016 Greater Manchester (GM) has responsibilities for managing and integrating hitherto separate, centrally funded NHS services and local authority adult care services. Both services are in crisis: in adult care, austerity budget cuts have reduced numbers receiving home care by some 20% nationally; and in health services, the halving of the number of hospital beds over the past thirty years has created a fragile system that suffers with demand peaks or delayed discharges. The National Audit Office has questioned whether integration of health and care will save money or reduce hospital admissions; and this finding is ominous when GM has a predicted £2 billion shortfall in health and care expenditure within five years. Against this background, it is unclear how GM will find the policy levers, financial resources and political will to tackle prevention of ill health and low life expectancy in deprived localities.

Challenge 1 How to lever in more financial resources for health and care services, where social ownership and operation of free services should be defended

Event participants recognised that “services cannot be run without proper funding” and the first priority of survey respondents is leveraging in more public funding. In health, as in housing, what citizens want is public provision that depends on reversing austerity cuts. By implication, the GM mayor and other GM politicians need to change central priorities as much as manage local services; as a Bury event participant put it: “make it the Mayor’s job to fight for more money for local services”.

The other clear theme is that public funding should support socially owned and operated services. While voluntary and other third-sector providers are often complimented, references to private providers in health and care are mostly negative: “Resist the influence of the private sector, because it takes money out of the system”; other respondents had concerns for poor pay and conditions in outsourced adult care.

- Pointers on what to do
  - Lever in more public funding.
    83% of all survey respondents agreed that ‘GM should urgently seek a better funded deal for health and social care’ - with just 2% opposed. Here again, as in other policy areas, like housing, what respondents want the GM mayor and other GM politicians to do is not just manage the system within existing funding limits but claim more resources. For example, investment in training for ongoing supply of nurses in GM services is an area where consequences of cuts to bursaries are a serious concern.

  - Use public funds to support not-for-profit and publicly owned and operated services.
    Survey respondents and event participants were against further outsourcing or privatisation. Health and care services need new ‘step down’ facilities for discharged hospital patients who cannot go back to their own homes and do not have a care home bed; but 67% of all survey respondents believed such facilities should be built and operated by NHS providers and 74% also supported provision by other not-for-profit providers, with only 10% supporting private for-profit providers.
**Challenge 2** Build a new kind of NHS as a civic institution which offers a wide range of stakeholders more participation in decision-making as well as providing more user-friendly services

Citizen attachment to the NHS is not all sentimental and uncritical. Ministers and managers have sought to restructure health and care services so that they meet user demands more effectively, but citizen critics go further and ask for a redefinition of the NHS as a new kind of civic institution where a wide range of local stakeholders would have a major influence over decision-making.

At a café-style event conversation about ‘Devo Manc’, participants posed a challenge to “find ways to put health and social care close to communities”. There is widespread dissatisfaction with current forms of consultation that are too often about changes already decided by service managers.

➢ **Pointers on what to do**

➢ **Experiment with direct public participation in decision-making.**
65% of all survey respondents wanted direct participation by the public for proposed changes, through means such as online polling, for example, whose results could not be easily ignored.

➢ **Create an advisory board representing wider interests.**
More traditional forms of representative democracy have even wider support. 77% of all survey respondents wanted a wider advisory board representing different stakeholders including voluntary and community organisations as well as provider groups. For example, representation for those with learning disabilities and their many challenges was strongly featured in the Health and Care themed event.

➢ **Provide more user-friendly services on a local community basis.**
This is the point where citizen priorities align with those of politicians and service managers. At a GM Older People’s Network event and in surveys, the GP and hospital appointments systems were described as “barriers” to access, with specific criticism about the availability of “on the day” appointments; and at a Wythenshawe event the complaint was that “public transport never lines up properly with health services”.
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Challenge 3 How to put more resources into prevention and into the inadequately funded ‘Cinderella’ services of mental health and adult care, which have now been damaged by austerity cuts

Many of the open survey responses and comments of event participants highlighted the problem of ‘Cinderella’ services. Some event participants thought hospitals were claiming resources that should have gone to prevention, primary and community provision; all agreed with the survey respondent who wanted “greater emphasis on prevention not cure” and worried about how austerity cuts in mental health and adult care had aggravated long standing problems about service provision. The result is pervasive insecurity about service availability, crystallised by the question at one Tameside event: “will it be there when you or your family members need it?”.

➢ Pointers on what to do

➢ Stop cuts to mental health services and increase funding.
This connects with prevention because, as one survey respondent argued, with more funding for primary care, GPs should be able to prescribe more one-on-one counselling and for more than six weeks.

➢ Revalue the workforce in adult care.
Some open responses registered the point that care workers are paid and trained worse than health service workers, although they had an increasingly important role in an ageing society. As one respondent argued: “properly trained care assistants would help people to stay at home”.
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Health and Care

Who should build and operate facilities for patients in hospital that can’t return to a care home or their own home?

- Private for-profit providers
- NHS providers
- Other not-for-profit providers

How should Greater Manchester decision makers consult to improve participation and make better decisions?

- By holding advisory board or panels of different stakeholders
- Directly by the public (e.g., using technology)

Greater Manchester should urgently seek a better funded deal for health and social care?

- Yes 83%
- No 2%
- Don’t know 6%

Didn’t say 9%
‘Northern Powerhouse’ plans involve public spending on projects to improve train connectivity between Northern cities and with London. Since the rejection of congestion charging in a 2008 referendum, within the city-region Greater Manchester (GM) has prioritised travel-to-work public transport, backed by extension of the tram system and new controls over the bus timetables. The GM draft transport strategy published in July 2016 has ambitious aims, including the integration of spatial and transport planning and the creation of an integrated public transport system. At the same time, the actual patterns of use are very far from this. Car and van transport is overwhelmingly dominant, accounting for over 40% of travel by distance; the great ‘showpiece’ initiative, the tram system, by contrast, accounts for under 5%. The transport strategy emphasises the provision of commuter links to work in the central district; the reality is that most journeys are cross-district, on routes not supported by radial services.

**Challenge 1  Prioritising transport improvements within GM**

The message from the survey responses is that citizens prioritise above all transport improvements across the GM city-region, much more so than investment in the kind of high profile inter-city schemes typified by HS2. 76% of all survey respondents agreed 'Devolution should see investment in transport improvements within and across GM, as well as improved intercity links', with 6% disagreeing. The open responses, and the event feedback, also overwhelmingly supported this priority: "Not everyone travels into Manchester to work. There is poor provision for people travelling to Manchester airport and Salford Quays for outlying boroughs. It takes over 1 hour to travel 10 miles in the rush hour - ridiculous!". There is an almost universal concentration by respondents on the importance of improving services within GM and comparatively very little mention of inter-city services.

- **Pointers on what to do**
  - **Focus on reform of the intra-city systems because that is what matters to GM residents.**
  
  On the evidence of this exercise, there is a major gap between the inter-city concerns of national and regional policymakers and many business interests in the city-region, and the intra-city issues that are uppermost in the public’s mind. An obvious thing to do is to align official priorities with public expectations and significantly shift and increase the emphasis and resources for intra-city transport improvements.
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**Challenge 2  How to match the transport system design to the actual everyday needs of travellers**

The survey responses show that the public wants a transport system more closely aligned to everyday needs. The focus on travel within the city-region is also reflected in what respondents thought were the most urgent priorities for transport improvements. The need to alleviate the existing difficulties of congested car journeys was raised by some respondents; but when improvement priorities were ranked, more respondents wanted lower fares and increased frequency of public transport services. The open responses and the event feedback reinforced this picture. There was emphasis on the importance of physical access, for instance for those with disability, but more so on the access enabled by close proximity to convenient services. A typical response was "systems work well if you live near a stop or station". The importance of journeys across the city-region was also reflected in the frequent comments of the cumbersome nature of cross-city journeys: "If I want to go anywhere... around the city I have to get one bus into the city centre and then another bus out again".

- **Pointers on what to do**
  - **Address high fares and cost of travel for passengers in a low wage city-region.**
    A top priority therefore needs to be the delivery of what is a strongly expressed priority of respondents: a cheaper, and therefore more socially accessible, transport system.
  - **Recognise the bus system has the flexibility to meet everyday needs.**
    The tram is the ‘showpiece’ in the present network and is valued by respondents, but the tram’s radial layout and high fares don’t map well onto actual patterns of travel. New powers to control the bus timetables are a first step in bringing the present fragmented and privatised system under closer public control, where the aim must be to create a better system of cross-district connections.
  - **Integrate the transport system for easy travel using different modes of transport.**
    The very clear message from the survey respondents is the importance of using ‘Devo Manc’ to create an integrated city-wide system. Integration means changes such as the creation of a single ‘Oyster card’ like system across the whole network, with “Joined up thinking in the provision of service so that it is easy both physically and through ticketing to switch from one mode of transport to another”, as well as better co-ordination of transport with health and care services.
Challenge 3  How to build a trusted transport system, managing many complex priorities

Survey respondents and event participants provided lots of direct feedback about their experiences and knowledge about what’s not working, raising a wide series of required improvements. When asked to select which transport improvements to prioritise, the highest support was for a GM owned and controlled system of rail and bus operations, but there was also very strong support for extending the tram network and for more dedicated cycle ways. In the open responses, network extension, unsurprisingly, was a theme of comments from those in the outer parts of the city-region where the tram system has not reached; while at the DivaManc event, cycling featured strongly.

The current system, managed by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) working with a network of private bus and rail operators, is leading to haphazard results and difficult experiences for travellers. The survey respondents and event participants often expressed that this system’s priorities resulted in difficult journeys with costly fares and unreasonable service frequencies.

With so many areas for improvement, this raises the important challenge of how to decide between priorities and how to maintain responsive systems with ongoing feedback from travellers’ experiences. Furthermore, there are the ongoing challenges of system efficiencies, costs, investments and fares associated with commercial models.

➢  Pointers on what to do

➢  Create a more integrated transport system under GM public control.
Recognise the new devolution reforms amount to an opportunity for “Integrated transport under public ownership, with profits reinvested in infrastructure improvement, fare subsidies and better services”. From several options, 69% of all survey respondents chose ‘Greater Manchester owned and controlled rail and bus operations’ as their top priority for improving GM’s transport network.

➢  Use traveller experience information for system delivery and ongoing improvements.
With an integrated system under GM public control, the opportunity exists to bring together lots of useful traveller information that would otherwise be fragmented and disconnected or not even collected. A much more responsive structure, that is listening to and acting upon people’s experiences, would build trust and lead to a world-class GM transport network.
Transport

Yes 76%

Greater Manchester owned and controlled rail and bus operations 69%
Dedicated cycleways 55%
Extended tram network 58%
Improved facilities for mixed mode travel 47%
More pedestrianised areas 38%

Didn't say

Should GM invest in transport links within and across Greater Manchester as well as intercity?

To improve our transport network what should Greater Manchester prioritise?

Which transport improvements are the most important?

Faster public transport journey times 21%
Lower public transport fares 27.3%

Didn't say

Easier commuting by car 13%
Increased frequency of public transport services 26.6%

Car sharing 26%
More

No 6%
Don't know 6%
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**DEMOCRACY**

Politically, devolution promised to "bring decisions closer to the people". Citizen participation between elections is limited by consultations of limited scope on major changes; while borough councils offer representative democracy under 'first past the post' electoral rules. But voter turnout in local government elections has often been far lower than 40%, which is much lower than in Westminster elections; and in nearly all Greater Manchester (GM) boroughs 'first past the post' has produced single party dominance and a permanent party of local government unafraid of electoral rejection. The GM devolution deal did not offer the city region an elected assembly as in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Instead, GM got something similar to an American-style elected mayor who may add leadership but will not revitalise democracy without further significant changes not yet on offer: turnout is below 30% in recent mayoral elections in New York, Philadelphia and Los Angeles; even London’s high-profile mayoral election in 2016 had a turnout of only 45%.

**Challenge 1  How to create democratic structures with checks and balances that earn the public’s trust**

With such a volume of strongly negative experiences and perceptions of current systems being expressed, one participant at a Bury event spoke for everybody: "there is a deficit in democracy; renewal is needed". Nobody thought that the institution of an elected mayor would improve effective scrutiny, challenge and accountability of decision makers, within a structure where they felt that "the Board members of GMCA are not directly accountable to anyone".

Across the events, people expressed their views that entire social groups feel alienated and excluded. DivaManc complained about the dominance of "old boys clubs" and argued for all-women shortlists; but the demand here was also for a more inclusive, cooperative and facilitative approach because "we need to actively listen to people, include and empower to build greater collective responsibility". At an Older People’s Network event, the complaint was that existing forms of board representation excluded "people with lived experience" of health and care service delivery and the result was "the feeling that you can’t really influence anything".

Respondents and participants held an expectation, as a matter of basic right, that "every elector’s vote must count" and criticised current systems where "my vote does not make a difference".

The following pointers on what to do are things that GM decision-makers currently may not have the powers to implement straight away and will require the GM mayor and other GM politicians to secure additional devolved powers.

- **Pointers on what to do**

  - **Introduce a measure of proportional representation.**

    The principle of proportionality is already accepted in the system used to elect the new mayor. And 69% of all survey respondents supported changing the dated and externally imposed ‘first past the post’ voting system to a more proportional system for elections in GM – with just 7% opposed. All methods of weighing voter preferences in other parts of the UK and in other countries will have imperfections; but survey respondents and event participants...
People's Plan GM registered a clear view that ‘first past the post’ is not working in GM and favoured more proportionality that would value every vote, capture the diversity of the city-region and add healthy counterbalancing opposition to dominant parties, in the belief that better proportionality in representation correlates with better overall outcomes for citizens.

- **Add an elected assembly.**

  60% of all survey respondents favoured having a directly elected assembly of GM representatives (like Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) – with just 9% opposed - whilst some open responses favoured a different “people’s assembly” approach (e.g. “Assembly members selected at random as per jury service”). The survey majority in favour of an assembly indicates a belief that the existing machinery of representation in GM is inadequate. Perceived dangers of the new mayoral model operating with an absence of day-to-day official opposition are prompting demands to “counterbalance the GM mayor through a directly elected assembly”.

- **Consider lowering the voting age for local elections to 16 years old.**

  Official means of participation are very poor at drawing in the young. 6% of survey respondents were under 25 and the youth event highlighted the need to include young people’s voices, many of whom felt “invisible” to the region’s politicians. A survey respondent reinforced why this was important: “That younger people get a say. It's their future” and there was widespread disappointment amongst youth event participants that as part of the GM devolution deals there had been no discussion about lowering the voting age to 16, as in Scotland.

### Challenge 2  How to deliver local democracy that is directly accessible, transparent and accountable for the public

Highlighted at the Trafford event and mentioned in survey open responses, was the absence of communications between councillors and the public and the lack of information for citizens to engage before decisions were taken (typified by the GM devolution deals). Councillors with ‘safe seats’ were also seen as not accountable after decisions either; an open response asked rhetorically: “how are you supposed to hold your councillors to account if they’re extremely unlikely to ever be voted out?”.

Respondents wanted better two-way communication; this was a commonly expressed priority alongside the yet more frequently demanded “transparency in every area and about all decisions”. Beyond just published information, desires for improved communications and transparency were often expressed in more social forms, within local neighbourhoods and communities: “people want to talk to people”.

Many obstacles and difficulties faced by citizens wanting to be well-informed and wanting worthwhile participation were raised, with the degree of effort required described as “an uphill battle against the odds to results that can only be measured in levels of disappointment” and pleas for “wider participation and opportunities to involve those who don’t have the time to attend meetings or read large amounts of documentation - targeted information sharing that’s conscious of people’s time and ability is key”. Some highlighted that a far more proactive approach was needed: “pushing information out instead of waiting for FOI requests”.
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 pointers on what to do

do more online - and do it well.
62% of all survey respondents supported online voting in elections, with a few security concerns raised alongside related concerns about postal votes. Survey responses strongly suggest that doing things well online can improve participation; for example, only 15% of all survey respondents had attended a council meeting in the past year whilst 45% had accessed council reports and documents online.

support more direct and accessible civic participation.
A concern submitted by a number of respondents was that one unaccountable layer of local government should not be replaced with another, as one open question respondent expressed: “Wariness about ‘community representatives’ - these can be self selecting and hard to remove”. As respondents offered what they did want to see developed, they also stated: “Don’t allow small cliques of activists to set themselves us as ‘community representatives’ to pursue their objectives”. Specific suggestions included: “E.g. Include a questionnaire or info sheet with the notice of council tax” and “turning local assets like libraries and community centres into democratic interface hubs”.

challenge 3 how to promote a stronger culture of democratic participation by a better informed public, with a real measure of influence and control

across survey respondents and events, people were strongly critical of the limitations and the disconnects they saw between official representatives and those represented. The commonly held expectation, stated simply by one respondent, is: “that local people are listened to and are able to have an impact, not just be heard and nothing changes”. The current methods of formal consultation were widely criticised as a charade that left citizens disillusioned and cynical - the objections were always the same: “often, exercises in democracy are no such thing, as decisions have already been made”.

other respondents further highlighted common concerns about who has real influence and power in decision-making: “Unelected committees ruling planning decisions, making decisions based on fear of developer appeals and cost”. Respondents wanted: “openness around corporate influences in local decisions” and that regional politicians should: “Stop listening to lobbyists and start listening to constituents.”

overall, there is a general sense that gm must seize this moment of change to pursue substantial improvements in local democracy, with the urgent challenge of combining methods of representation and real participation. As one respondent put it: “we need a new format that encourages participation in debate and involves people in decision making”. There is strong support for “more decisions made on a local level involving local residents” and a positive desire that “participating in civic life should be made enjoyable and productive”.
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Pointers on what to do

Add new mechanisms of deliberation involving ordinary citizens directly in decisions. A clear majority of respondents favoured more substantial changes; for example, many who participated in the democracy event and 57% of all survey respondents favoured citizen juries where decision-making on big change proposals would include panels of ordinary citizens hearing evidence and arguments. Similar to other successful approaches in other parts of the world, a proportion of public resources could also be allocated to participatory budgeting: “We should look at people’s projects. Setting aside money to vote on schemes put forward by the public or groups of local people.”

Develop civic education and ways to better inform the public. A role for schools in preparing young people for ongoing democratic participation featured in the youth event alongside the view that this could be usefully developed by students having more input in school decision-making. Other demographics also agreed that a better informed public was very important: “Clear, accurate and easily accessible information is key”. One respondent phrased the challenge with a question pointing to the heart of the issue: “Do people really know what they are voting for?”

Be bold and break the mould. From the majority of survey respondents and from events, the message is that devolution to the GMCA and an elected mayor alone will not fix long-standing problems about accountability and control. The implication is that we need to be much more proactive and ambitious in changing the rules and machinery of representative democracy and consider experimenting with adding new kinds of more direct, deliberative democracy to empower citizens.

---
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ENVIRONMENT

On official estimates, climate change could cost Greater Manchester (GM) tens of £billions in the coming decades, yet environmental issues have barely featured in the local devolution architecture. GM’s pursuit of a low carbon economy and more ambitious environmental targets is thought to be constrained because central government controls the levers in key areas of environmental policy. Yet the everyday reality is that environmental impacts are also produced by locally controllable practices. The evidence on transport patterns, for instance, is that GM is overwhelmingly a ‘car city’, with consequent implications for fuel consumption and for air pollution and associated harms to health from NOx and particulates, particularly from diesel. (Department of Transport 2016 data indicates over 12 million diesel cars accounting for 39% of all cars on Britain’s roads - a significant rise in the last 20 years. Numbers of alternative fuel cars are rising, but are proportionately low; for example, ultra low emission vehicles still only comprise 1.3% of new vehicle registrations). Likewise the regulation of building construction, both private and commercial, and the planning of new developments, have significant implications both for pollution control and for the shape of energy consumption – and these are factors that the devolved institutions can influence.

Challenge 1 Achieving carbon neutrality - should the city which led the first industrial revolution also aim to be a pioneer among those cities which aim to be carbon neutral by a specified date, like 2050?

The question of achieving more ambitious carbon targets was explicitly posed in the survey and the response was overwhelmingly in the affirmative. But what was most striking about the open responses, and the comments in discussion in the public events, was both how concrete were the ideas of how a target of carbon neutrality could be achieved, and how often these were directly linked to other important policy areas - notably power generation, transport, land planning and building regulation. It was widely agreed that more investment in recycling and renewables was required, but comments also focused – for instance in the Trafford event – on the pollution effects of the disconnect between modes of travel, and on the importance of protecting green spaces and prioritising brownfield sites in new developments. On this overall evidence, official policy is perceived as lagging behind the wider community, which sees possibilities for local initiative and ambition.

➢ Pointers on what to do

➢ Align the different policy areas with the aim of achieving carbon neutrality (which depends on a science-based carbon budget for GM).

Virtually every area examined in this survey process – but notably housing, transport and the economy – has huge implications for our environment, which in turn also has implications for health and care. While some regulations, like building insulation, are plainly designed with environmental impact in mind, achieving carbon neutrality requires that all policy initiatives be scrutinised with this aim in mind.
➢ Recognise the case for saying “no” to fracking and mobilising the public with better information.

The environment themed event and the survey responses were both strongly against fracking: 66% of all survey respondents favoured restricting/banning fracking and related processes. GM should join the many councils who have said “no” to fracking and coal bed methane drilling, while recognising national governments will only act on this position if pressed strongly by broad-based public opinion and demand. And that requires better information on the consequences of continued carbon use, the process of extraction and consequences for jobs, health, water, air and land.

**Challenge 2  How to concretely prioritise Greater Manchester’s future energy needs and at the same time improve and protect our environment.**

Those who responded to this challenge want an emphasis on two things: more efficient energy usage and generation of renewable energy. They also want a set of local, democratically controlled institutions to pursue these aims. Thus, 65% of all survey respondents wanted grants to improve insulation efficiency in homes and public buildings; 63% wanted a GM democratically owned and controlled energy supply company, and 71% supported local community clean energy projects.

➢ **Pointers on what to do**

➢ **Create a dedicated public, GM wide, integrated energy institution.**

A sustainable and resilient, major regional player in the energy supply market is an urgent priority for survey respondents and event participants.

➢ **Advance renewable energy, storage and efficiency.**

Many survey respondents and event participants had a positive view of opportunities for multiple benefits: “Renewable energy should be of high importance for a cleaner future and help reduce energy bills for the region”. Concrete examples of what is in people’s minds, include: increasing investment in renewable energy and storage systems and or high(er) energy efficiency for all new build.

➢ **Harness the creativity and initiative already shown by grass-roots activity.**

Support more projects like those cited in the open comments, which included Stockport Hydropower and GM Community Renewables.
Challenge 3  How to reduce harmful air pollution in Greater Manchester

A widely shared view was expressed by one respondent: “Air quality needs drastically improving - it damages people’s health and the current way things are run is not sustainable and therefore there needs to be a shift to more renewable energy sources.”

When survey respondents ranked ways to reduce harmful air pollution in order of importance, the top ranked option was: ‘Support more clean energy to replace polluting power generation’, followed by ‘Only allow low emissions buses and delivery vehicles’. Options that could be described as potentially adding restrictions or costs for drivers received lower support, even when they would have more immediate effects on local air quality in key locations, such as ‘low emission zones around schools and hospitals’.

Open question respondents stated aspects of the complicated issues GM faces: “I do not agree with charging polluting vehicles, this does not, in my opinion, benefit the aims of improving the air quality. It simply allows for those who can afford it, to simply make no effort to support the objectives of reducing our carbon footprint”. The information from respondents also highlighted GM’s deeply interconnected challenges in balancing the impacts on other priority areas: “Buses must not be sacrificed on the altar of reducing pollution. PM10 and NoX emissions from bus exhausts have reduced significantly”.

The disproportionate impact on GM’s poorest residents - from climate change issues, the need for energy security, health problems arising from pollution, and the development of GM’s major economic assets - was expressed by one open question respondent as: “Stop pretending that air travel is an unalloyed good. Admit that air quality in M’cr is damaging our kids’ lung development & function. Admit it’s worst in low income areas where the poor are housed on traffic islands between expressways for access from Cheshire.”

Poiters on what to do

- **Back renewable energy.**
  When asked to rank several ways for reducing harmful air pollution, 59% of rankers rated supporting more clean energy to replace polluting power generation as the most important (well ahead of the other options offered). This strong level of support was very evident also from event participants and survey open responses.

- **Curb air pollution through better public transport policy.**
  Better, cheaper public transport policy is one of the few locally controllable and politically acceptable mechanisms for curbing air pollution. If the car dominance of the city-region (with all its impact on air quality) cannot easily be reversed by restricting car use, the inputs to the Transport theme indicate that the way forward is a public transport system that is aligned more closely than at present to public need, and investment in safe, high quality walking and cycling infrastructure.

- **Improve health through air quality to deliver accumulating benefits**
  Some people are much more aware than others about the harmful impacts of air pollution on health, and public awareness is growing. With the devolution of health and care responsibilities to GM, more proactive and preventative measures are possible; for example, by more effectively embedding health drivers and consequences within GM’s planning for transport, homes and industry. There is considerable potential for accumulating benefits in tackling air pollution and improving air quality:
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better public health and making significant cost savings, public transport that leads innovation in travel efficiencies and responsiveness, liberating neighbourhoods suffering from poor air quality, reducing the cumulative impacts of ill health and sickness absence on the economy and recovering the health of our natural environment.
Greater Manchester (GM) is home to 2.8 million people, with an economy larger than Wales or Northern Ireland. The largest employment sectors are: business, financial and professional services (267,000); retail and wholesale (197,700); health and social care (157,400) and manufacturing (114,600). In recent years, the GM economy has seen overall growth but this has mainly benefitted some areas and people. There is no doubt that central Manchester has been transformed and the city can claim to have a critical mass of knowledge intensive jobs. However, if we consider new jobs created and average wages, some areas are being left behind. For example, from 2009-2014, most of the nearly 32,000 net new jobs in GM were in Manchester, Trafford and Salford. Annual wages are roughly £5,000 per year lower in the northern boroughs, compared with the city centre and southern boroughs.

**Challenge 1. How to create a more ‘balanced’ economy in Greater Manchester**

A key theme from both the survey responses and public events was developing an economy that serves local areas better. This implies that policy makers need to focus on much more than the city centre. This was expressed as the need for “better quality jobs particularly in poorer areas” and “more support and money put into north Manchester and traditionally mill areas which are still suffering without the universities and the airport”. The challenge was not viewed simply as north vs south within GM. Some respondents also noted that even the more prosperous boroughs had problems, such as “Trafford and Stockport hide huge inequalities and deprivation”, while “places like Wythenshawe, Moston and Levenshulme” also need “extra help and jobs”. As well as the need for a better geographical balance, people suggested the need for an economy which has a “better mix”, with some highlighting the need to encourage new forms of economic activity and local ownership: “worker cooperatives, inward investment and developing local supply chains across boroughs”.

When asked to rank where they would like to see jobs created, the poorer boroughs were ranked highest priority, followed by a popular response to ‘within 5 miles of own area’. This is not to say that respondents do not favour job creation in the city centre and the airport business park, but that they place a much higher priority on less prosperous areas and local proximity.

- **Pointers on what to do**

- **Use the survey responses as a checklist for promotional actions.**
  The survey responses should be used as a checklist for a large range of promotional actions that could be taken, such as encouraging “small businesses, retail industry start-ups, with wider range of support for local jobs for local people for local businesses” and improving “town centres”.

- **Local authorities can play a larger, more active role in developing local economies.**
  Align official policy closer with respondents who believe local authorities can play a larger and more active role in local economies. Suggestions included “strategic investment by local authorities in site regeneration, start up costs etc.” and a greater focus on how the public sector spends its money, to “support local business” and potentially a “preference for local businesses to be contracted for all local authority contracts”.
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Improve transport links for work.
Highlighted by some respondents, transport was an important component, acknowledging that "with a decent, affordable public transport network people can travel to work". For some this meant "improving access to the city centre for those living in the poorest boroughs... as well as job creation in the major towns of GM boroughs"; others noted the need for "better public transport borough to borough (e.g. Tameside to Stockport)... rather than just in and out of the centre".

Challenge 2 How to improve employment conditions in Greater Manchester, especially for young people

A major area of concern emerging from the survey and public events was the quality of jobs in GM. Many of the survey respondents who mentioned the need to improve working conditions specifically linked this challenge to the experiences of, and opportunities for, young workers. Some people said that a priority should be ‘better’ jobs rather than simply a focus on ‘volume’. For example, “a priority should be skilled, well paid jobs, rather than too many low paid jobs” and “we are told that employment rates are extremely high, but vast numbers are part-time or very insecure and low paid”.

Pointers on what to do

Adopt the ‘real Living Wage’.
Maximising the adoption of the ‘real Living Wage’ was strongly supported, with 68% of all survey respondents identifying this as a priority for GM. Local authorities were viewed as having an important role to play in improving working conditions. As direct employers, it was suggested that they “should adopt [the] living wage” and also use their position as contractors to promote ‘fair’ conditions more broadly in the local economy.

Work towards eliminating unfair zero-hours contracts, publicly recognise fair employers, require minimum standards from public contractors.
This was widely supported so that jobs and flexibility could work to the benefit of the individual employee. Another suggestion was that responsible employers that offer skills training, avoid unfair zero-hours contracts and deliver fair employment practices should be recognised “in publicity and investment”. 79% of all survey respondents agreed that ‘GM should require all employers operating public service contracts to meet defined ‘fair employment’ standards, including elements such as wages, conditions and union recognition’.

Easier access to affordable and quality childcare for working families.
‘Improved childcare options for GM’s working families’ was as an important priority registered by 62% of all survey respondents. With limited and expensive childcare provision, disposable incomes of working families are under strong pressure, making it even harder to make ends meet and reducing other spending into local economies.
Challenge 3  How to make training and apprenticeships more relevant to higher skilled work

Many people told us about the need for more training to improve skills across the workforce: this was seen as a way to create “higher value jobs to replace low-paid, low-skilled work”. Apprenticeships were mentioned as important: the challenge is not simply to create more apprenticeships, but to make them better paid and more relevant to higher skilled work. There was concern about “apprenticeships and internships” that may not offer routes into jobs, as well as a demand for “real training leading to real jobs for 18-35 year olds”. 63% of all survey respondents agreed on the need for 'targets and programmes for GM young people’s practical skills'. Other responses highlighted the need for training for older workers too, with retraining to help people get out of poor jobs where they had become “stuck’ and accept poor conditions as a result”.

➤ Pointers on what to do

➤ Develop meaningful apprenticeships and other training that helps local people to access higher skilled jobs.

Existing skills and training programmes should be thoroughly evaluated and high-profile efforts made to upgrade the quality and utility of up-skilling focus areas, particularly for younger and older workers. This could involve ‘responsible’ businesses, third sector and co-operatives in both commissioning and providing training.
Jobs and the Economy

Adopt the real Living Wage 68%
Improve childcare for working families 62%
Improve young people’s practical skills 63%
Adding & moving jobs across boroughs 42%

How should Greater Manchester improve quality of jobs and the economy?

Did’t say 18%

Where would you like to see jobs created?
- Manchester city centre 17%
- Manchester Airport Business Park 13%

Didn’t say 19%

Poorest boroughs: Rochdale, Oldham & Tameside 30%

Within 5 miles of own area 23%

Should all employers in Greater Manchester meet ‘fair employment’ standards, such as wages, conditions and union recognition?

Did’t say 17%

Don’t know 2%
No 2%
Greater Manchester’s Priorities Gap

So what has been found? How does all this detail fit together? The short answer is that the survey responses and the events show that Greater Manchester (GM) is a city-region with a ‘priorities gap’, demonstrated by the People’s Plan and also dramatized by the response to the Spatial Framework. What citizens want is complicated - individuals and groups may have different priorities and vary in ideas about policy instruments. That said, a clear majority of our survey respondents and event participants have a social vision of a grounded city-region - very different from the policies of the past twenty years and from the official priorities that may otherwise dominate for the next twenty years, or from the daily struggle to keep things going with austerity cuts.

For homes, the achievement in the past twenty years is the rebuilding of the city centre with its 1-2 bedroom buy-to-let flats, which are the epitome of housing as asset - whereas our citizens want more social housing as a priority. In health and care, the immediate struggle is to stop underfunded services falling over - whereas our citizens also want to see them redefined as civic institutions with wider participation in decisions and delivery. In transport, there is a gap between the inter-city concerns of national and regional policymakers and the intra-city issues uppermost in the public’s mind. For democracy, top-down GM devolution has installed a new mayor model and democratic engagement hasn’t featured in official strategic priorities - whereas our citizens want an upgraded and greatly strengthened mix of representative and direct participation. For our environment, policy makers have not established how GM will meet carbon reduction targets and will tackle air pollution - whereas our citizens want local institutions that change practices and outcomes. On jobs and the economy, policy makers have favoured job creation at the city centre and airport business park – our citizens want more jobs locally, especially in the northern boroughs.

Through all this, our citizens have a consistent vision of a pro-active and ambitious ‘people first’ city-region authority that delivers wellbeing by, for example, building social housing, not-for-profit provision of step-down beds for those between hospital and home care, running an integrated transport system and becoming a player in energy supply. The GM authority in the next twenty years needs to define its purpose and identity in doing much more than the boroughs did in the past twenty years when they, for example, gave out planning permissions, signed outsourcing contracts and supervised the policies which are done to deprived areas. GM’s authority needs to better connect with its citizens and civil society, because the current borough-level model of activity and purpose has delivered an absence of accountability and a harmful democratic deficit, which is not fixed by the offer of an elected mayor.

Policy makers have had a concept of how to try and build a city-region economy on growth and jobs for market income; but they have not been able to close gaps in economic output and income, or create jobs for citizens in the northern boroughs. Our citizens have a different vision of a more sociable city-region for individual and community wellbeing, where decent homes and tenants rights, sustainably funded public health and care, better connected and cheaper transport, healthy environment and renewable energy, better skills and fairer jobs take precedence and are delivered with a strengthened local democracy.

In a democracy, our citizens’ priorities need to be taken seriously.
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APPENDIX A: ONLINE SURVEY

The ordering of survey sections was randomised online, reproduced here in the order of themes within this report.

### Homes

The private rented sector has increased through tower block construction and house conversion, so that since 1991 Manchester and Salford have gained more than 42,000 new small flats. Meanwhile, social housing has been sold at a discount and not replaced, significantly increasing the list for housing benefit, with 60,000 plus families now on the waiting list for social housing in Greater Manchester.

17. Greater Manchester should seek to lift the cap on local public sector borrowing, in order to build more social housing for lower income households to rent - Do you agree?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t Know

18. Please use the drop down menu to rank these ways of improving and increasing housing stock in Greater Manchester (with 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important):
   - 1st Encourage a better mix of housing types (more homes, fewer 1 and 2 bed apartments)
   - 2nd Speed the locations of new developments (across boroughs, not just in the centre)
   - 3rd Local control - abandonment of “right to buy” for social housing
   - 4th Explore land value tax for funding social housing

19. Greater Manchester should introduce a compulsory landlord licensing scheme to protect standards and strengthen tenants’ rights in the rapidly growing private rented sector - Do you agree?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t Know

20. What else is important to you as regards housing?

### Health and Care

From 2016 Greater Manchester has responsibility for managing NHS services and local authority adult care services, with a predicted £2 billion shortfall within 5 years. Greater Manchester aims to improve public health and inequality, tackling obesity and low life expectancy linked with poverty, underemployment and environmental factors.

9. Greater Manchester should urgently seek a better funded deal for health and social care - Do you agree?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t Know

10. For proposed changes and resource allocations in Greater Manchester health and care (e.g. reorganisation and cuts in services and staff, mental health, prevention etc.), how should Greater Manchester decision makers consult, so as to improve participation and make better decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With a wider advisory board representing different stakeholders (professionals, unions, voluntary and community organisations, and others)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct participation by the public (e.g. including using technology such as online polling)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Greater Manchester needs more care facilities for patients who are in hospital beds because they can’t go to a care home or back to their own homes. Who should build and operate these facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private for-profit provider</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other not-for-profit providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What else is important to you as regards health and care?
Transport

Northern Powerhouse plans involve public spending on projects to improve connectivity between key Northern cities and London, via HS2. Since the rejection of congestion charging in a 2008 referendum, Greater Manchester has planned to work public transport within the city region, linked by the extension of the metro tram system and new control of the bus timetables.

1. Devolution should see investment in transport improvements within and across Greater Manchester, as well as improved intercity links. Do you agree?
   - [ ] Yes (transport improvements within and across Greater Manchester are as I view important)
   - [ ] No (intercity improvements are more important)
   - [ ] Don’t Know

2. Please use the drop down menu to rank the following transport improvements (1 being the most important, 4 being the least important)

   - [ ] 1. Faster public transport journey times
   - [ ] 2. Lower public transport fares
   - [ ] 3. Increased frequency of public transport services
   - [ ] 4. Easier commuting by car

3. Which of the following do you think that Greater Manchester should prioritise, to improve our transport network? Please select all that apply:
   - [ ] Dedicated cycleways
   - [ ] Improved facilities for mixed mode travel
   - [ ] Car sharing
   - [ ] Greater Manchester owned and controlled rail and bus operations
   - [ ] Extended tram network
   - [ ] More pedestrianised areas

4. What else is important to you as regards transport?

   

Democracy

Democratic participation through local government elections has been limited: voter turnouts have often been below 40% and in many Greater Manchester boroughs the first-past-the-post voting system has produced ample party dominance. The Greater Manchester devolution deal adds an elected metro mayor, but not an elected assembly as in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

13. Do you intend to vote in the Greater Manchester directly elected mayoral elections in May 2017?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Don’t Know

14. Which of the following have you done in the past 12 months?

   - [ ] Met with, or written to your local councillor
   - [ ] Attended a meeting of your local Borough Council or one of its committees
   - [ ] Accessed through Council or Greater Manchester Combined Authority produced reports and documents online
   - [ ] Responded to a public consultation by Borough Council or Greater Manchester Combined Authority

15. Which of the following structural changes and ways of increasing democratic participation in Greater Manchester would you support?

   - [ ] Online voting in elections
   - [ ] Citizen juries (e.g. for big change proposals)
   - [ ] Changing the “first past the post” voting system to a more proportional system
   - [ ] Directly elected assembly of Greater Manchester representatives (like Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland)

16. What else is important to you as regards democracy?
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The Environment

It is estimated that climate change could cost Greater Manchester £20 billion, yet environmental issues have barely featured in the local devolution debate. Greater Manchester’s pursuit of a low carbon economy and more ambitious environmental targets is constrained because central government controls the levers in key areas of environmental policy.

5. Greater Manchester should seek further powers and set more ambitious targets for reducing its carbon footprint (other cities aim to be Carbon neutral by 2050), with robust controls for keeping on track to achieve the targets. Do you agree?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t Know

6. Please use the drop down menus to rank the following ways of reducing harmful air pollution across Greater Manchester (with 1 being the most important, 4 being the least important):

   1. Set up low emissions zones around schools and hospitals
   2. Only allow low emissions buses and delivery vehicles
   3. Charge most polluting vehicles entering specified zones
   4. Support more clean energy to replace polluting power generation

7. Which of the following do you think Greater Manchester should prioritise to help meet the region’s future energy needs and carbon reduction targets and improve and protect our environment? Please select all that apply.

☐ Develop a Greater Manchester, democratically owned and controlled energy supply company, favouring renewables
☐ Provide grants to improve insulation and energy efficiency in homes and public buildings
☐ Reduce land banking and coal bed methane drilling
☐ Restrict vehicle access in specified zones
☐ Provide grants for energy storage
☐ Support local community energy projects to generate more clean energy

8. What else is important to you as regards the environment?

Jobs and the Economy

Manchester city centre has been transformed and Manchester can claim to have a critical mass of knowledge intensive jobs / service sector jobs. But there remains a large gap in wages and job creation between the centre and South side of Greater Manchester and the Northern boroughs, with average wage differences of £5,000 per annum.

21. Please use the drop down menus to rank the following areas where you would like to see jobs created (with 1 being the most important, 4 being the least important):

   1. Manchester city centre
   2. The prestwich borought (Manchester, Oldham and Tameside)
   3. Your local area (within 6 miles of where you live)
   4. Manchester Airport business park

22. Greater Manchester should require all employers operating public service contracts to meet defined ‘fair employment’ standards, including elements such as wages, conditions and career recognition - Do you agree?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t Know

23. Which of the following do you think that Greater Manchester should prioritise to improve the quality of jobs and the economy? Please select all that apply.

☐ Maximise the adoption of the real Living Wage (higher than the government’s National Living Wage of £7.79 per hour)
☐ Improve childcare options for Greater Manchester’s working families
☐ Targets and programmes for adding and moving jobs across Greater Manchester boroughs
☐ Targets and programmes for Greater Manchester young people’s practical skills

24. What else is important to you as regards jobs and the economy?
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## APPENDIX B: EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>BOOKINGS</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/09/2025</td>
<td>19:00-20:30</td>
<td>'What's missing?! We need woman to help shape Greater Manchester’s future - DivaManc!</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Manlay Park Community Centre, York Avenue, Whalley Range, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/09/2025</td>
<td>10:30-17:00</td>
<td>GMAUTC Conference on Devolution and Decentralisation in England</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Cross Street Chapel, Manchester, M2 1HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/09/2025</td>
<td>18:30-21:00</td>
<td>A better devolution? (Steady State Manchester)</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/2015</td>
<td>15:00-17:30</td>
<td>'Speak Up' launch event - Climate Change Coalition</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Cross St. Chapel, Cross St, Manchester M2 1HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/2015</td>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – NEON – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Birley Campus, Bonsall St, Manchester M15 6GX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/2015</td>
<td>10:30-18:00</td>
<td>JustFest – Volunteering and Social Justice Festival (98 degrees F) stall/activities</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>University of Manchester, The Academy, Oxford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2015</td>
<td>19:00-21:00</td>
<td>DivaManc Switch-Off: Connecting women &amp; their ideas for a brighter DivaManc open to all women and girls across Greater Manchester?</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Whalley Range High School for Girls, Wilbraham Road, Whalley Range, Manchester, M18 8GW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/11/2015</td>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
<td>Wigan, Bolton (West), Salford (North) - local boroughs event - The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Little Fifteens, 17-19 Walgate, Town Centre, Wigan, WN5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/10/2015</td>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Democracy – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/2015</td>
<td>18:30-20:30</td>
<td>Trafford, Salford (South), Manchester (Central) - local boroughs event - The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>The Life Centre, 235 Washway Road, Sale, Trafford, M33 8BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/10/2015</td>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Equality – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2015</td>
<td>19:00-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Housing – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>New venue, Methodist Central Hall, Oldham Street, Manchester M1 1JQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2015</td>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
<td>Oldham Tameside Rochdale (East) - local boroughs event - The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Age UK Tameside, 11 Katherine Street, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 7AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11/2015</td>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Economy – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11/2015</td>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
<td>Bury, Bolton (East), Rochdale (West), Manchester (North) - local boroughs event - The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Bury Masonic Hall, Parson’s Lane, Bury, BL9 6LY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2015</td>
<td>10:30-13:30</td>
<td>Older People’s Greater Manchester Devolution</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2015</td>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Health Care – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2015</td>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
<td>Stretford, Manchester (South) - local boroughs event - The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Woodhouse Park Lidgette Centre, Portway, Wythenshawe, Manchester, M22 1SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/2015</td>
<td>18:30-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Environment – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/2015</td>
<td>11:00-14:00</td>
<td>The People’s Plan for Sustainable Food by The Kindling Trust for organisations focused on food</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Bridge 5 Mill, 2A Beswick St, Ancoats, Manchester, M4 7HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/2015</td>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>Greater Manchester – Youth – The People’s Plan</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Mount St, Manchester, M2 5NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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