



DEBATE PACK

Number CDP 2019/0044, 19 February 2019

Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

This pack has been prepared ahead of the debate to be held in Westminster Hall on Thursday 21 February 2019 on the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. The subject for the debate has been nominated by the Backbench Business Committee, and the debate will be opened by William Wragg MP.

The House of Commons Library prepares a briefing in hard copy and/or online for most non-legislative debates in the Chamber and Westminster Hall other than half-hour debates. Debate Packs are produced quickly after the announcement of parliamentary business. They are intended to provide a summary or overview of the issue being debated and identify relevant briefings and useful documents, including press and parliamentary material. More detailed briefing can be prepared for Members on request to the Library.

By Gabrielle Garton
Grimwood
Cassie Barton
Nikki Sutherland

Contents

1.	Greater Manchester Spatial Framework	2
1.1	The Greater Manchester Combined Authority	2
1.2	The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework	3
1.3	Housing and green belt land within the GMSF	3
	Draft GMSF in 2016	3
	Revised draft GMSF in 2019	4
1.4	Views on the 2016 proposals	6
1.5	Further information	7
2.	Calculating housing demand: the standard method	7
3.	Neighbourhood planning	8
	Draft revised NPPF	8
	NPPF 2018	9
4.	News items	11
5.	Parliamentary material	13
	Debates	13
	PQs	13
6.	Useful links and further reading	15

1. Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

This debate was selected by the Backbench Business Committee. Requesting the debate, William Wragg MP stated:¹

[...] The application I am placing for the Committee's esteemed consideration is entitled "The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework." It might seem an obscure topic at this time, but in Greater Manchester it is the thing that is talked about most at the moment. It is to do with the allocation of land for housing, business and commerce. The most contentious aspect is the section on green belt release, which, as I am sure hon. Members know, is very important in our constituencies.

The application comes in the light of the draft being revised and being put out again for consultation. It is worth noting that the original consultation exercise was one of the largest ever undertaken, with one of the highest response rates from individual members of the public.

I am asking for a 90-minute debate in Westminster Hall. It has a range of cross-party support. In Greater Manchester we are but 26 constituencies, four of which are Conservative—mine is one—and the other 22 are Labour, so it has got a flavour of cross-party support.

1.1 The Greater Manchester Combined Authority

The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), established in 2011, is made up of the ten Greater Manchester councils.² The ten councils are: Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan.

The [Greater Manchester Combined Authority \(Functions and Amendment\) Order 2016](#) and the accompanying [explanatory memorandum](#) conferred on the GMCA, to be exercisable by the Mayor, a duty to prepare a spatial development strategy.³ Andy Burnham was elected Mayor in May 2017.⁴

For further information see Commons Library briefings [Combined Authorities](#)⁵ and [Devolution to Local Government in England](#).⁶

¹ [Backbench Business Committee: Representations: Backbench Debates, Tuesday 12 February 2019](#)

² As established by the [Greater Manchester Combined Authority Order 2011 SI 2016/1267](#)

³ The [Greater Manchester Combined Authority \(Election of Mayor with Police and Crime Commissioner Functions Order 2016\)](#), made on 29 March 2016, established the position of elected Mayor of the Combined Authority, with the first election on 4 May 2017 and the elected Mayor taking office, including taking over the functions of the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Commissioner, on 8 May 2017

⁵ SN 06649, [Combined Authorities](#), 4 July 2017

⁶ SN 07029, [Devolution to local government in England](#), 9 May 2018

1.2 The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

The GMCA is in the process of producing a “Greater Manchester Spatial Framework” (GMSF), which will be a joint plan to manage the supply of land for jobs and new homes across Greater Manchester, up to the year 2035. The idea is that the GMSF will be the overarching development plan within which Greater Manchester’s ten local planning authorities will be able to identify more detailed sites for jobs and homes in their own area. As such, the GMSF will not cover everything that a local plan would cover, and individual districts will continue to produce their own local plans.⁷

The consultation on the initial evidence base was launched in November 2014. Since then, key stages in the process have been:

- [Consultation on an initial GMSF evidence base - November 2014](#)
- [Consultation on vision and draft strategic options - November 2015 to January 2016](#)
- [Call for Sites](#)
- [Draft GMSF](#) in October 2016

It was at first expected that the GMSF would be published in 2017 and submitted, examined and adopted in 2018. That has not, though, happened. Instead, a [revised draft plan](#) was published in January 2019. The [consultation is open](#); it closes on 18 March 2019.

1.3 Housing and green belt land within the GMSF

One aspect of the draft GMSF that has attracted controversy is the proposal to release land from the Green Belt for development.

Draft GMSF in 2016

The [draft GMSF in 2016](#) proposed that 227,200 net additional dwellings would be needed in the period up to 2035, some of which it suggested should be built on 4,900 hectares of Greater Manchester's Green Belt.

The Green Belt in Greater Manchester is currently 47 per cent of the total land area of Greater Manchester. The proposals in the draft GMSF 2016 would have reduced this coverage of Green Belt land to 43 per cent.⁸ The “reasoned justification” provided for this in the draft GMSF 2016 was as follows:

The scale of development that needs to be accommodated within Greater Manchester over the next two decades means that some changes to the Green Belt boundaries within Greater Manchester are necessary, but these have been minimised as far as possible, having regard in particular to the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. This will result in a net reduction in the total area of designated green belt of 4,900 hectares (8.2%),

⁷ GMCA, [Greater Manchester Spatial Framework website](#) [accessed 15 February 2019]

⁸ GMCA, [draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework: draft for consultation](#), October 2016: page 76

ensuring that nearly 43% of Greater Manchester will be green belt.

16.0.2 As such, the Green Belt makes up a considerable proportion of Greater Manchester, and it is therefore vital that its various parts play a beneficial role that supports the environmental, social and economic well being of the sub-region's residents. The Greater Manchester Mayor and local authorities will plan, in particular, for the enhancement of its green infrastructure functions, such as improved public access and habitat restoration, helping to deliver environmental and social benefits for the residents of Greater Manchester and providing the high quality green spaces that will support economic growth.⁹

Revised draft GMSF in 2019

The [revised draft GMSF](#) published in January 2019 offered updated figures for the phasing of new housing in Greater Manchester, proposing a new, lower total of 200,980 dwellings. Information about the anticipated speed of development was also provided:

7.13 Taking all of these factors into account, it is anticipated that there will be around 9,200 housing completions on average up until 2023, accelerating to an average of around 11,000 net additional dwellings per annum up to 2037.

The table below shows the number of proposed dwellings in each district in the 2019 draft compared with the 2016 draft. Oldham is the only district to have had its proposed housing requirement increased.

2019 draft GMSF: proposed distribution of housing by district				
Numbers of dwellings				
District	2019 draft		Total requirement in 2016 draft	% change between drafts
	Total requirement	Annual average requirement		
Bolton	13,800	726	16,800	-18%
Bury	9,470	498	12,500	-24%
Manchester	54,530	2,870	55,300	-1%
Oldham	14,290	752	13,700	+4%
Rochdale	12,160	640	15,500	-22%
Salford	32,680	1,720	34,900	-6%
Stockport	14,520	764	19,300	-25%
Tameside	8,850	466	13,600	-35%
Trafford	19,280	1,015	23,100	-17%
Wigan	21,400	1,126	22,500	-5%
Total	200,980	10,578	227,200	-12%

⁹ As above

Source: GMCA, [Greater Manchester's Plan For Homes, Jobs And The Environment: Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Revised Draft](#), January 2019: Table 7.2; [Draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework: Draft for consultation](#), Table 8.1

Another [table on page 123](#) shows the sources of land supply to 2037.

The revised draft results in a reduced loss of Green Belt land compared with the 2016 draft. The 2019 draft proposes releasing 2,419 hectares (24.19 km²) of Green Belt for development, resulting in a net 4.1% reduction in the size of Greater Manchester's Green Belt compared with an 8.2% reduction in the 2016 draft. Overall, the reduction would result in Greater Manchester's Green Belt covering 45% of its total area (compared with 47% currently).

The draft says that the reduction in net loss between the 2016 and 2019 drafts is achieved by:

1. reducing the number of proposed sites
2. reducing the loss of Green Belt within sites
3. proposing 'new' Green Belt additions

The table overleaf shows the current extent of the Green Belt within each district in Greater Manchester.

Extent of Green Belt in Greater Manchester districts				
As at 31 March 2018				
District	Green Belt (km ²)	Total area (km ²)	% of land that is Green Belt	% of total Green Belt that is in this district
Bolton	72.3	139.8	52%	12%
Bury	59.2	99.5	60%	10%
Manchester	12.8	115.6	11%	2%
Oldham	62.5	142.3	44%	10%
Rochdale	99.3	158.1	63%	17%
Salford	33.7	97.2	35%	6%
Stockport	58.6	126.0	47%	10%
Tameside	50.7	103.2	49%	9%
Trafford	39.9	106.0	38%	7%
Wigan	106.5	188.2	57%	18%
Total	595.5	1276.0	47%	100%

Source: MHCLG, [Local authority Green Belt statistics for England: 2017 to 2018](#), Accompanying tables

The revised draft GMSF 2019 speaks of "selectively releasing Green Belt land". Although these releases will be kept as low as possible, removing some Green Belt land in strategic locations is (the draft says) the only realistic option:

7.21 A key aim of the GMSF is to boost the supply of new homes, in some areas this will help to diversify local housing markets that are often dominated by low-cost housing, bring more money into local economies, and deliver more mixed and inclusive communities. It will also help to increase the options for skilled workers looking to move into or within Greater Manchester. Focusing a significant proportion of housing growth in the northern areas will assist in this, supported by selectively releasing Green Belt sites to deliver a diverse mix of values and tenures that includes affordable homes as well as some higher value housing, (relative to prevailing values in the local area), within a high quality environment. This will help to achieve a better spread of higher value housing and prosperity across Greater Manchester, whilst also delivering greater diversity within individual areas.

(...)

7.23 A key part of the overall strategy is to maximise the amount of development on brownfield sites in the most accessible locations, and minimise the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land as far as possible. In order to deliver the necessary densities, an increasing proportion of new dwellings will be in the form of apartments and town houses, continuing recent trends.

(...)

7.32 The existing supply of potential housing sites identified in the districts' strategic housing land availability assessments, small sites and empty properties is insufficient to meet the overall identified need. Consequently, if Greater Manchester is to meet its future housing requirements, there is a need to identify additional sites across the city-region. The only realistic option for doing so is to remove some land from the Green Belt in strategic locations.¹⁰

Mapping the 2019 proposals

Local-level maps with detail of the 2019 proposals are available. Proposed allocations are outlined in detail in chapter 11 of the [2019 draft](#) (pp. 195-374). Appendix A has details on proposed additions to the Green Belt (pp. 375-440).

An interactive map is also available for viewing selected aspects of the proposals. The [version linked to here](#) shows the 2019 proposed allocations sites, existing Green Belt, proposed Green Belt additions, and parliamentary constituency boundaries. The 'layers' box in the top right of the screen lets the user select other features and boundaries.

1.4 Views on the 2016 proposals

A range of political views have been expressed on the original proposals. For example, specialist publication *Planning* reported in November 2016 that Andy Burnham (then MP for Leigh and Labour Mayoral candidate) had expressed concerns about the amount of Green Belt land that the draft GMSF 2016 earmarked for release. The article noted that while the new Mayor would need to agree to the plan for it

¹⁰ GMCA, [Greater Manchester's Plan For Homes, Jobs And The Environment: Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Revised Draft](#), January 2019: pages 119 -125

to be adopted, he/she would need to secure the agreement of the GMCA councils if they wanted to amend it.¹¹

Another article in the *Manchester Evening News* in October 2016 reported the views of each MP in the Greater Manchester region on the proposals.¹² Links to [more recent stories about the GMSF](#) are available from the *Manchester Evening News* website.

An [article from law firm Pinsent Masons](#) in October 2016 highlighted the view of their planning expert that the draft GMSF was “not ambitious enough” in terms of identifying enough land for new jobs and homes, suggesting that the numbers were lower than those that had been achieved by Greater Manchester in “recent years”.¹³

1.5 Further information

For further information on housing and Green Belt policy see Commons Library briefings [Green Belt](#),¹⁴ [Planning for Housing](#)¹⁵ and [Local authority housing data: housing supply](#).¹⁶

2. Calculating housing demand: the standard method

Although media coverage suggested that the release of the draft revised GMSF was to be delayed, to capture revised household projections to be published in September 2018,¹⁷ the revised draft 2019 uses the former Department of Communities and Local Government 2014-based household projections.¹⁸

The Commons Library briefing [What next for planning in England? The National Planning Policy Framework](#) sets out Government policy towards the introduction of a standard method for calculating housing need.¹⁹ More recently, the Government has held a [technical consultation on changes to planning policy and guidance](#), including the standard method. The Commons Library Insight [Housing targets: can we predict future need?](#) explains the difference between the 2014-based and newer, revised 2016-based household projections.

¹¹ “[What obstacles does the city-regional plan for Manchester face?](#)” *Planning*, 4 November 2016 [subscription required: Members and their staff can obtain copies of the article by contacting the Library]

¹² “[From 'crucial' to 'ridiculous' - what MPs think of Greater Manchester's radical expansion plans](#)”, *Manchester Evening News*, 31 October 2016.

¹³ “[Greater Manchester to consider draft 'Spatial Framework' planning strategy this week](#)”, *Out-law.com*, 26 October 2016

¹⁴ SN 00934, [Green Belt](#), 4 January 2019

¹⁵ SN 03741, [Planning for Housing](#), 14 June 2017

¹⁶ Commons Library Insight, [Local authority data: housing supply](#), 22 November 2018

¹⁷ “[Spatial framework for Greater Manchester delayed](#)”, *The Planner*, 2 July 2018

¹⁸ GMCA, [Greater Manchester's Plan For Homes, Jobs And The Environment: Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Revised Draft](#), January 2019: paragraph 7.6 and footnote 67

¹⁹ SN 08260, [What next for planning in England? The National Planning Policy Framework](#), 12 October 2018

The [Planning Practice Guidance on housing need assessment](#) remarks that the aim is to update that guidance consistent with increasing housing supply:

We have published a consultation paper on [Changes to planning policy and guidance including the standard method for assessing local housing need](#) which sets out proposals to update planning practice guidance on housing need assessment to be consistent with increasing housing supply.²⁰

According to the [consultation document](#), lower household projections do not mean fewer houses will be needed:

5. The recent household projections release, published by the Office of National Statistic (ONS), has led some areas to reconsider the number of homes they were planning for. However, as the ONS has confirmed, lower household projections do not mean fewer homes need to be built. If more homes are planned for and delivered, more people will be able to own or rent their own home. This consultation therefore proposes changes to the standard method to ensure consistency with the objective of building more homes, whilst providing the stability communities need.²¹

The consultation was launched on 26 October and closed on 7 December 2018; [responses are still being analysed](#).

3. Neighbourhood planning

One issue which sometimes attracts controversy is the relationship between neighbourhood plans and local plans; local residents may fear that the neighbourhood plan will be overridden in favour of the local plan.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised and updated in July 2018, following a consultation.

As the Commons Library briefing [What next for planning in England? The National Planning Policy Framework](#) explains, MHCLG's [Planning Practice Guidance on neighbourhood planning](#) says that there is no need to review or update Neighbourhood Plans but, if they conflict with more recent policies in a local plan, it is those more recent plans which take precedence.^{22,23} This, then, means that a Neighbourhood Plan may be overridden when considering local housing need or planning applications against the backdrop of a more recent local plan (or, conversely, an absent local plan), often to the frustration of the local community.

Draft revised NPPF

In revising the NPPF, the intention was to bring into the text policy changes already announced through written Ministerial Statements, in

²⁰ MHCLG, [Guidance: Housing need assessment](#), 20 March 2015, updated 13 September 2018

²¹ MHCLG, [Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance](#), October 2018: page 6

²² SN 08260, [What next for planning in England? The National Planning Policy Framework](#), 12 October 2018

²³ MHCLG, [Neighbourhood planning](#), 6 March 2014, updated 13 September 2018

this instance the former housing minister [Gavin Barwell's written statement in December 2016](#). In that statement, Gavin Barwell drew attention to the frustration felt by communities that had worked to put together a Neighbourhood Plan – which would in other circumstances mean that planning applications conflicting with that plan would normally be refused – but found that the presumption in favour of sustainable development nevertheless kicked in, because the LPA could not demonstrate a five-year land supply of deliverable homes. The statement was thus intended to give some clarity and some degree of weight to the Neighbourhood Plan, by saying that (with certain conditions, as listed in the statement) the Neighbourhood Plan's policies for supply of housing should not be considered out-of-date if that plan was less than two years old.²⁴ Paragraph 14 and footnote 9 of the [draft revised NPPF](#) therefore set this out.²⁵

The draft revised NPPF was, though, criticised by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) for (in their view) implying that Neighbourhood Plans would have to be revised every two years.²⁶

NPPF 2018

In the [Government response to the NPPF consultation](#), MHCLG remarked that neighbourhood planning bodies had suggested that Neighbourhood Plans should be considered up-to-date for five years rather than two, but rejected this suggestion, arguing that such a change was not necessary as the transitional arrangements reflected the December 2016 Written Ministerial Statement.²⁷

The [NPPF 2018](#) has therefore been reworded to remove the reference to the neighbourhood plan having been passed at referendum and to stipulate that, for the adverse impact of development conflicting with the Neighbourhood Plan to significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, one of the conditions is that the Neighbourhood Plan should have become part of the development plan within the last two years:

14. In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply:
- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made;
 - b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement;
 - c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply

Concerns remain about the weight to be given to older Neighbourhood Plans, as the NPPF 2018 limits the transitional arrangements to those that are less than two years old, although there is a limited exception: up to and including 11 December 2018, neighbourhood plans that became part of the development plan more than two years before the date on which the decision is made are also included.

²⁴ [HCWS346, 12 December 2016](#)

²⁵ MHCLG, [National Planning Policy Framework: Draft text for consultation](#), March 2018: page 7

²⁶ See, for example, CPRE, "[Letter: Crass threat to Neighbourhood Plans](#)", 23 April 2018

²⁷ MHCLG, [Government response to the draft revised National Planning Policy Framework consultation](#), July 2018: page 58

requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and

d) the local planning authority's housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.²⁸

The [relevant paragraph in NPPF 2018](#) setting out the transitional arrangements provided for a limited exception to the requirement in paragraph 14 (a) that the neighbourhood plan should have become part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made – until 11 December 2018. Plans that became part of the development plan more than two years before the date of decision were also included:

216. For the purpose of paragraph 14:

a) up to and including 11 December 2018, paragraph 14a also includes neighbourhood plans that became part of the development plan more than two years before the date on which the decision is made; and

b) from November 2018 to November 2019, housing delivery should be at least 25% of that required over the previous three years, as measured by the Housing Delivery Test.²⁹

CPRE continues to argue that this leaves the status of older Neighbourhood Plans unclear:

CPRE have a number of other concerns, including:

(...)

- the discouragement of neighbourhood planning because of uncertainty over the validity of plans older than two years.³⁰

For further background information, see the Commons Library briefing [Neighbourhood Planning](#).³¹

²⁸ MHCLG, [National Planning Policy Framework](#), Cm 9680, July 2018: page 7

²⁹ MHCLG, [National Planning Policy Framework](#), Cm 9680, July 2018: page 62

³⁰ CPRE, [New 'planning rulebook' heavily criticised by CPRE](#), 24 July 2018

³¹ SN 05838, [Neighbourhood Planning](#), 4 July 2016

4. News items

Rochdale Online

19 February 2019

Tandle Hill 'Save the Greenbelt' march to protest controversial proposals for building thousands of homes across local greenbelt

<https://www.rochdaleonline.co.uk/news-features/2/news-headlines/126166/tandle-hill-save-the-greenbelt-march-to-protest-controversial-proposals-for-building-thousands-of-homes-across-local-greenbelt>

Place North West

28 January 2019

Metrolink tram-train expansion wins Government backing

<https://www.placenorthwest.co.uk/news/metrolink-tram-train-expansion-wins-government-backing/>

Architects' Journal

22 January 2019

Manchester sets out plans for 50,000 affordable homes

<https://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/manchester-sets-out-plans-for-50000-affordable-homes/10039096.article>

Manchester Evening News

13 January 2019

Campaigners warn of repeat mass protests against green belt development in Oldham

<https://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/greater-manchester-news/oldham-council-green-belt-protest-15670703>

Messenger Newspapers

7 January 2019

Spatial Framework: Revised development plan cuts green belt loss

<https://www.messengernewspapers.co.uk/news/17339586.spatial-framework-revised-development-plan-cuts-green-belt-loss/>

Manchester Evening News

30 November 2018

Plans for Greater Manchester's green belt will FINALLY surface in January

<https://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/greater-manchester-news/plans-greater-manchesters-green-belt-15489748>

The Planner

2 July 2018

Spatial framework for Greater Manchester delayed

<https://www.theplanner.co.uk/news/spatial-framework-for-greater-manchester-delayed>

5. Parliamentary material

Debates

Housing, Planning and the Green Belt

HC Deb 6 February 2018 | Vol 635 c1416-

<http://bit.ly/2BiePd9>

Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

HC Deb 14 December 2016 | Volume 618 c385-

<http://bit.ly/2DRcGDm>

PQs

[Topical Questions](#)

Asked by: Mary Robinson

The expansion of the Metrolink network is a key part of Greater Manchester's transport strategy. In the light of proposals to increase the amount of housing stock in Gatley, Cheadle Hulme and Heald Green as part of the Greater Manchester spatial framework, improvements in our local transport capacity are a priority for my constituents. What steps has the Department taken to support tram-train technology, with a view to expanding the tram-train Metrolink to my constituency?

Answered by: Chris Grayling | Department: Transport

As my hon. Friend will know, the Mayor of Manchester and I recently agreed to work together on the potential expansion of the Metrolink network with the use of tram-train technology. The Government have already funded a tram-train system in Sheffield, which is making a difference there, and I am keen to see how we can extend that to Greater Manchester.

HC Deb 14 February 2019 | Vol 654 c1033

[Business of the House](#)

Jim McMahon: The Greater Manchester spatial framework is causing a great deal of anxiety in my constituency. The plan, with a Government-imposed housing target, will mean the net loss of green-belt land. At the same time, insufficient funding is in place to redevelop brownfield sites that the community is desperate to see redeveloped. How can it be right that landowners, through no positive action on their part, can be made millionaires overnight through a simple change in land use policy,

when brownfield sites, which are desperate for funding from Government, are being left to rot? How can that be a fair settlement for the community?

HC Deb 17 January 2019 | Vol 652 c1339

[Business of the House](#)

Chris Green: The original version of the Greater Manchester spatial framework that the Labour leadership in my region drew up was so bad that it was criticised by 27,000 residents, as well as Conservative colleagues across Greater Manchester—it was rightly torn up and started again. The new version of the GMSF is better, especially as it has more of a focus on the redevelopment of Bolton town centre. Can we have a debate on the importance of listening to local residents, who emphasise the importance of redeveloping our town centres and brownfield sites, rather than Labour's focus on using the green belt first?

HC Deb 10 January 2019 | Vol 652 c555

[Topical Questions](#)

Asked by: Mr William Wragg

Following the Office for National Statistics household projection figures being revised downwards by nearly a quarter, will my hon. Friend the Minister ensure that regional housing targets reflect the easing of pressure to build on the green belt, with particular reference to the Greater Manchester spatial framework?

Answered by: Kit Malthouse | Department: Housing, Communities and Local Government

My hon. Friend may know that we have already issued a technical consultation on the latest household projection numbers and the impact on projected housing need in local authority areas. We really do not want local authorities to take their foot of the accelerator, however, not least because we believe that there is pent-up demand for housing in this country. We are working with authorities across the country to get the formula right in the longer term, while we seek a short-term fix to keep numbers up, but I would be more than happy to meet him and his colleagues to discuss the Manchester spatial framework further.

HC Deb 05 Nov 2018 | Vol 648 c1231

6. Useful links and further reading

Manchester City Council consultation *Greater Manchester's plan for homes, jobs and the environment*

https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/info/200024/consultations_and_survey/7725/greater_manchester_s_plan_for_homes_jobs_and_the_environment

University of Manchester policy blog *Learning from the draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework process* September 6 2017

<http://blog.policy.manchester.ac.uk/posts/2017/09/learning-from-the-draft-greater-manchester-spatial-framework-process/>

Greater Manchester Spatial Framework – Friends of the Earth reaction
7th January 2019

<https://www.manchesterfoe.org.uk/blog/2019/01/07/greater-manchester-spatial-framework-friends-of-the-earth-reaction/>

Greater Manchester Housing Action *Why is the GM Spatial Framework delayed?* 11 October 2018

<http://www.gmhousingaction.com/why-is-the-gm-spatial-framework-delayed/>

About the Library

The House of Commons Library research service provides MPs and their staff with the impartial briefing and evidence base they need to do their work in scrutinising Government, proposing legislation, and supporting constituents.

As well as providing MPs with a confidential service we publish open briefing papers, which are available on the Parliament website.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in these publically available research briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

If you have any comments on our briefings please email papers@parliament.uk. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing only with Members and their staff.

If you have any general questions about the work of the House of Commons you can email hcinfo@parliament.uk.

Disclaimer

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties. It is a general briefing only and should not be relied on as a substitute for specific advice. The House of Commons or the author(s) shall not be liable for any errors or omissions, or for any loss or damage of any kind arising from its use, and may remove, vary or amend any information at any time without prior notice.

The House of Commons accepts no responsibility for any references or links to, or the content of, information maintained by third parties. This information is provided subject to the [conditions of the Open Parliament Licence](#).