**Schedule of comments made on the draft Statement of Community Involvement and the Council’s proposed response to them**

**Consultation 7th August – 2nd October 2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | **Comment ID** | **Document ref (whole doc / chapter / paragraph no. etc)** | | **Comment** | **Summary** | **Council’s response** |
| Network Rail | [1](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\1.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the proposed policy. Network Rail owns, maintains, renews and enhances the railway infrastructure in England, Wales and Scotland. Network Rail would comment as follows:  I am sure you are aware that Network Rail is a statutory consultee for:  (a) Any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and  (b) For any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order); in addition you are required to consult the Office of Rail and Road (ORR).  All planning applications and policy consultations should be flagged up to the Network Rail Town Planning Team London North Western Route at the following address only (please delete all other addresses):  Town Planning Team LNW Network Rail 1st Floor Square One 4 Travis Street Manchester M1 2NY Email: TownPlanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk | MCC summary: Would like to be consulted on specific planning applications as set out in the response and has provided an address for planning app and policy consultations. Requested deletion of other Network Rail addresses on our database. | Comments noted. Planning policy consultations will be sent to the address provided, contact details passed on to Development Management. Alternative Network Rail contacts at other addresses on the council's planning policy database have been deleted. |
| Trafford resident | [5](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\5.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | The very fact that this online consultation platform hasn't been used for a year speaks volumes about the lack of meaningful public consultation processes that take place. | Annual Opportunity to Comment | This online consultation platform is used for planning policy specific consultations only. We carry out policy consultations when we are reviewing existing policy documents or producing new ones. We do not review local development documents on an annual basis, as their policies are intended to remain relevant for the long term. The Local Plan, for example looks forward across a ten to fifteen year period. Whilst review work and consultation begins a long way in advance of policies coming into force, we do not undertake reviews and therefore consultations on a yearly basis as standard. However whilst we are in the process of preparing a specific document we will often consult more than once within a year.  The Council's Local Development Scheme sets out the timetable for producing Local Development Documents, it can be downloaded from http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/1804/local\_development\_scheme\_2017\_-2019  There are many other public consultations which take place on planning frameworks and non-planning specific issues which do not use this platform, but are available through http://www.manchester.gov.uk/consultations |
| Salford resident | [21](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\21.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | There can be no real change in manchester until the wrongs of the past have been put right. In the case homelessness there was no policy and only recently any policy has taken shape. That lack of policy and the gatekeeping function led to people dying or suffering harm. Until the council has put right the wrongs of the past there can be no real change. While the dovument is a good starting point - there is considerable lack of trust and the local authority needs to repair that lavk of trust and reach out to those so badly affected by the local authority. |  | The Council is taking a new approach to engagement across all services. The Our Manchester approach aims to listen and engage with people about what matters to them, their area and their services; and to focus on what can be achieved rather than what can't. It is hoped that over time as communities become more involved in decision making in the city this will help to build trust in the Council. |
| Natural England | [57](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\57.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | We are supportive of the principle of meaningful and early engagement of the general community, community organisations and statutory bodies in local planning matters, both in terms of shaping policy and participating in the process of determining planning applications.  We regret we are unable to comment, in detail, on individual Statements of Community Involvement but information on the planning service we offer, including advice on how to consult us, can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals.  We now ask that all planning consultations are sent electronically to the central hub for our planning and development advisory service at the following address: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk. This system enables us to deliver the most efficient and effective service to our customers. |  | Support welcomed. Planning policy consultations are sent to the email address provided. |
| Manchester Airport | [58](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\58.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | We are supportive of the general approach to consultation set out in the document and of the intention to encourage greater community involvement in the planning process. However, we would request that Manchester Airport is listed as a specific consultation body within any future Appendices or documentation relating to consultees.  Manchester Airport is the largest airport outside of the South East and the UK’s third busiest airport, handling around 27 million passengers in 2016. The Airport serves more than 225 destinations worldwide and enjoys significant cargo operations. As the primary international gateway for the North, Manchester Airport provides crucial links with overseas markets and is recognised as a key driver of the North West Economy. The Airport employs 22,000 people on site, with a further 45,000 jobs in the wider region. The Airport generates an estimated £925 million of GVA for the North West region.  Manchester City Council is without doubt well placed to both assist and benefit from the Airport’s role as a major transport and economic hub. It is therefore important for Manchester Airport to be involved in the consultation process when you are preparing planning documents. This will allow appropriate consideration of how the Airport impacts upon the city and ensure that a suitable policy framework is put in place to enable Manchester to benefit from and contribute to the economic advantages and transport facilities that Manchester Airport brings to the region. | MCC summary: Supportive of the general approach to consultation in the SCI but asks that Manchester Airport is listed as a specific consultation body within any future Appendices or documentation relating to consultees, with justification for this as set out in the response. | The Council recognises the role which Manchester Airport plays as a consultee during the preparation of planning policies and will continue to engage closely with the Airport. However the SCI does not include a list of consultees for planning policies, as we have a large number of organisations on our planning policy database and these change over time. Paragraph 4.3 of the SCI points people to the list of specific consultees in Regulation 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. |
| Northenden Neighbourhood Forum | [126](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\126.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | One method to devolve decisions is via Neighbourhood Forums. They can be focal points, to provide more information about how communities can apply for funding or community asset transfers, especially when particular issues are raised in surveys. They can assist with arranging meetings in local areas so that local residents could indicate preferred areas for and types of residential developments, as they hold regular meetings anyway.  Linking planning with other council departments could also assist- we have found as a forum that different council departments are supportive of working with partners in the community – for example to work on plans for assets of community value. Neighbourhood forums hold regular meetings and this an opportunity for planning matters and community initiatives to be discussed with the wider community. Neighbourhood Forums could be added automatically to the list of stakeholders for the portal database for planning in their area. Forums could be consulted at all stages in the planning process. |  | All Neighbourhood Forums will be included in our planning policy consultee database and will receive updates in relation to consultation on planning policies as they are prepared. To date (December 2017) Northenden Neighbourhood Forum is the only designated forum in Manchester and is on the database. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [145](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\145.pdf) | Statement of Community Involvement 2017 |  | It is not clear whether S106 funds will be used for improving streets and highways, this is an issue for many older people using mobility scooters and wheelchairs who often find it easier to travel on the highway; which unfortunately is a more dangerous option. These are the sort of issues that are important to local people. |  | This is beyond the scope of the SCI, which does not set out requirements for s106 contributions. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [127](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\127.pdf) | Preparing the Statement of Community Involvement | 1 | The font size was too small and it was difficult to adjust without losing some text off the page. |  | If you are viewing consultation documents via our consultation portal there is information about the accessibility settings under "accessibility" towards the top right hand of the page. Users can make the font larger from this page and also view an index of where the keyboard access keys will take them if they use these.  Our PDF versions of consultation documents are high resolution so that users can zoom in to enlarge text or images without losing clarity.  We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request and the SCI will be amended to refer to this. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [128](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\128.pdf) | Preparing the Statement of Community Involvement | 1 | The front page should have provided information on the availability of alternative formats. |  | It isn’t always possible to guarantee that all consultation documents will be available in different formats as standard. However we will try to accommodate requests for consultation materials in alternative formats, and paragraph 2.6 of the SCI will be amended to refer to this.  We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request and the SCI will be amended to refer to this. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [129](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\129.pdf) | Preparing the Statement of Community Involvement | 1 | The ability to print from the website for the public to read before commenting on-line would have been useful. |  | A PDF version of the draft SCI was available online during the consultation period, which could be printed off. |
| Manchester resident | [22](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\22.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.1 | Responses can be minimal from Councillors and MCC in terms of percentage response rate. |  | The Council will provide feedback when you make comments during planning policy consultations - comments, and our responses to them, will be available on the consultation portal at formal consultation stages.  When preparing Local Plans the Council will produce a consultation statement at Publication stage (see paragraph 4.10) summarising the main issues raised earlier in the preparation process and setting out how these have been addressed. |
| Manchester resident | [2](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\2.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.2 | When considering building new properties, what or who looks at education levels and vacancies for children.  What about the leisure side of life such as Allotments and parks with useful items within for use by young people, does anyone ever consider youth clubs, and the financial support that these need, or meeting areas for teenagers to stop the drinking, drug taking and general misbehaviour.  MCC are forever going on about a place to live with an affordable rent, then allow investors to build and charge what ever is the commercial rate, it is about time the MCC built or controlled the property boom. | It is time to think out of the box and include leisure activities within the greater concept of just putting up properties to live in. | Education provision is considered as part of the evidence base which is prepared to justify Local Plan policies.  The Statement of Community Involvement sets out how we will engage with you during planning policy preparation. The issues which you refer to in your comment are topics that would be covered as part of a Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Document - the Statement of Community Involvement itself does not include policies relating to leisure activities or affordable housing. We will be consulting on a Local Plan for Manchester next year and it will include these sorts of policy areas. |
| Trafford resident | [6](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\6.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.2 | The best possible vehicle for communities to have a stake in the planning process is clearly through formal Neighbourhood Forums. There are 1800 in the UK, two of which are in Manchester - why is that number so low?  Extensive support and assistance should be provided free of charge, as a public service, to help neighbourhoods gain some self empowerment in this way. | Support the Formation of More Neighbourhood Forums | Chapter 8 of the SCI relates to neighbourhood planning, with paragraph 8.7 setting out the support which the Council provides to communities working on neighbourhood planning. |
| Manchester resident | [23](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\23.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.2 | This is a 'nice' picture but not demonstrative of real events. For example see how MCC leaders avoid social responsibility, defy their ethic codes and create no affordable housing in tax avoiding companies. www.themeteor.org/2017/08/01/manchesters-property-investment-boom-funded-through-tax-dodging-offshore-companies-unethical-international-investment/ |  | Comments noted. The SCI deals with consultation on planning processes specifically, rather than the process for development partnerships. Residential tenure is something that would be addressed by the Council's Local Plan, which is to be reviewed in the near future. |
| Manchester resident | [60](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\60.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.2 | This document does not include a number of key things about residents' attempts to engage with Planning  A) what do residents do if we don't get any response to our reporting of breaches, or planning applications? (We know very well that there are not nearly enough enforcement officers in the whole council - so they are not doing the community liaison work as well as the actual planning documents)  B) what do residents do to protect our streets and neighbours if 'what the political party wants' means councillors cant support residents even if they agree with them  C) how do we 'report' lack of community involvement when it happens   D) Is there any way this community involvement statement could incorporate a "promise" to respond to residents reporting planning issues, within a short time frame (say 10 working days max), that explains what will be done. Can you include some kind of sanction/penalty if this doesn't happen | necessary communication mechanisms between Planners and residents  Promises and penalties in connection with these | If you have complained to us about a planning breach but you feel that this has not been dealt with properly, you can ask for the matter to be reviewed under the Council’s Complaints Procedure – see <http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/200025/complaints/67/tell_us_what_you_think_about_our_services/3> . Ultimately you can also make a complaint to the Local Government & Social Care Ombudsman. Please see <http://www.lgo.org.uk/make-a-complaint/fact-sheets/planning-and-building-control/planning-enforcement> for information on complaining to the Ombudsman about this.  Alleged breaches of planning control are acknowledged and the service aims to keep interested parties updated. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [63](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\63.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.2 | Consultation should include disabled people's organisations and other equality and diversity groups and feedback on comments and consultations should be standard. It should also include organisations involved with the Our Manchester Disability Plan.  In relation to another comment, voluntary organisations should be included as well as neighbourhood groups as they do not always represent equality and diversity issues.  It is also crucial that developers should also be encouraged, and required in large projects, to consult with disabled people's groups such as MDPAG, to ensure adequate access provision and other user groups and expect to pay for consultation, in pre-planning stages.. | Consultation with the voluntary sector should be a key issue as well as consulting with neighbourhood groups and developers should be encouraged and required to consult with MDPAG in pre-planning stages and logged in Design and Access Statements. | Consultation on planning policies includes voluntary groups including disabled people's organisations as well as other equalities groups representing people with the protected characteristics as set out in the Equality Act. Any individuals or organisations who wish to join the planning policy database can either register themselves online or ask us to include them by emailing / posting their contact details to us. This is set out in paragraph 2.3 of the SCI, which gives our website, email address and postal address details for anyone who would like to let us know that they would like to receive notifications on planning policy consultations. In relation to pre-application consultation, we cannot make it a requirement for developers to carry this out, but we do encourage them to, and on a case by case basis we suggest that they engage with various parties. This could include disabled people’s groups and other equalities organisations if appropriate.  We will add reference to paragraph 9.8 of the SCI to encouraging developers to consult with various parties on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the application; and an appendix will be added to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [64](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\64.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.3 | In the first sentence, the voluntary sector relating to equality and diversity, should also be consulted, not just residents and businesses and particularly Manchester Disabled People's Access Group in relation to access for disabled and older people. | Include voluntary sector and access groups in first sentence | Reference to the voluntary sector will be added to paragraph 1.3. The SCI does not list all of the specific groups which we consult, but MDPAG is on our planning policy database and will be consulted during the planning policy preparation process. |
| Manchester resident | [3](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\3.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.4 | The first part that needs removing is the EU directive as you may not have noticed but we are in the course of a brexit.  More advertising of the planning application needs carrying out, and it need to be made easier to comment for or against the application by internet, and to see the application on the same media. | More advertising | The first box in Picture 1.2 will be amended to state "whilst UK remains a member of the EU" after "EU Directives". As these still form part of the legal framework at present they are used when making planning decisions.  You can make comments on planning applications during a consultation period, and view planning applications which are pending or which have been decided, online at http://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/ This is set out in Chapter 9 of the SCI. |
| Trafford resident | [7](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\7.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.4 | The singular point of engagement is narrow, restrictive and not conducive to positive engagement. The framework should embrace co-operative approaches that involve planning, developer and broad and informed community engagement. Ultimately when dome properly the outcomes will see businesses thrive in developments in which the public have played a meaningful role in creating. Developers responding to local community needs will carry the support of surrounding communities, enhancing financial and social sustainability. | Meaningful Engagaement is a Process | The Council engages both the community and developers in planning policy preparation and in decision-making on planning applications. Proposals may be amended following comments from members of the public. Developers are also encouraged to engage with local communities at an early stage.  We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage and for planning frameworks. |
| Manchester resident | [24](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\24.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.4 | People beg for consultation. Often these are false. Many financial companies like Deloitte carve up the city. There are seldom genuine consultations. There advertising or making people aware of planning applications seems to be minimal effort via MCC. There need to be pre-planning applications. There needs to be more active publicity made for SRF's and application, many which people do not pick up on even if care about the issue. |  | The SCI sets out the engagement methods for advertising planning applications in line with legal requirements. In addition to these methods the Council will encourage developers to consult at the pre-application stage, with paragraph 9.10 suggesting methods to be used as appropriate.  Pre-application consultation is strongly encouraged by the Council, and we set out the approach to this in paragraphs 9.7 to 9.13. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage and for planning frameworks.  Comments are also invited by the Council on draft planning frameworks which are then addressed in reports to the Executive. |
| Manchester resident | [50](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\50.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.4 | I could not agree more with the following comment already on the portal:  Ultimately when done properly the outcomes will see businesses thrive in developments in which the public have played a meaningful role in creating. Developers responding to local community needs will carry the support of surrounding communities, enhancing financial and social sustainability | Buildings imposed on the city wont be successful ones. | The Council engages both the community and developers in planning policy preparation and in decision-making on planning applications. Proposals may be amended following comments from members of the public. Developers are also encouraged to engage with local communities at an early stage.  We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage and for planning frameworks. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [66](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\66.pdf) | Paragraph | 1.4 | This comment is in relation to the diagram and to the process. There have been major developments e.g. Town Hall Complex where detailed design issues needed further consultation and discussion with disabled people's organisations and there was only a two hour meeting organised even when it was clear that there were many issues, some of which were not discussed and have resulted in a range of access barriers. More time and consultation processes should be included in the diagram and in the process. It is recommended that the Planning Authority should develop and publish a more inclusive consultation process. | More time allocated to consultation | The diagram is a summary of what feeds into the decision-making process for planning applications, so although consultation is included into the diagram it does not list all of the consultations processes that are undertaken. Consultation processes for planning applications and for policy documents are set out in full detail in later chapters of the SCI. |
| Manchester resident | [4](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\4.pdf) | How we will ask about what is important to you | 2 | By email |  | Comments noted. The Council will email consultees when we carry out planning policy consultations. |
| Trafford resident | [8](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\8.pdf) | How we will ask about what is important to you | 2 | In ways, one wuld hope, that aren't ten chapters long. This very format deters people from contributing and takes far too long. | Efficiently in Future | Some of the planning policy documents that we produce are quite lengthy given the topics which need to be covered, and to ensure that we can provide full reasons for the policies that are being introduced. We will provide a summary of the key messages in policy documents, so that people will be able to tell quickly and easily that a particular policy document might be relevant or of interest to them. We will amend paragraph 2.2 of the SCI to refer to this. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [131](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\131.pdf) | How we will ask about what is important to you | 2 | Use of plain English to ensure the policy is easy to understand especially for those for whom English is not their first language (including BSL users) is important. |  | We will amend paragraph 2.2 of the SCI to refer to explaining clearly why we are asking for your views and that we will provide a summary of the key messages. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [132](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\132.pdf) | How we will ask about what is important to you | 2 | The consultation was only available electronically or a hard copy in central library which is difficult if as an older person you are limited on how far you can travel; could copies not be made available in local libraries on request? |  | Although hard copies of consultation documents will not be put in all Manchester libraries people will be able to access documents online at libraries if they are library members, as set out in paragraph 2.6 of the SCI. For those who are not library members we will try to accommodate requests for hard copies of documents, but would not be able to commit to doing this in all circumstances as it will depend on the scale of the document and the numbers of people requesting it. We will add wording to 2.6 to refer to providing documents in alternative formats including hard copies where this is possible. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [133](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\133.pdf) | How we will ask about what is important to you | 2 | Local and small projects will have a greater impact on older people and it is these that they should be consulted on; although older people would still wish to be consulted on large scale projects too. |  | We will consult everyone on the database in relation to planning policies at the local level and also at the strategic level. Paragraph 2.3 sets out how you can add yourself or how to let us know that you would like to be included on our planning policy database.  You will receive notification of both small and major planning applications if you live adjacent to where these are taking place. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [134](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\134.pdf) | How we will ask about what is important to you | 2 | Will simplified/summary versions of the various documents be available at the end of the process? |  | We will provide a summary of the key messages in policy documents, so that people will be able to tell quickly and easily that a particular policy document might be relevant or of interest to them. We will amend paragraph 2.2 of the SCI to refer to this. |
| Trafford resident | [9](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\9.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.1 | 'Support community action' by fully supporting the formation of Neighbourhood Forums. | Neighbourhood Forums | Chapter 8 of the SCI relates to neighbourhood planning, with the support offered by the Council set out in paragraph 8.7. |
| Manchester resident | [25](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\25.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.1 | The whole communications policy must be improved. The system is also inefficient. For example enquiring about land sales recently, no one knew the reference and it took a week to resolve query despite being advertised in the MEN. There IT needs reviewing. Local twitter handles for each MCC area need to make aware of what is happening. We need creative forums and platforms for pre-planning and this should be encouraged for each developer to meet with a community for substantial projects and especially around SRFs. The research needs to be made active in phone applications and easy ways to outreach and research busy citizens input, not in time-consuming or complex ways, but ones that are fair and effective and not biased in sample selection. |  | Please see response to your comment ID24.  Land sales do not fall within the remit of the local planning authority.  In terms of twitter specifically, the Council's neighbourhood teams retweet activity from the Council's main twitter feed where an issue affects their neighbourhood in particular.  Consultation on planning frameworks takes place by a range of methods. These though are not generally undertaken by the local planning authority. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage and for planning frameworks. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [113](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\113.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.1 | You list a range of methods: Communicating; Researching; Involving; Consulting; Devolving Decisions; Supporting Community Action. It would be good if MCC could deploy more of these methods For example, in my role as planning rep for the Rusholme & Fallowfield Civic Society, I’ve spotted on the planning portal that there is a planning application for Manchester City Council to install railings round Park Crescent – the “jewel in the crown” of Victoria Park Conservation Area in Rusholme. Only one of the methods listed above has been used, ie, Communicating – websites. |  | Unfortunately it is not possible to use all of the methods listed in 2.1 for all planning applications due to the large number which we receive. Chapter 9 of the SCI sets out more detail on planning application consultations and the types of method used. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [67](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\67.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.1 | Although a range of strategies have been included, this does not mean that the information gets to the right organisations and individuals and that the information is provided in the right contexts or formats. For example, young people are rarely consulted and do not always like attending meetings. Alternative action and workshop type activities should be involved in engaging young people and others. Similarly, the language and process is difficult to people to engage with and it might be difficult for them to understand the impact of proposals both locally and in the neighbourhoods. In relation to disabled people, groups such as MDPAG should be involved as we represent people with a range of impairments but local disabled people in neighbourhoods should also be involved including people with mobility, sensory, and other impairments, including people with learning difficulties, people with mental health and long term health issues, including diabetes, dementia etc, neuro-divergent people e.g. people with autism, dyspraxia, ataxia etc and people with multiple impairments. Neighbourhood services should be involved and have a good understanding of how to contact disabled and older people in their areas | Apply appropriate consultation methods to reach wider sections of our communities including all diversity and equality sectors. | We will engage with a wide range of people whilst preparing planning policy documents, as set out in paragraph 2.6, and in more detail in Chapter 4.  We will send consultation information to the Council's Neighbourhood Officers so that they can circulate this to groups in their areas, and will advertise consultations via MACC, Manchester's voluntary and community sector support organisation. Reference to this will be added to paragraphs 4.5 and 5.4 |
| Manchester resident | [26](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\26.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.2 | The failures of cases such as Manchester Life Development Company and St Michaels show this is not happening. How can people claim people are being valued when MCC and its leaders are in property consortiums with biases and vested interests? These real conflicts of interests need to be looked at so not rhetoric in meaningless policy such as this. |  | Comments noted; these fall outside the scope of this consultation. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [114](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\114.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.2 | You state that community involvement is a continuous process. It would be good if MCC could ensure that community involvement is a continuing process. For example, the last meeting Rusholme residents and residents’ reps had with Rusholme Officers and Councillors was in September 2016. The Fallowfield Forum where Fallowfield residents’ reps meet with Fallowfield Officers and Councillors tends not to cover planning matters. |  | Comments noted. The Council tries to accommodate requests for officers to attend local group meetings where possible and appropriate. |
| Trafford resident | [10](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\10.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.3 | Improve the user interface of the area you link to, so that it's easier for people to refine and select what they want to know and how they receive the information. Make it easier to use and publicise it far more widely. This encourages interaction with the planning process. | Simplify The Facility | Text has been added to the consultation portal landing page to explain to users how to select the policy documents that they are interested in, and to state that the registration process allows users to tell us how they would like to receive consultation notifications. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [115](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\115.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.3 | I am not sure if I am on the database. It would be really useful if, each year, say the start of each new financial year you emailed the people on the database to remind them that they are registered and to ‘de-register’ if they no longer need to be on the database. |  | Rather than emailing everyone at a specific time once a year with the option to de-register we will remind people that this is an option whenever we send out an email to the database. We send out emails at the beginning of consultation periods for planning policy documents and also when new policies are adopted, which in practice is at least once a year. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [68](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\68.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.3 | I think that MDPAG is already on the database, but pre-planning consultations which developers should be having and include in their Design and Access Statements, should also be encouraged to use this database so that changes can take place before formal consultations on a planning application take place. These consultations are included as recommended by various DCLG circulars, Disability Rights Commission advice and guidance on D&A Statements from the Urban Design Group. | Database available to developers to assist in pre-planning consultations | We cannot make it a requirement for developers to carry out pre-application consultation, but we do encourage them to, and on a case by case basis we suggest that they engage with various parties. This could include disabled people’s groups and other equalities organisations if appropriate.  We will add reference to paragraph 9.8 of the SCI to encouraging developers to consult with various parties on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the application. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. Consultees on our planning policy database have signed up specifically to receive updates on Local Development Documents prepared by the Council, so we would not supply consultees' personal information to developers. |
| Trafford resident | [11](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\11.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.6 | This is not a diverse range of ways in which a diverse range of people can easily become involved. There are many more ways to engage the diverse communities you refer to. | Diversification of Access | The Council aims to make it easy for people to get involved in planning policy consultation events, but also needs to be mindful of the resources available for carrying out events. Holding events in places and at times which are accessible to a range of people is an example of how this can be done. The specific requirements of individual events will depend on the scope of the consultation. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [116](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\116.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.6 | Again, it would be really useful if, each year, say the start of each new financial year you emailed the people on the database to remind them that material will be published on a particular webpage on your website. |  | Rather than emailing our contacts at a specific time, we email people at the beginning of a consultation period as this allows us to provide the relevant direct weblink to the consultation documents and to give them details of the consultation. As contacts on our database will always be emailed when new planning policies are available for consultation it means that they will not need to keep checking the website just to see if this is the case. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [69](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\69.pdf) | Paragraph | 2.6 | The Planning Authority should develop more imaginative ways to engage people, possibly based on Manchester City Council's Community Engagement Strategy and other policies and procedures and consult on a new engagement strategy. | community engagement strategies required | The Council's Our Manchester approach will set out a new way of engaging with Manchester residents. As well as following the emerging Our Manchester approach engagement processes on planning policies and planning applications will also need to meet statutory requirements. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [117](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\117.pdf) | Manchester's Local Development Documents | 3 | It is good to have the development documents accessible online, but the objectives and timescales set in the Core Strategy aren’t being met, eg, Policy EN1 - EN3 Review of Conservation Areas (to be developed) All reviewed by 2016 (5-year programme starting in 2011). This hasn’t been achieved in the case of the Victoria Park Conservation Area and possibly/probably others. |  | We have made some progress with this and have commenced a review of a number of conservation areas. Some are at a more advanced stage than others. In relation to Victoria Park we have produced a first draft appraisal and have organised (Councillor led) a couple of sessions with Councillors, residents and local groups to input into and help shape the appraisal. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [135](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\135.pdf) | Manchester's Local Development Documents | 3 | A concern was raised that Local Plans are not statutory and only available for the City Centre. |  | The Local Plans listed in Chapter 3 are statutory, as in they have the status of 'local plans' as defined in planning regulations. The engagement processes for Local Plans referred to in Chapter 4 of the SCI also fall within this definition. In addition, the Council has non-statutory local plans which cover a range of areas within Manchester - the SCI sets out engagement processes for this type of document in Chapter 7. |
| Manchester resident | [27](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\27.pdf) | Paragraph | 3.2 | Community infrastructure is minimal. How can you claim this is important when allowing developers to landmass, giving GMCA loans to developers, without S106 payments, transparency and often exemptions and poor advocacy on what they need to give back? |  | A Local Plan will need to demonstrate that it meets development and infrastructure requirements when it reaches the Examination stage. This would include community facilities where a specific need is identified. |
| Manchester resident | [51](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\51.pdf) | Paragraph | 3.2 | These Local Plans are big on words but are often vague and written purely to suit developers who want every option and availability without any reasoning or justification. And then they are ignored. Zones for certain uses or restrictions such as conservation areas or certain developments to be encouraged are then totally ignored and overridden at a developer's whim and scant justification or anything given back. ie S106. Or in local plans where it says to avoid further development of student housing to avoid a ghetto effect and destabilising the local community - this gets overridden with more student property built, or a sham description of the building as an apartment block is actually the same tiny unit sizes as identical student blocks ie Vita blocks on Circle Square. 3 big student blocks then further blocks that are described as apartments but are yet more student rooms. Hardly building the sustainable community the overall site application makes out. | Make it real and stick to it ! | Comments noted. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [70](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\70.pdf) | Paragraph | 3.2 | Agree with comments regarding Local Plans and not enough use of S106 to improve infrastructure and make the environment and facilities more accessible. Easy access to Local Plans should be available for all planning consultations and reference to meeting their requirements should be part of the planning application.  There should also be reference to accessibility as part of "good design" which includes designing for a wide range of disabled and older people but also for women, children, young people, BME, faith and LGBT communities and other equality and diversity groups | Local plans should include accessibility and easy access for consultees and applications should include statements of compliance. | A Local Plan will need to demonstrate that it meets development and infrastructure requirements when it reaches the Examination stage. This would include community facilities where a specific need is identified. In terms of access to Local Plans, as stated in Chapter 3 of the SCI all adopted Local Development Documents are available online at www.manchester.gov.uk/strategicplanning. The main Planning & Regeneration page on our website has a link to both this page and to the page where people can make comments on planning applications. Paragraph 9.16 of the SCI states that the decision whether or not to grant planning permission will be based on policies in LDDs and the UDP, amongst other considerations.  Reference to accessibility will be added to paragraph 3.2. |
| Manchester resident | [28](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\28.pdf) | Paragraph | 3.5 | MCC has proved and shown Neighbourhood plans are worthless. You forced Castelfield, for example, to accept a damaging building in the conservation area where Renaker did not consult with people. This flies in the face of your proposed policy statements! Why would people waste extensive time on trying to apply for these to be considered as applicable by a Council who does not respect the civic voice even on the most basic level? |  | Comments noted. The Council has already adopted a positive approach to engagement with its communities to support key strategic objectives for growth, therefore our approach to Neighbourhood Planning fits within this context. We need to ensure that Neighbourhood Planning activity complements the existing approach to regeneration and service delivery, which balances the strategic case for growth with the need to promote sustainable and attractive neighbourhoods.  Unlike in many parts of the country, opportunities for Neighbourhood Planning in Manchester will very likely emerge within a context where substantial activity is already evident at the neighbourhood level. Furthermore, the development of the Our Manchester approach which includes much deeper engagement between communities and public services, building on the strengths that already exist in neighbourhoods, is considered to be more likely to bring forward community-driven solutions to the problems and opportunities which exist in those places. |
| Manchester resident | [52](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\52.pdf) | Paragraph | 3.5 | The neighbourhood plan in Castlefield said it all. MCC wanted it solely to areas already fully developed. It was so restricted. So basically the plan would have no purpose. When this was challenged by residents the responses from MCC were ridiculous. Developer pressure for the undeveloped bits to still be free reign. Anti consultation if ever there was. I suggested the Castlefield conservation Area would be appropriate as this has been long established as the neighbourhood. The fact residents had to argue with MCC shows the true reality of consultation and the desire for community involvement. | Respect local plans. Don't allow developers to ride rough shod over everything. | Comments noted. The Council has already adopted a positive approach to engagement with its communities to support key strategic objectives for growth, therefore our approach to Neighbourhood Planning fits within this context. We need to ensure that Neighbourhood Planning activity complements the existing approach to regeneration and service delivery, which balances the strategic case for growth with the need to promote sustainable and attractive neighbourhoods.  Unlike in many parts of the country, opportunities for Neighbourhood Planning in Manchester will very likely emerge within a context where substantial activity is already evident at the neighbourhood level. Furthermore, the development of the Our Manchester approach which includes much deeper engagement between communities and public services, building on the strengths that already exist in neighbourhoods, is considered to be more likely to bring forward community-driven solutions to the problems and opportunities which exist in those places. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [118](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\118.pdf) | How you can get involved in Local Plans | 4 | I have searched “Local Plans” on Manchester City Council’s website and been presented with: on http://www.manchester.gov.uk/site\_search/no\_results - “Your search returned no results. Try using the Search below to find what you were looking for.”. So I’m not sure what Local Plans are. |  | Local Plans are defined in Chapter 3 of the SCI, and Chapter 4 relates to how we will involve you in their preparation. A search for 'Local Plan' on our website does take you to the Local Development Framework page but unfortunately the search function is not very focused and does include a lot of other results. The best web page to use to find out about Manchester's Local Development Documents is http://www.manchester.gov.uk/strategicplanning, which is set out in Chapter 3 of the SCI, and this page links to our Local Plan page. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [136](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\136.pdf) | How you can get involved in Local Plans | 4 | For many organisations the consultation time whether it is for SPD, LDF or any other important process is too short; as they have to arrange a time to meet and discuss the issues with members. They also need time to collate their formal responses. |  | The consultation periods referred to in the SCI for LDDs are in line with statutory requirements. However in practice we often consult for a longer period than the statutory minimum and the SCI will be amended to refer to this. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [140](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\140.pdf) | How you can get involved in Local Plans | 4 | Research for the consultation should not rely on a single method; for instance many older people do not like to go out in the evening or during the winter months to view exhibitions; some have yet to become ‘silver surfers’. Are there any other interactive ways of engaging them with the help of the Neighbourhood teams? |  | We do not rely on a single consultation method, and people are always able to make comments by post if they do not wish to use the web portal or email. We aim to hold consultation events in places and at times which are accessible to a range of people, as set out in paragraph 2.6. We will add wording to 2.6 to refer to providing documents in alternative formats including hard copies where this is possible. |
| Trafford resident | [12](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\12.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.1 | The only meaningful way that you can empower neighbourhoods in this respect is through supporting Neighbourhood Forums. You have done the opposite, instead finding ways to make it difficult for them, instead of supporting them to become more engaging. | Your Actions Toward Neighbourhood Forums are Prohibitive | Comments noted. The Council has already adopted a positive approach to engagement with its communities to support key strategic objectives for growth, therefore our approach to Neighbourhood Planning fits within this context. We need to ensure that Neighbourhood Planning activity complements the existing approach to regeneration and service delivery, which balances the strategic case for growth with the need to promote sustainable and attractive neighbourhoods.  Unlike in many parts of the country, opportunities for Neighbourhood Planning in Manchester will very likely emerge within a context where substantial activity is already evident at the neighbourhood level. Furthermore, the development of the Our Manchester approach which includes much deeper engagement between communities and public services, building on the strengths that already exist in neighbourhoods, is considered to be more likely to bring forward community-driven solutions to the problems and opportunities which exist in those places. |
| Trafford resident | [13](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\13.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.1 | The only meaningful way that you can empower neighbourhoods in this respect is through supporting Neighbourhood Forums. You have done the opposite, instead finding ways to make it difficult for them, instead of supporting them to become more engaging. | Your Actions Toward Neighbourhood Forums are Prohibitive | Representation is a duplicate of comment ID 12 - see ID 12 |
| Manchester resident | [29](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\29.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.1 | What an absolutely meaningless statement. You do not support Neighbourhood Plans or real consultation. The plans are not only meaningless, but people wouldn't have tried and wasted so much time if they knew how MCC would react to them or would not need them if the processes were genuine. |  | Comments noted. The Council has already adopted a positive approach to engagement with its communities to support key strategic objectives for growth, therefore our approach to Neighbourhood Planning fits within this context. We need to ensure that Neighbourhood Planning activity complements the existing approach to regeneration and service delivery, which balances the strategic case for growth with the need to promote sustainable and attractive neighbourhoods.  Unlike in many parts of the country, opportunities for Neighbourhood Planning in Manchester will very likely emerge within a context where substantial activity is already evident at the neighbourhood level. Furthermore, the development of the Our Manchester approach which includes much deeper engagement between communities and public services, building on the strengths that already exist in neighbourhoods, is considered to be more likely to bring forward community-driven solutions to the problems and opportunities which exist in those places. |
| Manchester resident | [53](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\53.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.1 | The local plans are poor on detail and don't look to improve an area from things like Traffic blight and congestion. Back of pavement line developments are the default in seems in MCC regardless if the current streets and roads are totally inadequate for decent access, light and sustainable decent homes. The Northern Quarter and Ancoats being prime examples for this. Narrow streets with low rise buildings have been replaced with 6-8 storeys or higher buildings but still with the incredibly narrow streets below. Often totally inadequate for emergency vehicles. At least 1960s towers provided footprint for road widening and towers were on podiums to reduce visual impact and oppression at street level. a further example is Regent Road ring road junction. Chances to improve the worst road junction in the City were lost to developers being allowed to build to their boundaries. Yes build a 25 storey block but make the developer give some frontage of the site to the highway so road widening can take place. They might even sell the flats quicker if there isn't a constant cue of traffic outside day and night. Chester Road towards Trafford similarly. Why this hasn't been widened to be dual carriage way is a scandal and a safety nightmare. Now new flats are going up on the Castlefield side the chance has been lost. Hyde road is similar. There are far too few radial dual carriageways or decent roads into the City. | Look to improve the area and solve it's problems before development takes place - not afterwards when the opportunity is lost. ie road widening, junction improvements etc before the developers roll in and build. | The Statement of Community Involvement sets out how we will engage with you during planning policy preparation. The issues which you refer to in your comment are topics that would be covered as part of a Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Document - the Statement of Community Involvement itself does not include policies relating to building design or transport. We will be consulting on a Local Plan for Manchester next year and it will include these sorts of policy areas. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [71](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\71.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.1 | Local plans and some of the guidance documents, such as the recent one on residential guidance, don't include enough considerations around accessible design of buildings and accessible environmental and street designs and there are continuing proposals for shared space, zebra crossings, lack of crossings over tram tracks and insufficient facilities such as public accessible toilets and changing places provision. There needs to be more involvement from disabled people's and older people's organisations in relation to strategy as well as the design of the external environment. There are opportunities to improve consultations around improving Local Plans in relation to housing and other issues. | Involvement of disabled and older people's organisations in improving and monitoring Local Plans and developments in relation to Local Plans and accessibility issues. | We have consulted disabled people's groups and also organisations representing older people during the preparation of Local Development Documents to date and will continue to do so, this is done in line with statutory regulations and the requirements set out in the SCI. These requirements have been amended to reflect comments received during the consultation. |
| Manchester resident | [30](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\30.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.4 | I have asked to be on this list and I do NOT get any updates. This is appalling. |  | We add all stakeholders who ask to be included on the database and provide notification of new consultations either by email or by post, alternatively stakeholders can register themselves, as you have done. We send out notifications at the beginning of a consultation period for planning policy documents, and also when policies are adopted. In terms of consultation on planning applications you can register to receive notifications of applications via Public Access at http://pa.manchester.gov.uk/online-applications/ - please click on 'Register' towards the top of the page. |
| Manchester resident | [54](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\54.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.4 | I do get some updates but I think it is selective as to what - or ill described so you don't realise the relevance. Again massively wordy documents and little content or anything definitive. Wishy washy to suit developers. | Wishy washy to suit developers. | We add all stakeholders who ask to be included on the database and provide notification of new consultations either by email or by post, alternatively stakeholders can register themselves. We send out notifications at the beginning of a consultation period for planning policy documents, and also when policies are adopted. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [73](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\73.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.5 | See my comments on 4.6 in relation to who is consulted and what engagement methods are used.  MDPAG and other disabled people's organisations should be consulted on all neighbourhood issues as well as city centre issues as many local residents organisations do not have a range of disabled people as members. | Scope and range of consultations | Please see response to your comments 71 and 72. We have consulted disabled people's groups and also organisations representing older people during the preparation of Local Development Documents to date and will continue to do so. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [72](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\72.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.6 | MDPAG and other disabled people's organisations are often not consulted and it appears to leave it open to the Planning Authority to decide who is consulted as it may be a result of resources or the Authority may decide who would be interested. As someone recommended earlier in the document, there should be a better filter so that people who want to receive everything will get all consultations and people who want to only receive certain consultations can indicate this. It is not appropriate in this document to say that it will be decided by the Planning Authority/Manchester City Council staff. | Manchester residents, businesses, voluntary sector organisation etc should be able to decide what consultations they wish to be involved with. | As set out in response to your comment ID 63, anyone who wishes to can be added to the planning policy database and will then receive notifications about planning consultations. As policy documents often cover a range of topics we notify everyone on the database rather than applying a filter, however it is up to the individual to decide whether this is of interest to them or not. Although this means that people may sometimes receive an email about a policy document that is of no interest to them we do not typically have more than a few consultations in a year so the frequency of emails is not very high. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [74](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\74.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.11 | There should be more reference to accessibility and equality and diversity, as with good Equality Impact Assessments. If these are no longer used, then the Sustainability Appraisal should include a detailed accessibility analysis relating to mobility and sensory issues and issues relating to mental and other health issues, issues for people with learning difficulties, and for neuro-divergent people and other barriers faced by people covered by the Equality Act. | More reference to accessibility in the development of each Local Plan | We do use Equality Impact Assessment as a tool for examining the impact which policies would have on people covered by the Equality Act 2010. This is referred to in paragraph 4.26 of the SCI. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [75](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\75.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.12 | Disabled people may have a range of impairments and/or health issues and just ticking a box about being a disabled person does not mean that access barriers have been commented on or considered or consulted about. It is important to use access groups who have experience of barriers for a range of impairments and issues relating to disabled people and that this issue is recognised. Recent major applications approved by MCC, e.g. the first St Michael's application, have clearly ignored barriers faced by disabled and other people. | Good to consider equality and diversity, but there are a wide range of barriers faced by disabled people and there is no way that ticking a box means that all of these issues have been covered. | Comments noted; access and design are important considerations which are tested by the Council throughout the planning process. |
| Manchester resident | [109](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\109.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.17 | Put a section on the comments section asking them whether daytime or evening is best for the hearing and then go with the majority. This will maximise the ability of those with work commitments to be involved. |  | The schedule for examination hearing sessions will be decided by the Inspector, in consultation with us. If there is enough interest in an evening session from participants then this is something that could potentially be organised, but it would only be effective if most participants wanted this. Wording will be added to paragraph 4.17 of the SCI to refer to this. |
| Trafford resident | [14](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\14.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.23 | If it should consider local communities then it should unequivically demonstrate meaningful consultation with communities. | Consider Engaging | In terms of meaningful consultation with communities on the Local Plan, the Council has to set out how it has involved the local community in plan preparation in the consultation statement which it must submit to the Planning Inspectorate at the Publication stage for a Local Plan (see paragraph 4.10). As set out in the SCI, this statement has to show how issues raised by stakeholders during the plan preparation process have been addressed in the Publication draft of the Local Plan. If the Planning Inspector does not consider that the consultation carried out was meaningful enough then the Council would need to address this.  In terms of consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal report this is consulted on at the Local Plan publication stage and any comments made on it would be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the Local Plan Examination. |
| Manchester resident | [31](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\31.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.23 | What absolute rubbish! Look at the Planning Executive! There is little engagement from Councillors. These decisions do not reflect going comprehensively going through these steps let alone in genuine research or engagement! |  | The Sustainability Appraisal process is undertaken alongside preparation of a Local Plan, as set out in the SCI. Depending on the scope of the Local Plan being assessed stakeholders are involved in the Sustainability Appraisal process as it progresses, and everyone has an opportunity to comment on the Sustainability Appraisal report at the Local Plan Publication stage. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [76](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\76.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.23 | The Equality Impact Assessments have never adequately recognised the range of barriers faced by disabled people and older people and regular training for MCC staff from disabled people's organisation should be required or involve disabled people's organisations in preparing EIAs and Sustainability Appraisals. | Improve understanding of barriers for disabled people by MCC staff to improve Sustainability and EIA | Equality Impact Assessment of Local Plans will be carried out using a toolkit put together by the Council's Equalities Team. The Equalities Team assist policy officers in using the toolkit, and comments from stakeholders during the engagement processes for Local Plans will feed into this where equality issues are raised.  Sustainability Appraisal is carried out alongside Local Plan preparation and in practice we will often involve stakeholders from the scoping stage onwards, depending on the scale of the Local Plan being prepared. In all cases we will always consult all stakeholders on the planning policy database on the Sustainability Appraisal report at Publication stage. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [77](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\77.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.24 | The organisations listed do not include any disabled people's organisations and therefore are unlikely to deal with accessibility adequately. All consultations on this should include disabled people's organisations | Sustainability Appraisals should include consultation with disabled people's organisations | We are legally required to consult the three organisations listed in paragraph 4.24, however in practice we often involve additional stakeholders at this point, such as MDPAG. This paragraph will be reworded to make it clear that the consultation with Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency is the minimum requirement. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [78](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\78.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.25 | A six week consultation period is not in line with the 3 months agreed as part of the Manchester Compact and should be altered. | Consultation time increased | The 6 week consultation period referred to here is in line with statutory requirements. In practice we often consult for longer periods - paragraph 4.25 will be amended to state that this will be "at least" six weeks. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [79](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\79.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.26 | Pleased to read this commitment but would like assurance that sufficient time is allowed to consult on and discuss with relevant MCC staff around these issues. | Sufficient time should be allowed for consultations | Comments made during consultation periods will feed into the preparation of the Equality Impact Assessment. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [80](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\80.pdf) | Paragraph | 4.27 | The diagram is far too small to read for many people. Please provide an alternative design and format. | Improve accessibility of the diagram. | The diagram is at a high resolution so if you are viewing it in the PDF you can zoom in to make it much larger without it becoming blurred.  We will make the diagrams and pictures more accessible in the portal versions of our planning policy consultation documents in the future by adding text descriptions to diagrams and pictures so that this can be picked up. We will enable images to be opened as popups when read via the portal, so that they can be viewed in a large format, and so that they can be copied and pasted as text if necessary. We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request and will amend the SCI to refer to this. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [119](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\119.pdf) | How you can get involved in Supplementary Planning Documents | 5 | I do think that any information should be emailed out by the relevant Neighbourhood Officer to their list of contacts. |  | Comments noted. Emails are shown in the summary diagram as a consultation method which we will use during Supplementary Planning Document preparation. As a minimum this will be emails to people on the planning policy database, but in addition we will ask neighbourhood officers to circulate consultation information to their contacts as well and the SCI will be amended to reflect this. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [137](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\137.pdf) | How you can get involved in Supplementary Planning Documents | 5 | There is data to confirm that many older people do not consider themselves to be ‘disabled’ and therefore the issues around disabled access are often not included in their comments. Asking the questions in a different may help resolve this. |  | Whilst we sometimes use questionnaires during the early stages of planning policy preparation at later stages and during formal consultation periods people will always have the opportunity to raise any issues which they choose. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [138](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\138.pdf) | How you can get involved in Supplementary Planning Documents | 5 | The box asking whether people have a disability, perhaps should be proceeded by a box asking whether participants ‘have a long term ailment/impairment?’ This would give you a more accurate picture of the number of disabled older people who may prefer this approach rather than admitting to having a disability. |  | Comments noted. Paragraph 4.12 of the SCI which related to use of a monitoring form at the Publication stage for Local Plans to collect data on respondents' disability status and the other protected characteristics set out in the Equality Act 2010 has been re-written so that it is less prescriptive about how equalities monitoring is carried out. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [139](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\139.pdf) | How you can get involved in Supplementary Planning Documents | 5 | An alternative process where the group can determine which projects they are involved in rather than leaving that decision to officers who may be unaware of extensive community interest. |  | Any individuals or organisations who wish to join the planning policy database can either register themselves online or ask us to include them by emailing / posting their contact details to us. This is set out in paragraph 2.3 of the SCI, which gives our website, email address and postal address details for anyone who would like to let us know that they would like to receive notifications on planning policy consultations.  We will all also circulate information about planning policy consultations to the Council's Neighbourhood Officers for them to share with groups in their area - we will amend the SCI paragraphs 4.5, 4.9 and 5.4 to refer to this. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [146](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\146.pdf) | How you can get involved in Supplementary Planning Documents | 5 | A 4 week consultation period for a Supplementary Planning Document is a very short period for such an important document; opportunities should be explored to determine whether this can be extended or pre-consultation discussions could be held with older people’s groups to give them time to collect their thoughts before the consultation deadline. |  | The four week consultation period is the statutory minimum. In practice consultations on Supplementary Planning Documents are often consulted on for a longer period during the formal consultation stage, paragraph 5.4 will be amended to refer to this.  In addition engagement takes place during the initial preparation stage, as referred to in 5.2. |
| Trafford resident | [16](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\16.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.1 | Quoting speed as an excuse for non-engagement is nothing beyond a very poor excuse. | Haste is Waste | The Council does engage with stakeholders during the preparation process for Supplementary Planning Documents, both at the initial preparation stage (see 5.1) and then more formally when a draft document has produced (see 5.4). Paragraph 5.1 has been amended to make it clearer that there are two separate consultation stages. |
| Manchester resident | [33](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\33.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.1 | So if it is faster to do nothing in this policy - you will! And do! Get out clause! |  | The Council does engage with stakeholders during the preparation process for Supplementary Planning Documents, both at the initial preparation stage (see 5.1) and then more formally when a draft document has produced (see 5.4). Paragraph 5.1 has been amended to make it clearer that there are two separate consultation stages. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [82](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\82.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.2 | Disabled people are often not included in consultations on local areas so groups such as MDPAG and other disabled people's organisations need to be included in all consultations | All consultations need to involve disabled people | Please see response to your comment ID 63. Consultation on planning policies includes disabled people's organisations. |
| Manchester resident | [110](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\110.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.2 | Have an updated residents association list. MCC claims it does not actually have one. Please include direct contact with them as one of your "range of engagement methods." These are the people who care about the neighbourhood and who are most likely to get the word round neighbours who are not online. |  | Any individuals or organisations who wish to join the planning policy database can either register themselves online or ask us to include them by emailing / posting their contact details to us. This is set out in paragraph 2.3 of the SCI, which gives our website, email address and postal address details for anyone who would like to let us know that they would like to receive notifications on planning policy consultations. |
| Trafford resident | [17](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\17.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.4 | One for week period, for developments that will change the landscape of our city for generations. It should be a process that aligns with teh development process, encouraging contributions to inform and assist the developers. | Not Good Enough | The four week consultation period is the statutory minimum. In practice consultations on Supplementary Planning Documents are often consulted on for a longer period during the formal consultation stage, paragraph 5.4 will be amended to refer to this.  In addition engagement takes place during the initial preparation stage, as referred to in 5.2. |
| Manchester resident | [34](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\34.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.4 | But you do not do genuine research. You allow developers to avoid this. MCC avoids promoting to various groups and people are unaware. You then claim these four weeks as 'no-one said anything'. Shameful. |  | Research is carried out to inform preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document. When the Council adopts a SPD it has to publish an 'adoption statement' which must set out any changes made to the SPD as a result of comments made during the consultation period (unless no changes were made). To date all SPDs adopted by the council have been changed to some degree as a result of public consultation and we have never reported that no responses were received. Stakeholders have the option of applying for judicial review of the Council's decision to adopt a SPD if they consider that no account has been taken of consultation responses. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [83](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\83.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.4 | The formal consultation period of 4 weeks is far too short for organisations to consult with members and to provide accessible facilities for meetings and information. Please increase this time period. | Increase consultation time | The four week consultation period is the statutory minimum. In practice consultations on Supplementary Planning Documents are often consulted on for a longer period during the formal consultation stage, paragraph 5.4 will be amended to refer to this.  In addition engagement takes place during the initial preparation stage, as referred to in 5.2. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [104](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\104.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.4 | The time period is far too short for proper consultation including organisations and forums consulting with their members. This does not comply with the Manchester Compact Agreement. | Consultation period too short. | The four week consultation period is the statutory minimum. In practice consultations on Supplementary Planning Documents are often consulted on for a longer period during the formal consultation stage, paragraph 5.4 will be amended to refer to this.  In addition engagement takes place during the initial preparation stage, as referred to in 5.2. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [84](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\84.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.5 | The Residential Design Guide received comments about the lack of reference to accessible design but these were not included in the final version neither did the person who made the comments receive any feedback. It is vital that all SPDs refer to accessibility issues and inclusive design. | All SPDs should include references to accessibility and inclusive design. | This section of the SCI sets out requirements and information in relation to consultation on SPDs rather than the issues that they should address. If you feel that an SPD has not addressed a topic adequately then you will be able to tell us during consultation on the SPD. We will always provide feedback to comments received during statutory planning policy consultations.  Comments on planning frameworks and other non-statutory guidance documents, such as the Residential Quality Guidance, are generally summarised and responded to in the committee report finalising and adopting the guidance rather than receiving individual feedback. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [85](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\85.pdf) | Paragraph | 5.9 | This might depend upon the issues as SPDs often include more detailed information so it is vital that inclusive design and accessibility is reviewed by disabled people's organisations such as MDPAG | Need to include a review of accessibility issues for all SPDs. | As stated in the SCI an Equality Impact Assessment is unlikely to be needed as it will already have been carried out for the Local Plan polices that the SPD is based on. However this does not mean that you would be unable to raise design and accessibility issues - all organisations on our planning policy database will be able to make comments on SPDs during the consultation period. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [120](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\120.pdf) | How you can get involved in Joint Local Development Documents | 6 | I do think that any information should be emailed out by the relevant Neighbourhood Officer to their list of contacts. |  | Comments noted. Paragraph 6.3 states that joint Local Development Documents would need to be in line with the SCIs of the districts involved, therefore as a minimum information will be sent out by email to people on our planning policy database, and in addition we will ask neighbourhood officers to circulate consultation information to their contacts as well. Reference to this will be added to the SCI. |
| Manchester resident | [35](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\35.pdf) | Paragraph | 6.2 | The name is out of date! GMCA behaved appallingly with the GM Housing Fund and who they loaned to. Burnham criticised the misappropriation of these funds. The GM model is not doing well enough. The consultation documents are obtuse, too long and misleading. The GMSF proved how poorly the consultation was received. The research do not respect novice people or busy people. |  | An approach which makes the plan and accompanying documents more accessible to a larger number of people is being considered for the next GMSF consultation stage.  Paragraph 6.4 of the SCI will be amended to refer to the GMSF being prepared by the ten authorities as a joint plan. At present a decision has not been made about whether it will switch to being a Spatial Development Strategy, which would be a GMCA document rather than a Joint GMCA/AGMA Executive Board document. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [86](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\86.pdf) | Paragraph | 6.2 | It is likely that following discussions with Andy Burnham, there will be disability panels and an access panel working across the Combined Authority. These groups should be involved with any consultations as well as Manchester based groups. | involvement of disability groups across the Combined Authority and in Manchester. | Organisations at the GM level will be involved as appropriate during plan preparation. Once these groups have been set up we can add them to our planning policy database if they would like to be involved. |
| Manchester resident | [36](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\36.pdf) | Paragraph | 6.4 | The critical response to the failing of the GMSF is infamous. Again the research was purposely long, tried to ostracise people from responding or having a say. The everyday language or fair research methods are needed. People cannot read hundreds of pages of expert or sales based material full of bias. This does not mean there are no other ways for them to have a say and to not do so is lazy and represents vested interests and political failure of plain language. |  | Some of the planning policy documents that are produced by Manchester City Council are quite lengthy given the topics which need to be covered, and to ensure that we can provide full reasons for the policies that are being introduced. We will provide a summary of the key messages in policy documents, so that people will be able to tell quickly and easily that a particular policy document might be relevant or of interest to them. We will amend paragraph 2.2 of the SCI to refer to this.  In terms of the GMSF, an approach which makes the plan and accompanying documents more accessible to a larger number of people is being considered for the next consultation stage. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [121](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\121.pdf) | How you can get involved in Planning Frameworks | 7 | I do think that any information should be emailed out by the relevant Neighbourhood Officer to their list of contacts. |  | Officers working on planning frameworks notify Neighbourhood Officers of upcoming consultations and local councillors are briefed. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [141](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\141.pdf) | How you can get involved in Planning Frameworks | 7 | The use of exhibitions whilst interesting for some, can be difficult for many who do not understand the technical jargon used or cannot read plans. Are there other ways of explaining the proposed changes? |  | Exhibitions aimed at engaging the public in the preparation of planning frameworks will often be staffed so that the proposals can be explained to attendees and their questions can be answered. Such exhibitions are usually arranged by the developer / landowner of the site in question rather than the Council. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [142](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\142.pdf) | How you can get involved in Planning Frameworks | 7 | Exhibitions and public consultations need to be well advertised and at fully accessible venues (that can also accommodate electric mobility scooters, used in increasing numbers by older and disabled people). |  | Exhibitions and engagement events on planning frameworks are usually organised by the developer / landowner of the site in question.  When we hold engagement events in relation to planning policy documents produced by us we will hold events and meetings in places which are accessible, as set out in paragraph 2.6 of the SCI. |
| Manchester resident | [37](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\37.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.1 | Successfully? Often under 100 people respond to these appalling sales documents written by Financial Institutions like Deloitte. The outreach model is shameful. People and groups with no money have made reports far exceeding the research of the SRF and respondents, without any money or paid communications staff. This is unacceptable. @OurMcrForum need to now identify groups and outreach fairly. The SRFs cannot just be Deloitte or other huge organisations carving up the city without a say. It is NOT acceptable to have hundreds of pages written in sales brochure language. The ways to garner what is a priority for communities must be researched and not with this subjectivity. It is NOT good enough to have an open question to hundreds of pages or carefully presented material in SRFs. It is purposely disempowering. |  | Comments noted. Please see paragraph 7.6 for more information on developer-led consultation. The Council works closely with developers to advise them with regard to reaching out to stakeholders. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement for planning frameworks. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [87](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\87.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.1 | There is not enough consultation with local neighbourhoods or equality and diversity groups in relation to Strategic Frameworks and other similar documents and as a result, very little or no reference to accessibility and certainly not to the range of barriers faced by disabled people and solutions to these. It is vital that equality and diversity is at the centre of planning documents including joint ventures with the private sector and that affordability and diversity is central to the approach to planning, particularly in the city centre. | more involvement around and commitment to accessibility and equality and diversity. | Consultation on planning frameworks involves only a small number of statutory consultees, however the frameworks are available online, and comments can be made by any interested party. These documents have to be in line with both Manchester's Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework which cover issues relating to equality and diversity. |
| Manchester resident | [38](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\38.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.4 | These fours weeks are done again with little social media attention. The documents are too long and written from a position of bias. There need to be focus groups, out reach surveys, phone application with easy engagement exercises, making sure community groups are informed about the SRF and that people do have a say. There should in larger instances be pre-planning events made with the developer and partners as well as ways to seek a fairer model according to your principles in this policy. |  | The Council is moving towards greater use of social media to advertise consultations, so we will be aiming to use Twitter and Facebook to reach more people and direct them to consultations on planning frameworks.  Developers, landowners and other partners often do hold engagement events from the outset, with their proposals being modified in response to feedback from the public and other stakeholders. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement for planning frameworks. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [88](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\88.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.4 | Agree with previous comment - 4 weeks is too short and engagement needs to be diverse. The Compact states 3 months. | Improve consultation times and engagement strategies | In practice the consultation period is often longer than this. We will amend the SCI to refer to always consulting for at least four weeks and generally for a minimum of six weeks. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [105](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\105.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.4 | Agree with previous comment about using a range of outreach and consultation methods,including using plain English and keeping the reading levels low and making all events and communications more accessible. | More accessible information and outreach methods | The Council is moving towards greater use of social media to advertise consultations, so we will be aiming to use Twitter and Facebook to reach more people and direct them to consultations on planning frameworks. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [89](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\89.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.5 | Disabled people's organisations including the Our Manchester Disability Plan members need to be included, not just local organisations. | include disability organisations | Please see response to your comment ID 87. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [106](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\106.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.5 | MDPAG is not always consulted even though MCC is very well aware of our work. If relevance is determined by officers, then it is likely that we will not be included so this is not inclusive or democratic. It should be our choice whether we wish to be involved, particularly in relation to large projects and public spaces and design frameworks related to these. | Inclusive consultation focus allowing people and organisations to choose if they wish to be involved | Please see response to your comment ID 87. |
| Manchester resident | [111](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\111.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.5 | MCC was unable to provide a list of residents associations to the Local Government Boundary Commision last year when asked as part of a minimum information requirement.and councillors didn't talk to us so residents were shut out of the consultation. They were, however able to produce a list of all the youth groups. WHen you say that you will include any community groups "of which you are aware" this is problematic, if MCC can only produce contacts for youth groups and not organsations that exist for all ages. Active effort needs to be made to establish the names and addresses of all the constituted residents associations across the city. Saying "of which we are aware" is too woolly. MCC needs to make itself aware of them and have a list that it feels able to depend on. | Get your list of residents associations sorted. | All residents within the area covered by a proposed Planning Framework will receive a letter to notify them when the document is consulted on. We are also moving towards greater use of social media to advertise consultations on planning frameworks. |
| Manchester resident | [112](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\112.pdf) | Paragraph | 7.5 | You will include any community groups of "which you are aware." When the Local Government Boudary Commission asked MCC, as a minimum information requirement, for a comprehensive list of all community groups, residents associations, stakeholders last year, MCC was able to supply a long list of youth groups but not a single residents assocation across the whole city. So teenagers received direct notification of the consultation, but groups for all ages that exist to care for the neighbourhood did not. Thus decisions were made that went unchallenged and it made a complete joke of democracy. Please make yourselves aware of who the constituted residents associations are across the city.  MCC also did not send info on the ward boundary consultation via the e-bulletin, and decided that Twitter and FB were adequate substitutes for direct notification. Don't rely on Twitter and FB. These are hit and miss approaches that could easily fail and are no subsittute for direct notification. On their own, they are potentially just a cop out for a local authority that wants to pretend it did all it could to involve the public, when actually public involvement is far from wanted. | Actively find out who the constituted residents associations are, (and let the Comms Team know.) | Comments noted. Your response about residents' groups and information supplied to the Boundary Commission is beyond the scope of the SCI, which sets out how we will involve residents in policy preparation and consult them on planning applications.  In relation to consultation on planning frameworks we do not rely solely on social media, but send letters to all residents who live within the area covered by a proposed Planning Framework. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [122](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\122.pdf) | How you can get involved in Neighbourhood Planning | 8 | It is good to see that Manchester City Council will support Neighbourhood Planning initiatives. |  | Support welcomed. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [143](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\143.pdf) | How you can get involved in Neighbourhood Planning | 8 | How would the process deal with participants who relate to several equality strands; would they be restricted to only one opportunity to comment? |  | People making comments on applications for designation of Neighbourhood Areas or Neighbourhood Forums, or making comments on a draft Neighbourhood Plan or Neighbourhood Development Order may make as many comments as they wish, in relation to different equality strands. The same is true of making comments on Local Development Documents, Planning Frameworks and Planning Applications. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [144](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\144.pdf) | How you can get involved in Neighbourhood Planning | 8 | Are there any plans to increase the number of Neighbourhood Plans? |  | Neighbourhood Planning is a community-led process, and Neighbourhood Plans are initiated by community groups rather than by us, therefore we do not have any plans in relation to increasing their numbers. |
| Manchester resident | [55](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\55.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.1 | All I will say along with other comment is Castlefield and Renaker. A done deal with the developer and sod the neighbourhood plan. One of the most appalling planning decisions in the city despite massive objections and a neighbourhood plan. Noi wonder consultation is seen as a farce in the City. Was it because Renaker were building massive blocks across on Owen Street ? - so basically MCC allowed them to do as they like in Castlefield too. A white monolith towering over the Castlefield basin. Awful. | Neighbourhood plans in tatters if Developer is in with the Council.... | Comments noted. |
| Manchester resident | [39](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\39.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.1 | You have shown Neighbourhood Plans are meaningless. Renaker did not even consult with Castlefield residents. This was a form of abuse allowed by MCC. This policy you highlight here is meaningless. No Neighbourhood Plans are being pursued by any group because shamefully MCC has shown it does not respect them via its Chief Executive. As for the Manchester Life Development Company and multiple directorships of some leaders, how can these NP have any fair or objective treatment with the vested interests and biases presented in these clear conflicts of interest? |  | Comments noted. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [91](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\91.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.3 | There is no encouragement for local neighbourhood groups to get advice on accessibility issues. This should be a priority as there are a range of reasons why disabled people are not currently involved. It is a public sector duty under the Equality Act that MCC should promote equality and diversity | Ensure that accessibility advice is available from disabled people's organisations to Neighbourhood Forums | Paragraph 8.7 will be amended to state that the Council could offer support to a Neighbourhood Forum in terms of providing advice and guidance on involving a range of different groups in Neighbourhood Planning processes, including encouraging input from disabled people's group and making consultation events accessible.  This would involve suggesting groups that the Neighbourhood Forum should contact in relation to accessibility issues. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [92](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\92.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.4 | Please improve consultation period as in Manchester Compact. | Improve consultation period | We would not be able to consult for longer than six weeks on applications for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area or Neighbourhood Forum, as we are now required by law to make a decision on these types of application within 3 months of the date when the six week consultation period begins. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [93](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\93.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.5 | Please improve consultation time period | Improve consultation time | This timescale is in line with statutory requirements. However we will amend the SCI to refer to the six week period being a minimum. |
| Trafford resident | [18](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\18.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.7 | THis does not demonstrate suppport, it outlines how you will issue hoops for Neighbouhood Forums to jump through without real support from you. | That's Not 'Support' | Comments noted. The Council has already adopted a positive approach to engagement with its communities to support key strategic objectives for growth, therefore our approach to Neighbourhood Planning fits within this context. We need to ensure that Neighbourhood Planning activity complements the existing approach to regeneration and service delivery, which balances the strategic case for growth with the need to promote sustainable and attractive neighbourhoods.  Unlike in many parts of the country, opportunities for Neighbourhood Planning in Manchester will very likely emerge within a context where substantial activity is already evident at the neighbourhood level. Furthermore, the development of the Our Manchester approach which includes much deeper engagement between communities and public services, building on the strengths that already exist in neighbourhoods, is considered to be more likely to bring forward community-driven solutions to the problems and opportunities which exist in those places. |
| Manchester resident | [40](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\40.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.7 | No, you don't! Either scrap section 8 altogether or ensure that policy applies to all citizens and better research and civic rights in general. There is no specific advantage for having a NP with your Council! |  | The Council has already adopted a positive approach to engagement with its communities to support key strategic objectives for growth, therefore our approach to Neighbourhood Planning fits within this context. We need to ensure that Neighbourhood Planning activity complements the existing approach to regeneration and service delivery, which balances the strategic case for growth with the need to promote sustainable and attractive neighbourhoods.  Unlike in many parts of the country, opportunities for Neighbourhood Planning in Manchester will very likely emerge within a context where substantial activity is already evident at the neighbourhood level. Furthermore, the development of the Our Manchester approach which includes much deeper engagement between communities and public services, building on the strengths that already exist in neighbourhoods, is considered to be more likely to bring forward community-driven solutions to the problems and opportunities which exist in those places. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [94](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\94.pdf) | Paragraph | 8.7 | All information and events need to be accessible | make all information and events accessible | Paragraph 8.7 will be amended to state that the Council could offer support to a Neighbourhood Forum in terms of providing advice and guidance on involving a range of different groups in Neighbourhood Planning processes, including encouraging input from disabled people's group and making consultation events accessible. |
| Manchester Airport | [59](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\59.pdf) | How you can comment on Planning Applications | 9 | Manchester Airport has an influential role in the development management process due to our aerodrome safeguarding procedures and role as acting Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority. Manchester Airport is officially safeguarded to ensure that the safe operation of aircraft and future development potential is not compromised in any way by potentially hazardous development and activity at or in the vicinity of the airport. Legislative provisions regarding the safeguarding process are set out in the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002 (DfT/ODPM Circular 1/2003). In order to determine the safety implications of a proposal there is an established safeguarding process between local planning authorities and safeguarded aerodromes. Safeguarding maps (which are issued to LPA’s by the CAA) show the extent of the safeguarded area and set out the requirements for statutory consultation with the Airport.  Manchester City Council is located within Manchester Airport’s safeguarded area and the LPA must therefore consult Manchester Airport as statutory consultee on any application that falls within the remit of Circular 1/2003 and criteria indicated on the safeguarding map. Specifically, this includes; all buildings, structures, erections or works exceeding 90m in height, including all applications for wind turbines. | MCC summary: Manchester Airport is a statutory consultee for certain types of planning application as set out in the response, and must therefore be consulted in line with the established safeguarding process. | The Council will always consult Manchester Airport on these types of application, in line with statutory requirements. We will continue to work closely with the Airport in this respect. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [123](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\123.pdf) | How you can comment on Planning Applications | 9 | We request that MCC’s Planning Department ensure that planning applications satisfy the Council’s own standards BEFORE Planning Officers “validate” them on the Planning Portal. The Council includes a number of checklists on their website, the first one bulleted below states: “When we receive your application, it will be vetted for accuracy and for the fullness of the information supplied. It will not be registered if relevant information is missing.”, yet many applications appear on the planning portal as validated when they don’t meet the Council’s stated requirements, as per the checklists bulleted below. It should be the case that by the time planning applications get onto the planning ported with a “validated” status, all of MCC’s stated requirements have been met. Members of the public shouldn’t have to do this pre-validation checking. They should be able to rely on the fact that the planning officer has vetted the application for accuracy and for the fullness of the information supplied, and will not register and “validate” it if relevant information is missing.  • Full application checklist • Householder application checklist • Listed building application checklist • Conservation area application checklist • Advert application checklist • Telecomms application checklist |  | Comments noted. The validation process is outside the scope of this consultation. However, the applications showing on the Planning Portal are valid applications which have been through a validation process involving officers. An application's compliance with other standards will be assessed as part of the application process rather than as part of the validation. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [147](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\147.pdf) | How you can comment on Planning Applications | 9 | There needs to be a community consultation process for developers to follow to ensure that they actively consult with the various sectors of the community as part of their design and access statement. |  | Design and Access Statements form part of the suite of documents produced on behalf of an applicant when a planning application is registered. We do encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation prior to submitting an application on the overall scheme proposed, and will add reference to the SCI to encouraging developers to consult with various parties on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the application. We will also add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. |
| Manchester resident | [56](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\56.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.3 | Having been on the rough end of trying to get planning permission I think the phrase fiddling while Rome burns comes to mind. I had to go through the planning process to change some patio doors in my apartment as it is in a conservation area (but is not a listed building). First I waited 8 weeks for someone to decide if I needed to make an application or not. I had showed how high up and tucked away the doors are and only visible to a handful of surrounding roof top apartments. But that didn't matter and I was then told I had to still apply. Then I was asked to prove with calculations that german engineered patio doors I was fitting were better for sound and heat insulation than 30 year old barely double glazed, draughty and rotten doors that I was replacing. I had all the technical spec for the new doors but nothing for the old doors - as it probably never existed. I was then in a stale mate situation as no amount of reasoning would budge planning. In the end I went to Building Control and got them to advise that of course my new replacement windows would be better. Then planning backed down. In the meantime developers throw up massive blocks in many locations including conservation areas and the detailing and finish is just awful leaving a legacy of poor quality buildings. excessive Overhangs of buildings that get struck by passing wagons coming out of side streets (I can think of three examples within 3 minutes walk of the town hall all built in the last 10 years). That sort of detail they should be all over. But aren't. |  | Comments noted. The matters you raise are outside the scope of this consultation. If you have concerns about the service you can raise these via <http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/200011/building_control/4737/planning_and_building_control_-_feedback> |
| Manchester resident | [41](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\41.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.6 | Please improve you IT services and social media communications. |  | We will add wording to 9.5 to refer to QR codes on planning application site notices. We do not use social media to consult on planning applications at present. |
| Manchester resident | [47](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\47.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.6 | The city council needs to embrace modern technology. There are thousands of people in Manchester who have an opinion but whose voice is not heard because it is hard to comment on planning applications and other schemes in the city (e.g. multiple council logins for commenting on this document and planning applications).  Major applications for sites in prominent city center locations should have large advertisements displayed notifying passers by of the schemes. Perhaps QR codes could be displayed on and around the sites to link people quickly to short surveys where they can fill in comments and their views on the plans or what the area needs. This could allow passers by to comment on the schemes in a matter of minutes using a smartphone. This kind of engagement would probably also work very well for the public consultations schemes use prior to submitting planning applications.  You could also use services like google opinion rewards to send opinion surveys to people who have passed by the schemes. | Smartphone based planning application comments should be implemented to make it easier to comment on applications. For example using an online form (surveymonkey, google forms) which is linked to via posters/advertisements at the site (perhaps with QR codes) and in social/traditional media. | In order to make a comment on a planning application during the statutory consultation period you will need to provide your name and contact details as we do not accept anonymous comments. We do accept comments online via a form on our Public Access page, as set out in paragraphs 9.5 and 9.6 of the SCI. QR codes are now used on site notices advertising planning applications and link to the application. Wording will be added to the SCI to refer to this. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [96](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\96.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.7 | This does not seem to happen though and this section needs a definition of the "community". Disabled people's organisations need to be consulted on every major non-industrial development. Information on Design for Access 2 used to be sent out with every planning application information pack but that doesn't seem to have happened for a long time. Pre-planning consultation is advised before all Design and Access statements are produced but these D&AS are not properly monitored or reviewed and sent back if not appropriate. | Need to be more specific and committed to making developers consult about accessibility on new developments and include details in the Design and Access Statements. | Disabled access is covered nationally by Building Regulations and in addition we now refer developers to the Council's Residential Quality Space Standards which is our most up to date guidance.  The Council cannot legally require developers to undertake pre-application consultation, but we do encourage them to. However we would not expect a developer to do their own consultation on individual documents such as their Design and Access Statement. |
| Manchester resident | [43](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\43.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.8 | Rubbish! Developers are doing the minimum as only 'exhibitions' are required. they go to a defunct Places Matter consultation and other statutory consultees and the civic voice is avoided. This must be improved greatly and count in the planning executive decision if people have avoided research or consultation. Perhaps a small fines process should be considered? |  | Please see response to your comment ID 42. We cannot legally require developers to carry out pre-application consultation and we cannot impose penalties for not doing this. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [97](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\97.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.8 | Agree with previous response and find that many "exhibitions" are not accessible! It is vital that disabled people's organisations are involved and other community and equality and diversity groups. It is problematic that officers are responsible for making these decisions as I have had experience in the past of at least one planning officer taking no interest in dealing with accessibility issues. | Making it obligatory to involve disabled people's organisations and local communities | As stated in response to your comment ID 96, we cannot make it a requirement for developers to carry out pre-application consultation, but we do encourage them to, and on a case by case basis we suggest that they engage with various parties. This could include disabled people’s groups and other equalities organisations if appropriate. We will add reference to paragraph 9.8 of the SCI to encouraging developers to consult with various parties, which could include equalities groups, on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the application, and to 9.10 to exhibitions being in accessible locations. We will also add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [98](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\98.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.10 | This is not appropriate for consulting with disabled people and their organisations and focus groups and detailed consultation should be included as part of the Design and Access Statement process and is in line with the requirements of the Equality Act. Unfortunately this section shows a lack of understanding of how to engage with disabled people and allows developers to ignore, misunderstand or be unaware of accessibility features. Some developers, architects and designers I have met are unaware of BS 8300, Design for Access 2 or some elements of Building Regulations, let alone Guidance on the Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces and other national guidance | Detailed pre-planning consultation should be required with disabled people's organisations to ensure that local and national standards are understood and followed. | Design and Access Statements form part of the suite of documents prepared by the applicant when a planning application is registered. We would not expect a developer to do their own consultation on individual documents at pre-application stage but we do encourage them to carry out pre-application consultation prior to submitting an application on the overall scheme proposed, and on a case by case basis we suggest that they engage with various parties. Potentially this could include disabled people’s groups and other equalities organisations if appropriate. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. |
| Manchester resident | [44](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\44.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.11 | When!? St Michaels, for example, had a different low to mid rise SRF and MCC leaders met with developer and architect in many meeting to increase land massing and size. Library Walk, The Factory, many schemes are just given by the technocrats despite public money being used. This is not a genuine statement and you are not holding your own leaders accountable whatsoever or having a democratic or considered approach to pre-planning, which can lead to so many damaging decisions and shortcomings for an ambitious and smart city of active citizens. |  | Comments noted. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [99](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\99.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.11 | As stated previously, disability issues should be consulted on at every occasion as most recent developments have not done so with major consequences. | Engagement with disabled people's access groups should be required | Please see response to your comment ID 97. In addition disabled access is covered through nationally by Building Regulations. The Council tests access issues throughout the planning process. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [100](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\100.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.12 | It is surprising to read this as recent developments have not included consultation with local disabled people's groups. All developments should include local consultations with disabled people's organisations or the application is delayed until it happens. | ensure that planning applications that do not include local consultation on accessibility for all disabled people is delayed until the consultations take place. | Please see response to your comment ID 97. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [101](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\101.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.13 | It is also required under the Public Sector Equality Duty that Planning Authorities take the initiative to ensure that discrimination doesn't take place. | MCC should use the requirements of the Equality Act to ensure that developers consult | Please see response to your comment ID 97. |
| Manchester resident | [45](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\45.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.15 | I have been to the Planning Meeting and the quorum has only just been met. There is a reserves list. Councillors fall asleep. They seem ill prepared to assess applications. The bow to political and property biases and influences. Thre should be more intense training and fines for those who do not attend. They should assess genuine consultation data and also be made to have some form of advocacy related work to be on that committee. |  | Your comments are noted but they lie outside the scope of this consultation. The Council’s constitution addresses the issues you raise. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [102](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\102.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.15 | Agree that the Planning and Highways Committee should have training on accessibility issues as have other local authorities  *MCC addition: for clarification - this comment is an agreement with the previous comment, rather than agreement with a statement in the SCI.* | Provide training for councillors sitting on Planning and Highways committees | Your comments are noted but they lie outside the scope of this consultation. The Council’s constitution addresses the issues you raise. |
| Manchester resident | [46](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\46.pdf) | Paragraph | 9.17 | You need to consider the difference of CGIs and the final product. If there is a big juxtaposition there need to be fines or a reserve to ensure improvement up to what those images were sold as. |  | Comments noted. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [124](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\124.pdf) | Getting help from Planning Aid | 10 | Thank you for providing information on the services available from Planning Aid. |  | Support welcomed. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [148](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\148.pdf) | Getting help from Planning Aid | 10 | If a small group or individual realised in the middle of a consultation that they require additional support from an organisation like Planning Aid; does that mean the consultation period would have expired before they gained the necessary assistance? |  | If you feel that you need additional time to make comments on planning policies during consultation periods, please contact us as soon as possible and we will let you know whether we will be able to accept late submissions. In practice this has often been possible. |
| Trafford resident | [20](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\20.pdf) | Paragraph | 10.1 | From the website that you link to: encourage this: http://www.rtpi.org.uk/planning-aid/neighbourhood-planning/ | Support Neighbourhood Planning Forums | Agree that this is a useful website to point community groups to in relation to Neighbourhood Planning. This is more relevant to the Neighbourhood Planning section, where the SCI sets out the support that the Council will provide to you if you are working on Neighbourhood Planning, therefore this section will be amended to state at the end of paragraph 8.7 that Planning Aid also offers support to groups working on this, and to give this weblink. In addition 10.1 will be amended to state that Planning Aid offers support in relation to Neighbourhood Planning as well as on planning applications etc. |
| Manchester resident | [48](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\48.pdf) |  | Picture 1.1 | Listening has to be genuine. Past consultations have been an absolute waste of time. Clearly decisions were already made and weren't going to change. Lip service at best. Where genuine and useful input was given during consultations it was ignored - even ridiculed by former MCC leader - and the outcome was much to the city's detriment. Piccadilly Gardens a very obvious example. Users of the City will often know what will work and wont, much better than architects or planners who simply want it off their desks. We've got to live it - and many now loath past decisions or the detail that wasn't taken care of. We are left with a legacy of buildings and public spaces that are poor quality, dirty looking and difficult to maintain. | Needs to be more than lip service. Genuinely listen and respond. We know the city better than most professionals so our' insight should be seized on from the start. | Comments noted. Decision-making on planning applications is a transparent and democratic process and decisions are never made without the relevant neighbour notification and publicity. Comments received are an important factor in the decision making process. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [62](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\62.pdf) |  | Picture 1.1 | It is important that consultation includes a wide range of organisations and different methods of consultation to read young people, voluntary organisations and in appropriate formats to meet the needs of disabled people, including blind and partially sighted people including text versions for people who use text browsers which cannot read images.  It is also important that consultations allow for at least 3 months as it takes a while for people to access alternative formats and to allow for contacts and meetings for members of organisations. This was identified in the Compact agreed a few years ago and available on the City Council website, "Working Together: A Compact for Manchester" | Important to commit to long consultation times as agreed in the Compact and for formats and arrangements for consultation are reviewed and improved | We try to make planning policy engagement events as accessible as possible to meet the needs of different groups of people, as set out in paragraph 2.6 of the SCI. A range of engagement methods are set out in the summary tables for each type of policy document in later chapters of the SCI. We will try to accommodate requests for materials in alternative formats and wording will be added to paragraph 2.6 of the SCI to refer to this.  The timescales for consultation periods for policy documents as set out in the SCI are in line with statutory requirements. In practice we often consult for longer periods - the SCI will be amended to refer to this. |
| Manchester resident | [49](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\49.pdf) |  | Picture 1.2 | Consultation and neighbour notification is far too late and the decision has already been made by planners to approve and the rubber stamp applications. Then comes the Planning Committee who are no more than nodding dogs. Objections don't get any credence and the detail and impact of schemes is brushed over as the applicant say there isn't a problem - when often there is on access, anti social behaviour, transport etc that will blight the buildings and local areas once built. | Consultations all too late and planning decisions just a rubber stamp. | Please see response to your comment ID 48. |
| KIngsbrook Residents Association | [61](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\61.pdf) |  | Picture 1.2 | We have had 2 major planning applications in our area in the past 3years, concerning large properties with an impact on the whole area in terms of change of use of the buildings and traffic and appearance of the area. In both cases the numbers of residents who received a letter advising them of the planning application was very narrow - immediate neighbours and houses opposite. It seems inappropriate to have a one size fits all approach to the planning process. An extension to a house is very different to making a building a private hospital facility, and there should be a more considered strategy for ensuring that all interested parties are consulted.  With regard to making comments on the council system, residents have reported that there is no acknowledgement of the comment, so it is not clear whether it has been considered. Ideas to improve process : acknowledge comments and notify those who do appeal of the outcome of the applicationand notification of the outcome of the application.  Time to comment appears to be very short too, with Residents having received letters very close to the closing date. | Suggestions for improving process when large scale developments or change of use are concerned. Need wider distribution of notice letters under certain circumstances. Acknowledgement of appeals and notification of outcome of application to those who have appealed | The Council sends out neighbour notification letters in line with the requirements of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015, and must allow enough time for comments to be made. In addition to these statutory requirements, we encourage developers to carry out wider consultation with the community for more significant development proposals as these will have a greater impact, as you say. However legally we cannot require developers to do this. In response to your point about acknowledgement of comments unfortunately we are not able to acknowledge receipt as we receive such a large volume of representations. However you can track applications online via Public Access and choose to receive email notifications about their progress, such as the committee date for determining the application. Committee reports summarise the comments which have been received during the public consultation period. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [65](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\65.pdf) |  | Picture 1.2 | The diagram is displayed in very small print and a new version needs to be designed to make it possible for visually impaired people including older people to read this, also a text version needs to be provided. | More accessible design of the diagram. | We will make the diagrams and pictures more accessible in our planning policy consultation documents and we will amend the SCI to refer to this.  We will add text descriptions to diagrams and pictures so that this can be picked up when planning policy documents are read online via our consultation portal. We will enable images to be opened as popups when read via the portal, so that they can be viewed in a large format, and so that they can be copied and pasted as text if necessary. In our PDF versions of consultation documents we will use high resolution images so that users can zoom in to enlarge the image without losing clarity. We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request.  If you are viewing consultation documents via our consultation portal there is information about the accessibility settings under "accessibility" towards the top right hand of the page. Users can make the font larger from this page and also view an index of where the keyboard access keys will take them if they use these. |
| Age-Friendly Manchester Design Group | [130](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\130.pdf) |  | Picture 1.2 | Where diagrams are defined by colour, a key should be provided alongside especially if printed versions are available only in black and white not colour.  The diagrams of the planning process feature text that is too small. |  | The reference to the colour of the boxes has been removed from paragraph 1.3 as it is not needed to explain the diagram.  We use high resolution diagrams in PDFs so that you can zoom in to make the diagram and text much larger without it becoming blurred. |
| Trafford resident | [15](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\15.pdf) | Local Plan consultation stages | Picture 4.1 | Whilst what is 'possible' is informative, it should surely illustrate what needs to happen for cpnsultation to be considered a genuine attampt to engage? | Possibly Improbable | The consultation methods to be used will depend on the scope of the policies being consulted on. The diagrams summarising consultation stages for Local Plans, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Frameworks and Neighbourhood Planning will be amended to show in bold the methods that will definitely be used at each stage. |
| Manchester resident | [32](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\32.pdf) | Local Plan consultation stages | Picture 4.1 | Social media? I have NEVER seen MCC promote awareness about planning applications! For example, the Gaskel Campus demolished for a private hospital went through with barely anyone being aware of it or making the news. I see little evidence of genuine communications. That is EASY to remedy if this is to mean anything at all! |  | Picture 4.1 refers to consultation on policies in Local Plans, which are promoted through social media. Consultation methods for planning applications are set out in Chapter 9 and social media could potentially be a method that developers might use at the pre-application stage. |
| Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society | [125](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\125.pdf) | Local Plan consultation stages | Picture 4.1 | I do think that any information should be emailed out by the relevant Neighbourhood Officer to their list of contacts. |  | Comments noted. Emails are shown in the summary diagram as a consultation method which we will use during Local Plan preparation. As a minimum this will be emails to people on the planning policy database, but in addition we will ask neighbourhood officers to circulate consultation information to their contacts as well. Reference to this will be added to the SCI. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [81](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\81.pdf) | Local Plan consultation stages | Picture 4.1 | All information should be provided in alternative formats and events and meetings should be accessible for all disabled people. More imaginative formats and events should be provided for some groups. | All information should engage everyone and be accessible | It isn’t always possible to guarantee that all planning policy documents will be available in different formats as standard. However we will try to accommodate requests for materials in alternative formats where we can and wording will be added to paragraph 2.6 of the SCI to refer to this. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [103](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\103.pdf) | Local Plan consultation stages | Picture 4.1 | Poor colour contrast - blue text on blue background making it difficult to read. Please provide text alternatives for people using text browwers which cannot read images | More accessible design of diagrams | We will amend the font colour in Picture 4.1. We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request and the SCI will be amended to refer to this. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [90](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\90.pdf) | Planning Framework consultation stages | Picture 7.1 | Firstly accessibility of the fonts is poor, blue on blue particularly bad  Also needs more engagement methods | improve accessibility of text and range of engagement strategies | Additional engagement methods are often used by developers / landowners in advance of the formal consultation on a planning framework by the Council. Picture 7.1 will be amended to show this. We will also amend the font colour. We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [107](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\107.pdf) | Planning Framework consultation stages | Picture 7.1 | Please see previous comments on poor colour contrast and lack of text alternative | More accessible information in diagrams | Please see response to your comment ID 90. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [95](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\95.pdf) | Summary of Neighbourhood Planning consultation stages | Picture 8.1 | See previous comments on lack of accessible and colour contrasted text and the design of the diagram and need for text version  Also range of consultation options are limited as some people may need to meet to discuss the issues and do not use websites, social media and emails. | Improve design of diagram and consultation options | We will change the font colour in Picture 8.1. We will offer text versions of diagrams and charts on request and the SCI will be amended to refer to this.  Neighbourhood Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders are initiated and prepared by the community rather than by the Council, with our role and therefore the consultation methods used being more limited than for Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents. As shown in the table the engagement processes whilst the Neighbourhood Plan / Neighbourhood Development Order is being prepared are determined by the Neighbourhood Forum / parish council who is producing it. However we will encourage the use of a broad range of engagement methods and paragraph 8.7 will be amended to refer to this. |
| Trafford resident | [19](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\19.pdf) | Advertisement and Consultation Methods | Table 9.1 | Inadequate and woefully underdeveloped engagement streams. | Do More | Table 9.1 sets out the engagement methods for advertising planning applications in line with legal requirements. In addition to these methods the Council will encourage developers to consult at the pre-application stage, with paragraph 9.10 suggesting methods to be used as appropriate. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. |
| Manchester resident | [42](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\42.pdf) | Advertisement and Consultation Methods | Table 9.1 | Your ways of communicating these applications are beyond flawed. There is little advocacy or seemingly genuine communications. There is no impetus for pre-planning consultation, you do not reach the many groups interested in these applications. Much of MCC policy seems to be to do the statutory minimum and hide from significant applications from public knowledge. The research is appalling. It needs to be involved with genuine outreach from @ourmcrforum and many other ways to enhance communications with your many paid communication staff, who should also be making accessible public research for improving schemes ambitions. |  | We encourage developers to carry out pre-application consultation for larger scale applications - please see paragraphs 9.7-9.13 of the SCI. We will add an appendix to the SCI to provide guidance on early developer-led engagement at the pre-application stage. However the Council cannot legally require developers to engage with communities at this stage, nor can we force them to use particular methods.  Table 9.1 sets out the engagement methods for advertising planning applications in line with legal requirements. |
| Manchester Disabled People's Access Group | [108](file:///\\mcc001c27fdfs\dfs-all$\CEX\CityPolicy\Policy%20&%20Strategy\Planning%20Strategy\LDF%20and%20Local%20Plan\2015%20SCI\Jan%202017%20re-write\Dec%20Exec%20Report%20&%20Adoption\108.pdf) | Advertisement and Consultation Methods | Table 9.1 | Voluntary sector organisations need to be included in this notification especially in relation to access for older and disabled people. Agree with previous comments about the need to improve communication and notification and consult on this. Letters are not always understood and local organisations may not be reaching a wide range of disabled people and people with long term health issues such as dementia. Developments and design documents may have major implications for accessibility in neighbourhoods and the city centre. It is stated elsewhere that MCC is committed to improving access through the requirements of the Equality Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty so this should be reflected through the notification processes. | Notification and advertisement methods need vast improvement to be more inclusive. | Table 9.1 sets out the legal requirements in relation to advertisement of and consultation on planning applications. As set out in the paragraphs following the table, we encourage developers to consult the community before they submit a planning application for a significant development, and this often includes a range of engagement methods beyond the ones in Table 9.1. We have added a diagram to Chapter 9 to summarise the different consultation methods which are used at both the pre-application stage and once a planning application has been submitted.  Once a valid application has been submitted it will be available publicly via Public Access, as set out in paragraph 9.6 of the SCI. |