

Question No 56 - Protection of Opens Space, Sport and Recreation

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (3) In Part (10) No (2)

Yes (LP321-55, LP309-53, LP292-37, LP291-37)

In part (LP395-23, LP292-24, LP290-19, LP267-37, LP261-16, LP28-56, LP27-13, LP18-1, LP11-1, LP9-2)

No (LP385-45, LP15-1)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	I passionately agree with the Policy. Trees and Open Spaces are the lungs of every city. The Victorians knew that. They got it right, we should too.	Support noted	LP309-53
2	The Trust agrees with and supports the policy. We particularly welcome and support the reasoning within paragraph 13.9. The value of such open spaces in providing important stepping stones for nature needs to be assessed when considering development on recreational open space	Support noted	LP291-37
	Connectivity		
3	Protection of Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation Land and Facilities: the TPT/NCN should be recognised as a strategic recreational and active travel route of local, regional	No change proposed to the plan. Where other policies in the Local Plan deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole. The TPT/NCN is included in the Local Plan under the 5 th bullet point in Policy EN1 and on the Policies Map. Policy	LP365-1

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	and national importance. Any development impacting these routes must improve accessibility and quality for all users. Quality represents the quality of the route and the quality of the visitor experience.	EN1 also requires development to “Facilitate extensions to and connections with strategic recreational routes, where appropriate opportunities arise.”	
4	The community support Policy EN1 and take this to mean that the remaining areas of open space within the Aquarius Estate are to be protected. In addition, the Aquarius community are keen to retain convenient and safe walking and cycling routes through the local area.	Existing public open space will be subject to the requirements within Policy SI 1. It is also subject to the requirements of Policy EN1 Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure. Change agreed. Additional wording in Policy EN1. “Development proposals will be expected to: Maintain and enhance existing green and blue infrastructure in terms of its quality, quantity, accessibility and multifunctionality.” And add the word accessibility into the last section to EN1.	LP383-11
	Open Space		
5	Agree with the restrictions on the following; d) preserve the existing green spaces, don't allow them to be taken by yet more housing projects.	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan has to seek a balance between the different needs of the city. Policy SI1 protects existing green spaces in accordance with National Planning policy and Places for Everyone.	LP378-3
6	Moss Side is deficient in open space and there are poor pedestrian connections to nearby open spaces. The residents therefore welcome the local plan policies protecting open space (EN1) and requiring new space to be created as part of new development (SI1 and 2).	Support noted.	LP393-5

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
7	Welcome the Local Plan's policies protecting existing open space (EN1) and requiring new open space to be provided as part of new development (SI1 and SI2). While the policy acknowledges the unequal distribution of open space across the city, it is not clear whether the impact of increased population density from new development has been fully considered in planning for additional green space. This is particularly important in areas such as Victoria North, where accessible open space is limited, and existing spaces are not always age-friendly or safe, for example, verges, green edges, and wedges. The Plan should ensure that green space provision grows proportionately with population and is designed to meet the needs of all age groups safely and inclusively.	Support and comments noted. The evidence used to set the open space quantity thresholds listed within Policy SI 1 supporting text considered the impact of the increasing population. Policy GL4 sets out how development will contribute to enhanced and extended green space provision.	LP296-18, LP308-36, LP379-23
8	Focus on brownfield sites first before building on existing open space. Protect informal play areas and community gardens from infill development.	No change proposed to the plan. Most development within Manchester, typically over 90%, takes place on brownfield land. Where a planning application is received for development on an existing open space Policy SI1, in line with national planning policy, requires the developer to provide an open space	LP384-6

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		assessment that either shows the open space to be surplus or to provide replacement open space.	
9	Highlighting the importance and need to invest in and protect the following green spaces around Castlefield: St John Gardens, Beaufort St Corner, Pioneer Quay, Community Veg Garden, Liverpool Rd, Granary Gardens, Roman Gardens, Old Granada Studios - Land opposite St Johns Gardens on Lower Byrom St.	A separate assessment has been undertaken to look at all sites which have received a request for Local Green Space designation. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP360-1
10	Suggest that the first four bullet points following the sentence: “The development of existing open space, sport or recreational land or facilities for uses other than sport, open space or recreation will only be permitted where:” should end with “and” rather than “or”. We are interested to note that Table 13.1 “Open Space Standards against which surpluses and deficits should be calculated” includes ‘walking thresholds’ for times/distances to access open spaces. This is a welcome principle but should also be applied across the relevant Local Plan policies and could form a key part of a 20 minute	No change proposed to the plan. Amending “or” to “and” between the bullet points would not conform with national policy and guidance. Policy SP2 incorporates aspects that would feature within a 20 minute neighbourhood concept.	LP290-19

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	neighbourhoods policy as discussed in our response to Question 5 above.		
11	Please see our earlier comment under Q1 about the quality of evidence in the Open Space Assessment – this and the following Question 57/ New Open Spaces Policy cannot be properly evaluated without a robust evidence base, which includes ALL the open spaces in Manchester greater than >0.2Ha.	The Open Spaces Assessment excluded open spaces that were either within the SHLAA or were publicly inaccessible. This was to enable a realistic assessment to be made of the quantity of publicly accessible open space that could be provided across Manchester during the lifetime of the plan, notwithstanding the quantity of housing and employment land required to be delivered to be consistent with PfE. Being excluded from the OSA does not of itself mean a site is not open space. The OSA and Policy SI1 makes it clear that planning applications on any open space still need to have an appropriate open space assessment to determine whether there is a surplus or a deficit. The OSA has been reviewed to seek to address any inconsistencies and remove amenity or semi natural sites less than 0.2ha in accordance with the methodology.	LP395-23
12	We do not agree that amenity/civic spaces of less than .2ha should not be included. It should be recognised that leisure space is not just for organised leisure or sporting activities. Space also needs to be protected for people to meet and talk without having to impart with money. This should apply to privately held land (eg in shopping	No change proposed to the plan. The Open Space Assessment excludes sites below 0.2ha except for parks and play areas, so as not to place too much reliance on small spaces such as grass verges in considering how much open space provision there is across the City. However, this does not mean that these sites are unimportant and under Policy SI1 a planning application for such a site would still require a proportionate open space assessment to judge whether it was surplus.	LP267-37

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	centres) as well as in Council held land. It is good to see the Open Space standards table includes notes of 10 and 15 minute walking distances. If a 20 Minute neighbourhood (better still, the 15 minute neighbourhood) were adopted as policy, this would embrace these spaces.	It is not necessary to refer to 20 minute neighbourhoods as Policy SP2 already sets out principles, alongside other policies in the plan, that are consistent with the concept whilst allowing flexibility for other spatial solutions.	
13	We also need enhanced protection for pocket-spaces of greenery (under 0.2 HA), as these are critical areas where young people can play and engage on.	No change proposed to the plan. The Open Space Assessment excludes sites below 0.2ha except for parks and play areas, so as not to place too much reliance on small spaces such as grass verges in considering how much open space provision there is across the City. However, this does not mean that these sites are unimportant and under Policy SI1 a planning application for such a site would still require a proportionate open space assessment to judge whether it was surplus.	LP15-1
14	Amenity/civic spaces of less than .2ha most definitely <i>should</i> be included. Leisure space is not just for organised leisure or sporting activities. Space needs to be protected for people to meet and talk without having to pay out money. This should apply to privately held land (e.g. in shopping centres, housing developments) as well as for Council land. It is good to see the Open Space standards table includes notes	No change proposed to the plan. The Open Space Assessment excludes sites below 0.2ha except for parks and play areas, so as not to place too much reliance on small spaces such as grass verges in considering how much open space provision there is across the City. However, this does not mean that these sites are unimportant and under Policy SI1 a planning application for such a site would still require an open space assessment to judge whether it was surplus.	LP292-24

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	of 10 and 15 minute walking distances: why not throughout the plan? It is a key principle as we have argued above: 20 Minute neighbourhoods.	It is not necessary to refer to 20 minute neighbourhoods as Policy SP2 already sets out principles, alongside other policies in the plan, that are consistent with the concept whilst allowing flexibility for other spatial solutions.	
15	Small areas of local recreational space should also be subject to protection.	No change proposed to the plan. The Open Space Assessment excludes sites below 0.2ha except for parks and play areas, so as not to place too much reliance on small spaces such as grass verges in considering how much open space provision there is across the City. However, this does not mean that these sites are unimportant and under Policy SI1 a planning application for such a site would still require an open space assessment to judge whether it was surplus.	LP28-56
	Local Green Space		
16	The University is strongly supportive of the Draft Local Plan. To ensure the Draft Local Plan meets the tests of soundness, and that it is fully aligned with the University's future direction and interests, we respectfully request that the University's land at Ryebank Road, Chorlton remains identified within the Southern Areas and is not subject to any environmental or recreational designations that may restrict the development envisaged within the adopted Ryebank Road Development Framework	Comments noted. The land at Ryebank Rd is the subject of an assessment which is looking at all sites which have received a request for Local Green Space designation. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP376-1

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
17	Manchester could do much better than a commitment to protect an amount of open space that is just 50% of the national recommendation. One way to do so would be to recognise all eligible Local Green Space applications.	No change proposed to the plan. National benchmarks are different for different types of open space. In most cases Manchester's provision is higher than 50% of the national benchmarks. Policy SI 1 brings in strong protection for existing accessible public open space. The criteria for assessing Local Green Space is provided in national planning policy (NPPF and NPPG). A separate assessment has been undertaken to look at all sites which have received a request for Local Green Space designation. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP347-2, LP356-2
18	Request that Godfrey Ermen Playing Field Village Green in Abbey Hey, recognised as a vital Local Green Space	A separate assessment has been undertaken for all requests for Local Green Space. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP334-2, LP335-2, LP336-2, LP337-2, LP338-2, LP339-2, LP340-2, LP342-2, LP343-2, LP415-1
19	Request for Ryebank Fields to be designated a Local Green Space	A separate assessment has been undertaken for all requests for Local Green Space. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP11-1, LP18-1, LP254-2, LP274-4, LP372-1, LP395-23, LP404-20, LP405-1,

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
			LP406-1, LP407-1, LP408-1, LP409-1, LP410-1, LP411-1, LP412-1, LP413-1, LP414-1, LP415-1, LP416-1, LP417-1, LP418-1, LP419-1, LP420-1, LP421-1, LP422-1, LP423-1, LP424-1, LP425-1, LP426-1, LP427-1, LP428-1, LP429-1, LP430-1, LP431-1, LP432-1, LP433-1,

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
			LP434-1, LP435-1, LP436-1, LP437-1, LP438-1, LP439-1, LP440-1, LP441-1, LP442-1, LP443-1, LP444-1, LP445-1, LP446-1, LP447-1, LP448-1, LP449-1, LP450-1, LP451-1, LP452-1, LP453-1, LP454-1, LP455-1, LP456-1, LP457-1, LP458-1, LP459-1, LP460-1, LP461-1,

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
			LP462-1, LP463-1, LP464-1, LP465-1, LP466-1, LP467-1, LP468-1, LP469-1, LP470-1, LP471-1, LP472-1, LP473-1, LP474-1, LP475-1, LP476-1, LP477-1, LP478-1, LP479-1, LP480-1, LP481-1, LP482-1, LP483-1, LP484-1, LP485-1, LP486-1, LP487-1, LP488-1, LP489-1,

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
			LP490-1, LP491-1, LP492-1, LP493-1, LP494-1, LP495-1, LP496-1, LP498-1, LP499-1, LP500-1, LP501-1, LP 502-1, LP503-1, LP504-1, LP505-1, LP506-1, LP507-1, LP508-1, LP509-1, LP510-1, LP511-1, LP512-1, LP513-1, LP514-1, LP515-1, LP516-1, LP404-20

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
20	Request for Lower Medlock to be designated a Local Green Space	A separate assessment is being undertaken for all requests for Local Green Space. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP395-23
21	Request for Bobs Hill and Sandhills to be designated a Local Green Space	A separate assessment is being undertaken for all requests for Local Green Space. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP274-4, LP395-23
22	Request for Hough End Clough and Fields to be designated a Local Green Space	A separate assessment is being undertaken for all requests for Local Green Space. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP395-23
23	Request for Nico Ditch to be designated a Scheduled Ancient Monument	The designation of a Scheduled Ancient Monument is outside of the scope of the Local Plan. All Scheduled Ancient Monuments are assessed and designated by Historic England, to whom any request should be made.	LP516-1
24	The GM State of Nature report (March 2024) commits to <i>Nature Recovery</i> and to increase the accessibility to nature within walking distance of residents. We can calculate that at least 12,000 people live within a 15 minute walk to the centre of the fields. I feel that this is a very pertinent fact to this Local Green Space consultation and should be given great weight in your decision making.	A separate assessment has been undertaken for all requests for Local Green Space. Any sites that are proposed for designation following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan.	LP428-1

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	We as residents agree that It NV should be protected as per SI 1 Policy. Therefore, it should be declared a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) to do so.	The declaration of Local Nature Reserves is a process that can be undertaken completely separately to a Local Plan. Policy SI1 applies to all open spaces regardless of whether they are a Local Nature Reserve.	LP261-16
	Allotments		
25	Allotments need to have a robust local policy to protect them from development	Policy SI1 applies to all open spaces including allotments.	LP404-20
	Accessibility and Play		
26	Current accessibility standards focus too narrowly on walking distances. It should include accessibility for people who are wheelchair users, people with any other disability or who have multiple disabilities and cover other accessibility issues(routes, seating, safety, toilets etc) listed in specific national standards such as BS8300.The Local Plan should be revised to include broader accessibility issues and provide appropriate references as the current text does not guide organisations at to how to design accessible parks, sports or leisure facilities.	Where other policies in the Local Plan deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole. Accessibility is covered by Policy DM1 which states that buildings and neighbourhoods must be fully accessible to disabled people, any further amendments, considered necessary, will be made to this policy. Proposed change as follows. "Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods, including recreational open space and public realm , fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes."	LP385-45

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
27	Children's play areas should all be fully accessible for disabled children, family and friends and guardians.	No change proposed to the plan. Accessibility is covered by Policy DM1 which states that buildings and neighbourhoods must be fully accessible to disabled people, any further amendments, considered necessary, will be made to this policy. Proposed change as follows. "Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods, including recreational open space and public realm , fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes."	LP385-45
28	We need to further protect play facilities and encourage developers to make play spaces, as opposed to gentle encouragement. The current level is significantly below Fields In Trust Standards.	Change agreed. In view of the low existing children's and youth play provision, it is proposed that the threshold in the Open Space Standards table used for assessing this typology be increased from 0.04 ha/1000 (16% of the national best practice standard) to 0.125ha/1000 pop. The fourth paragraph after the table will be amended to read "The current provision for children and young people is 0.04ha/1000 population. This is 16% of the national best practice. In seeking to protect existing play provision a higher threshold of 0.125ha /1000 population is included which is 50% of the national best practice standards. (LP15-1, LP395-23) The proposed standard for children's play space and youth provision is aligned to the existing provision of 0.04 ha per 1,000 population. This is well below the FiT guidance of 0.25 ha per 1,000 population, and w Where viable opportunities arise new play provision may be created on existing sites to enhance their recreational value and function."	LP15-1

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
29	It is not enough to say 'new play provision may be created', this needs to be written into policy and will need a more ambitious target to make that happen. 12% of national standards is a shockingly low figure and we must do better for our children, please improve these targets.	Change proposed. In view of the low existing children's and youth play provision, it is proposed that the threshold in the Open Space Standards table used for assessing this typology be increased from 0.04 ha/1000 (16% of the national best practice standard) to 0.125ha/1000 pop. The fourth paragraph after the table will be amended to read "The current provision for children and young people is 0.04ha/1000 population. This is 16% of the national best practice. In seeking to protect existing play provision a higher threshold of 0.125ha /1000 population is included which is 50% of the national best practice standards. (LP15-1, LP395-23) The proposed standard for children's play space and youth provision is aligned to the existing provision of 0.04 ha per 1,000 population. This is well below the FiT guidance of 0.25 ha per 1,000 population, and w Where viable opportunities arise new play provision may be created on existing sites to enhance their recreational value and function."	LP395-23
	Nature/Park		
30	We disagree that you can offset Nature provision with Park provision, unless you have audited it as such. In addition, the biggest deficits in Nature space are in areas with little Parks provision.	The policy recognises the important multi functionality of Manchester's open spaces. Manchester's historic growth pattern means that it is not always possible to increase the quantity of open space provision. But enhancing and managing existing publicly accessible open spaces to increase their multi functionality can help to address this.	LP395-23

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
31	Please make clearer the criteria for a park to be strategic and why only 3-4 make that criteria, for example excluding Chorlton Park which is quite large, important to community, hosts events & sellers. I would like Chorlton Park (and similar in other areas) to receive solid consideration, and it is not clear how & why different parks are viewed differently.	The criteria for a park to be defined as a strategic park is set out in the Park strategy and not through the Local Plan process.	LP359-2
	Further Guidance		
32	Sport England considers that the wording of bullet point one of the third paragraph offers a broad scope to undermine the use of the site as a playing field as a proposal would only need to "complement the character". This policy needs strengthening to reflect NPPF 104(c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use	Change agreed. Addition to first bullet point of third paragraph of Policy SI1 : "The development of existing open space, sport or recreational land or facilities for uses other than sport, open space or recreation will only be permitted where: It is ancillary to the main function of the sport or recreational use and complements the character of the open space, sport or recreational use; or The development is for alternative sports, play or other recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use; or "	LP 9-2
33	Sport England support the wording at 13.15 of the reasoned justification for the policy.	Support noted	LP9-2
34	While the draft Local Plan recognises Core Local Nature Sites and the	No change proposed to the plan. National benchmarks are different for different types of open space. In most cases	LP371-2

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	importance of connecting them, it still risks creating isolated green islands within the city potentially limiting the positive effect of the natural environment on well-being and cutting off those who live further away from Core sites from those benefits. The Manchester Local Plan should make a commitment to protect an amount of open space that is just 50% of the national recommendation whilst recognising all eligible Local Green Space applications. There needs to be a specific recognition of the potential for the built environment to provide habitats, helping to connect Core Sites. For example, 61,000 new homes by 2039 will provide at least 61,000 opportunities to provide nesting sites for swifts through swift bricks or boxes, so such provision should be made part of the planning process with an expectation placed on developers and builders to provide a good reason not to include such habitats in both new buildings and refurbishments. Swift's have also been impacted by the decline in insects to address this the Local Plan	Manchester's provision is higher than 50% of the national benchmarks. Policy SI 1 brings in strong protection for existing accessible public open space. The criteria for assessing Local Green Space is provided in national planning policy (NPPF and NPPG). All Local Green Space requests are being assessed in accordance with this guidance.	

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	should commit to increasing the planting of wildflowers in all Manchester parks.		
35	The Plan should identify, designate and have policies to protect and enhance areas of Local Green Space that are of particular importance to local communities. Open space provision can use Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework Standards to determine needs based on size, proximity, capacity and quality. As previously mentioned, an initial focus should be on access to green and blue spaces within 15 minutes' walk from home.	A separate assessment has been undertaken to look at all sites which have received a request for Local Green Space designation. Any sites that are proposed for designation as a following this assessment will be included in the Local Plan. The different types of open space listed in Table 13.1 have an accessibility threshold that varies between 10-15 mins.	LP325-14 (EA)
36	From an SRN perspective, no direct impacts are anticipated. However, where new/replacement facilities are near SRN boundaries, transport assessments should be required, particularly for strategic hubs/large-scale sports facilities, to evaluate traffic, parking and access.	The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. This issue is addressed through other policies in the plan. (Places for Everyone Policy JP C8) sets out transport requirements for new development including the need for transport assessments where appropriate). Where other policies in the Local Plan deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole	LP321-55
37	Powerleague support the improvement of and investment in open space, sports and recreation facilities. However, Powerleague contend that the Plan	This will be considered at the 25/26 SHLAA Update.	LP285-10

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	should recognise the opportunity and potential associated with intensifying and redeveloping suitable recreation sites and that this should be recognised in site specific allocations and Citywide policies. The Powerleague Manchester Central site has the ability to achieve a truly exemplar mixed use redevelopment, serving as a catalyst for wider regeneration in Ardwick Green, with residential development being complimented by upgraded and improved sporting facilities and the unlocking of the railway corridor emanating from/to Manchester Piccadilly.		
38	Remove the following wording "Where the loss of an unused playing field site is proposed, consideration will be given to the length of time it has been unused and the following priority order of options will be used:" Suggest the following additional clause for replacement playing field: Wherever practicable, replacement provision shall be made directly by the developer and shall be available for community use before the existing recreation	No change proposed to the plan. Where an unused playing field is still open space it will be subject to the first four bullet points linked to the third paragraph. This allows consideration of how the site could meet a deficit in any open space, sport or recreation use or facility. Policy DC1 addresses the nature and scale of developer contributions.	LP277-10

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	facility is lost. The payment of a financial contribution to the city council for replacement provision may be acceptable in other circumstances subject to a commuted sum for continued maintenance of the site for a minimum of 10 years."		
39	Paragraph 13.7 Delete the following text: "Open Space Standards against which surpluses and deficits should be calculated and with reference to the latest Open Space Assessment, and Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy" Reason: Quantitative standards based on the PPOSS and BFS cannot be established due to the varying pitch types, sizes, and court dimensions required for different sports and team numbers. For instance, a tennis court is designed for two or four players, whereas a full-sized rugby pitch accommodates two teams of 15. As a result, uniform standards are not feasible. Instead, current Needs Assessments are employed to identify and address deficiencies in sports facilities within specific localities.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy already addresses this issue in paragraph 13.15	LP277-10

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
40	Table 13.1 - Outdoor and Indoor Sports Provision delete the following text Need Assessment to be informed by the findings in the current PPOSS and Indoor Sports Strategy. Suggest rewording to "Provision for new or enhanced indoor and outdoor sports facilities should be guided by the findings of the up to date Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy and Indoor Sports Strategy."	Change agreed. Replace text in Table 13.1 relating to quantity standard for Outdoor and Indoor Sports Provision. "Need Assessment to be informed by the findings in the current PPOSS and Indoor Sports Strategy." Provision for new or enhanced indoor and outdoor sports facilities should be guided by the findings of the up to date Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy and Indoor Sports Strategy."	LP277-10
41	The policy should be amended to require all four criteria to be met.	No change proposed to the plan. The change proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP27-13

Question No 57 - Provision of Opens Space, Sport and Recreation

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (3) In Part (4) No (0)

Yes (LP321-56, LP28-57, LP9-4)

In part (LP395-24, LP292-25, LP267-38, LP27-12)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Support	Support and comments noted	LP9-4, LP27-12 LP28-57, LP291-38, LP 267-38, LP292- 25, LP303-5, LP321-56, LP395-24
	Transport and Connectivity		
2	New/expanded facilities require transport assessments and where near to SRN corridors these should evaluate access, parking and traffic generation, in coordination with National Highways.	The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. This issue is addressed through other policies in the plan. (Places for Everyone Policy JP C8) sets out transport requirements for new development including the need for transport assessments where appropriate). Where other policies in the Local Plan deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole.	LP321-56
3	Opportunities should be taken to connect new open spaces and developments to the TPT/NCN, to maximise value.	This is picked up in Policy EN1.	LP365-16

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
4	There is little detail in policy statement about how need will be assessed. Disagree that there is a sufficient supply of facilities as facilities are not always accessible by walking or public transport. A 20 minute neighbourhood policy would help assess and plan for open space, recreational land and facilities.	No change proposed to the plan. This policy covers a wide range of facilities from smaller scale local provision such as a local park to larger scale district facilities accessed from much greater distances. An assessment of need, including accessibility issues will vary depending on the specific recreational or sporting use proposed. A 20 minute policy would not be appropriate to cover this range of provision. All facilities will be assessed to ensure they are accessible by a range of transport means including walking and public transport in line with Places for Everyone and Policy T1.	LP292-25, LP261-35
	The balance between new and existing open space		
5	The difference between new and existing open spaces is not clear. Spaces may exist that are not accessible or are overprovided (e.g. parks), which could evolve into underprovided spaces.(e.g. nature spaces) Ryebank is an example of an undesignated space that still has benefits to nature and the local community.	No change proposed to the plan. Policy SI.2 applies to proposals to enhance existing or to create new open space, sport, recreation land and facilities.	LP395-24
6	Step Places and Southway support Draft Policy SI 2. In line	Comments noted	LP303-5

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	with the policy, the proposed development of the land off Ryebank Rd will create areas of high quality publicly accessible open space, including a children's play area, footpath, cycleway and wildlife habitat and community growing area, that would be mostly maintained and managed and accessible to the public in perpetuity.		
7	Whilst supporting the policy, the new open spaces should not be at the expense of existing small spaces. See comment on Q56	No change proposed to the plan. The Open Space Assessment excludes amenity and natural/semi natural sites below 0.2ha so as not to place too much reliance on small spaces such as grass verges in considering how much open space provision there is across the City. However, this does not mean that these sites are unimportant and under Policy SI1 a planning application for such a site would still require a proportionate open space assessment to judge whether it was surplus.	LP28-57
	Biodiversity and Environment		
8	The provision of new recreational open space should be multi-functional and enhance biodiversity rather than negatively impact on biodiversity.	This is picked up in Policy EN1.	LP291-38

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
9	The policy should contain a presumption against replacing natural grass with artificial grass pitches due to health and environmental concerns.	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan policy does not require the use of artificial grass pitches above grass pitches. However, it is recognised that artificial grass pitches have a part to play in ensuring that the capacity of existing and accessible playing pitch locations can meet the increasing level of demand which often takes place at limited times of the day and week.	LP404-21, LP27-12
	Disabled Access		
10	Accessibility standards for disabled people specific to each open space, sport, recreation and leisure facility need improving to meet national standards.	Sport England's technical design guidance, referred to in the policy, provides detailed technical guidance for inclusive design. Change agreed. Amend policy DM1 fourth bullet from "Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes." to "Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods, including recreational open space and public realm , fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes."	LP384-46
11	Chorlton has little in the way of indoor leisure and sports facilities, with limited public transport access to Hough End.	Comments noted.	LP267-38
	More detailed guidance		
12	Sport England suggests that the words 'and associated' be replaced with 'or', requiring any new sports facilities to be designed in accordance with	Change agreed. Proposed change be made to the policy explanation. Insert following text to end of paragraph 13.18 "Wherever possible, developers are encouraged to provide community access, to all sports facilities and use Sport England's technical design guidance."	LP9-4

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	SE's technical design guidance and provide community access.		
13	Sport England recommends that the Local Plan reference its Active Design principles—potentially including a link to the guidance—to help create healthier, more active communities. The guidance promotes designing towns and cities that integrate green and blue spaces to encourage physical activity and strengthen community wellbeing.	No change proposed to plan. This policy references Sport England technical Design Guidance. Sport England’s Active Design guidance covers a range of principles of wider relevance than the provision of new open space, sport and recreational facilities. Many of these principles are already picked up under other policies such as EN1 strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure and T1 Transport Principles.	LP9-4
	Community access		
14	Previous Donkey Sanctuary soon to be education on long lease from the council with a community agreement for partial public access.	Comment noted. This Policy requires community access as a condition of planning approvals granted for new schools, school extensions and associated sports facilities.	LP518-1

Question No 58 - Social Value

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (7) In Part (4) No (1)

Yes (LP385-47, LP321-57, LP309-54, LP290-20, LP284-23, LP28-58, LP27-23)

In part (LP272-18, LP267-39, LP19-2, LP15-2)

No (LP24-2)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Support Policy.	Support noted.	LP385-47, LP309-54, LP290-20, LP284-23, LP27-23
2	Support Policy. Note loss of service and facilities in Aquarius estate area and suggest s106 contributions should be provided for the refurbishment of the Aquarius Community Centre.	Support noted. The agreement and delivery of s106 must follow national policy in terms of the three specific tests required for a s106 to be applied. The consideration for improvements to community facilities would need to meet the tests for the use of s106, and will be considered a case by case basis.	LP383-10
3	Support in part. Policy is missing environmental and public green space as part of social infrastructure.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole. Environmental infrastructure and public green space are covered by other policies in the plan, and Policy DC1 includes both social and environmental infrastructure as matters that may require s106 contributions where appropriate.	LP19-2
4	Support in part. Suggest the policy should apply to small developments as well.	No change proposed to the plan. The inclusion of smaller developments is not considered appropriate subject to any requirements that may arise	LP15-2

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		from Policy DC1, which does apply to all developments.	
	Community Involvement/Delivery		
5	Support Policy. Concerned that the expectations on developers are not clear and that agreements are not monitored to ensure that they are delivered. Suggest more resources to monitor social value and S106 commitments. (LP	Support noted. The Monitoring Framework that accompanies the Local Plan sets out the approach to how policies will be monitored once the plan is adopted	LP
6	Support in part. Suggest additional wording to clarify the delivery of social infrastructure.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole. Specific infrastructure matters are set out in relevant Growth Location policies and Policy DC1 includes the various infrastructure requirements that may be considered for delivery as a result of new development.	LP272-18
7	Support in part. Request the involvement of local people throughout a development included in practices with social value.	Support in part and comment noted which is a matter for the delivery of the plan once adopted.	LP267-39

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
8	Identify that there is no mechanism for community-led planning, co-design, or activation. Request that Castlefield to be used as a testbed for community-led place governance.	No change proposed for the plan. The mechanism for delivery of social value is via the use of a Social Value Statement and any specific matters agreed via a s106 where appropriate.	LP374-15)
9	Suggest the proposed social value statement could be incorporated into the existing need for a planning statement.	No change proposed to the plan. The addition of a social value statement is considered necessary to mark out the importance of these matters given the specific policy set out in the Local Plan.	LP306-8
10	Suggest the inclusion of a social value strategy (statement) is not justified by evidence. Preference for the social value statement to be included in local validation list rather than in the policy.	No change proposed to the plan. The addition of a social value statement is considered necessary to mark out the importance of these matters given the specific policy set out in the Local Plan.	LP269-17
	Transport		
11	General observation that sustainable transport and recreational routes such as the TPT/NCN deliver significant social value.	Comment noted.	LP365-17
12	Identifies the benefits to the SRN from social value that	Comment noted.	LP321-57

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	delivers local employment and training, with regional supply chains potentially reducing long distance freight movements and helping to improve air quality.		
13	Object. Considers the policy does not go anywhere near far enough to require provision of arts, culture and entertainment facilities. The plan does not follow national guidelines from the National Planning Policy Framework - this states that councils should "plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship)".	No change proposed to the plan. Places for Everyone Policy JP-P3 and Policies C9 and C10 of this plan provide a positive framework for provision and use of cultural buildings.	LP24-2