

Setting Quality Standards / Vision – Manchester City Council

Field	Comment
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	Details of any existing national standards for each typology usually provided by national organisations e.g. Green Flag criteria for parks produced by Civic Trust
Existing Local Quality Standards	There maybe some existing local standards that will need to be taken into account and used as a guidance benchmark when setting new local standards
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations)	Results from the household survey with regards to users of each typology in relation to their aspirations and needs and existing quality experiences
Consultation (other)	Results from all the consultations undertaken with regards the quality issues for each typology
PMP Recommendation	PMP recommendation of a local quality standard for discussion and approval by the client
PMP Justification	PMP reasoning and justification for the locals standard that has been recommended

Setting the Local Quality Standards – Explanation and Justification of the recommended approach

For each typology, the recommended quality standards have been derived directly from local consultations, where residents were asked to consider their opinions on the quality of sites in their local area and also to highlight the key features of a good quality site for each typology.

For each typology, these key features have been divided into those that are essential, and those that are desirable. National standards for provision and good practice examples for the rest of the country have also been taken into account as part of these recommendations.

These lists therefore set out the quality vision (as required by PPG17), which should be applied to all new sites and should inform the enhancement of existing sites.

For each typology, two lists are therefore provided. An example is set out below:

Essential	Desirable
Clean and litter free	Toilets
Provision of seats	A range of equipment
Provision of bins	An information board
Even footpaths	

In order to relate the recommended quality vision to the site assessments, those priorities derived from consultation have been used to inform the percentage scores achieved during site assessments. For each type of open space, those elements that have emerged as being of particular priority to local residents during consultation are given a greater weighting in the site assessments. This weighting ensures that those areas considered to be of higher relative importance have a greater influence on the overall score achieved.

The key aspirations of local residents with regards the quality of open spaces have therefore been categorised into the four overarching categories considered within the site assessments, specifically:

- Cleanliness and maintenance
- Vegetation
- Ancillary accommodation
- Security and safety.

These classifications are set out below:

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

Cleanliness and maintenance	Vegetation	Ancillary accommodation	Security and safety
Well kept grass	Flowers/Trees	Changing facilities	Welcoming staff
Clean and litter free	Level surface	Parking facilities	Good access
Play equipment	Nature features	Footpaths	On site security
Well laid out		Toilets	
Range of facilities		Seating	
Equipment maintenance		Dog bins	
		Litter bins	
		Information boards	

For each typology, in addition to other comments made during consultations and national standards, the number of responses received indicating that each of the above features is considered and have been used to determine the relative importance of each of the four key areas.

Given that for each typology, respondents were able to select as many key features as they felt appropriate, the proportion of respondents prioritising each area is determined by calculating the total number of responses that could have been received and measuring this against the number of responses that were received.

The following example sets out the calculations using the above methodology, on the assumption that there were 100 respondents to the survey (who could all have ticked every box if they felt this was appropriate).

Site assessment classification	Number of features contributing to this area	Total Number of Possible Responses
Cleanliness and maintenance	6	600
Vegetation	3	300
Ancillary accommodation	8	800
Security and safety	3	300

The response rate for each of the four key areas is therefore derived by calculating the questions ticked as a percentage of the total number of responses that could have been received. A fictitious example, building on the previous example, is set out below:

Site assessment classification	Number of features contributing to this area	Total Number of Possible Responses	Responses Received	Percentage
Cleanliness and maintenance	6	600	400	66%
Vegetation	3	300	25	8%
Ancillary accommodation	8	800	400	50%
Security and safety	3	300	280	93%

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

The percentage response rates above (informed by other consultations) can then be used to determine the relative importance of each component of quality. Using the example above, it can be seen that for this typology, security and safety are most important, cleanliness and maintenance is second and ancillary accommodation and vegetation are less important.

This relative importance will be reflected in the overall score of the site assessment through a weighting system whereby:

The score for the most valued element will be multiplied by 4

The score for the second most valued aspect will be multiplied by three

The score for the third most valued aspect will be multiplied by two

The score for the fourth element will be multiplied by one.

For each typology, all sites can therefore be measured against each other in order to determine which sites best meet public need.

This approach means that in line with PPG17, both the quality vision and the site assessment scores are directly correlated with the findings of the local consultation. The justification behind all of these standards is that they are directly reflective of local needs and the degree to which sites achieve the required standard can be measured using the findings of the site assessments.

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION CITY PARKS	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>Manchester Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 1995 Environmental improvement is a policy outlined in the development plan (replaced by the Local Development Scheme), upgrading the City's parks and other recreational areas are one of several priorities identified under this policy.</p> <p>The NW Regional Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Policy EM3 highlights the need for local authorities to develop multi-purpose networks of greenspace, focusing primarily on areas where access is poor to or connectivity between these spaces is poor. The importance of green infrastructure within regeneration and major development schemes is also highlighted for recreational and biodiversity benefits.</p> <p>Manchester Community Strategy 2002-2012 This strategy seeks to encourage community interaction within high-density housing areas through well-managed and attractive open spaces.</p> <p>Parks For All Seasons – A Parks Strategy for Manchester 2003 This strategy highlights the need to manage biodiversity, identifying priorities in relation to urban countryside, sustainability and environmental impact. For the City's parks and open spaces, the following priorities are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat management plans for relevant parks and open spaces • Adoption of Local Authority Eco-Management and Audit Scheme • Integration of environmental strategies and policies • Links with voluntary groups.
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated City Parks as their most frequently used open space)	<p>Highest rated aspirations: Footpaths (73%), well kept grass (72%), flowers and trees (72%), clean and litter free (63%) and good access (60%). Respondents to the survey highlighted specifically staff on site (45%) and adequate lighting (31%) as being key to providing safe open spaces.</p> <p>When asked about the quality of city park sites, of those people who gave an opinion, dog fouling (34%), vandalism and graffiti (35%) and miss-use of the site (31%) were rated as significant problems. Litter problems (46%) were rated</p>

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p>as a minor problem, with poor maintenance (40%) and safety and age of equipment (50%) rated as no problem.</p>
<p>Consultation Household Survey - other</p>	<p>In general, City Parks were rated good for quality by 37% of household survey respondents and average for quality by 32%. Across the analysis areas, the highest levels of satisfaction are found in the North where 43% of respondents feel that the quality of provision is good. Heaton Park is listed grade II by English Heritage and is an example of a high quality site in this analysis area. The lowest levels of satisfaction are found in the East where 31% of respondents feel that the quality of provision is good. Overall, City Parks were perceived to be the highest quality type of open space in the City.</p>
<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</p>	<p>Parks were the most frequently discussed types of open space at drop in sessions. While there was a positive response to the quantity of provision of both City Parks and Local Parks in Manchester, the quality of these parks was the main area of discussion.</p> <p>Residents acknowledged Manchester’s prestigious park heritage (17 Green Flag Awards in 2006) and the value of these parks throughout the city. However, quality concerns were noted throughout consultation. The majority of concerns in drop in sessions and workshops related to the maintenance of City Parks, safety and problems of litter and graffiti. In North Manchester, Boggart Hole Clough, despite achieving Green Flag status was highlighted as a site that has seen some deterioration in quality and subject to neglect over the last decade.</p> <p>Residents at drop in sessions highlighted the need for increased security and surveillance in parks, suggesting more park wardens or community officers are needed. Comments from the drop in sessions suggested that due to the negative behaviour (robbery, theft of cycles, vandalism, etc) of a minority, parks could be areas that people shy away from. It was mentioned that problems such as robbery and vandalism are detracting people from visiting parks, which in turn creates a less than appealing environment for park users.</p> <p>With City Parks in particular, several constraints were highlighted including lack of toilets, insufficient lighting and a lack of necessary infrastructure. These reasons were noted as key in dissuading residents from using some City Parks.</p> <p>Attendees at workshops, many of whom currently have an interest in the maintenance of open spaces throughout the city, emphasised the benefit of information boards, providing residents with an understanding of the facilities available, in addition to the wildlife and habitats offered. Workshop sessions also highlighted the value of Friends of Parks groups, local residents who volunteer to care for and improve their local park or green space. They have a vital role to play in conserving and enhancing the trees and woodlands in parks.</p> <p>There are currently 47 ‘Friends of’ groups in Manchester and the city is recognised as an example of good practice of community involvement by GreenSpace. Residents at drop in sessions acknowledged friends groups as an important asset and suggested that some parks may be reliant on them to maintain and upgrade. It was mentioned that this involvement must remain a priority and receive full support if parks are to adhere to quality standards and criteria.</p>

	<p>Parks were highlighted by young people as being particularly valuable and it was clear that they are one of the most frequented of all typologies.</p>									
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 391 1350 424">Essential</th> <th data-bbox="1350 391 2047 424">Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 424 1350 458">Footpaths</td> <td data-bbox="1350 424 2047 458">Clean/Litter Free</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 458 1350 491">Flowers/Trees</td> <td data-bbox="1350 458 2047 491">Good Access</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 491 1350 520">Well Kept Grass</td> <td data-bbox="1350 491 2047 520">Nature Features</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Desirable	Footpaths	Clean/Litter Free	Flowers/Trees	Good Access	Well Kept Grass	Nature Features	
	Essential	Desirable								
	Footpaths	Clean/Litter Free								
Flowers/Trees	Good Access									
Well Kept Grass	Nature Features									
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to parks, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 646 1115 679">Component of quality</th> <th data-bbox="1115 646 1579 679">Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 679 1115 713">Security and Safety</td> <td data-bbox="1115 679 1579 713">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 713 1115 746">Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td data-bbox="1115 713 1579 746">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 746 1115 780">Vegetation</td> <td data-bbox="1115 746 1579 780">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 780 1115 804">Ancillary accommodation</td> <td data-bbox="1115 780 1579 804">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component of quality	Weighting	Security and Safety	4	Cleanliness and maintenance	3	Vegetation	2	Ancillary accommodation	1
Component of quality	Weighting									
Security and Safety	4									
Cleanliness and maintenance	3									
Vegetation	2									
Ancillary accommodation	1									

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION LOCAL PARKS	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>Parks For All Seasons – A Parks Strategy for Manchester 2003</p> <p>This strategy highlights the need to manage biodiversity, identifying priorities in relation to urban countryside, sustainability and environmental impact. For the City’s parks and open spaces, the following priorities are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat management plans for relevant parks and open spaces • Adoption of Local Authority Eco-Management and Audit Scheme • Integration of environmental strategies and policies • Links with voluntary groups
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated Local Parks as their most frequently used open space)	<p>Highest rated aspirations: Flowers and trees (69%), well kept grass (65%), footpaths (63%) and good access (60%). Respondents to the survey highlighted specifically staff on site (21%) and adequate lighting (15%) as being key to providing safe open spaces.</p> <p>When asked about the quality of Local Parks, of those people who gave an opinion, dog fouling (42%) and miss-use of the site (43%) were rated as significant problems. Vandalism and graffiti (45%) was rated as a minor problem, with safety and age of equipment (52%), poor maintenance (48%) and litter problems (39%) rated as no problem.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>In general, Local Parks were rated good in terms of quality by 31% of household survey respondents. Local Parks were also rated poor by 20% of respondents, higher than that for City Parks (11%). There was a similar trend across all the analysis areas. The highest level of satisfaction is found in the central analysis area where 35% of respondents feel that the quality of provision is good. The lowest level of satisfaction is found in the North where only 29% of respondents feel that the quality of provision is good. Many residents indicated that the lack of facilities at some sites contributed to the overall perceived quality. Additionally, cleanliness and maintenance was perceived to be particularly important.</p>

**Consultation (Other including IT
Young People Survey)**

Parks were the most frequently discussed types of open space at drop in sessions. The majority of concerns related to the maintenance of city and Local Parks, safety and problems of litter and graffiti. Residents at drop in sessions highlighted the need for increased security and surveillance in parks, suggesting more park wardens or community officers are needed. Comments from the drop in sessions suggested that due to the negative behaviour (robbery, theft of cycles, vandalism, etc) of some people, parks could be areas that people shy away from. Local meetings amongst friends groups regularly have reports of deviant activities in and around parks - whether it is robbery or damage to park property. It was mentioned that these problems are detracting people from visiting parks, which in turn creates a less than appealing environment for park users.

Several constraints were also highlighted including a lack of toilets, insufficient lighting and a lack of necessary infrastructure within City Parks. These reasons were noted as key in dissuading residents from using the City Parks and Local Parks.

Workshops highlighted the need for the protection of small Local Parks and gardens as they act as 'green lungs' in a predominantly urban environment. Marie-Louise Gardens and Old Moat Park were noted examples of good practice and sites that needs protecting and maintaining.

Attendees at workshops, many of whom currently have an interest in the maintenance of open spaces throughout the city, emphasised the benefit of information boards, providing residents with an understanding of the facilities available, in addition to the wildlife and habitats offered.

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Flowers/Trees	Footpaths
	Clean / Litter Free	Litter Bins
	Well Kept Grass	Good Access
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to City Parks, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
Component of quality	Weighting	
Security and Safety	4	
Cleanliness and maintenance	2	
Vegetation	3	
Ancillary accommodation	1	

**MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION
NATURAL AND SEMI NATURAL**

**National Standards and/or
Benchmarks**

GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.

Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context

The NW Regional Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

Policy EM3 highlights the need for local authorities to develop multi-purpose networks of greenspace, focusing primarily on areas where access is poor to or connectivity between these spaces is poor. The importance of green infrastructure within regeneration and major development schemes is also highlighted for recreational and biodiversity benefits.

The **MCC Tree Strategy (2006)** suggests that LNRs serve a way of protecting wildlife habitats and natural features and increasing the public's awareness of their local environment.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

This plan sets out policies setting the framework for the control of development, use of land and conservation within the city. There is a focus on the protection and enhancement of habitats and the plan promotes the protection and enhancement of woodlands and trees.

Manchester Biodiversity Strategy (2005)

This strategy highlights the value of Local Nature Reserves (LNR's) in the protection of wildlife habitats and natural features. It is recommended that cities such as Manchester should provide:

- accessible natural green space less than 300m (in a straight line) from home
- at least one accessible 20 ha site within 2km of home
- one accessible 100 ha site within 5km of home
- one accessible 500 ha site within 10km of home
- statutory LNR's provided at a minimum level of 1ha per thousand population.

The Manchester Community Strategy 2002-2012

Managing the biodiversity of green spaces in Manchester is outlined in this strategy as a key driver in ensuring sustainable communities. By improving the quality of the local environment, it is highlighted that issues such as pollution and health problems can be improved. Another objective of this strategy is to increase the use of the natural environment by local residents through improved site security and enhanced community safety.

Manchester Leisure Greenspace Management Strategy 2003

This strategic framework includes a summary of existing habitat management objectives, including site specific and general woodland management planning. This strategy seeks to address the inconsistencies in the management of biodiversity in Manchester by undertaking a systematic approach to site management and the continuous improvement of parks and open spaces citywide.

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

<p>Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated natural and semi-natural sites as their most frequently used open space)</p>	<p>Highest rated aspirations: Nature features (84%), footpaths (73%), flowers and trees (71%), clean and litter free (64%) and good access (56%).</p> <p>When asked about the quality of natural and semi-natural sites, of those people who gave an opinion, poor maintenance (51%) and safety and age of equipment (47%) were rated as no problem. This demonstrates high satisfaction with these areas. Areas for concern included dog fouling and litter problems where 32% and 20% respectively feel that these areas are a significant problem.</p>
<p>Consultation Household Survey - other</p>	<p>27% of respondents to the household survey felt that the quality of sites was good, with 36% stating these open spaces were average. 20% felt that the quality of sites was poor. The quality ratings given by residents were similar across all analysis areas, with the modal response that the quality of provision was average. The most satisfied residents were those in South where 31% felt that the quality of the sites were good. A contributing factor to this is that 31% of residents state there are more than enough/about right amount of these open spaces.</p>
<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)</p>	<p>Consultation indicated that residents are more concerned about the quality of natural areas and ensuring sites are protected. There was strong support to protect and enhance natural areas in order to encourage biodiversity, an issue raised by a number of residents. Chorlton Meadows was identified as an example of best practice. .</p> <p>There appeared to be confusion over whether natural areas should be left to grow and encourage wildlife and vegetation or managed and maintained to improve appearance and increase the amount of usable open space. While residents appeared to value the benefits derived from allowing an area to develop naturally, it was considered important to maintain the site to an extent to ensure that it appeared aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>It is clear that Local Nature Reserves (LNR), of which there are two in Manchester (Blackley Forest and Chorlton Water Park), provide an important protection to quality of life and biodiversity. These are valued by local residents.</p>

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Nature Features	Clean/Litter Free
	Flowers/Trees	Good Access
	Footpaths	Litter Bins
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to natural and semi natural open space, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
Component of quality	Weighting	
Security and Safety	2	
Cleanliness and maintenance	3	
Vegetation	1	
Ancillary accommodation	4	

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION AMENITY GREEN SPACE	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>The Unitary Development Plan (UDP)</p> <p>This plan sets out planning policies setting the framework for the control of development, use of land and conservation within the city. There is a focus on the protection and enhancement of habitats and the plan promotes the protection and enhancement of woodlands and trees.</p> <p>The Manchester Community Strategy 2002-2012</p> <p>This strategy highlights the value of green space in residential areas, acknowledging that managed green space is the first point of contact with nature that local residents have. This strategy seeks to encourage community interaction within high-density housing areas through well-managed and attractive open spaces. The social benefit and value to young people is also a key driver in managing open green space.</p>
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated amenity green space as their most frequently used open space)	<p>Amenity green spaces were one of the least used open spaces in the City, however the visual benefits of this type of open space are often as important as the level of use.</p> <p>Highest rated aspirations: Footpaths (90%), clean and litter free (80%), well kept grass (70%) and good access (70%).</p> <p>When asked about the quality of amenity green spaces, of those people who gave an opinion, poor maintenance (71%) and safety and age of equipment (85%) were rated as no problem. Areas for concern included dog fouling and miss-use of site where 42% and 40% respectively feel that these areas are a significant problem.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>40% of respondents to the household survey felt that the quality of sites was average, with 32% stating the sites were poor. Only 16% felt that the quality of sites was good. The quality ratings given by residents were similar across all analysis areas, with the modal response that the quality of provision was average. The most satisfied residents were those in South where 20% felt that the quality of the sites was good.</p>

Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)

Consultation indicated that residents value amenity green spaces within Manchester. The majority of responses focused on the provision of amenity green spaces as opposed to quality issues. However, several comments were made about amenity areas within the City Centre. A desire was expressed for more spaces such as Piccadilly Gardens in the City Centre. It was generally felt that these sites act as spaces to escape into from the pressures of work and city life.

The main issue identified by residents at drop in sessions was the need for a balance between quality and quantity. It was felt that while amenity green spaces are important visually, they are valued sites for local communities as alternative spaces for recreational use. Ensuring amenity spaces are well maintained with appropriate ancillary accommodation was noted by a number of residents at drop in sessions. This was highlighted as being particularly important in areas of deprivation, where residents may not have ready access to other facilities.

Respondents to the household survey provided a number of general comments about amenity green spaces. One of the most common themes was safety concerns, which many felt act as a barrier to entry. The installation of adequate lighting may alleviate some of these concerns and increase the number of users, a view held by a number of residents.

Children responding to the IT Children and Young People Survey highlighted that amenity spaces were their most frequently used open space. Reasons for usage of these sites related primarily to their close proximity to their homes, rather than to the quality or range of facilities provided. Young people highlighted that the quality of their local open spaces was perceived to be average, with some improvements required.

35% of respondents to the IT Children and Young People survey stated that there are enough informal grass areas, whilst 47% of children suggested that they would like to see more of this typology. 19% of children use amenity green spaces more than any other type of open space, reinforcing the recreational benefit of this type of open space. Furthermore, 44% of children felt that being close to the home was what they liked most about their favourite open space. This reinforces the value of amenity spaces.

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:	
	Essential	Desirable
	Flowers/Trees	Well laid out
	Clean / Litter Free	Good Access
	Footpaths	Litter Bins
<i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to amenity green space, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i>		
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
Security and Safety	27%	2
Cleanliness and maintenance	62%	3
Vegetation	13%	1
Ancillary accommodation	75%	4

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PLAY AREAS FOR CHILDREN	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>Criteria set out by the NPFA in relation to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, a varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA are also relevant to play areas and include Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti-social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment, and highlights that there is a better solution: invest in place making and improving public spaces to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space’s study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings.’ <i>CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces.</i></p>
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated play areas for children sites as their most frequently used open space)	<p>3% of respondents to the household survey use play areas for children most frequently of all typologies. However, it is important to note that the level of use of children’s play areas demonstrated through the household survey may not be representative of the actual level of use on the ground due to the age of the majority of respondents. Only a small percentage of people under the age of 16 completed the household survey, therefore it is important to consider all other consultation. The majority of respondents to the survey will be of an older age that are more likely to use them as a secondary facility to other types of open space. For example, a parent may visit a natural and semi natural site most regularly to walk the dog, but many also visit a children’s play area with their child on a less frequent basis.</p> <p>Of those people stating they do use children’s play areas as their most frequent type of open space, their highest rated aspirations are: clean and litter free (58%), well kept grass (50%), well laid out (42%) and good access (42%). When asked about the quality of the play areas for children, of those people who gave an opinion, poor maintenance (50%) and dog fouling (44%) was rated as significant problems.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Consultation indicated that the quality of children’s play areas in the city is rated average by 33% of household respondents. A higher percentage of people stated that they were poor (32%) as opposed to being good (21%).</p>

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

	<p>The quality ratings stated by residents were similar across all analysis areas, with 'poor' being the modal response. Residents in Central Manchester expressed the lowest satisfaction of all areas with 39% of respondents rating the quality of play areas as poor.</p> <p>General comments within the household survey produced recurring themes in terms of safety concerns and problems with facilities, further cementing issues surrounding these sites.</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)	<p>Many residents at drop in sessions expressed concerns that older children use facilities intended for younger children and cause damage and vandalism. There were suggestions that the design of these facilities do not provide enough risk or challenge for older children, leading to some children seeking their own risk and often misusing equipment. It was felt that this scenario might be a consequence of a lack of provision for young people and a not enough informal play opportunities.</p> <p>A key concern noted in the drop in sessions and workshops was that of safety. Some residents felt that play areas for children were not being maintained and there were issues with glass and vandalism at some sites. Broadhurst Park play area was perceived to be particularly poor, as was Southwick Road Park play area.</p> <p>While 31% of respondents to the IT Children and young People Survey stated that play areas are clean, safe and nice to use, 44% felt that sites often unclean and facilities need improving. There was also a significant amount (18%) who felt that sites regularly suffered from litter problems and broken bottles.</p> <p>When asked what improvement they would make to existing facilities, safer facilities (24%) and more provision (23%) were the most common responses.</p>

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Clean/Litter Free	Good Access
	Well Kept Grass	Litter Bins
	Well laid out	Flowers/Trees
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to children’s play areas, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
Component of quality	Weighting	
Security and Safety	4	
Cleanliness and maintenance	3	
Vegetation	2	
Ancillary accommodation	1	

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>NPFA guidance relating to LAPs, LEAPs and NEAPs provide some quality aspirations in terms of seating for adults, varied range of equipment and meeting places for teenagers. GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>CABE Space believes that the use of target hardening as a first response to anti-social behavior is resulting in the fortification of our urban environment. Investment: invest in place making and improving public spaces should be used to prevent the onset and escalation of these problems. Evidence from CABE Space’s study shows that well designed, well maintained public spaces can contribute to reducing the incidence of vandalism and anti-social behavior, and result in long term cost savings.’ <i>CABE Space Policy Note: preventing anti-social behavior in public spaces.</i></p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>None.</p>
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated teenage facilities as their most frequently used open space)	<p>Only a very small percentage of respondents to the household survey use facilities for young people most frequently of all typologies. However, it is important to note that the level of use demonstrated through the household survey may not be representative of the actual level of use on the ground due to the age of the majority of respondents (63% of respondents stated that they don’t use facilities for young people). Only a small percentage of people under the age of 16 completed the household survey, therefore it is important to consider all other consultations across the city.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>The quality of facilities for young people is rated poor by 52% of household survey respondents. This is significantly higher than for any of the other typologies. This high level of dissatisfaction is consistent across all of the analysis areas. These issues surrounding the quality of existing provision are compounded by the dissatisfaction with the quantity of provision – with 84% of respondents stating that there is a lack of facilities.</p> <p>From the general comments given, parents seem to suggest that there is a distinct lack of facilities for their children; furthermore, safety concerns of existing sites are seen as an issue that prevents them from being used.</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young People Survey)	<p>Many residents at drop in sessions expressed concerns that facilities intended for younger children were being misused by older children (over 12) and cases of vandalism were frequent. It was argued that this was a result of the low level of provision for young people. Furthermore, safety concerns of existing sites are seen as an issue that</p>

	<p>prevents them from being used (Moss Side Park MUGA).</p> <p>It was noted that it is important to ensure that children and young people are involved in any consultation for further provision in order to ensure they adopt a sense of ownership and facilities are appropriate for use among this age group. It was argued that current levels of provision for young people generates a feeling of exclusion amongst this age group and can lead to associated behaviour and social problems.</p> <p>Whilst consultation highlighted the need for further facilities for young people, it was considered that these should be carefully located to protect residential amenity. Plattfields Park skate area was perceived to be of good quality and was cited as an example of good practice.</p> <p>Young people responding to the IT Young people survey indicated that on the whole, facilities are perceived to be of average quality and requiring improvements. The quantity of provision was perceived to be a far greater issue, with young people wanting local facilities.</p>																		
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 790 2042 922"> <thead> <tr> <th>Essential</th> <th>Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Good Access</td> <td>Clean/Litter Free</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Changing Facilities</td> <td>Well laid out</td> </tr> <tr> <td>On site security</td> <td>Range of facilities</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to facilities for young people, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 1046 1581 1209"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component of quality</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Desirable	Good Access	Clean/Litter Free	Changing Facilities	Well laid out	On site security	Range of facilities	Component of quality	Weighting	Security and Safety	4	Cleanliness and maintenance	2	Vegetation	1	Ancillary accommodation	3
Essential	Desirable																		
Good Access	Clean/Litter Free																		
Changing Facilities	Well laid out																		
On site security	Range of facilities																		
Component of quality	Weighting																		
Security and Safety	4																		
Cleanliness and maintenance	2																		
Vegetation	1																		
Ancillary accommodation	3																		

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>NPFA suggests in order to provide good quality sports facilities, which are fit for purpose; consideration should be given to the quality of provision including gradients, orientation, ancillary accommodation, planting and community safety.</p> <p>The Green Flag award is recognised on the approved list of quality assurance schemes listed by Sport England. CPA choice and opportunity indicators stipulate that residents should be within three different sport and recreation facilities one of which is quality assured. Parks containing pitches which have achieved the Green Flag award can therefore contribute to the achievement of this indicator, reinforcing the importance of the Green Flag Criteria on the national stage.</p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>None.</p>
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated outdoor sports facility sites as their most frequently used open space)	<p>A small percentage of people stated that outdoor sports facilities (3%) were their most frequently used open space, they attract a specific user group that are specific to their sporting needs. Of those people indicating that they used this open space the highest rated aspirations were; Parking facilities (92%), good access (85%), changing facilities (69%), and well laid out (62%). Safety factors considered appropriate for outdoor sports facilities included adequate lighting (41%) staff-on-site (41%) and CCTV (34%). Problems experienced at this type of open space are minor, vandalism and graffiti (31%) and miss-use of the site (31%). Safety and age of the equipment, poor maintenance and dog fouling are considered not to be a problem.</p>
Consultation Household Survey - other	<p>Consultation indicated that the quality of outdoor sports facilities in the city is rated average by 35% of household respondents. A higher percentage of people stated that they were poor (31%) as opposed to being good (22%).</p> <p>North and Wythenshawe displayed a higher level of satisfaction with 28% (Wythenshawe) and 23% (North) of people stating that the quality of the facilities was good. Throughout the analysis areas the modal response was average.</p>

<p>Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)</p>	<p>Residents at workshops highlighted the value of the use of school facilities, although constraints of this policy were also highlighted by workshop attendees, focusing particularly on the lack of appropriate ancillary accommodation, particularly changing facilities.</p> <p>The multifunctional use of outdoor sports facilities has also emerged as a key issue, with comments at both workshops and drop in sessions highlighting problems with dog fouling and litter, occurring as a result of the use of pitches as amenity space for dog walking. It was mentioned by some residents that in addition to a lack of available tennis courts, parks needed more usable courts that are functional throughout the year and not just the summer months.</p> <p>Not only did respondents to the IT Young People survey suggest a need for more outdoor sports facilities, but also a need to improve the quality of existing sites (31%). Despite this, 35% of respondents were happy with the quality of current provision, stating that facilities are clean, safe and nice to use.</p>																		
<p>PMP Recommendation</p>	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 727 2038 858"> <thead> <tr> <th>Essential</th> <th>Desirable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Parking Facilities</td> <td>Good quality facilities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Changing Facilities</td> <td>Meet with NGB requirements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accessibility – including physical access and cost</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to outdoor sports facilities, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 979 1581 1142"> <thead> <tr> <th>Component of quality</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Security and Safety</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleanliness and maintenance</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vegetation</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ancillary accommodation</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Essential	Desirable	Parking Facilities	Good quality facilities	Changing Facilities	Meet with NGB requirements	Accessibility – including physical access and cost		Component of quality	Weighting	Security and Safety	4	Cleanliness and maintenance	3	Vegetation	1	Ancillary accommodation	2
Essential	Desirable																		
Parking Facilities	Good quality facilities																		
Changing Facilities	Meet with NGB requirements																		
Accessibility – including physical access and cost																			
Component of quality	Weighting																		
Security and Safety	4																		
Cleanliness and maintenance	3																		
Vegetation	1																		
Ancillary accommodation	2																		

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION ALLOTMENTS	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	Manchester Allotment Survey 2008 is currently underway.
Consultation (Household Survey - aspirations) (Of those that rated allotment sites as their most frequently used open space)	Only a small percentage of users currently use allotments in Manchester (according to the household survey). The perception of the quality of allotments is rated poor or very poor by 40% of all respondents. The small number of users provides difficulty in determining aspirations for allotments, however the importance of providing high quality allotments is recognised by residents in suggesting that current provision is only of average quality.
Consultation Household Survey – other	<p>The majority of residents in Manchester perceive the quality of allotments to be poor and very poor (40%), 21% feel the sites are good and 34% would rate them as average. When analysing the individual areas the quality ratings follow those given in the overall results, with exception of the East, where no respondents feel the quality is good, and 52% rate it as poor or very poor. Of those people who gave an opinion, 78% stated that they did not currently use this type of open space.</p> <p>General comments regarding these sites show several barriers to entry, namely, a lack of knowledge and available information regarding accessing and obtaining an allotment site. Addressing this issue may convert people from merely being interested to actively using these open spaces. A significant issue noted is the number of people currently on a lengthy waiting list. This has also had an effect on the number of people applying for an allotment site with the comments stating that the lengthy waiting time had discouraged them from applying.</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)	<p>Residents attending drop in sessions felt that the quality of allotments was varying. Workshop discussions highlighted a quality issue with some allotments. Allotments society groups across Manchester have been proactive in their approach to correcting ongoing problems. According to some, vandalism is an issue for allotments across the city but there have been measures to combat this with more fencing. It was noted that there are only six toilets in the 40 sites across Manchester and with women plot holders having tripled over the last few years this issue is a priority. Woodhouse Park in Wythenshawe was used as an example of a site that has received little help from the council. Some help has been offered from Groundwork.</p> <p>Allotments are now recognised as an alternative healthy pastime and there is greater focus on the use of allotments in schools and by young people. A number of residents emphasised the need for education in terms of using allotments</p>

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

	for growing fresh produce and embracing the 'outdoor life'.
PMP Recommendation	The Council and its partners will strive to provide allotments which are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ accessible➤ provide a sanctuary for biodiversity and habitat creation➤ safe and secure➤ clean and litter free➤ offer parking➤ offer appropriate ancillary facilities.

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION GREEN CORRIDORS	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p> <p>Countryside Agency (now a key partner in Natural England)- what the user should expect to find is i) a path provided by the protection and reinforcement of existing vegetation; ii) ground not soft enough to allow a horse or cycle to sink into it; iii) a path on unvegetated natural surfaces.</p> <p>Natural England, the Countryside Agency and the British Heart Foundation advocate providing a network of local health walks to promote the ‘Walking the Way to Health Initiative’, something that can easily be enhanced through the provision of quality green corridors and natural linkages with other open spaces.</p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>No existing quality standards.</p> <p>The NW Regional Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) 2006</p> <p>Policy RT7 of this strategy highlights a need to develop networks of continuous, attractive and safe routes for walking and cycling. High quality pedestrian and cycle facilities are noted as key priorities.</p>
Consultation (Other)	<p>The importance of green corridors was emphasised in drop in sessions, with some residents highlighting that these are well used and well valued, despite some concerns over a lack of appropriate corridors. The bridleways from Ancoats to Tameside and Mersey Valley were noted as examples of good practice. At drop in sessions, many visitors to the local area commended the quality bridleways and identified opportunities for new provision.</p> <p>There was a contrast in the responses of residents in the City Centre. Many felt that green corridors, footpaths and cycleways across the city were not being utilised and that currently large stretches dirty and run down. Some residents suggested that these areas (walking and cycling routes) are great resources but often feel unsafe and difficult to access. The ‘Fallowfield Loop’ and the cycleways from Longsight to Newton Heath were noted as examples of underused and under maintained routes. Green corridors may offer the opportunity to meet deficiencies in areas where there are limited other opportunities for new open spaces.</p> <p>Consultation also highlighted the fact that increased awareness of green corridors would both increase the use of these routes and also promote sustainable transport.</p>

APPENDIX G – QUALITY STANDARDS

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Clean/Litter Free	Litter Bins
	Footpaths	Level Surface
	Nature Features	Flowers/Trees
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to green corridors, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
Component of quality	Proportion of possible total responses received	Weighting
Security and Safety	17%	1
Cleanliness and maintenance	26%	2
Vegetation	52%	4
Ancillary accommodation	29%	3

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL – SETTING QUALITY STANDARDS / VISION CIVIC SPACES	
National Standards and/or Benchmarks	<p>GREEN FLAG CRITERIA - Welcoming Place / Healthy, Safe and Secure / Clean and Well-maintained / Sustainable / Conservation and Heritage / Community Involvement / Marketing / Management.</p>
Existing Local Quality Standards and strategic context	<p>The NW Regional Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)</p> <p>An overriding aim of the regional plan is to promote “<i>sustainable patterns of development and physical change</i>”. It acknowledges the significant ‘ecological footprint’ of the North West and sets out policies that give support for urban green spaces and further tree planting and improving the city’s public realm.</p> <p>Policy W7 (Principles for Tourism Development) of this plan highlights the need to improve the public realm in order to harness the tourism potential of Manchester.</p>
Consultation (Of those that rated civic spaces as their most frequently used open space)	<p>29% of respondents to the household survey felt that the quality of sites was good or very good, with 40% stating these open spaces were average. The remaining 31% felt that the quality of sites was either poor or very poor. The quality ratings given by residents were similar across all analysis areas, with the modal response that the quality of provision was average.</p> <p>The most satisfied residents were those in the City Centre where 43% felt that the quality of the sites was good or very good. Contributing factors to these satisfaction levels are that 30% of the residents feel that there are more than enough/about right amount of civic spaces and only 27% stated that they never use this type of open space.</p>
Consultation (Other including IT Young people survey)	<p>Civic spaces were one of the least discussed open spaces throughout the consultation. The majority of discussions focused on City Centre civic spaces (Piccadilly Gardens and Albert Square). It was generally felt that there were not enough grassed areas within Manchester City Centre and that the design of some sites were not conducive to a relaxed environment. The design and functionality of civic spaces were discussed in the quantity standards.</p> <p>Some residents explained that civic spaces are important in a City Centre environment in order to escape the stress of work and access fresh air.</p>

PMP Recommendation	<p>Local consultation, national guidance and best practice therefore suggest that the following features are essential and desirable to local residents:</p>	
	Essential	Desirable
	Clean / Litter Free	Flowers / Trees
	Seating and litter bins	Security
<p><i>Detailed analysis of the local consultation suggests that with regards to parks, the relative importance of the key components is as follows:</i></p>		
Component of quality	Weighting	
Security and Safety	1	
Cleanliness and maintenance	3	
Vegetation	2	
Ancillary accommodation	4	