



Manchester City Open Space Assessment

Prepared For: Manchester City Council

Document Reference: 10280.01.001

May 2025

Version 5.0

TEP
401 Faraday Street
Birchwood Park
Warrington
WA3 6GA
Tel: 01925 844004
Email: tep@tep.uk.com
Offices in Warrington, Market Harborough, Gateshead, London and Cornwall

Document Title	Manchester City Open Space Assessment
Document Ref	10280.01.001
Version	Version 5.0
Prepared For	Manchester City Council

Author	Rebecca Martin
Date	May 2025
Checked	Mike Hodgkinson
Approved	Mike Hodgkinson

Amendment History					
Version	Date	Modified by	Check/ Approved by	Reason	Status
1.0	05/07/24	RM	MH	Initial issue	Superseded
2.0	26/07/24	RM	MH	Update following client comment	Superseded
3.0	09/09/24	VJ	RM	Updated quality standards	Superseded
4.0	06/02/25	RM	MH	Final issue	Superseded
5.0	21/05/25	AK	RM	Update to Executive Summary and paragraph 3.6	Issued

Contents

Executive Summary	4
1.0 Introduction	10
2.0 Policy Context	13
3.0 Method	21
4.0 Identifying Local Needs	28
5.0 Auditing Local Provision	39
6.0 Setting Standards.....	55
7.0 Applying Standards	65
8.0 Recommendations and Strategy.....	73

Tables

Table 1: Open Space Typologies included in the Open Space Assessment	22
Table 2: Quality and Value Matrix	26
Table 3: Walking Distance, Thresholds and Time	26
Table 4: Open Spaces by Typology, Number and Area.....	39
Table 5: Ha of Open Space by Typology and Sub-area	41
Table 6: Open Space Hectare per 1,000 population (current and future)	42
Table 7: Walking and Driving Accessibility for Open Space Typologies	42
Table 8: Open Space by Quality Score.....	43
Table 9: Quality Score for Open Space Typology	43
Table 10: Open Spaces by Value Score	44
Table 11: Value Score for Open Space Typologies	44
Table 12: Range of Quality and Value Score by Typology	45
Table 13: Quality Range for Amenity Greenspace	47
Table 14: Value Range for Amenity Greenspace	48
Table 15: Quality Range for Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	49
Table 16: Value Range for Cemeteries and Churchyards	49
Table 17: Quality Range for Civic Spaces	50
Table 18: Value Range for Civic Spaces.....	50
Table 19: Quality Range for Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace.....	51
Table 20: Value Range for Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces	51
Table 21: Quality Score for all Parks and Gardens	52
Table 22: Quality Score for all Strategic Parks only	52
Table 23: Value Range for Parks and Gardens.....	53
Table 24: Quality range for Provision for Children and Young People.....	54
Table 25: Value Range for Provision for Children and Young People.....	54
Table 26: Existing Quantity Standards (ha per 1,000 Population).....	55
Table 27: Existing Accessibility Standards.....	56

Table 28: Summary of National Benchmark Standards for Allotments	59
Table 29: Proposed Quantity Standards for Manchester	61
Table 30: Future Quantity Provision against the Proposed Quantity Standard.....	62
Table 31: Existing Accessibility Standards.....	62
Table 32: Proposed Quality Standard.....	63
Table 33 North sub-area Open Space Provision by Typology.....	65
Table 34: Central sub-area Open Space Provision by Typology	67
Table 35: South sub-area Open Space Provision by Typology	69
Table 36: Wythenshawe Open Space Provision by Typology	71

Figures

Figure 1: Hierarchy of Planning Policy in Manchester City	13
Figure 2: Open Space Assessment Process	21
Figure 3: Current population distribution by 5-year age bracket	33

Drawings

Map 1: Parks and Garden Accessibility (TEP ref: G10280.01.004)
Map 2: Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace Accessibility (TEP ref: G10280.01.005)
Map 3: Amenity Greenspace Accessibility (TEP ref: G10280.01.006A)
Map 4: Provision for Children and Young People Accessibility (TEP ref: G10280.01.007)
Map 5: Open Spaces in Manchester City (TEP ref: G10280.01.001B)
Map 6: Population Density (TEP ref: G10280.01.013)
Map 7: Indices of Multiple Deprivation (National) (TEP ref: G10280.01.011)
Map 8: Indices of Multiple Deprivation (Manchester ranked) (TEP ref: G10280.01.012)
Map 9: Open Space Quality (TEP ref: G10280.01.002A)
Map 10: Open Space Value (TEP ref: G10280.01.003A)
Map 11: Allotment Provision (TEP ref: G10280.01.008)

Executive Summary

1. TEP was commissioned by Manchester City Council in June 2024 to produce an updated Open Space Assessment (OSA) for the City of Manchester (the City). This OSA builds on work undertaken by KKP in 2022.

Introduction

2. Open space is important due to its valuable contribution to quality of life, health and the economy. Provision of a range of open space facilities in our towns and villages is very important in planning for a sustainable future and is embedded in national planning policy.
3. The evidence in this OSA comprises an assessment of the quantity, accessibility, quality and value of open spaces within the City, and for each of the four sub-areas outlined below:
 - North;
 - Central;
 - South; and
 - Wythenshawe
4. This OSA has been completed using the below methodology:
 - Define the context, purpose and scope of the OSA (Chapter 1);
 - Review of national and local policy (Chapter 2);
 - Identification and mapping of open spaces per typology (Chapter 3);
 - Identify local needs including consultation with key stakeholders (Chapter 4);
 - Assess the quantity, quality and accessibility of each open space (Chapter 5);
 - Develop local standards for open space provision (Chapter 6);
 - Review of current provision of each sub-area (Chapter 7); and
 - Provide recommendations and strategy based on the findings of the Open Spaces OSA (Chapter 8).

Methodology

5. This OSA is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Open Space, which have replaced Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation (2002) and its companion guide, Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to Planning Policy Guidance 17 (2002).

6. This OSA considers all open spaces over 0.2 hectares, including multifunctional sports facilities (e.g. those which are available for wider community use). This Assessment excludes specific sport provision which is covered in other studies e.g. the Manchester Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy. On sites with multiple functions, pitches contribute to the overall site area and overall open space provision.

Open Space Provision as of 2024

7. The current open space provision in the City is shown in the table below. 1010 sites are designated as open space, with a total area of 1,909.85 hectares. Parks and Gardens¹ cover 771.09ha and accounts for the majority of the City's open space provision. The total open space within the City equates to 3.36 ha per 1,000 population.
8. Sites categorised as "Other" i.e. those which are not accessible, for example, privately owned, fenced or on motorway embankments, or which are documented in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) or Employment Study, have not been assessed as part of the total open space provision. This is because they:
- Do not currently provide publicly accessible recreational open space; or
 - Are likely to be developed over the lifetime of the next Local Plan and, therefore, will not provide publicly accessible open space by the end of the plan period.
9. Any SHLAA or Employment Study site which is currently considered open space should still be assessed for its open space value on an individual basis as part of any planning application for that site, in line with national and local planning policy.

Open Space Typology	Current Provision (ha)
Allotments and Community Gardens	56.24
Amenity Greenspace	313.41
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	158.49
Civic Spaces	9.92
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	578.96
Parks and Gardens	771.09 (including 489.04 Strategic Parks)

¹ 1 Note: Parks and Gardens refers to public parks and gardens, and excludes private residential gardens.

Open Space Typology	Current Provision (ha)
Provision for Children and Young People	21.74
Final total - rounded to two decimal places	1,909.85

Quantity Assessment and Standards

10. The proposed quantity standard reflects the current level of provision due to the lack of available space for new provision. An assessment of quantity against population figures and best practice guidance has also been undertaken. This has been used to identify possible shortfalls in provision and help inform priorities. Applying the proposed standard against the current, and future forecast population up to 2041 can be used to identify future shortfalls against the proposed Standard.

Open Space Typology	Proposed Standard (ha per 1,000)	2024 ha per 1,000	2041 ha per 1,000
Allotments and Community Gardens	0.10	0.10	0.09
Amenity Greenspace	0.55	0.55	0.50
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	0.28	0.28	0.25
Civic Spaces	0.02	0.02	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	1.02	1.02	0.92
Parks and Gardens	1.36 (incl. 0.86 Strategic Parks)	1.36 (incl. 0.86 Strategic Parks)	1.22 (incl. 0.77 Strategic Parks)
Provision for Children and Young People	0.04	0.04	0.03
Final total - rounded to two decimal places	-	3.36	3.02

11. As of 2024 the population for the City was 568,402. The future population of the City is projected to be 632,639 by 2041. When compared to the current provision of open space, this increase in population would result in reduction in the amount of open space per 1,000 population.

Quality and Value

12. Of the 1010 open spaces in the City, 448 sites were audited for Quality and Value. The following open space typologies were excluded from the site audits, for the reasons set out below:
- Sites smaller than 0.2 ha, smaller sites have limited usage compared to larger sites and limited multi-functionality;
 - Outdoor Sports Facilities with a sole sporting purpose - These are considered separately in the Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy; and
 - Sites within the 2022 Strategic Housing Land availability Assessment, or Pipeline Employment site (2022) as these are expected to come forward for development within the lifetime of the emerging Local Plan.
13. The Table below shows the current Quality scores for the 448 audited sites.
- | Quality Score against Green Flag Award Criteria | Number of sites | % of Audit |
|---|-----------------|-------------|
| Excellent | 0 | 0% |
| Very Good | 75 | 17% |
| Good | 93 | 21% |
| Fair | 189 | 42% |
| Poor | 91 | 20% |
| Total | 448 | 100% |
14. The recommended Quality standard is for the following sites over 0.2ha, to achieve a Good Quality Score (60% or above):
- Amenity Greenspace;
 - Civic Space;
 - Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace;
 - Parks and Gardens; and
 - Provision for Children and Young People.
15. A Quality standard has not been set for Allotments and Community Gardens or Cemeteries and Churchyards due to the nature and specific use of these spaces.
16. The proposed value standard is based on 'Assessing needs and opportunities: a companion guide to PPG17':
- High - 60 to 100%
 - Medium - 40 to 59%

- Low - 0 to 39%

17. The table below shows the current value of the 448 sites audited.

Value Score	Number of Sites	% of Audit
High	172	38%
Medium	176	39%
Low	100	22%
Total	448	100%

18. The recommended Value standard is for the following sites over 0.2ha to obtain a Value Score of 40% or above, classed as "Medium" Value:

- Amenity Greenspace;
- Civic Space;
- Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace;
- Parks and Gardens; and
- Provision for Children and Young People.

Accessibility

19. Amenity Greenspace, Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace, Parks and Gardens and Provision for Children and Young People have been assigned an accessibility standard. There is no accessibility standard assigned for Civic Spaces as there is no accessibility National Benchmark (Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard², 2020) for this typology.
20. Accessibility standards have not been set for allotments and community gardens or cemeteries or burial grounds due to the nature of these sites.
21. The proposed accessibility standards are shown 'as the crow flies' (straight line) from an open space. This has been converted into walking time to show approximately how long it should take for residents to walk to their local open space typology. The accessibility standards are shown in the table below.

Open Space Typology	Walking Threshold
Allotments and Community Gardens	n/a
Amenity Greenspace	480 metres (10-minute walk)
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	n/a

² [Fields in Trust Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard](#)

Open Space Typology	Walking Threshold
Civic Spaces	n/a
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	720 metres (15-minute walk)
Parks and Gardens	710 metres (15-minute walk)
Provision for Children and Young People	Local Area of Play (LAP) (100m) Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) (400m) Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) (1000m) MUGA (700m)

22. Maps 1-4 Open Space Accessibility for Parks and Gardens, Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace, Amenity Greenspace and Provision for Children and Young People (G10280.01.004-007), show accessibility catchments for each relevant open space typology. Accessibility to each typology varies between sub-areas. Parks and gardens accessibility is generally highest in the central sub-area. Full analysis of accessibility to open space by typology is provided in Chapter 5 Auditing Local Provision.
23. For this OSA, straight-line modelling has been used when assessing accessibility to open space sites.

Recommendations

24. Recommendations have been made in Chapter 8 Recommendations and Strategy. The recommendations include:
- Adopt the recommended standards (Chapter 7);
 - Increase the multi-functionality of open spaces where possible, including increasing green travel routes, improving aesthetic, increasing habitat for wildlife and the cultural offering;
 - Production of a guidance document to outline open space requirements in new developments;
 - Seek funding opportunities including through developer contributions and prioritise investment to low quality/low value sites to improve them; and
 - Provide an updated Assessment of open space to document changes in the baseline and ensure the approach to open spaces across the City meets the needs of residents. See Chapter 8 for further information.

1.0 Introduction

Context

1.1 Open space is important because of its valuable contribution to quality of life, health and the economy. Furthermore, open spaces provide green infrastructure (GI) benefits such as mitigating climate change, flood alleviation, and ecosystem services. The provision of these facilities in our cities, towns and villages is of high importance to a sustainable future and is embedded in national planning policy.

1.2 The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), updated in December 2024, recognises the opportunities that appropriately located and well-designed open spaces can provide. Paragraph 103 states:

Access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.

1.3 Open space provision crosses many other aspects of the NPPF including:

- Promoting healthy and safe communities;
- Delivering sustainable development;
- Supporting a prosperous rural economy;
- Promoting sustainable transport;
- Requiring good design;
- Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment; and
- Meeting the challenges of climate change.

Purpose and Scope

1.4 TEP was commissioned by Manchester City Council (MCC) in June 2024 to produce an updated Open Space Assessment (OSA) for the City of Manchester (the City). This OSA builds on work undertaken by KKP in 2022.

1.5 The evidence in this OSA comprises an assessment of the quantity, accessibility, quality and value of open spaces within the City.

1.6 This OSA has been completed using the following structure:

- Define the context, purpose and scope of the OSA (Chapter 1);
 - Review of national and local policy (Chapter 2);
 - Identification and mapping of open spaces per typology (Chapter 3);
 - Identify local needs including consultation with key stakeholders (Chapter 4);
 - Assess the quantity, quality and accessibility of each open space (Chapter 5);
 - Develop local standards for open space provision (Chapter 6);
 - Review of current provision of each sub-area (Chapter 7); and
 - Provide recommendations and strategy based on the findings of the Open Spaces OSA (Chapter 8).
- 1.7 The OSA provides robust and up to date information concerning the demand and use of open space throughout the City irrespective of ownership. It supports the current use of the existing Local Plan (Core Strategy 2012-2027) and the preparation of the emerging new Local Plan through to 2041.
- 1.8 This OSA will identify open spaces of poorer quality and/or lower value, which will assist the Council to bid for funds and prioritise investment in improvements. It will also help with the consideration of local open space needs in determining planning applications and the potential for developer contributions.

Methodology

- 1.9 This OSA is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Open Space, which have replaced Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation (2002) and its companion guide, Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to Planning Policy Guidance 17 (2002).
- 1.10 This Open Space Assessment (hereby referred to as the OSA) replaces the City-Wide Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study, adopted by Manchester City Council (hereby referred to as 'the Council') in August 2009.
- 1.11 The following typologies are included in this OSA, further descriptions are provided in Table 1
- Allotments and community gardens;
 - Amenity greenspace;
 - Cemeteries and churchyards;
 - Civic Spaces;
 - Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace;
 - Parks and Gardens; and

- Provision for Children and Young People.
- 1.12 This OSA considers all open spaces over 0.2 hectares, including multifunctional sports facilities (e.g. those which are available for wider community use). This Assessment excludes specific sport provision which is covered in other studies e.g. the Manchester Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy. On sites with multiple functions, pitches contribute to the overall site area and overall open space provision.

Analysis Area

- 1.13 The OSA looks at the overall provision of the City and across four sub-areas of North, Central, South and Wythenshawe. The sub-areas are consistent with other evidence-based studies and are based on amalgamated wards shown in Appendix A.
- 1.14 The sub-areas boundaries are shown on Map 5 Open Space Typology Map (ref: G10280.01.001B).

2.0 Policy Context

2.1 This chapter summarises how open spaces feature in the following national and local policy. Figure 1 illustrates the hierarchy of planning policy for the City.



Figure 1: Hierarchy of Planning Policy in Manchester City

National Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2024)

2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in December 2024 and sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are to be applied. The NPPF is a material consideration in decision and Local Plan making. The NPPF requirements in relation to open space are outlined in the following paragraphs.

2.3 The NPPF defines 'open space' as:

"All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity".

Plan-Making

- 2.4 Paragraph 20 outlines that Strategic Policies as set by local authorities should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of places, making specific provision for the *'conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation'*.

Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities

- 2.5 Paragraph 96 states that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive, safe, and accessible places which promote social interaction and enable and support healthy lifestyles.
- 2.6 Paragraph 103 states that access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.
- 2.7 Paragraph 104 states that existing open space, including sports and recreational buildings and playing fields, should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space is surplus to requirements; or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in a suitable location; or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision.

Local Green Space Designation

- 2.8 Paragraphs 106 to 108 in the NPPF set out the Local Green Space designation as a way for communities to identify and protect green space of particular importance to them through local and neighbourhood plans. For the Local Green Space designation to be used the green space must be:
- in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
 - demonstrably special to the local community with a particular local significance (aesthetically, historical, recreational or environmental); and
 - local in character and not an extensive tract of land.
- 2.9 The NPPF states that local policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.

Achieving well-designed places

- 2.10 Paragraph 136 states that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments. Planning policies and decisions should ensure

that new streets are tree-lined and that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments.

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

- 2.11 The NPPF emphasises that responding to climate change is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.
- 2.12 Paragraph 162 states that plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts.
- 2.13 Furthermore paragraph 164 states that new development should be planned to avoid increased impacts from climate change. In areas which are vulnerable from impacts of climate change these should be mitigated against and managed through suitable adaption measures, such as green infrastructure (GI). Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- 2.14 Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that the planning system has a role to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Valued landscapes and ecosystems should be protected, with development prevented from adversely affecting soil, air or water, or from causing noise pollution and land instability.
- 2.15 The NPPF states in paragraph 192 that local planning authorities should plan to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity. This should be achieved through identifying and mapping local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them. Furthermore, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.
- 2.16 Paragraph 193 states that planning applications should promote opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments and should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.
- 2.17 With regards to GI, paragraph 199 states that there are opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts through the provision and enhancement of GI.

Planning Practice Guidance

Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities; Public Rights of Way; and Local Greenspace (March 2014)³

- 2.18 This planning practice guidance (PPG) provides advice on open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way (PRoW) and the Local Green Space designation. The guidance states that it is for local planning authorities to assess the need for open space and opportunities for new provision in their areas. It describes the Local Green Space designation in further detail than the NPPF.

Healthy and Safe Communities⁴ (August 2022)

- 2.19 The Healthy and Safe Communities PPG sets out key advice on the how to account for health and wellbeing in the planning process in two ways:
- Creating environments that support and encourage healthy lifestyles; and
 - Identifying and securing the facilities needed for primary, secondary and tertiary care and the wider health and care system.
- 2.20 This PPG states how planning can influence the built environment to improve health and reduce levels of obesity in local communities.
- 2.21 The PPG also covers the promotion of the benefits of estate regeneration and supporting safe communities.

Climate Change⁵ (June 2014 updated March 2019)

- 2.22 The Climate Change PPG advises how to identify suitable mitigation and adaption measures in the planning process to address the impacts of climate change.
- 2.23 The PPG states that the impact of climate change needs to be taken into account in a realistic way and, as part of this, local planning authorities should identify no or low-cost responses to climate risks that deliver a multitude of benefits, for example, GI that improves adaption, biodiversity and amenity.
- 2.24 Furthermore, the Climate Change PPG states that when Local Authorities are preparing Local Plans and taking planning decisions they should pay particular attention to integrating adaptation and mitigation approaches and looking for 'win-win' solutions. For example, the provision of multi-functional GI can reduce urban heat islands, manage flooding and help species adapt to climate change whilst also contributing to a pleasant environment that encourages people to walk and cycle.

³ [Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/282241/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space-ppg.pdf)

⁴ [Healthy and safe communities - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/115241/healthy-and-safe-communities-ppg.pdf)

⁵ [Climate change - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/282241/climate-change-ppg.pdf)

Natural Environment⁶ (February 2024)

- 2.25 The Natural Environment PPG advises on land of environmental value, GI, biodiversity and ecosystems and landscape.
- 2.26 The PPG highlights the importance of GI as a natural capital asset. These include community benefits such as enhancing wellbeing, outdoor recreation and access, enhanced biodiversity and landscapes, food and energy production and mitigating the effects of climate change, such as urban cooling and flood risk management.
- 2.27 The PPG also identifies the benefits of wider environmental net gain to reduce pressure on and achieve overall improvements in natural capital, ecosystem services and the benefit they deliver.

Flood Risk and Coastal Change⁷ (August 2022)

- 2.28 The Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG advises how to take account of, and address the risks associated with flooding and coastal change in the planning process.
- 2.29 The PPG highlights that open space provide opportunities to reduce overall flood risk in a development area and beyond. Sustainable drainage systems provide opportunities such as combining water management with green space with associated benefits for amenity, recreation and wildlife.

A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment⁸

- 2.30 The 25 Year Environment Plan sets out government actions to help the natural world regain and retain good health. It aims to deliver cleaner air and water in our cities and rural landscapes, protect threatened species and provide richer wildlife habitats.
- 2.31 Policies are divided into key areas to focus actions:
- Using and managing land sustainability;
 - Recovering nature and enhancing the beauty of landscapes;
 - Connecting people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing;
 - Increasing resource efficiency and reducing pollution and waste;
 - Securing clean, productive and biologically diverse seas and oceans; and
 - Protecting and improving the global environment.

⁶ [Natural environment - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁷ [Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

⁸ [25-year-environment-plan.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

Greater Manchester Policy Context

- 2.32 Manchester City Council forms part of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), which is made up of ten local authorities.
- 2.33 The Greater Manchester Strategy was updated in March 2022. The Strategy is Greater Manchester's plan for all communities, neighbourhoods, towns and cities which make up the city-region. It is a plan for recovery and renewal following the pandemic.
- 2.34 The Greater Manchester Plan for Jobs, Homes and the Environment (known as GMSF), started in 2016 and was a joint development plan between all ten Greater Manchester local authorities. However, in December 2020 Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council decided not to continue with the GMSF 2020. Therefore, GMSF was revised in 2020 and the Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Plan was adopted in 2024, covering the nine remaining Greater Manchester local authorities (including Manchester City Council).
- 2.35 PfE Joint Plan which took effect and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the nine PfE authorities in March 2024 includes key aims for Manchester, which are:
- Making the most of the key locations and assets;
 - Address disparities; and
 - Creating places more resilient to climate change.
- 2.36 Specific policies which relate to open space in this joint local plan are as follows:
- Policy JP-G 6 - Urban Green Space: To ensure there is an appropriate scale, type, quality and distribution of accessible urban green space that can support a high quality of life and other important green infrastructure functions;
 - Policy JP-P-1 Sustainable Places: Incorporating high quality and well managed GI and quality public realm, with:
 - A. Opportunities for recreation and outdoor play for children, and interaction between the generations;
 - B. Public and private spaces clearly distinguished;
 - C. Development clearly defining, and promoting activity within, public spaces; and
 - D. High quality landscaping with schemes
 - Policy JP-P-6 - Health: To help tackle health inequality new development will be required, where practicable to maximise positive contribution to health and wellbeing, and support healthy lifestyles through the use of active design principles.

- Policy JP-P 7- Sport and Recreation: Develop a network of high quality and accessible sports and recreation facilities, supporting greater levels of activity for all ages.

Local Policy

- 2.37 Manchester's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012 and is the key Development Plan document in the Local Development Framework. The Strategy was updated following the adoption of PfE in March 2024, and lists Core Strategy Policies replaced by PfE policies⁹.
- 2.38 The current Local Plan is under review, and a key issues paper was published in May 2020 which identified the challenges which will influence the Local Plan. The document formed the initial stage of the consultation process for the Local Plan Review.
- 2.39 A key challenge identified was the preservation of open space, including where neighbourhoods become increasingly dense, and the demand for open space increases.
- 2.40 The Core Strategy sets out a Vision of "Manchester as a successful city with a growing economy, an increasing and healthy population and a place where people choose to live."
- 2.41 The vision was developed further through the Council's "Our Manchester Strategy". The strategy provides a long-term vision and strategy for Manchester.

Vision and Objectives

- 2.42 The vision for the City from the Core Strategy DPD states that by 2027, Manchester will be:
- 'A successful sustainable and accessible City in the front rank of cities in Europe and the world.
 - A City with a growing economy driven by the strength of the regional centre and Manchester Airport which supports a successful City region.
 - Meeting the challenge of climate change at the forefront of environmental initiatives and improvements.
 - A City with an increased and sustainable healthy population and a community which both benefits from and drives the City's productivity upwards.
 - A City with neighbourhoods where people choose to live all their lives because they offer a wide range of quality housing and an attractive environment where locally distinctive character is conserved and enhanced.

⁹ [Core Strategy | Core Strategy | Manchester City Council](#)

- A City with thriving district centres, which have a distinct local character and provide a good range of accessible public services, retail and local facilities.
 - A City which is supported by transport infrastructure which provides sustainable and efficient links locally, within the city, and more widely, between the Regional Centre and workers across the City region. It will also have strong national and international connections made possible by its world class airport.
 - A City defined by excellence in urban design and environmental quality, where its distinctive historic environment is understood, valued, cared for and its potential fully realised.
 - A City where residents and visitors regularly enjoy a network of quality open spaces, parks and river valleys, enriched with biodiversity.
 - An international destination for tourism and culture with the Eastlands area of the regional centre a national attraction for sport, leisure and recreation.'
- 2.43 Manchester City Council (MCC) will maintain and create a network of open spaces which provide all residents with good access to recreational opportunities to achieve the vision outlined below. The River Valleys (the Irk, Medlock and Mersey) and City Parks are particularly important, and access to these resources will be improved.
- 2.44 The Vision includes that Manchester will be 'A City where residents and visitors regularly enjoy a network of quality open spaces, parks and river valleys, enriched with biodiversity'.

Other relevant documents:

- 2.45 The following other documents have been reviewed as part of this OSA and details are provided in Appendix B:
- Manchester Parks Strategy (2017 - 2027);
 - Manchester City Council Climate Change Framework (2020-2025);
 - Manchester's Great Outdoors;
 - Our Rivers, Our City Strategy (2021)
 - Manchester City Council: Design for Access 2;
 - Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (2017);
 - Year of the Child Survey (2022);
 - Manchester Play Satisfaction (2021);
 - Greater Manchester Air Quality Action Plan; and
 - Core Strategy DPD - developer contributions.

3.0 Method

Guidance and Best Practice

- 3.1 This Open Space Assessment is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Open Space, which have replaced Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation (2002) and its Companion Guide, Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to Planning Policy Guidance 17 (2002).
- 3.2 Whilst the Companion Guide to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 has been superseded, it is acknowledged that the principles and approach within the guidance have not been replaced and it is still relevant to apply the methodology to assess needs for open space provision.

Stages of the Assessment

- 3.3 The Open Space Assessment process follows five stages as illustrated in Figure 2: Open Space Assessment Process.




Figure 2: Open Space Assessment Process

Typologies

- 3.4 Table 1 provides a description of each of the open space typologies included in this Assessment. A threshold of 0.2 hectares has been applied to Amenity Greenspace and Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace in line with the Companion Guide to PPG17.
- 3.5 Sports pitches which serve multiple functions and contribute to overall open space provision are included in this Assessment, however sole-purpose pitches are not included as they are considered in the Outdoor Sports and Playing Pitch Strategy.

- 3.6 Sites listed in the 2022 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), or Pipeline Employment Site (2022) are not included in the OSA as they are expected to come forward for development within the lifetime of the emerging Local Plan. However, any SHLAA or Employment Study site which is currently considered open space should still be assessed for its open space value on an individual basis as part of any planning application for that site, in line with national and local planning policy.
- 3.7 As part of this Assessment TEP has undertaken a data consolidation exercise, including of comparison with Ordnance Survey layers, update to sites including those to be removed, and updates or merging of site boundaries.

Table 1: Open Space Typologies included in the Open Space Assessment

Open Space Typology	Description
Allotments	Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion.
Amenity Greenspace	Most commonly but not exclusively found in housing areas. Includes informal recreation green spaces.
Cemeteries, Churchyards and other Burial Grounds	Cemeteries and churchyards including disused churchyards and other burial grounds.
Civic Spaces	Mostly hard surfaced areas usually located within town or city centres.
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	Includes country parks, nature reserves, publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands, wetlands and wastelands
Parks and Gardens	Includes urban parks and formal gardens. Parks usually contain a variety of facilities and may have one or more of the other types of open space within them. Note this typology does not include private residential gardens.
Provision for Children and Young People	Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction specifically designed as equipped play facilities for young people and children.

Quantity

- 3.8 The quantity assessment is carried out through a desk-based GIS exercise, using open space data provided by the Council. Open space sites are mapped in a GIS geo-database which provides total area in hectares of each site. Each site is assigned an open space typology so that a total area of sites by typology can be calculated.
- 3.9 The quantity provision of sites is based on the Council's Open Space Asset list. Further updates to the open space data have been captured during the site audits by KKP in 2022, and through an update of data by TEP in 2024. Most, but not all open spaces are within the Council's ownership.
- 3.10 When combined with population figures, quantity can be expressed in terms of a hectare per 1,000 population figures. This is the way that local authorities express their quantity of open space and is how quantity standards for open space are expressed.
- 3.11 In this assessment, total area, or in some cases numbers of sites, has been used to calculate the current quantity provision for the City and each sub-area. Population figures have been used to calculate the hectare per 1,000 population figures for each typology on a City wide basis, for the current and future population.

Quality

- 3.12 KKP undertook site audits in spring/summer 2022. Sites which were accessible were included in the quality and value audit, and each site was classified based on its core typology.
- 3.13 All parks and gardens and provision for children and young people, were audited, as well as amenity greenspaces over 1 hectare. Allotments and cemeteries and churchyards were not audited due to the nature of the sites. Only sites which are publicly available were audited.
- 3.14 The audit methodology applies scoring to adjacent sites of the same typology to ensure the wider network of that typology is considered, and for budgetary and logistical constraints.
- 3.15 The open space quality assessment is based on site audits aligned to the Green Flag Award assessment criteria. The Green Flag Award is widely recognised as a quality benchmark for parks and green spaces, is advocated by Fields in Trust (FiT) and used by many other local authorities as part of their open space assessments.
- 3.16 This is utilised to calculate a quality score for each site visited. Scores in the database are presented as percentage figures allowing a relative comparison of open spaces across the City.

- 3.17 Additional criteria for provision for children and young people, is also built around the Green Flag Award. This visual assessment of the site includes a review of general equipment and surface quality/appearance plus an assessment of additional street furniture.
- 3.18 The Quality audit comprises an assessment of:
- Physical access - e.g. public transport links, directional signposts;
 - Personal security - e.g. site is overlooked, natural surveillance;
 - Access-social - e.g. appropriate minimum entrance widths;
 - Parking - e.g. availability, specific, disabled parking;
 - Information signage - e.g. presence of up-to-date site information, notice boards;
 - Equipment and facilities - e.g. assessment of both adequacy and maintenance of provision such as seats, benches, bins, toilets;
 - Site problems, e.g. presence of vandalism, graffiti;
 - Healthy, safe and secure, e.g. fencing, gates, staff on site;
 - Maintenance and cleanliness, e.g. condition of general landscape & features;
 - Groups that the site meets the needs of, e.g. elderly, young people; and
 - Site potential e.g. possible enhancements to improve a site.
- 3.19 The quality assessment does not attempt to 'judge' all sites as to whether they would pass or fail the Green Flag Award. This would not be appropriate to do as part of an Open Spaces Assessment due to the types and nature of the sites; the proportionate amount of time needed to spend assessing each site in full; and the information available to undertake the assessment. The full Green Flag Award process involves reviewing a management plan for each site, and undertaking a site visit with the site managers, key stakeholders and the local community.
- 3.20 The full site audit results are included as Appendix C.

Value

- 3.21 The open space value assessment is based on 'Assessing needs and opportunities: a companion guide to PPG17¹⁰ (September 2002). Although PPG17 has been superseded by the NPPF 2024, there has been no supporting guidance published to supersede 'Assessing needs and opportunity: a companion guide to PPG17'. This is the most up to date guidance for value assessment for open spaces.

¹⁰

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7660/156780.pdf

3.22 The Value assessment as defined in the Companion Guide to PPG17 seeks to review:

- Site context - accessibility, historic value and sense of place;
- Function - level and type of use; and
- Wider benefits - to people, nature and the environment.

3.23 The Value Assessment comprises a review of each audited site's:

- Level of use (observations only), e.g., evidence of different user types (e.g. dog walkers, joggers, children) throughout day, located near school and/or community facility;
- Context of site in relation to other open spaces;
- Structural and landscape benefits, e.g., well located, high quality defining the identity/ area;
- Ecological benefits, e.g., supports/promotes biodiversity and wildlife habitats;
- Educational benefits, e.g., provides learning opportunities on nature/historic landscapes;
- Social inclusion and health benefits, e.g., promotes civic pride, community ownership and a sense of belonging; helping to promote well-being;
- Cultural and heritage benefits, e.g., historic elements/links (e.g. listed building, statues) and high-profile symbols of local area;
- Amenity benefits and a sense of place, e.g., attractive places that are safe and well maintained; helping to create specific neighbourhoods and landmarks; and
- Economic benefits, e.g., enhances property values, promotes economic activity and attracts people from near and far.

3.24 Provision for Children and Young People is scored as part of the value audit including the site size, range of equipment and play type.

Quality and Value Matrix

3.25 The Value of a site, in conjunction with the Quality, can be used to guide planning decisions about the future of the sites as shown in Table 2.

3.26 Quality and Value scores are independent of one and other. A poor-quality site may be unkempt and poorly maintained, however may provide a highly valuable open space within the local area.

Table 2: Quality and Value Matrix

Poor Quality High Value High value sites that are poor quality should look to be enhanced in terms of their quality	Good Quality High Value Ideally all spaces should fall into this category, and decisions focused on protection of the best sites
Poor Quality Low Value Where possible look to enhance quality and value, or review if sites are surplus to requirements	Good Quality Low Value Where possible look to enhance value in terms of the functions the sites provide, or consider if value could increase by a change of use

Accessibility

- 3.27 The accessibility assessment applies Walking Thresholds ('as the crow flies') to open spaces. Walking Thresholds are shown on accessibility maps in this report to indicate areas with access to each type of open space, and those without. For this Assessment, straight line buffers have been used.
- 3.28 Table 3 sets out the walking distances and walking thresholds from the Fields in Trust (FiT) Guidance for Outdoor Sports and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard and the Existing OSA (2009), and how the distances, in metres (m) can be interpreted as walking time.
- 3.29 When applied, accessibility buffers can be used to identify deficiencies in access to specific open space provision across an area. Cross-boundary provision has been considered as part of this OSA as users of sites do not only visit those within a specific Local Authority area.

Table 3: Walking Distance, Thresholds and Time

Typology	Benchmark Standard ¹¹	Existing Accessibility Standard (Taken from Core Strategy)
Allotments	None set	15 minute walk time (approx. 720m)
Amenity Greenspace	480 metres	10 minute walk time (480m)
Cemeteries & Burial Grounds	None set	N/A

¹¹ [FiT Guidance](#)

Typology	Benchmark Standard ¹¹	Existing Accessibility Standard (Taken from Core Strategy)
Civic Spaces	None set	N/A
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces	720 metres	15 minutes' walk time/ 720 metres City Centre - 15 minute drive time (public transport)
Parks and Gardens	710 metres	City Parks (and city centre) - 15 minute public transport time Local Parks - 10 minute walk time (480m)
Provision for Children	LAP - 100 metres LEAP - 400 metres NEAP – 1,000 metres MUGA - 700m	10 minutes' walk time (480 metres)
Provision for Young People	LAP - 100 metres LEAP - 400 metres NEAP – 1,000 metres MUGA - 700m	15 minutes' walk time (720 metres)

4.0 Identifying Local Needs

National Strategy Documents

4.1 The following strategy documents provide an overview of the national strategic context and actions in relation to open space and are summarised in the following paragraphs:

- Promoting Healthy Cities (Royal Town Planning Institute);
- Green Infrastructure Strategies (Natural England);
- The Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (2011); and
- Everybody Active, Every Day (Public Health England, 2014).

Promoting Healthy Cities (Royal Town Planning Institute)¹²

4.2 The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) published Promoting Healthy Cities, a document tackling the role of planning in creating healthy cities in October 2014.

4.3 The report calls for the UK to develop more integrated strategies for healthy place making, gather greater intelligence on the social and economic determinants of health and reform and strengthen institutions to ensure integration of health policies. This process should involve a range of professions and community stakeholders.

Green Infrastructure Strategies (Natural England)¹³

4.4 Green Infrastructure Strategies (Natural England, October 2014) provides guidance on:

- Why we need GI;
- What GI should achieve;
- What GI is; and
- GI strategies.

4.5 Natural England states that GI:

"Contributes so much to the setting and quality of people's living and working environments, and its role in generating economic benefit has often been overlooked".

¹² <https://www.rtpi.org.uk/policy/2014/february/promoting-healthy-cities/>

¹³ <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35033>

- 4.6 The guidance states that "policies and decisions on development proposals should conserve and enhance environmental assets". Consideration should be made to providing off road, green routes for walkers and cyclists, and consider privately owned land, which provides connectivity for wildlife, and helps tackle climate change and flooding.

The Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature (2011)¹⁴

- 4.7 The NEWP states that "People cannot flourish without the benefits and services our natural environment provide. Nature is a complex, interconnected system. A healthy, properly functioning natural environment is the foundation of sustained economic growth, prospering communities and personal wellbeing".
- 4.8 The Government wants to put the value of nature at the heart of decision-making, in Government, local communities and businesses. To achieve this the NEWP focuses on 4 key areas:
- Protecting and improving our natural environment - Achieve a better quality natural environment by taking and promoting actions across farmed land, woodlands and forests, towns and cities, and rivers and water bodies;
 - Growing the green economy - Economic growth and the natural environment are mutually compatible. Sustainable economic growth relies on services provided by the natural environment, often referred to as 'ecosystem services';
 - Reconnecting people and nature - High-quality natural environments foster healthy neighbourhoods; green spaces encourage social activity and reduce crime. The natural environment can help children's learning; and
 - International and EU leadership - Environmental leadership should be demonstrable internationally and within the EU, to protect and enhance natural assets globally, promoting environmentally and socially sustainable growth.

Everybody Active, Every Day¹⁵ (Public Health England, 2014)

- 4.9 Everybody Active, Every Day is the national physical activity framework for England. The aim of the framework is to bring about real and long lasting change using a long-term, evidence based approach to embed physical activity into the fabric of daily life, making it an easy, cost-effective and 'normal' choice in every community in England. The priorities of the framework are:

¹⁴ [The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature CM 8082 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228842/8082.pdf)
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228842/8082.pdf

¹⁵ [Framework 13.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228842/8082.pdf)

- Active society - Making physical activity part of the daily routine;
- Moving professionals - Thoughtful urban design, understanding land use patterns and creating transportation systems that promote walking and cycling will help to create active, healthier and more liveable communities; and
- Active environment - Creating the right spaces, including healthy environments to support health, recreation and wellbeing and encouraging people to use green space, playground and cycle lanes.

National Best Practice

Green Infrastructure Framework (Natural England)¹⁶

- 4.10 The Green Infrastructure Framework (Natural England, January 2023) comprises:
- GI Principles (what and how of good GI);
 - GI Standards (National standards for GI quantity and quality);
 - GI mapping including environmental and socio-economic datasets;
 - GI Planning and Design Guide; and
 - Process journeys.
- 4.11 Natural England states that GI:
- "Good quality GI has an important role to play in our urban and rural environments for improving health and wellbeing, air quality, nature recovery and resilience to and mitigation of climate change, along with addressing issues of social inequality and environmental decline."*
- 4.12 The guidance states that *"GI strategies and policies can be used to support aspirations for a Nature Recovery Network (NRN), connecting across urban, urban-fringe, coastal and rural areas and enhancing landscape character."*
- 4.13 Natural England has developed a set of 15 GI Principles which underpin the GI Framework. The Principles aim to provide a baseline for organisations to develop stronger GI policy and delivery. Principles cover why, what and how GI is achieved.
- 4.14 The Framework updates the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) to broaden their scope to Accessible Greenspace Standards. The headline standard is that everyone should have access to good quality green and blue spaces, with an initial focus of accessing these spaces within 15 minutes' walk from home.
- 4.15 Good provision is dependent on the size-proximity, capacity and quality criteria. The Accessible Greenspace Standards are:

¹⁶ [Green Infrastructure Home \(naturalengland.org.uk\)](https://naturalengland.org.uk/green-infrastructure-home)

- Within 15 minutes' walk either:
- A doorstep greenspace of at least 0.5ha within 200m; or
- A local natural greenspace of at least 2ha within 300m walk from home.
- AND
- A medium sized neighbourhood natural greenspace (10ha) within 1km.
- AND
- Beyond 15 minutes' walk:
- A medium/large wider neighbourhood natural greenspace (20ha) within 2km; and
- A large district natural greenspace (100ha) within 5km; and
- A very large subregional greenspace (500ha) within 10km.

Fields in Trust

- 4.16 Fields in Trust (FiT) is a national charity which formed in 1925 and aims to protect and safeguard outdoor space for sport and recreation. FiT provides guidance to practitioners on open space provision, including benchmark standards for the quantity and accessibility of open spaces.

Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard, 2020

- 4.17 The Guidance for Outdoor Sport Beyond the Six Acre Standard was last updated in 2020 to reflect updated planning policy and to promote healthy communities. The document provides benchmark standards on the quantity, quality and accessibility for open spaces.

Local Strategy Documents

- 4.18 The following strategy documents provide an overview of the Council's strategic context and actions in relation to open space:
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority Corporate Plan (2022-2025);
 - Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan (2022-2039);
 - Manchester City Council Climate Change Framework (2020-2025);
 - Manchester City Council Design for Access 2 (2003);
 - Manchester City Council Residential Quality Guidance (2017);
 - Manchester City Council Year of the Child Survey (2022);
 - Manchester City Council Play Satisfaction (2021);

- Manchester Local Plan (2012 to 2027) also Manchester Local plan Issues Consultation 2020;
- Manchester's Park Strategy (2017 - 2027);
- Manchester's Great Outdoors - A Green & Blue Infrastructure Strategy for Manchester (2015-2025) (refreshed 2021);
- Manchester City Wide Open Spaces, Sport & Recreation Study (2009);
- Manchester Strategic Regeneration Frameworks;
- Manchester's Sport and Physical Activity Strategy (2019–2028);
- Manchester's Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy and Action Plan (2022-2031);
- Lower Irk Valley Neighbourhood Development Framework (2016);
- Our Manchester Strategy (2016-2025); and
- Our Rivers, Our City (2021-2030).

Population

Current Population

- 4.19 This Assessment uses Office for National Statistics (ONS) population data, including the 2018-based sub-national population, high migration data. Although more recent population data is available, it is considered inaccurate due to the high proportion of migration to the City.
- 4.20 Figure 3 shows the current (2024) population data taken from 2018-mid year estimates (ONS). The total population in 2024 is estimated at 568,402.
- 4.21 There is a higher proportion of 20-30 year olds within Manchester than any other age group within the City. Population predictions estimate a 10.15% increase in population up to 2041.




Figure 3: Current population distribution by 5-year age bracket

Population Density

- 4.22 Map 6 (ref: G10280.01.013) shows the population density (people per square kilometre) across the City. Owing to its urban location, student accommodation and areas of Victorian terraced streets, the Central and South sub-areas have some of the highest density of population. There are also areas within the North, and Wythenshawe sub-areas with over 8,500 people per square kilometre.

Deprivation

- 4.23 Map 7 (ref: G10280.01.011) shows the Indices of Multiple Deprivation Decile (2019) and the rank of each Lower Super Output Area compared to others in England. Areas in Manchester are some of the Most Deprived across England.
- 4.24 When applying the Indices of Multiple Deprivation to Manchester only, there are higher levels of deprivation in the North and Wythenshawe sub areas as shown in Map 8 (G10280.01.012). Open spaces in these areas are often most impactful providing opportunities for physical recreation and improvements to health and wellbeing.

Future Population

- 4.25 Using the 2018 High Migration Variant, the projected future population for the City in 2041 is 632,639. All ages except for 10-14 years old are expected to increase. The largest estimated increase in population is in the 25–29-year age bracket.

Consultation

- 4.26 KKP and MCC undertook a consultation to gather evidence for an updated OSA to gather views of residents and key stakeholders across Manchester. Consultation was undertaken through:
- Key Stakeholder meetings;
 - Friends of Group surveys; and
 - A community questionnaire.
- 4.27 The aims of the OSA consultation were to:
- Provide key stakeholders across the City with information about the Open Space Study;
 - Allow key stakeholders and the local community to comment on the vision and approach to managing and developing open spaces within the City; and
 - Consider feedback received as a result of the consultation process.

Community Consultation

- 4.28 Community consultees were invited to answer a set of bespoke targeted questions related to the use and perception of open space in the City. Questions and a summary of responses are outlined in Appendix D.
- 4.29 A total of 1,023 responses were received to the questionnaire, including 965 (94%) respondents within Manchester. The largest responses were from Chorlton ward (12.5%), Ancoats and Beswick (7.3%) and Withington (6.5%).

Usage

- 4.30 Over 70% of respondents used local parks most often, and over 53.8% of respondents use Community Parks. Civic spaces are used the least (9%), followed by cemeteries and churchyards (14%).
- 4.31 Consultees were also asked how often each type of space was visited. Respondents who visited a local park include over 80% who visit the spaces at least weekly (31% daily, 50% weekly).

- 4.32 The second most frequently visited/used spaces were recreational routes (footpaths, cycleways and bridleways). Over 69% of respondents use these spaces on a weekly basis as a minimum.
- 4.33 Respondents were asked how long they spend at each type of space. Destination Parks, Allotments and Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces are generally where respondents stayed longer (e.g. over 2 hours or more).

Accessibility

- 4.34 Respondents travel to open spaces through a variety of methods however walking was the highest-ranking method of travel to local parks, provision for young children, amenity greenspace, community parks and allotments.
- 4.35 Respondents usually travel to Destination Parks and Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace by car likely owing to their location, or distance respondents were willing to travel to these spaces.

Use

- 4.36 Respondents were asked why they visit open spaces, with 86% of respondents visiting for fresh air, and 86% to go for a walk.
- 4.37 When reviewing barriers to visiting open space 76% of respondents noted the quality of open space as a factor, and 51.3% noted antisocial behaviour as a barrier.

Quality

- 4.38 When asked about the quality of open spaces across the City, 50% of respondents were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. 24% of respondents were satisfied with the quality of open space across the City. 4% of respondents were very satisfied with the quality of open space across the City.

Quantity

- 4.39 When asked about the quantity of open spaces across the City, 31% of respondents were satisfied with the quantity of open space in the city, and 7% of respondents were very satisfied. 27% of respondents were dissatisfied, and 17% were very dissatisfied with the amount of open space.

Improvements

- 4.40 Respondents were asked what would improve open space across the City. Better maintenance achieved the highest response rate at 78.2%, followed by greater attractiveness (62%).

Stakeholder Meetings

- 4.41 Officers and Key Stakeholders were consulted as part of the OSA. Officers included MCC staff including neighbourhood officers, allotment officers and blue and green infrastructure managers.
- 4.42 Other key stakeholders included neighbouring authorities, local community groups and the Mersey Valley Trust.

Officer Consultation

- 4.43 Consultation raised that each sub-area presents its own unique challenges, and possible solutions for open space:
- North - there was considered to be growing pressure on open spaces for new houses and primary schools with the exception of Heaton Park and Boggart Hole Clough;
 - City Centre - there is less greenspace and open space should be maximised in the public realm; and
 - South - open space in this sub-area is sufficient owing to several key parks which are well supported by friends of groups (Alexandra Park, Platt Fields and Chorlton Park).
- 4.44 Generally, Officers noted that sites across the City require investment and several key sites were identified:
- Peter Pan Park;
 - Symmetry Park;
 - Mersey Bank Playing Fields; and
 - Crumpsall Park.
- 4.45 Officers recognised that key open spaces should be well connected through sustainable travel and ongoing efforts to provide new cycling infrastructure such as that at Wythenshawe Park will improve connectivity to local and national cycle routes.
- 4.46 Officers noted anti-social behaviour as a key issue across open spaces in the City, however suggestions were made to address this including providing sufficient new provision for young people (e.g. skate parks), and improving activity programme, including links to current groups for young people (e.g. Youth Zone in Harpurhey).
- 4.47 Officers understood new housing developments and the new open space provision being provided as part of these. Mayfield Park provides a good quality example of this which will provide open space provision between Piccadilly Station and the Mancunian Way.

Key Stakeholder Consultation

4.48 Several key themes were identified through consultation with Key Stakeholders including:

- Signage and wayfinding - consistent and appropriate signage should be provided across the City. The city centre was felt to be good, however there are other areas which lack good provision. Signage should be inclusive and designed to meet the needs of all.
- Access - open space should be provided for all abilities, including lighting, signage and pathways designed for all abilities as well as appropriate management of car parking and toilets. Pathways should be maintained as overgrown vegetation discourage use of open spaces.
- Technology - This has the potential to support users of open space, for example, access to easy to find online information about open spaces helps users prepare for a visit. Assistive technology may also benefit users of open spaces, e.g. Navi Lens which can empower independent travel.
- Deprivation - Manchester City has some of the poorest levels of health deprivation across England, and access to open spaces is critical in ensuring residents remain active.
- Maximising blue infrastructure including the use of the three rivers of Medlock, Irwell and Mersey, and the canal network. Usage of these spaces should be maximised as in large they run through heavily urbanised areas. Maintenance should focus on infrastructure (benches, information boards and waymarking) and ensuring access for all users. Invasive Non-Native Species should be treated. Key future projects include a designated walking route from Heaton Park to the City Centre, better access to and across the Medlock, and improved safety of the canal network in and around the City Centre.
- Cross-boundary provision - Consultation with Trafford Council noted that Longford Park is being improved using a £5m Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) fund.

4.49 MCC issued a survey to existing Friends of Groups within the City, the following Groups responded which range in size from 10 volunteers to over 100 members:

- Hulme Park;
- Broadhurst Park;
- St Georges Park;
- Didsbury Park;
- Hough End;
- Alexandra Park;

- Platt Fields;
 - Fletcher Moss Park and Parsonage Gardens;
 - Angel Meadows;
 - Ladybarn Park;
 - Chorlton Park;
 - Carisbrook Park;
 - Chorlton Meadows; and
 - Whitworth Park.
- 4.50 Common activities undertaken by Friends of Groups include litter picking, gardening and maintenance of notice boards.
- 4.51 Larger groups such as Friends of Didsbury Park also complete nature walks and nature events. The St Georges Youth and Community Association provide events, such as a weekly Narcotics Anonymous session.
- 4.52 When asked what would help make better use of open spaces or the local area the following items were identified:
- Site specific improvements including new cycling or walking tracks, or areas for rewilding;
 - Designated social areas e.g. talking benches for those who are suffering from loneliness;
 - Funding to regenerate sites e.g. the Friends of Platt Fields requested funding to repurpose three old garages on site for a Men in Sheds programme.
- 4.53 Several common challenges were identified by the Groups including lack of communication with third parties, budgetary constraints, and difficulties in seeking approvals for events. Recruiting volunteers was also highlighted as a concern with all organisations.

5.0 Auditing Local Provision

Introduction

- 5.1 This section presents the results of the quantity, quality, value and accessibility assessment for the City as a whole, the sub-areas and each of the open space typologies.
- 5.2 Outdoor Sports Facilities (other than those which are multifunctional) are not included in the review of open spaces within the City, as these are considered as part of the Outdoor Sports and Playing Pitch Strategy.
- 5.3 Audits were undertaken by KKP and the results of the audits are summarised below.

City Overview

Quantity

- 5.4 The number, area and percentage of each type of open space within the City is shown in Table 4. The highest proportion of open space is provided by Parks and Gardens.
- 5.5 Civic spaces provide the least provision across the City (0.5%).

Table 4: Open Spaces by Typology, Number and Area

Open Space Typology	Description	No.	Area (ha)	Area (%)
Allotments and Community Gardens	Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion.	43	56.24	2.94%
Amenity Greenspace	Most commonly but not exclusively found in housing areas. Includes informal recreation green spaces and village greens.	318	313.41	16.41%

Open Space Typology	Description	No.	Area (ha)	Area (%)
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	Cemeteries and churchyards including disused churchyards and other burial grounds.	112	158.49	8.30%
Civic Spaces	Hard surfaced areas usually located within town or city centres.	23	9.92	0.52%
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	Includes country parks, nature reserves, publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands, wetlands and wastelands.	179	578.96	30.31%
Parks and Gardens	Includes urban parks and formal gardens. Parks usually contain a variety of facilities and may have one of more of the other types of open space within them.	98 (incl. 5 Strategic Parks)	771.09 (incl. 489.04 Strategic Parks)	40.38% (incl. 25.61% Strategic Parks)
Provision for Children and Young People	Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, multi-use games areas and skateboard parks.	237	21.74	1.14%
Final Total rounded to two decimal places	-	1010	1,090.95	100.00%

Table 5 shows the quantity of each typology by sub-area in ha.

Table 5: Ha of Open Space by Typology and Sub-area

Open Space Typology	North	Central	South	Wythenshawe
Allotments and Community Gardens	12.85	18.25	17.03	8.10
Amenity Greenspace	140.89	49.39	73.64	49.43
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	72.43	18.32	60.84	6.89
Civic Spaces	1.12	8.80	0.00	0.00
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	266.67	75.77	121.11	115.41
Parks and Gardens	405.95 (incl. 325.37 Strategic Parks)	101.28	116.32 (incl. 56.23 Strategic Parks)	147.53 (incl. 107.43 Strategic Parks)
Provision for Children and Young People	7.45	6.03	4.41	3.85
Total rounded to two decimal places	907.36	277.87	393.35	331.21

- 5.6 Using the ONS 2018-based sub-national population, high migration estimates the current (2024) population for the City is 568,402 and the total amount of open space of 1,909.85 ha, current provision of open space is calculated at 3.36 ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.7 Using the projected future population figures it is also possible to calculate future provision. The area of each open space typology per 1,000 population (current and future) is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Open Space Hectare per 1,000 population (current and future)

Open Space Typology	2024 ha/ 1,000	2041 ha/ 1,000
Allotments and Community Gardens	0.10	0.09
Amenity Greenspace	0.55	0.50
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	0.28	0.25
Civic Spaces	0.02	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	1.02	0.92
Parks and Gardens	1.36	1.22
Provision for Children and Young People	0.04	0.03
Total rounded to two decimal places	3.36	3.02

Accessibility

5.8 The current accessibility standards are provided in Table 7 below. A review of accessibility for each of these typologies is included in Chapter 7.

Table 7: Walking and Driving Accessibility for Open Space Typologies

Open Space Typology	Existing Accessibility Standards (Taken from Core Strategy)
Allotments and Community Gardens	15 minute walk time (approx. 720m)
Amenity Greenspace	10 minute walk time (480m)
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	N/A
Civic Spaces	N/A
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	15 minutes' walk time/ 720 metres City Centre - 15 minute drive time (public transport)
Parks and Gardens	City Parks (and city centre) - 15 minute public transport time Local Parks - 10 minute walk time (480m)
Provision for Children and Young People	Children - 10 minutes' walk time (480 metres) Young People 15 minutes' walk time (720m)

- 5.9 Maps 1-4 (G10280.01.004-007) shows accessibility to Parks and Gardens, Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces, Amenity Greenspaces and Provision for Children and Young People mapped using accessibility standards outlined by FIT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard.
- 5.10 Accessibility thresholds have not been assigned to Civic Spaces as they are limited to a very small number of sites in urban areas. An accessibility threshold would not be appropriate due to the nature and use of these spaces.

Quality

- 5.11 A selection of sites were audited by KKP, and the scores have been included as part of this OSA. 448 sites had full quality audits as part of this OSA and the results are shown on map 9 (G10280.01.002A).
- 5.12 The range of scores from the quality audits of open spaces are provided in Table 8 and the quality score split by each typology audited is in Table 9.

Table 8: Open Space by Quality Score

Quality Banding	No. of Open Space Sites	Percentage of Sites
Excellent	0	0%
Very Good	75	17%
Good	93	21%
Fair	189	42%
Poor	91	20%
Total	448	100%

Table 9: Quality Score for Open Space Typology

Open Space Typology	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Amenity Greenspace	0	4	10	19	14
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	0	3	0	2	0
Civic Spaces	0	4	15	1	0

Open Space Typology	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	0	6	2	17	37
Parks and Gardens	0	9 (incl. 4 strategic parks)	22 (incl. 2 strategic parks)	55 (incl. 1 strategic parks)	5 (incl. 1 Strategic Park)
Provision for Children and Young People	0	49	44	95	35
Total	0	75	93	189	91

Value

5.13 The range of value score from the audits of open space is shown at a City level on map 10 (G10280.01.003).

5.14 The range of value scores from the audits of open spaces are provided in Table 10 and the value scores for each typology are in Table 11.

Table 10: Open Spaces by Value Score

Value Banding	No. of Open Space Sites	Percentage of Sites
High	172	38%
Medium	176	39%
Low	100	22%
Total	448	100%

Table 11: Value Score for Open Space Typologies

Open Space Typology	High	Medium	Low
Amenity Greenspace	4	18	25
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	1	3	1
Civic Spaces	19	1	0

Open Space Typology	High	Medium	Low
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	3	27	32
Parks and Gardens	36 (incl. 7 strategic parks)	37 (incl. 1 strategic park)	18
Provision for Children and Young People	109	90	24
Total	172	176	100

5.15 Map 10 (G10280.01.003) shows the results of the value assessment by site, and results are broken down in Appendix C.

Key Finding on Quality and Value

5.16 Table 12 provides an overview of the range of quality and value scores achieved in the sites audits, and results are presented in Appendix C.

5.17 There were 91 sites that had a Quality score of Poor. The greatest range of quality score is within Amenity Greenspace typology.

5.18 The greatest Value scores range was for Parks and Gardens.

Table 12: Range of Quality and Value Score by Typology

Open Space Typology	Sites Audited	Range of Quality Scores	Range of Value Scores
Allotments and Community Gardens	n/a	n/a	n/a
Amenity Greenspace	47	9-79	7-73
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	5	41-81	28-82
Civic Spaces	20	58-77	52-90
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	62	13-82	12-82
Parks and Gardens	91 (incl. 8 strategic parks)	28-88	7-94

Open Space Typology	Sites Audited	Range of Quality Scores	Range of Value Scores
Provision for Children and Young People	223	16-88	12-90
Total	448	9-88	7-94

Allotments and Community Gardens

- 5.19 Allotments and community gardens provide opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long-term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion.

Quantity

- 5.20 There are 43 sites providing 56.24 ha of Allotments and Community Gardens in the City, this equates to 0.10 ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.21 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) does not provide a national benchmark for Allotments and Community Gardens.
- 5.22 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.
- 5.23 The largest Allotment and Community Gardens site is Levenshulme Allotment in the Central sub-area providing 5.02ha.

Quality and Value Assessment

- 5.24 Allotment and Community Gardens were not audited as part of the OSA due to the nature of the sites.

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.25 Allotment and Community Gardens have not been assigned an accessibility threshold, however sites have been mapped to assess the spatial distribution of this typology.
- 5.26 Map 11 Allotments Plan (G10280.01.008) shows that the distribution across the City and each of the four sub-areas is sparse.

Amenity Greenspace

- 5.27 Amenity Green Spaces are informal green spaces providing opportunities for informal recreation for residents and workers whilst enhancing the appearance of the area.

Quantity Assessment

- 5.28 There are 318 Amenity Greenspace sites providing 313.41 hectares of open space across the City which equates to 0.55 ha per 1,000 population. Several recreation grounds are classified as Amenity Greenspace.
- 5.29 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) provides a benchmark of 0.6 ha per 1,000 population. FiT's guidance is based on a survey of 119 (33%) local authorities in England and Wales which found that the median level of provision of Amenity Green Space sought was 0.55 ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.30 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Quality Assessment

- 5.31 Quality and Value scores for audited Amenity Green Spaces are summarised in Appendix C in order of their quality audit score and the results are also shown on Map 9 (G10280.01.002A).
- 5.32 47 Amenity Greenspace sites received a full quality audit by KKP.
- 5.33 The average quality score for Amenity Green Spaces is 49.83% which falls under the Fair Quality category as shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Quality Range for Amenity Greenspace

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
49.83%	Fair	14	19	10	4	0

- 5.34 The lowest scoring Amenity Greenspaces are outlined below and achieved Poor quality due to maintenance issues, a lack of street furniture, and presence of vandalism.
- Mersey Meadows;
 - Rochdale Canal;
 - Underwood Close; and
 - Carrswood Open space.

Value Assessment

- 5.35 Value scores for audited Amenity Green Spaces are summarised in Appendix C in order of their quality audit score and the results are also shown on Map 10 (G10280.01.003).
- 5.36 The average value score for Amenity Green Spaces is 40.05% which falls under the Medium value category as shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Value Range for Amenity Greenspace

Average Score	Average Banding	Low	Medium	High
40.05%	Medium	25	18	4

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.37 When applying the existing 480m buffer to Amenity Greenspaces, there is relatively good distribution to this typology across the City. Map 3 Open Space Accessibility - Amenity Greenspace Plan (G10280.01.006A.1-5) shows there are some small gaps in provision to this typology in each of the sub-areas, including around Manchester City Centre itself, Rusholme and Levenshulme, Didsbury, Northern Moor and to the south of the study area around Manchester airport, although it should be noted that the levels of population are significantly lower in this location.

Cemeteries and Burial Grounds

- 5.38 Cemeteries and Churchyards include disused churchyards and other burial grounds. There are 112 Cemeteries and Burial Grounds in the City providing 158.49 ha of open space.

Quantity Assessment

- 5.39 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) does not provide a national benchmark for Cemeteries and Burial Grounds.
- 5.40 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Quality Assessment

- 5.41 5 Cemeteries and Churchyard sites were audited as part of the OSA.
- 5.42 Table 15 shows that the Cemeteries and Burial Grounds sites audited ranged in quality from Fair to Very Good. The average score for Churchyards and Burial Grounds was 66.43% which is categorised as Good.

Table 15: Quality Range for Cemeteries and Burial Grounds

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
66.43%	Good	0	2	0	3	0

Value Assessment

- 5.43 Value scores for audited Cemeteries and Churchyards are summarised in Appendix C.
- 5.44 The average value score for Cemeteries and Churchyards is 59.26% which falls under the Medium value category as shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Value Range for Cemeteries and Churchyards

Average Score	Average Banding	Low	Medium	High
59.26%	Medium	1	3	1

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.45 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) does not provide a national benchmark for Cemeteries and Burial Grounds.
- 5.46 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Civic Spaces

- 5.47 Civic Spaces are hard surfaced areas usually located within town or city centres.

Quantity Assessment

- 5.48 There are 23 sites classed as Civic Spaces in the City providing 9.92 ha of open space. This equates to a quantity provision of 0.02ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.49 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) does not provide a national benchmark for Civic Spaces and Market Squares.

Quality Assessment

- 5.50 The Civic Spaces which were audited for quality and value are listed in Appendix C in order of their quality audit score.

- 5.51 20 Civic Spaces received a full quality audit. Table 17 shows that the Civic Space sites audited were categorised as Fair to Very Good. The average score for Civic Spaces was 66.72% which is categorised as Good.

Table 17: Quality Range for Civic Spaces

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
66.72%	Good	0	1	15	4	0

Value Assessment

- 5.52 Value scores for audited Civic Spaces are summarised in Appendix C in order of their quality audit score.
- 5.53 The average value score for Civic Spaces is 69.62% which falls under the High value category as shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Value Range for Civic Spaces

Average Score	Average Banding	Low	Medium	High
69.62%	High	0	1	19

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.54 There is no accessibility threshold for Civic Spaces. FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) does not provide a national benchmark for Civic Spaces.
- 5.55 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace

- 5.56 Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace includes country parks, nature reserves, publicly accessible woodlands, urban forestry, scrub, grasslands, wetlands and wastelands.

Quantity Assessment

- 5.57 There are 179 Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace sites providing 578.96 ha of open space which equates to 1.02 ha per 1,000.

Quality Assessment

- 5.58 The City's Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces are listed Appendix C in order of their quality, value scores are also shown. Quality audit scores are shown on Map 9 (G10280.01.002A).
- 5.59 62 Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace received a full quality audit. The average quality score for Natural and Semi-Natural Green Space is 50.13% which is categorised as fair, as shown in Table 19.

Table 19: Quality Range for Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
50.13%	Fair	37	17	2	6	0

Value Assessment

- 5.60 Value scores for audited Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces are summarised in Appendix C in order of their quality audit score.
- 5.61 The average value score for Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace is 52.42% which falls under the Medium value category as shown in Table 20.

Table 20: Value Range for Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspaces

Average Score	Average Banding	Low	Medium	High
52.42%	Medium	32	27	3

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.62 Natural and Semi-natural Greenspace has been assigned a walking accessibility threshold of 720m (15-minute walk) which aligns with the FiT guidance.
- 5.63 Map 2 Open Space Accessibility - Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace (G10280.01.005) illustrates that there is good access to this typology in the North and Wythenshawe sub-areas, however large areas of the Central and South areas have no accessible natural and semi-natural greenspace.
- 5.64 Additional analysis and information on standards is covered in Chapter 7.

Parks and Gardens

- 5.65 Parks and Gardens are generally multi-functional spaces, providing a range of facilities including landscaped gardens, playing fields, play areas and facilities for outdoor sport provision.

Quantity Assessment

- 5.66 There are 98 Parks and Gardens (including 5 strategic parks) providing 771.09 ha of open space across the City, which equates to 1.36 ha per 1,000.
- 5.67 There are 5 Strategic Parks which contribute to the total number of parks and gardens, providing 489ha of open space (0.86 ha per 1,000 population).
- 5.68 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) provides a benchmark of 0.8 ha per 1,000 population. FiT's guidance is based on a survey of 119 (33%) local authorities in England and Wales. The survey found that the median level of provision sought for Parks was 1.78 ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.69 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Quality Assessment

- 5.70 91 Parks and Gardens (including Strategic Parks) were audited, and the sites are listed in Appendix C in order of their quality, value scores are also shown.
- 5.71 The average quality score for all Parks and Gardens (inclusive of Strategic Parks) is 55.86% which is categorised as Fair Quality, as shown in Table 21. The Quality Scores for Strategic Parks and Gardens is provided at Table 22.

Table 21: Quality Score for all Parks and Gardens

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
55.86%	Fair	5	55	22	9	0

Table 22: Quality Score for all Strategic Parks only

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
60.81%	Good	1	1	2	4	0

Value Assessment

- 5.72 Value scores for audited Parks and Gardens are summarised in Appendix C.

- 5.73 The average value score for Parks and Gardens is 56.46% which falls under the Medium value category as shown in Table 23.

Table 23: Value Range for Parks and Gardens

Average Score	Average Banding	Low	Medium	High
56.46%	Medium	18	36	29

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.74 Parks and Gardens have been assigned a walking accessibility threshold of 710m (15-minute walk time). This aligns with FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) which provides a benchmark of 710m.
- 5.75 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Provision for Children and Young People

- 5.76 Provision for Children and Young People are areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, multi-use games areas and skateboard parks.

Quantity Assessment

- 5.77 There are 237 Provision for Children and Young People sites, providing 21.74 ha of Provision of Children and Young People which equates to 0.04 ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.78 FiT's Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) provides a benchmark of 0.25 ha per 1,000 population. FiT's guidance is based on a survey of 119 (33%) local authorities in England and Wales which found that the median level of Provision for Children and Young People was 0.25 ha per 1,000 population.
- 5.79 Standards are covered further in Chapter 7.

Quality Assessment

- 5.80 223 Provision for Children and Young People sites were audited.
- 5.81 Quality scores for audited Provision for Children and Young People are summarised in Appendix C in order of their quality audit score. Value scores are also shown.
- 5.82 Table 24 shows that the average score for Provision for Children and Young People based on the site audits fall into the Good banding.

Table 24: Quality range for Provision for Children and Young People

Average Score	Average Banding	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
55.65%	Fair	35	95	44	49	0

Value Assessment

- 5.83 Value scores for audited Provision for Children and Young People are summarised in Appendix C.
- 5.84 The average value score for Provision for Children and Young People is 60.00% which falls under the High value category as shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Value Range for Provision for Children and Young People

Average Score	Average Banding	Low	Medium	High
60.00%	High	24	90	109

Accessibility Assessment

- 5.85 FiT Guidance provides a range of benchmark standards dependent on the type of play provision:
- LAP - 100m
 - LEAP - 400m
 - NEAP - 1000m
 - Other (including MUGA) - 700m.
- 5.86 Map 4 Open Space Accessibility - Provision for Children and Young People Plan (G10280.01.007) illustrates that there is coverage of play provision across the City, however there are large gaps in provision in LAP provision, and general play provision within the north hand south sub-areas.

6.0 Setting Standards

- 6.1 This OSA is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Open Space, which have replaced Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation (2002) and its Companion Guide, Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to Planning Policy Guidance 17 (2002).
- 6.2 Whilst the Companion Guide to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 has been superseded, it is acknowledged that the principles and approach within the guidance have not been replaced and it is still relevant to apply the methodology to assess needs for open space provision.
- 6.3 Recommended standards of provision are based on local assessment and analysis and may be the same as a national recommended standard, if appropriate. Where current levels of provision do not meet a national recommended standard, this should be viewed as a minimum. Equally, the existing provision may already meet the future recommended standard and to lose it would significantly change the natural character of the area. By combining the existing level of provision with local views on its adequacy, it is possible to develop a range of new provision standards.

Manchester City Council Existing Standards

Quantity

- 6.4 Table 26 presents the existing standards for each open space typology.

Table 26: Existing Quantity Standards (ha per 1,000 Population)

Open Space Typology	Existing Standard (ha per 1,000 population) (Taken from Core strategy)
Allotments and Community Gardens	0.13
Amenity Greenspace	0.40
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	None set
Civic Spaces	None set
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	1.86
Parks and Gardens- City Parks	0.20 (excludes Wythenshawe Park and Heaton Park)
Parks and Gardens- Local Parks	0.49
Provision for Children	0.0265
Provision for Young People	0.035

Accessibility

- 6.5 Appropriate distance thresholds for walking in a straight-line threshold as shown in Table 27.

Table 27: Existing Accessibility Standards

Open Space Typology	Existing Standard (ha per 1,000 population) (Taken from Core strategy)
Allotments and Community Gardens	15 minute walk time
Amenity Greenspace	10 minute walk time (480m)
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	None set
Civic Spaces	None set
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	15 minute walk (720m) City Centre - 15 minute drive time (public transport)
Parks and Gardens- City Parks	15 minute public transport time City centre - 15 minute drive time (public transport)
Parks and Gardens- Local Parks	10 minute walk time (480m)
Provision for Children	10 minute walk time (480m)
Provision for Young People	15 minute walk time (720m)

- 6.6 Access to woodland has not been considered as a separate standard as part of this Strategy, however ANGSt has been considered (see benchmark standards below). In addition, tree planting and access to woodland will be supported in the recommendations.

Quality

Benchmark Standards

- 6.7 National Benchmark Standards are from Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play: Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2020) which replaces FiT's 2015 guidance Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play. Beyond the Six Acre Standard guidance reflects the NPPF, The Localism Act 2011 and the phased introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The guidance draws out new recommendations for accessibility and, alongside formal open space such as sports pitches and play areas, introduces benchmarking for informal open space (e.g. Amenity Green Space and Natural Green Space sites). The latest guidance has been informed by a survey commissioned by FiT in 2014 resulting in a response

from 119 local authorities in England and Wales, representing a total response rate of 33%.

- 6.8 In 1996, English Nature (now Natural England) produced recommendations for the provision of accessible natural green space, this is often referred to as the ANGSt model.
- 6.9 According to the ANGSt model, a natural green space is defined by the level of management or other forms of disturbance, and accessibility is the ability of visitors to physically gain access to a site.
- 6.10 Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework - Principles and Standards (2023) has updated the scope of the ANGSt model, originally published in 1996. These standards are now called Accessible Greenspace Standards and include all publicly accessible green and natural spaces. The Accessible Greenspace Standards focus on access to green and blue spaces within 15 minutes' walk from home and define good provision based on different size-proximity, capacity, and quality criteria set out below:

Size Proximity Criteria

- 6.11 Within 15 minutes' walk, EITHER a Doorstep OR Local Accessible Greenspace
- A doorstep greenspace of at least 0.5ha within 200 metres, or
 - A local natural greenspace of at least 2ha within 300 metres walk from home.
 - AND
 - A medium sized neighbourhood natural greenspace (10ha) within 1km.
 - AND, beyond 15 minutes' walk:
 - A medium/large wider neighbourhood natural greenspace (20ha) within 2km. and
 - And large district natural greenspace (100ha) within 5-km. and
 - A very large subregional greenspace within (500 ha) within 10 km.

Capacity Criteria

- 6.12 A Capacity standard of at least 3 ha accessible greenspace per 1,000, measured at district /borough/ unitary authority-wide scale.

Quality Criteria

- 6.13 The Accessible Greenspace Standards Quality Criteria recommend that accessible greenspace meets the Green Flag Award Criteria, as well as the Access for All criteria based on the principle of inclusive access, and best practice guidance set out in 'By All Reasonable Means – Least restrictive access to the outdoors'.

- 6.14 The Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard aspires to the following guidelines:
- no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2 ha in size; and
 - there should be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20 ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.

Additional Information on Allotment Standards

- 6.15 There is no legal national minimum quantity provision standard for allotments¹⁷.
- 6.16 The 1969 Thorpe Report recommended a minimum provision equivalent to 15 plots per 1,000 households¹⁸, which equates to 6.5 plots per 1,000 population or 0.16 ha per 1,000 population.
- 6.17 The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (NSALG) recommends a minimum level of provision of 20 allotment plots¹⁹ per 1,000 households, which equates to 8.7 plots per 1,000 population or 0.21 ha per 1,000 population. NSALG advises that the standard plot size is 250 sq. metres.
- 6.18 A Review of Allotment Provision for Cambridge City Council²⁰, stated that there is difficulty in considering a standard of provision based on household given the trend of falling household size since the 1950s. The report referenced the Survey of Allotments, Community Gardens and City Farms, carried out by the University of Derby on behalf of Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in 2006, which showed that the national average provision was 7 plots per 1,000 population, which equates to 0.175 ha per 1,000 population.
- 6.19 In the FiT Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play Review, Phase 2 Survey Findings for England and Wales (2014), the median level of provision for allotments, community gardens and urban farms was 0.3 ha per 1,000 population.
- 6.20 A summary of national benchmark standards for allotments is provided in Table 28.

¹⁷ <http://www.allotmoreallotments.org.uk/legislation.htm>

¹⁸ Average Household size in England & Wales is 2.3 (2011 Census)

¹⁹ Based on a standard plot of 250 m²

²⁰ Review of Allotment Provision for Cambridge City Council (Ashley Godfrey Associates, January 2010)

Table 28: Summary of National Benchmark Standards for Allotments

Report	No. of households	No. of Allotment plots per 1,000 household	Population (based on household size of 2.3)	Hectare (based on plot size of 250m2)
Thorpe Report 1969	1,000	15	2,300	0.375
	-	6.5	1,000	0.16
NSALG	1,000	20	2,300	0.5
	-	8.7	1,000	0.21
University of Derby	-	7	1,000	0.175
	-	-	1,000	0.3

Proposed Standards

Quantity

- 6.21 The proposed quantity standards are based on a review of the existing quantity provision in Manchester. The context of open space provision in the City is a strong consideration in setting standards, since the standards should be locally derived based on supply and demand; as well as consideration of the differing nature of the sub-areas across the city.
- 6.22 These considerations lean towards protecting the existing amount of open space through setting standards which align with existing provision, rather than standards which require the provision of more open space, which may be less achievable due to land constraints and funding required to implement new open space.

Allotments

- 6.23 The proposed standard is aligned to the existing provision at 0.10 ha per 1,000 population. There is no FiT benchmark standard for Allotments, but the FiT survey to inform the Guidance states that the median level of provision across local authorities was 0.3 hectares per 1,000.
- 6.24 See Table 28 for further information on benchmark Allotment standards.

Amenity Greenspace

- 6.25 The proposed standard is aligned to the existing provision at 0.55 ha per 1,000. This is slightly lower than the FiT standard of 0.6 ha per 1,000 however new amenity greenspace provision could be provided as part of new development.

Cemeteries and Burial Grounds

- 6.26 No standard is proposed for this typology. There is no FiT benchmark standard because Cemeteries and Burial Ground provision cannot be quantified in this way as their provision is not led by the need for open space and recreation, even though it is acknowledged that they contribute to the overall open space provision of an area.
- 6.27 The standard for Cemeteries and Burial Grounds is based on demand for burial space rather than hectarage of land.
- 6.28 Cemeteries and burial grounds analysis is based on the size (hectares) of the site. Analysis of this typology does not consider the capacity of the sites or death rates which would be covered in the Cemeteries and Burial Strategy.

Civic Space

- 6.29 The proposed standard for Civic Space is aligned to the existing provision at 0.02 ha per 1,000 population, there is no FiT Benchmark Standard for Civic Space. This standard leans to retaining existing Civic spaces.

Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace

- 6.30 The proposed standard is aligned to existing provision of 1.02 ha per 1,000 population for the City as a whole. The FiT benchmark for Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace is 1.80 hectares per 1,000 population, however this is unlikely to be achieved in the City due to its urban nature.

Parks and Gardens

- 6.31 The proposed standard is aligned to existing provision of 1.36 ha per 1,000 population. This exceeds the FiT benchmark standard of 0.80ha per 1,000 population and in part is due to the number of larger Strategic Parks across the city including Heaton Park.

Provision for Children and Young People

- 6.32 The proposed standard is aligned to existing provision 0.04 ha per 1,000 population. This is well below the FiT guidance of 0.25 ha per 1,000 population, however new play provision could be provided on existing sites to enhance the value and function provided.

Table 29: Proposed Quantity Standards for Manchester

Open Space Typology	Existing Provision (ha/1,000)	National Benchmark	Existing Standard (ha/1,000)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Allotments and Community Gardens	0.10	No Standard	0.13	0.10
Amenity Greenspace	0.55	0.60	0.40	0.55
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	0.28	No Standard	No Standard	No Standard
Civic Spaces	0.02	No Standard	No Standard	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	1.02	1.80	1.86	1.02
Parks and Gardens	1.36 (incl. 0.86 strategic parks)	0.80	0.20 - city parks 0.49 - Local Parks	1.36
Provision for Children and Young People	0.04	0.25	0.027 - Children 0.03 - Young People	0.04

- 6.33 Whilst some of the proposed standards are lower than the benchmark standards, these could be addressed by increasing the multi-functionality of other existing open spaces. As an example heavily maintained sites could adapt the existing maintenance regime to create a more natural environment which could contribute to the provision of natural and semi-natural open spaces.

Surplus and Deficiencies by Quantity Standard

- 6.34 Table 30 compares the existing quantity provision against the proposed quantity standard for Manchester to show the future surplus and deficiency for the forecasted population at 2041.

Table 30: Future Quantity Provision against the Proposed Quantity Standard

Open Space Typology	Existing Provision (ha/1,000)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)	2041 Surplus/Deficiency (ha/1,000)
Allotments and Community Gardens	0.10	0.10	-0.01
Amenity Greenspace	0.55	0.55	-0.06
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	0.28	No Standard	No standard
Civic Spaces	0.02	0.02	-0.002
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	1.02	1.02	-0.10
Parks and Gardens	1.36	1.36	-0.14
Provision for Children and Young People	0.04	0.04	-0.004
Total rounded to two decimal places	3.36	3.02	-0.34

Accessibility

- 6.35 Revised accessibility standards are proposed based on a review of baseline data, consultation and national benchmark standards. These are summarised in Table 31.

Table 31: Existing Accessibility Standards

Open Space Typology	National Benchmark Standard	Proposed Accessibility Standard
Allotments and Community Gardens	No Standard	No Standard
Amenity Greenspace	480 metres (10 mins walk)	480 metres (10 mins walk)
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	No Standard	No Standard

Open Space Typology	National Benchmark Standard	Proposed Accessibility Standard
Civic Spaces	No Standard	No Standard
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	720 metres (10 mins walk)	720 metres (15 mins walk)
Parks and Gardens	710 metres (15 mins walk)	710 metres (15 mins walk)
Provision for Children and Young People	LAP - 100m (2-3 mins walk) LEAP - 400m (20 mins walk) NEAP - 1000m (20 mins walk) Other - 700m	LAP - 100m (2-3 mins walk) LEAP - 400m (20 mins walk) NEAP - 1000m (20 mins walk) Other - 700m

Quality

6.36 The proposed quality standard for open space across Manchester provides a local quality standard. The proposed bandings for the quality are:

- Excellent - 90% to 100%
- Very Good - 70% to 89%
- Good - 60% to 69%
- Fair - 40% to 59%
- Poor - 0% to 39%

The proposed quality standard of 60% ensures that all sites achieve at least a Good quality score.

6.37 The national benchmark standard for quality is set out in Table 32.

Table 32: Proposed Quality Standard

Open Space Typology	National Benchmark Standard
Parks and Gardens	Parks to be of Very Good quality, whereas Amenity Greenspace and Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace should be Good as per above. Appropriately landscaped. Positive management.
Amenity Greenspace	
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace	

Open Space Typology	National Benchmark Standard
	Provision of footpaths. Designed to be free of the fear of harm or crime.
Allotments and Community Gardens	No standard in the guidance, but it can be assumed the same standards as above apply to other types of green space.
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	
Civic Space	No standard in the guidance, but it can be assumed the same standards as above apply to other types of green space.
Provision for Children and Young People	Quality appropriate to the intended level of performance, designed to appropriate technical standards. Located where they are of most value to the community to be served.

Value

6.38 The proposed value standard for open spaces in Manchester is based on 'Assessing needs and opportunities: a companion guide to PPG17 (September 2002).

6.39 The bandings for the open space value audits are as follows:

- High - 60 to 100%
- Medium - 40 to 59%
- Low - 0 to 39%

The proposed Value Standard of 40% ensures that all sites achieve a Medium value score.

6.40 Adding value to open space is very important as it enables them to provide more ecosystem services and the benefits that can be derived from them. Value can be added in a multitude of ways to draw out their contextual, heritage, local amenity/ sense of place, recreation, play and ecological value.

7.0 Applying Standards

- 7.1 This Chapter analyses the open space provision in each of the 4 sub-areas across the City. This includes details on each open space typology, including quantity, quality and accessibility. Considering the existing provision against the individual characteristics of each sub-area, including the socio-economic factors, will help inform the most appropriate means of future open space provision. Whilst analysis at a sub-area level provides a level of detail to help decision making, it is not the intention that each sub-area should have equal provision due to differences in population.
- 7.2 Tables in each section provide a breakdown of open space provision by sub-area as well as where the proposed open space quantity standards are being met. Additional commentary is provided about whether there is access to open space, as quantity should not be considered as the only measure of provision, particularly at a sub-area level as people access open spaces regardless of the geographical sub-area boundaries.
- 7.3 Open space data was provided by the Council at the outset of the project. Analysis in this Assessment is based on a snapshot in time. This assessment accounts for a forecasted population increase of 10.15% between 2024- 2041 based on ONS based subnational population, high migrant variant data.

North Sub-Area

Sub-Area Analysis

- 7.4 The North Sub-Area has the most open space both in terms of number of sites and total hectareage. There are 322 open spaces in the north sub-area providing 907.36 hectares of open space.
- 7.5 Map 5 (G10280.01.001B.2) shows open space typologies across the sub-area, there is provision of all typologies across the North sub-area. Parks and Gardens provide the largest amount of open space provision in the sub-area when assessing the total hectareage of each typology.
- 7.6 Table 33 shows a breakdown of typologies in the sub-area.

Table 33 North sub-area Open Space Provision by Typology

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Allotments and Community Gardens	12	12.85	0.10

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Amenity Greenspace	142	140.89	0.55
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	40	72.43	0.28
Civic Spaces	4	1.12	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	70	266.67	1.02
Parks and Gardens	31 (incl. 2 strategic parks)	405.96 (incl. 325.37 ha strategic parks)	1.36
Provision for Children and Young People	100	7.45	0.04
Total	399	907.36	-

Accessibility Analysis

- 7.7 The north sub-area has good accessibility to Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace and Amenity Greenspace. There is some provision of accessible Parks and Gardens, however there are gaps to the Moston and Charlestown areas of this sub-area.
- 7.8 There is little access to play provision across a large proportion of the north sub-area particularly for LAP and LEAP provision. Harpurhey, Moston and Charlestown have limited access to any formal play provision.
- 7.9 Access to all play space provision (including other e.g. MUGA's) is generally good across the north sub-area.
- 7.10 No accessibility standard has been set for Allotments and Community Gardens however map 11 (G10280.01.008) shows the spatial distribution of these sites in the sub-area. Provision of this typology is sparse across the north sub-area, with large gaps in provision towards the centre of Manchester.

Quality Analysis

- 7.11 Map 9 (G10280.01.002) shows each open space and the Quality score from the open space audits.

- 7.12 177 sites were audited in the North sub-area and scores ranged from Poor to Very Good. Heaton Park achieved the highest quality score in the sub-area of 87.1% (Very Good Quality). Kirkhaven Square Play area achieved the second highest quality score in the sub-area of 82.5%.
- 7.13 Andrew Road MUGA, provision for children and young people ranked lowest quality in the sub-area with 16.5% (Poor Quality). Details of these sites can be found in Appendix C.

Value Analysis

- 7.14 Map 10 (G10280.01.003A) shows each open space and the Value score from the open space audits.
- 7.15 Audited sites in the North sub-area ranged from Low to High Value. The highest value sites were NEAP play areas of Heaton Park Play Area 2, and Heaton Park Play Area 3 achieving a value score of 90.9%. Rochdale Canal Amenity Greenspace scored lowest value in the sub-area at 7.1%. Details of audit results can be found in Appendix C.

Central Sub area

Sub-Area Analysis

- 7.16 The Central Manchester Sub-Area includes Manchester City Centre, Hulme, Longsight, Rusholme and Levenshulme.
- 7.17 There are 244 open spaces in the sub-area providing 277.87 ha of open space. The Central sub-area has the least amount of open space provision in terms of hectareage.
- 7.18 Map 5 (G10280.01.001B.2) shows open space typologies across the sub-area. There is provision of all typologies across the sub-area, however there are no Strategic Parks within the central sub-area itself. Parks and Gardens provide the largest hectareage of open space across the central sub-area.
- 7.19 Table 34 shows a breakdown of current provision by typology.

Table 34: Central sub-area Open Space Provision by Typology

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Allotments and Community Gardens	12	18.25	0.10
Amenity Greenspace	67	49.39	0.55

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	26	18.32	0.28
Civic Spaces	19	8.80	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	21	75.77	1.02
Parks and Gardens	40	101.28	1.36
Provision for Children and Young People	59	6.03	0.04
Total	244	277.87	-

Accessibility Analysis

- 7.20 The central sub-area has good accessibility to Parks and Gardens and Play Provision. Whilst there is no specific Strategic Park within the sub-area, there is access to this typology within 710m from Alexandra Park and Platt Fields Park which are in the south sub-area.
- 7.21 There are gaps in the provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace particularly around Hulme, Moss Side and around the universities.
- 7.22 There are some gaps in access to Amenity Greenspaces around Levenshulme and Castlefield areas.
- 7.23 Although there is no accessibility standard set for Allotments and Community Gardens, Map 11 (G10280.01.008.3) shows the spatial distribution of this typology. Provision is only in the east and south of this sub-area with no Allotment sites at northern and western parts of the sub-area.

Quality Analysis

- 7.24 Map 9 (G10280.01.002) shows each open space and the Quality score from the open space audits.
- 7.25 119 open spaces were audited in the central sub-area and scores ranged from Poor to Very Good. The highest scoring sites in the central sub-area were Mayfield Park play area (88.7%) and Glenbarry Close Play Area (80.8%) both achieving Very Good quality scores.

- 7.26 Underwood Close NSN Amenity Greenspace, and Secret Lake Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace scored the lowest quality at 18.3% and 23.3% (poor quality) respectively. Details of these sites can be found in Appendix C.

Value Analysis

- 7.27 Map 10 (G10280.01.003A) shows each open space and the Value score from the open space audits.
- 7.28 Audited sites ranged from Low to High Value. 40 sites achieved a High value score, including St Peter's Square Civic space, King George V Playing Field Play Area, and Mayfield Park Play Area which all achieved a High Value score of 90.9%.
- 7.29 Brynton Road Garden Park and Garden achieved the lowest value score at 7.4% (Low). Details of audit results can be found in Appendix C.

South Sub area

Sub-Area Analysis

- 7.30 The South Sub-Area includes Whalley Range, Fallowfield, Chorlton-cum-hardy, Didsbury, East Didsbury and West Didsbury.
- 7.31 There are 168 open spaces in the sub-area providing 393.35 hectares of open space. There are no Civic Spaces in this sub-area.
- 7.32 Map 5 (G10280.01.001B.3) shows open space typologies across the south sub-area. Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace sites provide the highest proportion of open space provision in the South sub-area in terms of hectareage.
- 7.33 Table 35 shows a breakdown of current provision by typology in the sub-area.

Table 35: South sub-area Open Space Provision by Typology

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Allotments and Community Gardens	12	17.03	0.10
Amenity Greenspace	47	73.64	0.56
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	28	60.84	0.28
Civic Spaces	0	0.00	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	27	121.11	1.02

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Parks and Gardens	14 (incl. 2 strategic parks)	116.32 (incl. 56.23 strategic parks)	1.36
Provision for Children and Young People	40	4.41	0.04
Total	168	393.35	-

Accessibility Analysis

- 7.34 The south sub-area has some accessible parks and gardens provision, however there are gaps in provision at Whalley Range and at Chorlton.
- 7.35 There are also gaps in provision to Amenity Greenspace at Didsbury, Whalley Range and some areas of Withington.
- 7.36 There is limited access to LAP and LEAP play provision across the sub-area, and when reviewing all types of accessible play provision there is no access to play provision in some areas of Didsbury, Chorlton and Whalley Range.
- 7.37 Access to Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace is generally good to the south of this sub-area however there is no access to this typology in some areas of Whalley Range, Withington and Didsbury.
- 7.38 Whilst Allotments and Community Gardens have no accessibility standard set, the spaces are shown in Map 11 (G10280.01.008.4). Allotments are identified throughout the sub-area, except to the east around Burnage and Didsbury.

Quality Analysis

- 7.39 Map 9 (G10280.01.002) shows each open space and the Quality score from the open space audits.
- 7.40 74 open spaces were audited in the sub-area, sites fell in each of the quality bandings. 13 sites achieved a Very Good quality score, including Alexandra Park at 88%. Mersey Meadows Amenity Greenspace was the lowest scoring site in the sub-area (9.7% Poor Quality). Details of these sites can be found in Appendix C.

Value Analysis

- 7.41 Map 10 (G10280.01.003A) shows each open space and the Value score from the open space audits.

- 7.42 Of the 74 sites audited, 29 sites achieved a High Value score, 30 sites a Medium Value score and the remaining 15 sites achieved a Low Value score. The Highest Value site was Alexandra Park (90.5%), Mersey Meadows achieved the lowest value score at 7.1%. Details of audit results can be found in Appendix C.

Wythenshawe Sub area

Sub-Area Analysis

- 7.43 The Wythenshawe Sub-Area is to the far south of the study-area and comprises Baguley, Northenden, Newhall Green and the area around Manchester airport.
- 7.44 There are 199 open spaces in the sub-area providing 331.32ha of open space. There are no Civic Spaces in this sub-area.
- 7.45 G10280.01A.001 shows open space typologies across the sub-area. Parks and Gardens provide the highest open space provision across the sub-area in terms of hectareage.
- 7.46 Table 36 shows a breakdown of current provision by typology in the sub-area

Table 36: Wythenshawe Open Space Provision by Typology

Open Space Typology	Number of open spaces	Existing Provision (ha)	Proposed Standard (ha/1,000)
Allotments and Community Gardens	7	8.10	0.10
Amenity Greenspace	62	49.43	0.56
Cemeteries and Burial Grounds	18	6.89	0.28
Civic Spaces	0	0.00	0.02
Natural and Semi-Natural Areas Greenspace	61	115.41	1.02
Parks and Gardens	13 (incl. 1 strategic park)	147.53 (incl 107.43 strategic parks)	1.36
Provision for Children and Young People	38	3.85	0.04
Total	199	331.21	-

Accessibility Analysis

- 7.47 The Wythenshawe sub-area has some access to Parks and Gardens however there are gaps in provision around Manchester Airport, and Northenden. Access to

Amenity Greenspaces is generally good, although there are small areas lacking access to this typology in Northern Moor and Sharston as well as around Manchester Airport.

- 7.48 Access to Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace in the sub-area is very good, with only small gaps in provision at Baguley and around Manchester Airport.
- 7.49 There is little access to LAP and LEAP play provision across the sub-area particularly at Northern Moor, Northenden, Baguley and Benchill.
- 7.50 There are seven Allotment and Community Garden sites in the Wythenshawe Sub-area and there are large gaps in provision of this typology to the centre and east of the sub-area.

Quality Analysis

- 7.51 Map 9 (G10280.01.002) shows each open space and the Quality score from the open space audits.
- 7.52 78 sites were audited in the sub-area. 22 sites scored Poor quality, 34 sites scored Fair quality, 12 sites scored Good quality and 10 sites Very Good quality. There were no Excellent quality sites in Wythenshawe. Details of these sites can be found in Appendix C.
- 7.53 The highest quality sites were Peel Hall Park play area (78% - Very Good) and Baguley Park play area (77.3% Very Good).
- 7.54 Simonsway Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace achieved the lowest quality score of 13.6% (Poor Quality).

Value Analysis

- 7.55 Map 10 (G10280.01.003A) shows each open space and the Value score from the open space audits.
- 7.56 Of the 78 sites audited 40 sites ranked High Value, 19 sites Medium value and 19 sites Low Value. Princess Parkway Park, and Wythenshawe Park scored the highest Value at 94.7% (High Value). Details of audit results can be found in Appendix C.

8.0 Recommendations and Strategy

Adopt the Recommended Standards

- 8.1 This OSA is in line with the NPPF (2024) and PPG for Open Space, which have replaced PPG 17: Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation (2002) and its Companion Guide, Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A companion guide to PPG 17 (2002). Whilst the Companion Guide to PPG17 has been superseded, the principles and approach within this guidance have not been replaced and remain relevant.
- 8.2 This OSA has reviewed local open space provision within Manchester, including the quantity, accessibility, quality and value.
- 8.3 This OSA has resulted in recommendations for standards which are robust and can form a basis for addressing any deficiencies resulting from proposed development and population increase.
- 8.4 It is recommended that the proposed standards are adopted by the Council to support the delivery and implementation of Local Plan policies to 2041.

Standards and New Development

- 8.5 Appropriately designed and multi-functional open space is essential to provide recreational opportunities, help tackle climate change, create flood risk resilience, reverse biodiversity decline and provide many health and wellbeing benefits for the immediate and wider community. Furthermore, new development is required to provide measurable net gain for biodiversity under the NPPF (paragraph 187) and the Natural Environment PPG.
- 8.6 The results of this OSA should be used to identify which typology(ies) should be included as part of new development. Due to the urban nature of the City, and limited land availability the emphasis is on retention and increase in quality and value of existing spaces. An example Assessment Process for Open Space is provided at Appendix E.
- 8.7 Funding through planning obligations should be used to improve the quality of open space such as Provision for Children and Young People, as well as improving walking and cycling accessibility to open spaces through provision of improved cycleways and recreation routes and connectivity.

Open Space Guidance Documents

- 8.8 A guidance document could be published to outline the open space requirements of new developments to:

- protect, replace or enhance open spaces impacted by development proposals;
- Implement standards proposed in this OSA; and
- Review local open space provision in regard to the increase in population.

8.9 The guidance document could include a broad design guide related to open spaces.

Multi-functional Open Space

8.10 Wherever possible, the Council should look to open spaces to deliver multiple functions, including:

- Recreation;
- Green travel route;
- Aesthetic;
- Shading from the sun;
- Evaporative cooling;
- Trapping air pollutants;
- Noise absorption;
- Habitat for wildlife;
- Connectivity for wildlife;
- Heritage;
- Cultural;
- Carbon storage;
- Food production;
- Wind shelter;
- Education;
- Water storage;
- Water infiltration; and
- Water interception.

Long-Term Management of Open Spaces for New Development

Application of Standards

8.11 It is recommended that the proposed standards are adopted as policy, as part of the updated Local Plan. New development should use the standards outlined in this

document to integrate well designed, quality open space which are accessible for all communities, taking into consideration different age groups, abilities, ethnicities and gender.

- 8.12 Any SHLAA or Employment Site which is currently considered open space should be assessed on an individual basis as part of the planning application for that site.
- 8.13 The standards set out in the OSA will provide the baseline for assessing any potential shortfall or surplus as a result of proposed development.

Management of Open Space

- 8.14 Once development has been granted planning permission, implemented on the site and practical completion has been achieved, the open space on site is usually either transferred to the Council or managing organisation (e.g. third-party Management Company, or resident led Management Company).
- 8.15 It is recommended that a Landscape Management Plan (or combined Habitat and Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan where Biodiversity Net Gain is considered) is required for the long-term management of open space and should be produced prior to the transfer of open space. A Landscape Management Plan should provide the following minimum information:
 - Desktop review of the site including context, designations and history;
 - Site specific information including ecology, arboriculture and public rights of way;
 - Aims and objective for the management of the Site;
 - Management organisation who will be responsible for the open space post-practical completion;
 - Funding of long-term maintenance of the Site; and
 - Procedure of review and monitoring of the open space and the Landscape Management Plan.
- 8.16 It should be the developer's responsibility to inform buyers of new properties of the requirement to pay for an annual maintenance contribution (Service Charge/Estate Fee).
- 8.17 Once open space has been transferred to a management organisation, the Council or other organisation it is no longer the developer's responsibility to manage the open space. It is also recommended that any costs or other resident commitments in relation to the management of open space on new developments (e.g. service charge) should also be flagged by the appointed solicitor during the conveyancing process to residents.

Updated Assessments

- 8.18 To ensure an up-to-date evidence base, it is recommended that quality and value audits are refreshed on an annual basis. Audits should be undertaken to a proportion of open spaces, across each relevant typology in Manchester (e.g. 10%). Audits will provide a picture of any variances to the existing evidence base and will identify priority areas for investment.

Maps

Map 1: Parks and Garden Accessibility (TEP ref: G10280.01.004)

Map 2: Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace Accessibility (TEP ref:
G10280.01.005)

Map 3: Amenity Greenspace Accessibility (TEP ref: G10280.01.006A)

Map 4: Provision for Children and Young People Accessibility (TEP ref:
G10280.01.007)

Map 5: Open Spaces in Manchester City (TEP ref: G10280.01.001B)

Map 6: Population Density (TEP ref: G10280.01.013)

Map 7: Indices of Multiple Deprivation (National) (TEP ref:
G10280.01.011)

Map 8: Indices of Multiple Deprivation (Manchester ranked) (TEP ref:
G10280.01.012)

Map 9: Open Space Quality (TEP ref: G10280.01.002A)

Map 10: Open Space Value (TEP ref: G10280.01.003A)

Map 11: Allotment Provision (TEP ref: G10280.01.008)

Appendix A: Sub-Area Breakdown

North	Central	Central/North	Central/South	South	Wynthenshawe
Ancoats & Beswick Charlestown Cheetham Clayton & Openshaw Crumpsall Harpurhey Higher Blackley Miles Platting & Newton Heath Moston	Ardwick Gorton & Abbey Hey Hulme Levenshulme Longsight Rusholme	Deansgate Piccadilly	Burnage Fallowfield Moss Side Whalley Range	Chorlton Chorlton Park Didsbury East Didsbury West Old Moat Withington	Baguley Brooklands Northenden Sharston Woodhouse Park
*Provided where there are overlaps between Ward and sub-area					

Appendix B: Policy and Strategy Information

Appendix B - MCC Policy and Strategy Review

A key element of the Local Plan is the Core Strategy (2012-2027). This, together with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and PfE Joint Plan (2024), provides the strategic planning context for Manchester.

The current Local Plan is under review, and as part of the consultation phase for the Local Plan, a key issues paper was published in May 2020. The paper lists the challenges that will influence the Local Plan and identify approaches that could be particularly important for development in Manchester. The document forms the basis for the first stage in the consultation process for the Local Plan Review.

Preserving open space is one of the key challenges listed. This is particularly important as future neighbourhoods become relatively denser and therefore, there is an importance to preserve green space in the competing demands for space.

The vision set out within the Core Strategy refers to Manchester as a successful city with a growing economy, an increasing and healthy population and a place where people choose to live.

This vision has been further developed through the council's "Our Manchester Strategy", which provides a long-term vision and strategy for Manchester and is overseen by a forum of Manchester leaders drawn from all the partners – public services, voluntary groups and communities working together for Manchester.

Vision and Objectives

The vision for the City from the Core Strategy DPD states that by 2027, Manchester will be:

- 'A successful sustainable and accessible City in the front rank of cities in Europe and the world.
- A City with a growing economy driven by the strength of the regional centre and Manchester Airport which supports a successful City region.
- Meeting the challenge of climate change at the forefront of environmental initiatives and improvements.
- A City with an increased and sustainable healthy population and a community which both benefits from and drives the City's productivity upwards.
- A City with neighbourhoods where people choose to live all their lives because they offer a wide range of quality housing and an attractive environment where locally distinctive character is conserved and enhanced.
- A City with thriving district centres, which have a distinct local character and provide a good range of accessible public services, retail and local facilities.
- A City which is supported by transport infrastructure which provides sustainable and efficient links locally, within the city, and more widely, between the Regional Centre and workers across the City region. It will also have strong national and international connections made possible by its world class airport.

- A City defined by excellence in urban design and environmental quality, where its distinctive historic environment is understood, valued, cared for and its potential fully realised.
- A City where residents and visitors regularly enjoy a network of quality open spaces, parks and river valleys, enriched with biodiversity.
- An international destination for tourism and culture with the Eastlands area of the regional centre a national attraction for sport, leisure and recreation.'

To achieve the vision of a 'City where residents and visitors regularly enjoy a network of quality open spaces, parks and river valleys, enriched with biodiversity', MCC will continue to maintain and create a network of parks and open spaces that will provide all residents with good access to recreation opportunities. The River Valleys (the Irk, Medlock and Mersey) and City Parks are particularly important, and access to these resources will be improved.

Open Space and Recreation

Open space has a key role to play in the protection of the environment, enhancing the biodiversity of the City and creating habitats. Access to quality open space is essential to health and well-being, encouraging increased physical activity and exercise and contributing to improved mental health.

The Core Strategy (July 2012) (DPD) states that the Council will seek to retain and improve existing open spaces, sport and recreation facilities to the standards set out in the Strategic Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, and provide a network of diverse, multi-functional open spaces.

The vision of Manchester's Park Strategy (2017-2027) is to establish a city where both residents and visitors frequently relish a network of high-quality open spaces, parks, and river valleys teeming with biodiversity, offering recreational pathways, and sporting opportunities throughout the city. To achieve this vision, the Strategy has delineated four strategic themes: the creation of new parks, fostering vibrancy, ensuring maintenance, and promoting productivity within parks.

Climate Change

Climate change will affect both temperature and rainfall in the North West. The Council is committed to implementing all necessary measures to mitigate these impacts and ensure that buildings are future-proofed and adaptable to expected climate changes throughout the plan period and beyond.

The Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 is the City's high-level strategy for tackling climate change, with the aim of 'ensuring that Manchester will play its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change and create a healthy, green, socially just City where everyone can thrive'. The framework outlines seven areas for action to meet the listed objectives, one of them is to enhance and create green infrastructure and nature-based solutions.

Green Infrastructure and Environmental Protection

Greater Manchester's green infrastructure is a crucial life support system for the City Region, offering numerous benefits to residents, workers, investors, and visitors through its network of multifunctional open spaces and corridors. The Core Strategy DPD encourages developers to enhance and expand green infrastructure, improve its functions, and strengthen connections between these areas.

Manchester's Great Outdoors – a green and blue infrastructure strategy and action plan for Manchester 2015-25 has something for everybody and will play a huge role as the city grows and thrives over the coming years. By 2025, the plan affirms that *'high quality, well maintained green and blue spaces will be an integral part of all neighbourhoods'*.

Landscape designations

Manchester has limited areas within the Green Belt, with the most significant part including Manchester Airport and its surrounding land. The Council believes its vision and objectives can be achieved without further altering the Green Belt.

Blue Infrastructure and Flood Risk

Development can help mitigate and manage flood risk by creating storage areas and reducing surface water runoff. They should minimise surface water runoff using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and appropriate Green Infrastructure.

Our River Our City Strategy (2021) is the most comprehensive re-assessment and appraisal of Manchester's three main river valleys (Irk, Mersey and Irwell). It is a bold and ambitious ten-year plan, taking on board and developing further new concepts such as sponge city thinking, where permeability and landscape-led approaches are the norm not the exception. The strategy refers to the potential for a Manchester Blue Space Access standard, identifying areas where there is a rectifiable shortfall in quantity or quality of access to river valleys.

Environment and Biodiversity

The City acknowledges the crucial role of biodiversity in urban renewal. The Council aims to maintain or enhance sites with biodiversity and geological value across the City. River valleys and canal corridors are key components of the City's ecological framework within the emerging Green Infrastructure Framework, offering opportunities for further landscape and habitat enhancement and creation.

The Core Strategy DPD stipulates that the Council will promote consideration of potential tensions between biodiversity enhancement and recreational access.

Air Quality

The council are part of the Greater Manchester Wide Air Quality Action Plan and are working to tackle air pollution.

Water Quality

Water quality affects wildlife, public health, and the appearance and amenity of watercourses. The ongoing growth and regeneration of Greater Manchester must not exacerbate existing water quality issues, particularly pollution from surface water runoff, industrial discharges, and sewerage system discharges.

Developer Contributions

The Core Strategy DPD sets out the requirements for developers to provide or contribute to the costs of appropriate infrastructure that results from the development and/or to mitigate the effects of the proposal through a commuted sum.

Where a financial contribution for open space is provided, the developer will be required to enter into a planning obligation with the council for the provision and maintenance of the open space.

Housing

Approximately 60,000 new dwellings will be provided for in Manchester between March 2009 and March 2027. The City Centre, including Castlefield, Piccadilly, the Southern Gateway, and the Northern Quarter, is expected to experience the most concentrated development.

Sustainable Travel

Open spaces facilitate safe and accessible travel throughout the City. The primary aim of the Transport Strategy for Manchester City Centre is to encourage more people to opt for sustainable modes of transportation.

The Council will strive to make cycling and walking appealing choices, taking into account road conditions, pathways, cycleways, and potential facility needs within the City Centre. Additionally, improved gateways, enhanced pedestrian facilities within developments, and the establishment of pedestrian priority routes through the retail core area will facilitate movement into and across the City Centre.

Economy

Natural England's report 'The Economic Value of Green Infrastructure' (2008) states that environmental attractiveness, enhances the value of property, further boosting the local economy. The approach also recognises that workers with access to open spaces and GI are healthier and more productive.

Design

The Core Strategy DPD emphasises the significance of quality design, which can maximise the utilisation of the heritage and natural environment while enhancing or establishing a distinctive and welcoming character in neighbourhoods.

The Design for Access 2 document provides a best practice guidance of inclusive design standards which the City, including street layout, building design and play area design. The Manchester Residential Quality Guidance (March 2017) further sets out quality design for residential developments and the elements needed to create healthy, sustainable, safe, resilient and attractive neighbourhoods.

Year of the Child Survey (2022)

Manchester City Council as part of its covid recovery planning, sought to gather the views of children and young people on their experience of living in the city.

Some of the important things to children and young people include:

- Safe spaces, safe places – highlighted a need for spaces which they were able to take ownership, as well as traffic and crime free places to socialise and play
- Hobbies and activities – access to creative and leisure activities
- Nature and the environment – cleaner air, less litter, and caring for wildlife were important to children/young people as well as preventing climate change
- Health – identify good emotional, mental, and physical health as important

A cleaner, greener, and safer city was noted as something which would make life better with more green spaces, less pollution/litter and safer roads highlighted. A commitment to nature and the outdoors was also noted, with a desire to see more tree planting and improved greenspaces.

Manchester Play Satisfaction (2021)

Some of the key findings to the play satisfaction survey include:

- Local parks are the most popular place to play by both child respondents and parent/carer respondents.
- Adventure playgrounds, supervised play provision and greenspaces also feature prominently within the responses.
- Common barriers to play for children include parents/carers, bullies, feeling unsafe.
- Common barriers to lay for parents/carers include unkept spaces, distance and cost.

For children, play could be improved by

- safer places to play,
- less litter,
- better parks (with more equipment) and
- more nature gardens.

For parents/carers, play could be improved by

- cleaner/safer parks,
- more play spaces with signs,
- smoke free play zones and
- better play equipment (including inclusive play equipment)

Appendix C: Audit Information

NORTH SUB AREA

Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score

Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
Amenity Greenspace						
269	Harpurhey Park	Amenity greenspace	79	Very Good	47.1	Medium
41	Bignor Street Park	Amenity greenspace	71.7	Very Good	34.1	Low
484	Smedley Fields	Amenity greenspace	69.5	Good	70.6	High
408	Orford Road	Amenity greenspace	64.9	Good	45.9	Medium
78	Broadhurst Park Playing Fields	Amenity greenspace	61.3	Good	35.3	Low
2232	Claytonbrook Road Openspace	Amenity greenspace	56.5	Fair	34.1	Low
<Null>	Damhead Park	Amenity greenspace	56.5	Fair	27.1	Low
355	Lower Crumpsall Recreation Ground	Amenity greenspace	53.8	Fair	47.1	Medium
291	Hewlett Johnson Playing Fields	Amenity greenspace	53.2	Fair	40	Medium
1078	Hugo Street	Amenity greenspace	52.2	Fair	40	Medium
1079	Lightbowne Road	Amenity greenspace	52.2	Fair	40	Medium
695	Tweedle Hill Park	Amenity greenspace	50.5	Fair	32.9	Low
584	Waterson Avenue	Amenity greenspace	48.9	Fair	40	Medium
630	Highfield Street Openspace	Amenity greenspace	47.9	Fair	31.8	Low
1179	Bailey's Wood	Amenity greenspace	45.5	Fair	41.2	Medium
895	Tweedle Common	Amenity greenspace	44.8	Fair	32.9	Low
2285	Greenside Street	Amenity greenspace	39.3	Poor	12.9	Low
678	Alconbury Walk	Amenity greenspace	36	Poor	32.9	Low
1143	Rochdale Canal	Amenity greenspace	18.3	Poor	7.1	Low
Churchyards and Cemeteries						
426	Philips Park Cemetery	Cemeteries	81.2	Very Good	82.4	High
47	Blackley Cemetery	Cemeteries	74.8	Very Good	58.8	Medium
522	St Joseph's Roman Catholic Cemetery	Cemeteries	59.8	Fair	58.8	Medium
Civic Spaces						
57	Angel Square	Civic spaces	66.8	Good	69.1	High
556	Stevenson Square	Civic spaces	66.7	Good	61.8	High
88	Cutting Room Square	Civic spaces	63.9	Good	52.7	Medium
59	Sadler's Yard	Civic spaces	58.9	Fair	63.6	High
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace						
2118	Clayton Vale	Semi / Natural greenspaces	82	Very Good	82.4	High
71	Broadhurst Park 2	Semi / Natural greenspaces	69.7	Good	52.9	Medium
701	Blackley Forest	Semi / Natural greenspaces	57.7	Fair	38.8	Low
707	The Heaton Park Inn	Semi / Natural greenspaces	57.7	Fair	38.8	Low
930	Boardman Brook	Semi / Natural greenspaces	56.2	Fair	51.8	Medium
2207	Bank Street	Semi / Natural greenspaces	48.9	Fair	40	Medium
1002	Belgrave Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	43.5	Fair	47.1	Medium
1022	Moston Fairway Nature Reserve	Semi / Natural greenspaces	40.7	Fair	47.1	Medium
1184	Bailey's Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	40.1	Fair	41.2	Medium
671	Gildersdale Drive	Semi / Natural greenspaces	38.2	Poor	32.9	Low
942	The White Way (Shackcliffe Green)	Semi / Natural greenspaces	36.9	Poor	41.2	Medium
193	Delaunays Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	36.9	Poor	32.9	Low
625	Woodlands Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	36.9	Poor	21.2	Low
1027	Moston Brook	Semi / Natural greenspaces	36	Poor	47.1	Medium
705	Middleton Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	34.7	Poor	12.9	Low
1071	Carisbrook Street	Semi / Natural greenspaces	34.4	Poor	47.1	Medium
1061	Moston Vale	Semi / Natural greenspaces	34.4	Poor	47.1	Medium
<Null>	Welling Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	34.1	Poor	45.9	Medium
796	Harpurhey Reservoirs and Ponds	Semi / Natural greenspaces	33.1	Poor	47.1	Medium
730	Ashenhurst Common	Semi / Natural greenspaces	33.1	Poor	32.9	Low
1147	Victoria Avenue East Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	32.2	Poor	24.7	Low
782	Alderside Road Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	30.9	Poor	25.9	Low
791	Harpurhey Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	30.9	Poor	25.9	Low
679	Alconbury Flashes	Semi / Natural greenspaces	27.4	Poor	27.1	Low
704	Middleton Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	26.2	Poor	12.9	Low
931	Boggart Hole Brook	Semi / Natural greenspaces	23.3	Poor	31.8	Low
717	King Billy's Ponds	Semi / Natural greenspaces	17	Poor	25.9	Low

NORTH SUB AREA

Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score

Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
Parks and Gardens						
279	Heaton Park	Strategic Parks	87.1	Very Good	89.5	High
423	Philips Park	Parks and Gardens	73.8	Very Good	89.5	High
70	Broadhurst Park 1	Parks and Gardens	69.7	Good	78.9	High
451	Queen's Park	Parks and Gardens	68.5	Good	78.9	High
82	Brookdale Park	Parks and Gardens	64.4	Good	89.5	High
54	Boggart Hole Clough	Strategic Parks	62	Good	68.4	High
540	St Michael's Flags	Parks and Gardens	60.6	Good	68.4	High
167	Crumpsall Park	Parks and Gardens	58.2	Fair	57.9	Medium
582	Victoria Mill Park	Parks and Gardens	58.1	Fair	68.4	High
63	Bradford Park	Parks and Gardens	57.2	Fair	47.4	Medium
140	Clayton Park	Parks and Gardens	56.9	Fair	45.3	Medium
140	Clayton Park West	Parks and Gardens	56.9	Fair	45.3	Medium
393	Nuthurst Park	Parks and Gardens	55.9	Fair	63.2	High
431	Plant Hill Park	Parks and Gardens	55.4	Fair	52.6	Medium
110	Cheetham Park	Parks and Gardens	54	Fair	47.4	Medium
404	Openshaw Park	Parks and Gardens	53.4	Fair	52.6	Medium
192	Delamere Park	Parks and Gardens	52.2	Fair	57.9	Medium
478	Scotland Hall Road Recreation Ground	Parks and Gardens	51.7	Fair	42.1	Medium
178	David Lewis Recreation Ground	Strategic Parks	51.5	Fair	68.4	High
83	Old Church Street	Parks and Gardens	51	Fair	34.7	Low
474	Sandywell Millennium Green	Parks and Gardens	50.9	Fair	50.5	Medium
244	Goldstone Gardens	Parks and Gardens	49.2	Fair	40	Medium
50	Blackley Park	Parks and Gardens	46.5	Fair	45.3	Medium
288	Herristone Park	Parks and Gardens	45.4	Fair	66.3	High
231	Freshfields Park	Parks and Gardens	45.1	Fair	27.4	Low
237	Gaskell Street Park	Parks and Gardens	44.3	Fair	42.1	Medium
293	Hexagon Close / Cody Avenue	Parks and Gardens	43.6	Fair	48.4	Medium
103	Baywood Street Community Garden	Parks and Gardens	42.1	Fair	43.2	Medium
946	The White Way (Shackcliffe Green)	Strategic Parks	36.9	Poor	41.2	Medium
349	Lees Street Park	Parks and Gardens	36	Poor	42.1	Medium
Provision for Children and Young People						
329	Kirkhaven Square play area	Children's and Youth Provision	82.5	Very Good	81.8	High
423.1	Philips Park play area 3	Children's and Youth Provision	81.4	Very Good	81.8	High
8.1	Gleden Street play area	Children's and Youth Provision	80.4	Very Good	50.9	Medium
968.1	Boggart Hole Clough play area	Children's and Youth Provision	79.4	Very Good	63.6	High
279.1	Heaton Park play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	77.7	Very Good	90.9	High
178.1	David Lewis Recreation Ground play area	Children's and Youth Provision	77.3	Very Good	81.8	High
279.2	Heaton Park play area 3	Children's and Youth Provision	76.6	Very Good	90.9	High
393.2	Nuthurst Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	76.6	Very Good	72.7	High
393.1	Nuthurst Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	76.6	Very Good	72.7	High
451.1	Queen's Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	76.6	Very Good	72.7	High
140.1	Clayton Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	76.3	Very Good	54.5	Medium
52.1	Sandal Street play area	Children's and Youth Provision	75.6	Very Good	69.1	High
387	Newtown Close play area	Children's and Youth Provision	72.9	Very Good	50.9	Medium
192.1	Delamere Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	72.2	Very Good	50.9	Medium
431.1	Plant Hill Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	72.2	Very Good	50.9	Medium
70.1	Broadhurst Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	71.5	Very Good	63.6	High
12.1	Attleboro Road play area	Children's and Youth Provision	71.5	Very Good	47.3	Medium
232	Gaitskill Close play area	Children's and Youth Provision	71.1	Very Good	47.3	Medium
176	Damhead ball court	Children's and Youth Provision	70.8	Very Good	81.8	High
191.1	Damhead Park outdoor gym	Children's and Youth Provision	70.8	Very Good	81.8	High
177	Damhead Rosy Gardens play area	Children's and Youth Provision	70.8	Very Good	81.8	High
63.1	Bradford Park play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	70.4	Very Good	50.9	Medium
423.4	Philips Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	69.4	Good	47.3	Medium
423.2	Philips Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	69.4	Good	47.3	Medium
35.1	Landos Road play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	69.1	Good	56.4	Medium
29.1	Douro Street play area	Children's and Youth Provision	68.7	Good	56.4	Medium
167.2	Crumpsall Park basketball court	Children's and Youth Provision	67.4	Good	81.8	High
167.3	Crumpsall Park MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	67.4	Good	81.8	High
167.1	Crumpsall Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	67.4	Good	81.8	High
60.2	Bothwell Road MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	67	Good	83.6	High
60.1	Bothwell Road play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	67	Good	83.6	High
36	Barnstable Drive play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	66.7	Good	60	High
82.6	Brookdale Park mini football area	Children's and Youth Provision	66.3	Good	69.1	High
82.2	Brookdale Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	66.3	Good	69.1	High
484.2	Smedley Fields basketball area	Children's and Youth Provision	66	Good	63.6	High
484.1	Smedley Fields play area	Children's and Youth Provision	66	Good	63.6	High
404.1	Openshaw Park play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	66	Good	47.3	Medium
82.1	Brookdale Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	64.6	Good	72.7	High
4.2	Collyhurst Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	63.6	Good	78.2	High
4.1	Collyhurst Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	63.6	Good	78.2	High
478.2	Scotland Hall Road Recreation Ground MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	63.2	Good	63.6	High
478.1	Scotland Hall Road Recreation Ground play area	Children's and Youth Provision	63.2	Good	63.6	High
582.2	Victoria Mill Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	60.8	Good	81.8	High
582.1	Victoria Mill Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	60.8	Good	81.8	High
110.1	Cheetham Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	60.1	Good	69.1	High
563	Talgarth Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	60.1	Good	65.5	High
483	Smedley Dip play area	Children's and Youth Provision	59.1	Fair	56.4	Medium

NORTH SUB AREA

Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score

Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
288.2	Herristone Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	58.8	Fair	69.1	High
288.1	Herristone Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	58.8	Fair	69.1	High
474.2	Sandywell Millennium Green MUGA goal	Children's and Youth Provision	58.8	Fair	50.9	Medium
474.1	Sandywell Millennium Green play area	Children's and Youth Provision	58.8	Fair	50.9	Medium
237.2	Gaskell Street Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	58.4	Fair	69.1	High
237.1	Gaskell Street Park play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	58.4	Fair	69.1	High
349.2	Lees Street Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	58.4	Fair	50.9	Medium
349.1	Lees Street Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	58.4	Fair	50.9	Medium
423.3	Philips Park Pump Track	Children's and Youth Provision	57.7	Fair	63.6	High
60.3	Bothwell Road play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	56.7	Fair	56.4	Medium
110.2	Cheetham Park mini MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	56.4	Fair	56.4	Medium
346	Lathbury Road MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	54.6	Fair	72.7	High
564	Talgarth Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	54.6	Fair	65.5	High
408.1	Orford Road MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	54.6	Fair	60	High
382	Narborough Walk MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	54.6	Fair	56.4	Medium
140.2	Clayton Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	54.3	Fair	47.3	Medium
348	Lathbury Road skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	53.6	Fair	60	High
30.1	Islington Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	53.6	Fair	50.9	Medium
872.2	Alcester Walk MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	52.2	Fair	25.5	Low
872.1	Alcester Walk play area	Children's and Youth Provision	52.2	Fair	25.5	Low
51	Blackley Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	51.5	Fair	47.3	Medium
291.1	Hewlett Johnson Playing Fields play area	Children's and Youth Provision	51.2	Fair	50.9	Medium
97	Riverdale Road MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	49.5	Fair	56.4	Medium
404.3	Openshaw Park basketball court	Children's and Youth Provision	48.5	Fair	38.2	Low
404.2	Openshaw Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	48.5	Fair	38.2	Low
48.1	Rosewood play area	Children's and Youth Provision	48.5	Fair	25.5	Low
110.3	Cheetham Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	46.7	Fair	81.8	High
178.3	David Lewis Recreation Ground MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	46.7	Fair	60	High
240.1	Glandford Avenue play area	Children's and Youth Provision	46.7	Fair	43.6	Medium
267	Harmer Close ball court	Children's and Youth Provision	45.4	Fair	56.4	Medium
178.2	David Lewis Recreation Ground MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	44	Fair	56.4	Medium
291.2	Hewlett Johnson Playing Fields MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	43.3	Fair	47.3	Medium
269.1	Harpurhey Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	41.6	Fair	60	High
192.2	Delamere Park MUGA/basketball area	Children's and Youth Provision	40.9	Fair	47.3	Medium
82.4	Brookdale Park play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	39.5	Poor	43.6	Medium
82.5	Brookdale Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	39.5	Poor	43.6	Medium
82.7	Brookdale Park teenage shelter	Children's and Youth Provision	39.5	Poor	43.6	Medium
192.3	Delamere Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	38.8	Poor	38.2	Low
41.1	Bignor Street Park ball court	Children's and Youth Provision	38.1	Poor	56.4	Medium
70.2	Broadhurst Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	35.1	Poor	60	High
431.2	Plant Hill Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	34.4	Poor	47.3	Medium
63.2	Bradford Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	33	Poor	47.3	Medium
431.3	Plant Hill Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	33	Poor	47.3	Medium
207	Earby Grove MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	28.9	Poor	52.7	Medium
408.2	Orford Road ball court	Children's and Youth Provision	26.8	Poor	52.7	Medium
574	Tweedle Hill Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	24.7	Poor	43.6	Medium
22	Andrew Road MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	16.5	Poor	12.7	Low

CENTRAL SUB AREA

Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score

Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
Amenity Greenspace						
1904	Cornbrook Openspace	Amenity greenspace	76.7	Very Good	35.3	Low
320	King George V Playing Field	Amenity greenspace	66	Good	70.6	High
364	Manchester University, Brunswick Street	Amenity greenspace	64.5	Good	28.2	Low
1951	Parkstone	Amenity greenspace	43	Fair	44.7	Medium
1973	Alston Road	Amenity greenspace	39.8	Poor	27.1	Low
2013	Taylor Street Playing Fields	Amenity greenspace	38.7	Poor	20	Low
576	Underwood Close NSN	Amenity greenspace	18.3	Poor	20	Low
Churchyards and Cemeteries						
245	Gorton Cemetery	Children's and Youth Provision	70.3	Very Good	52.9	Medium
Civic Spaces						
80	St Peter's Square	Civic spaces	77.5	Very Good	90.9	High
1995	Library Walk	Civic spaces	71.7	Very Good	81.8	High
109	Brazennose Street	Civic spaces	71.7	Very Good	72.7	High
62	Exchange Square	Civic spaces	70.6	Very Good	72.7	High
81	Outside Convention Centre	Civic spaces	69.7	Good	70.9	High
79	Great Northern Square	Civic spaces	68.6	Good	72.7	High
1224	Spinningfields Square	Civic spaces	68.3	Good	63.6	High
84	Barbirolli Square	Civic spaces	68.2	Good	70.9	High
501	St Ann's Church	Civic spaces	68.1	Good	72.7	High
73	St Anne's Square	Civic spaces	66.7	Good	81.8	High
179	Deansgate Square	Civic spaces	65.8	Good	63.6	High
1193	Number One	Civic spaces	65.6	Good	63.6	High
108	Castlefield Bowl	Civic spaces	64.2	Good	80	High
66	Trinity Square	Civic spaces	61.1	Good	63.6	High
75	Hardman Square	Civic spaces	60.3	Good	63.6	High
74	Crown Square	Civic spaces	60	Good	60	High
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace						
295	Highfield Country Park	Semi / Natural greenspaces	52.7	Fair	41.2	Medium
2023	Nutsford Vale	Semi / Natural greenspaces	52.7	Fair	34.1	Low
1966	Debdale Reservoir	Semi / Natural greenspaces	48.6	Fair	70.6	High
1957	Debdale Reservoir	Semi / Natural greenspaces	35.3	Poor	24.7	Low
1974	Tannery Way	Semi / Natural greenspaces	26.8	Poor	18.8	Low
2017	Gore Brook Valley	Semi / Natural greenspaces	25.2	Poor	14.1	Low
1802	Secret Lake	Semi / Natural greenspaces	23.3	Poor	27.1	Low
Parks and Gardens						
367	Mayfield Park	Parks and Gardens	78.1	Very Good	68.4	High
185	Debdale Park 1	Parks and Gardens	75.5	Very Good	89.5	High
85	Castlefield Urban Heritage Park	Parks and Gardens	74.5	Very Good	55.8	Medium
559	Swinton Grove Park	Parks and Gardens	64.9	Good	84.2	High
158	Crowcroft Park	Parks and Gardens	64.8	Good	63.2	High
246	Gorton Park	Parks and Gardens	64.2	Good	57.9	Medium
586	West Point Gardens	Parks and Gardens	64	Good	26.3	Low
186	Debdale Park 2	Parks and Gardens	62.6	Good	36.8	Low
1955	Vine Street Community Park	Parks and Gardens	62.1	Good	57.9	Medium
520	St John's Gardens	Parks and Gardens	61.7	Good	55.8	Medium
590	Whitworth Park	Parks and Gardens	59.5	Fair	57.9	Medium
152	Cringle Fields Park	Parks and Gardens	59.2	Fair	63.2	High
42	Birchfields Park 1	Parks and Gardens	58.8	Fair	52.6	Medium
254	Greenbank Park 1	Parks and Gardens	58.7	Fair	37.9	Low
263	Grosvenor Square	Parks and Gardens	57.7	Fair	47.4	Medium
233	Gartside Gardens	Parks and Gardens	57.5	Fair	24.2	Low
467	Sackville Gardens	Parks and Gardens	56.8	Fair	36.8	Low
25	Ardwick Green Park	Parks and Gardens	56.4	Fair	24.2	Low
259	Greenbank Playing Fields	Parks and Gardens	55	Fair	31.6	Low
512	St George's Park	Parks and Gardens	53.7	Fair	57.9	Medium
61	Cathedral Gardens	Parks and Gardens	53.7	Fair	42.1	Medium
102	Chapel Street Park	Parks and Gardens	52.5	Fair	29.5	Low
419	Parsonage Gardens	Parks and Gardens	50.6	Fair	40	Medium
1968	Debdale Reservoir	Parks and Gardens	48.6	Fair	70.6	High
23	Annie Lees Playing Fields	Parks and Gardens	48.3	Fair	40	Medium
557	Sunny Brow Park	Parks and Gardens	46.3	Fair	55.8	Medium
44	Moss Side Park	Parks and Gardens	44.1	Fair	45.3	Medium
310	Hulme Park 2	Parks and Gardens	43	Fair	24.2	Low
86	Vimto Park	Parks and Gardens	42.3	Fair	21.1	Low
598	Wonderland Park	Parks and Gardens	41.8	Fair	22.1	Low
309	Hulme Park 1	Parks and Gardens	40.5	Fair	40	Medium
560	Symphony Park	Parks and Gardens	40.3	Fair	31.6	Low
372	Millennium Green	Parks and Gardens	31.5	Poor	32.6	Low
92	Brynton Road Garden	Parks and Gardens	28.9	Poor	7.4	Low
Provision for Children and Young People						
367.1	Mayfield Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	88.7	Very Good	90.9	High
26.1	Glenbarry Close play area	Children's and Youth Provision	80.8	Very Good	56.4	Medium
320.1	King George V Playing Field play area	Children's and Youth Provision	78.4	Very Good	90.9	High
44.1	Moss Side Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	78.4	Very Good	50.9	Medium
152.1	Cringle Fields Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	78	Very Good	50.9	Medium

CENTRAL SUB AREA

Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score

Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
42.1	Birchfields Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	77.7	Very Good	54.5	Medium
254.1	Greenbank Park play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	77.7	Very Good	47.3	Medium
102.1	Chapel Street Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	76.6	Very Good	50.9	Medium
559.2	Swinton Grove Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	74.9	Very Good	54.5	Medium
559.1	Swinton Grove Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	74.9	Very Good	54.5	Medium
246.1	Gorton Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	74.2	Very Good	50.9	Medium
186.2	Debdale Park basketball	Children's and Youth Provision	70.1	Very Good	72.7	High
186.1	Debdale Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	70.1	Very Good	72.7	High
158.1	Crowcroft Park play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	70.1	Very Good	60	High
233.2	Gartside Gardens MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	67	Good	54.5	Medium
233.1	Gartside Gardens play area	Children's and Youth Provision	67	Good	54.5	Medium
34.1	West Gorton Community Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	64.9	Good	63.6	High
14.2	Basilidon Road MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	64.6	Good	69.1	High
61.1	Cathedral Gardens play area	Children's and Youth Provision	62.9	Good	54.5	Medium
557.1	Sunny Brow Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	62.2	Good	50.9	Medium
375.1	Moss Side Adventure Playground MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	60.1	Good	58.2	Medium
42.2	Birchfields Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	58.8	Fair	60	High
158.2	Crowcroft Park MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	58.8	Fair	60	High
512.2	St George's Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	58.1	Fair	56.4	Medium
512.1	St George's Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	58.1	Fair	56.4	Medium
246.2	Gorton Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	55.7	Fair	47.3	Medium
25.1	Ardwick Green Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	55.3	Fair	32.7	Low
46.1	Rosebery Street play area	Children's and Youth Provision	54.6	Fair	47.3	Medium
23.1	Annie Lees Playing Fields play area	Children's and Youth Provision	54.6	Fair	29.1	Low
152.2	Cringle Fields Park MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	53.6	Fair	47.3	Medium
320.2	King George V Playing Field MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	51.5	Fair	72.7	High
598.2	Wonderland Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	51.5	Fair	60	High
598.1	Wonderland Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	51.5	Fair	60	High
1955.1	Vine Street Community Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	47.4	Fair	41.8	Medium
260	Greenbank Playing Fields MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	46.4	Fair	50.9	Medium
309.3	Hulme Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	45.4	Fair	72.7	High
309.1	Hulme Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	45.4	Fair	72.7	High
43	Rutherford Avenue MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	43.3	Fair	60	High
55.2	St Mary's Playing Fields MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	43.3	Fair	38.2	Low
55.1	St Mary's Playing Fields play area	Children's and Youth Provision	43.3	Fair	38.2	Low
430.1	Piccadilly Gardens play area	Children's and Youth Provision	43	Fair	50.9	Medium
44.2	Moss Side Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	42.3	Fair	60	High
158.3	Crowcroft Park MUGA 2	Children's and Youth Provision	42.3	Fair	41.8	Medium
372.1	Millennium Green play area	Children's and Youth Provision	40.2	Fair	38.2	Low
246.3	Gorton Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	39.2	Poor	47.3	Medium
58.2	Botham Close MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	37.1	Poor	47.3	Medium
58.1	Botham Close play area	Children's and Youth Provision	37.1	Poor	47.3	Medium
252	Great Southern Street MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	36.1	Poor	50.9	Medium
152.3	Cringle Fields Park MUGA 2	Children's and Youth Provision	35.1	Poor	56.4	Medium
42.3	Birchfields Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	30.9	Poor	50.9	Medium
254.3	Greenbank Park 2	Children's and Youth Provision	28.9	Poor	21.8	Low
254.2	Greenbank Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	28.9	Poor	21.8	Low
186.3	Debdale Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	27.8	Poor	25.5	Low
590.1	Whitworth Park play areas	Children's and Youth Provision	24.7	Poor	20	Low

SOUTH SUB-AREA						
Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score						
Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
<Null>	Chorlton Water Park	Amenity greenspace				
	155 Cringle Fields Park Pitches	Amenity greenspace	75.1	Very Good	58.8	Medium
	218 Fletcher Moss Gardens 2	Amenity greenspace	67.2	Good	40	Medium
	37 Manley Park	Amenity greenspace	64.7	Good	73.7	High
	597 Withington Green	Amenity greenspace	62.5	Good	51.8	Medium
	1608 Princess Road	Amenity greenspace	55.4	Fair	38.8	Low
	1537 Stenner and Millgate	Amenity greenspace	52.7	Fair	38.8	Low
	115 Chorlton Green	Amenity greenspace	40.3	Fair	40	Medium
	414 Parkway Playing Fields	Amenity greenspace	35	Poor	27.1	Low
	1612 Mersey Meadows	Amenity greenspace	32.6	Poor	38.8	Low
Churchyards and Cemeteries						
	361 Manchester Southern Cemetery 1	Cemeteries	41.5	Fair	28.2	Low
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace						
	112 Barlow Eye	Semi / Natural greenspaces	75.1	Very Good	58.8	Medium
	1598 Chorlton Water Park	Semi / Natural greenspaces	75.1	Very Good	58.8	Medium
	3302 River Mersey Section (NSN 48)	Semi / Natural greenspaces	75.1	Very Good	58.8	Medium
	3458 Chorlton Brook (NSN 69)	Semi / Natural greenspaces	71.3	Very Good	47.1	Medium
	1656 Ivy Green	Semi / Natural greenspaces	71.3	Very Good	47.1	Medium
	218 Fletcher Moss Gardens 2	Semi / Natural greenspaces	64.7	Good	73.7	High
	1659 Hardy Farm	Semi / Natural greenspaces	59	Fair	41.2	Medium
	1657 Chorlton Ees	Semi / Natural greenspaces	50.8	Fair	58.8	Medium
	3278 Ivy Green (NSN 45)	Semi / Natural greenspaces	50.8	Fair	58.8	Medium
	1235 River Mersey	Semi / Natural greenspaces	31.9	Poor	21.2	Low
	1600 The Hollies	Semi / Natural greenspaces	20.5	Poor	12.9	Low
Parks and Gardens						
	13 Alexandra Park	Strategic Parks	88	Very Good	90.5	High
	403 Old Parsonage Gardens	Parks and Gardens	71.1	Very Good	68.4	High
	437 Platt Fields Park	Strategic Parks	66.7	Good	68.4	High
	117 Chorlton Park	Parks and Gardens	65.3	Good	63.2	High
	218 Fletcher Moss Gardens 2	Parks and Gardens	64.7	Good	73.7	High
	221 Fog Lane Park	Parks and Gardens	63.4	Good	76.8	High
	366 Marie Louise Gardens	Parks and Gardens	63.1	Good	71.6	High
	201 Didsbury Park 1	Parks and Gardens	61.5	Good	73.7	High
	326 Kingswood Recreation Ground	Parks and Gardens	61.3	Good	47.4	Medium
	335 Ladybarn Park	Parks and Gardens	61.1	Good	57.9	Medium
	399 Old Moat Park	Parks and Gardens	56.4	Fair	63.2	High
	99 Cavendish Road Park	Parks and Gardens	51.7	Fair	45.3	Medium
	38 Beech Park	Parks and Gardens	48.7	Fair	43.2	Medium
	418 Parris Wood Open Space	Parks and Gardens	43.2	Fair	20	Low
Provision for Children and Young People						
	399.1 Old Moat Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	79	Very Good	50.9	Medium
	437.2 Platt Fields Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	78.4	Very Good	54.5	Medium
	16.1 Arrowfield play area	Children's and Youth Provision	76.6	Very Good	74.5	High
	437.1 Platt Fields Park play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	74.6	Very Good	54.5	Medium
	326.1 Kingswood Recreation Ground play area	Children's and Youth Provision	70.8	Very Good	50.9	Medium
	437.6 Platt Fields Park BMX track	Children's and Youth Provision	68	Good	54.5	Medium
	124 Chorlton Water Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	64.3	Good	60	High
	105.1 Wintermans Road outdoor gym	Children's and Youth Provision	62.5	Good	38.2	Low
	117.3 Chorlton Park MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	61.9	Good	74.5	High
	117.2 Chorlton Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	61.9	Good	74.5	High
	201.1 Didsbury Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	58.1	Fair	72.7	High
	13.1 Alexandra Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	56.7	Fair	61.8	High
	399.2 Old Moat Park MUGA 2	Children's and Youth Provision	53.6	Fair	60	High
	326.2 Kingswood Recreation Ground MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	51.5	Fair	54.5	Medium
	399.3 Old Moat Park MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	48.5	Fair	60	High
	37.2 Manley Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	48.1	Fair	81.8	High
	37.1 Manley Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	48.1	Fair	81.8	High
	335.3 Ladybarn Park basketball court	Children's and Youth Provision	48.1	Fair	65.5	High
	335.2 Ladybarn Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	48.1	Fair	65.5	High
	335.1 Ladybarn Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	48.1	Fair	65.5	High
	335.4 Ladybarn Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	48.1	Fair	65.5	High
	221.4 Fog Lane Park basketball	Children's and Youth Provision	46	Fair	52.7	Medium
	221.1 Fog Lane Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	46	Fair	52.7	Medium
	437.5 Platt Fields skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	44.3	Fair	54.5	Medium
	144 Clinton Avenue MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	43.3	Fair	60	High
	13.3 Alexandra Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	43	Fair	69.1	High
	13.2 Alexandra Park play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	43	Fair	69.1	High
	369.1 Mersey Bank Playing Fields MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	40.6	Fair	38.2	Low
	437.3 Platt Fields Park MUGA 1	Children's and Youth Provision	40.2	Fair	54.5	Medium
	437.4 Platt Fields Park basketball court	Children's and Youth Provision	38.1	Poor	63.6	High
	370 Mersey Bank Playing Fields basketball	Children's and Youth Provision	31.3	Poor	25.5	Low
	414.1 Parkway Playing Fields play area	Children's and Youth Provision	30.2	Poor	30.9	Low
	38.2 Beech Park MUGA goal	Children's and Youth Provision	29.9	Poor	56.4	Medium
	38.1 Beech Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	29.9	Poor	56.4	Medium
	221.2 Fog Lane Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	29.6	Poor	47.3	Medium
	221.3 Fog Lane Park skate park	Children's and Youth Provision	27.5	Poor	47.3	Medium
	414.2 Parkway Playing Fields basketball	Children's and Youth Provision	18.6	Poor	30.9	Low
	414.3 Parkway Playing Fields MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	18.6	Poor	30.9	Low

WYTHENSHAW SUB-AREA

Sites in red do not meet the proposed Quality or Value score

Site Reference	Site Name	Typology	Quality Score	Quality Banding	Value Score	Value Banding
Amenity Greenspace						
114	Chesterton Road Park	Amenity greenspace	63.1	Good	52.9	Medium
<Null>	Brownley Road	Amenity greenspace	61.8	Good	57.6	Medium
1303	Cotefield Road Openspace	Amenity greenspace	54.8	Fair	52.9	Medium
1220	Ashstead Road	Amenity greenspace	46.1	Fair	37.6	Low
1217	Dorchester Drive	Amenity greenspace	46.1	Fair	37.6	Low
1373	Foxfield Road Openspace	Amenity greenspace	41.2	Fair	40	Medium
138	Clay Lane	Amenity greenspace	37.6	Poor	45.9	Medium
1689	Homewood Road Openspace	Amenity greenspace	36.6	Poor	31.8	Low
1425	Whitecarr Lane	Amenity greenspace	33.2	Poor	34.1	Low
1646	Kerworthy Lane Openspace	Amenity greenspace	32.3	Poor	20	Low
1212	Sandilands Wood	Amenity greenspace	28	Poor	64.7	High
Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace						
1602	Kenworthy Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	49.5	Fair	52.9	Medium
1250	Big Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	46.4	Fair	34.1	Low
1276	Threapwood Road Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	46.4	Fair	34.1	Low
1218	Sparkford Avenue	Semi / Natural greenspaces	46.1	Fair	37.6	Low
1296	Baguley Bottoms Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	38.5	Poor	47.1	Medium
1307	Blackcarr Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	38.5	Poor	47.1	Medium
3212	Sunbank Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	31.9	Poor	40	Medium
1555	Kenworthy Lane	Semi / Natural greenspaces	28.4	Poor	20	Low
1366	Bleasdale Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	25.6	Poor	32.9	Low
1409	Moor Lane Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	22.7	Poor	28.2	Low
1272	Hatchetts Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	22.1	Poor	32.9	Low
1422	Fairlywell Brook	Semi / Natural greenspaces	20.5	Poor	34.1	Low
1632	Willenhall Road	Semi / Natural greenspaces	19.6	Poor	24.7	Low
1338	Greatfield Road Wood	Semi / Natural greenspaces	18.9	Poor	45.9	Medium
1340	Peter's Spinney	Semi / Natural greenspaces	18.9	Poor	45.9	Medium
1362	Fairlywell Brook	Semi / Natural greenspaces	18.3	Poor	38.8	Low
1335	Simonsway	Semi / Natural greenspaces	13.6	Poor	30.6	Low
Parks and Gardens						
1325	Princess Parkway	Strategic Parks	76.5	Very Good	94.7	High
608	Wythenshawe Park 3	Strategic Parks	74	Very Good	94.7	High
420	Peel Hall Park	Parks and Gardens	69.6	Good	68.4	High
411	Painswick Park	Parks and Gardens	68.5	Good	68.4	High
296	Hollyhedge Park	Parks and Gardens	57.6	Fair	68.4	High
24	Culmere Park	Parks and Gardens	56.7	Fair	45.3	Medium
33	Baguley Park	Parks and Gardens	55.5	Fair	78.9	High
270	Haveley Park	Parks and Gardens	53.8	Fair	68.4	High
56	Tayfield Park	Parks and Gardens	53.2	Fair	63.2	High
330	Kirkup Gardens	Parks and Gardens	48.3	Fair	68.4	High
490	Southwick Park	Parks and Gardens	47.7	Fair	33.7	Low
39	Milky Button Park	Parks and Gardens	44.9	Fair	40	Medium
1345	Alderman Rodgers Park	Parks and Gardens	33.2	Poor	63.2	High
Provision for Children and Young People						
420.1	Peel Hall Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	78	Very Good	81.8	High
33.1	Baguley Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	77.3	Very Good	81.8	High
24.2	Culmere Park MUGAs	Children's and Youth Provision	74.9	Very Good	81.8	High
24.1	Culmere Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	74.9	Very Good	81.8	High
600.2	Woodhouse Lane play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	73.9	Very Good	90.9	High
296.1	Hollyhedge Park play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	71.5	Very Good	81.8	High
573	Topfield Road play area	Children's and Youth Provision	70.1	Very Good	81.8	High
600.1	Woodhouse Lane play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	70.1	Very Good	83.6	High
330.1	Kirkup Gardens play area 1	Children's and Youth Provision	69.1	Good	81.8	High
56.1	Tayfield Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	67.7	Good	90.9	High
39.1	Milky Button play area	Children's and Youth Provision	67	Good	87.3	High
458.1	Riverside Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	66	Good	60	High
1287.1	Brookfield Gardens play area	Children's and Youth Provision	65.6	Good	81.8	High
600.3	Woodhouse Lane MUGAs	Children's and Youth Provision	65.3	Good	90.9	High
330.3	Kirkup Gardens MUGAs	Children's and Youth Provision	64.9	Good	70.9	High
379	Mottershead Road play area	Children's and Youth Provision	63.2	Good	81.8	High
611.1	Wythenshawe Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	59.8	Fair	87.3	High
420.3	Peel Hall Park MUGAs	Children's and Youth Provision	56.4	Fair	74.5	High
114.1	Chesterton Road Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	53.6	Fair	30.5	Low
411.1	Painswick Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	52.2	Fair	90.9	High
296.3	Hollyhedge Park play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	51.2	Fair	81.8	High
610	Wythenshawe Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	48.5	Fair	60	High
270.2	Haveley Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	46.7	Fair	70.9	High
39.2	Milky Button Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	46.7	Fair	60	High
460.1	Rodger's Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	46.4	Fair	81.8	High
296.2	Hollyhedge Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	45.4	Fair	52.7	Medium
1287.2	Brookfield Gardens basketball	Children's and Youth Provision	45	Fair	70.9	High
270.1	Haveley Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	44.3	Fair	81.8	High
330.2	Kirkup Gardens play area 2	Children's and Youth Provision	42.6	Fair	74.5	High
490.3	Southwick Park basketball area	Children's and Youth Provision	42.3	Fair	52.7	Medium
490.2	Southwick Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	42.3	Fair	52.7	Medium
490.1	Southwick Park play area	Children's and Youth Provision	42.3	Fair	52.7	Medium
33.2	Baguley Park MUGAs	Children's and Youth Provision	41.2	Fair	72.7	High
56.2	Tayfield Road Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	41.2	Fair	54.5	Medium
411.2	Painswick Park MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	39.5	Poor	78.2	High
305.1	Hollyhedge Court Road play area	Children's and Youth Provision	27.5	Poor	58.2	Medium
1219.1	Sparkford Avenue MUGA	Children's and Youth Provision	26.8	Poor	34.5	Low

Appendix D: Consultation Summary

In total, the community questionnaire received 1,023 responses. Of these, 965 respondents (94%) resided in a ward in Manchester. The largest response was from the Chorlton ward (12.5%) followed by Ancoats and Beswick (7.3%) then Withington (6.5%).

As illustrated below, there was a stronger response from the south compared to the north of the city. For example, the wards of Chorlton and Withington both had greater responses, compared to Cheetham and Harpurhey. To address this, KKP undertook additional consultation meetings at four housing association community events across the north to try and gather local resident's views on open space. This has fed into the qualitative responses within this document.

Q1 – Where are you responding from?





Figure 1 Online Survey Response Locations

Types and frequency of open space visited

The most visited open space typology is local parks, with over 70% of respondents using them. Second was nature reserves (54%), followed by community parks (54%). The least visited typology is civic spaces (9%) and cemeteries and churchyards (14%).

Q2 - What type of open space do you use most often?²¹




To understand the visitor frequency at each typology, respondents were asked how often they visited each one. Of those who visited a local park, over 80% visited at least weekly (31% visiting daily and 50% visiting weekly), demonstrating how important local parks are to communities.

The second most frequently used typology is cycleways, footpaths, bridleways etc, with 69.3% using such provision on a minimum weekly basis (34% visiting daily and 35% visiting weekly). The 34% visiting daily is the highest figure for any typology. This is likely a reflection of its role in people's daily commutes.


²¹ Indoor and outdoor sports provision information can be found in MCC's Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy and Indoor Built Facilities Strategy.

Q3 - How often do you visit each type of space?



It is also useful to understand how long people spend at each typology which can inform what types of amenities are required. Sites where people generally stayed longer (i.e. over two hours), were destination sites, nature reserves and allotments/community gardens.

Q4 - How long do you typically spend at each type of open space?




Accessibility

Method of travel varies dependant on the type of open space. However, walking is the most popular choice of travel to five types of open space including local parks (81%), play areas for young children (71%), general amenity greenspace (68%), community parks (66%), and allotments (57%).

For indoor sports provision (51%), destination parks (50%), outdoor sports provision (44%), nature reserves (43%) and play areas for older children (34%) respondents usually travel by car or private vehicle.


Q5: How do you usually travel to each type of space?




Reasons for visiting and not visiting

The most popular reasons why people use open spaces are for fresh air (86%) and to go for a walk (86%). This demonstrates the importance open spaces have for exercise and mental health benefits. It must be noted that dog walking was also cited as a popular activity. In terms of deterrents to using open spaces across the City, the key factors included the quality of the site (76%), followed by anti-social behaviour (51%).

Q6: Why do you use these spaces?




Q7: What factors affect your choice of visiting an open space site?




In terms of quantity of sites, a slightly greater proportion of respondents (44%) are either dissatisfied (27%) or very dissatisfied (17%) with the amount of open space. This is compared to the 38% of respondents either satisfied (31%) or very satisfied (7%) with the amount of open space.

Q8: Are you satisfied with the amount of open space sites across the city?




Quality of sites

In terms of quality of sites, 50% of respondents are either dissatisfied (33%) or very dissatisfied (17%) with the quality of open space sites. Just over a quarter of respondents are either satisfied (24%) or very satisfied (4%) with quality.

Q10: Are you satisfied with the quality of open space sites across the city?

In terms of improving the quality of sites, better maintenance of sites is the most common answer (78%) followed by greater attractiveness (62%). To improve maintenance, general comments include improving the drainage of sites, regular emptying of bins, removal of low-lying branches and addressing dog mess.

To increase the attractiveness of sites, improved toilet facilities and better lighting within parks are common comments. Also, there is a recognition of the importance to ensuring sites are more integrated with both cycling routes and the public transport network. Respondents were also keen to see secure cycle parking provision at key sites.


Q11: What would improve open space for you?**Qualitative responses**

An open text box was also provided for respondents to provide any further comments. Issues regarding the maintenance and management of sites was the focus. Responses cited that there has been a lack of investment, particularly at certain sites. Site specifically mentioned are Boggart Hole Clough, Crumpsall Park and Wythenshawe Park. Maintenance and quality issues at these (and other) sites included the need to upgrade play equipment, more and improved toilet provision along with addressing the issue of litter (particularly broken glass in MUGAs and ball courts).

Anti-social behaviour was frequently mentioned as a key deterrent to visiting sites and the lack of activities for teenagers at key sites. Suggested solutions include better management of sites, improved facilities such as skateparks and more activities provided in key sites (such as free football sessions).

Some comments cite a lack of green space particularly in areas including the City Centre and East Manchester where it is perceived that open space is being lost to development.

Appendix E: Example Assessment Process





WARRINGTON

401 Faraday Street
Birchwood Park
Warrington
WA3 6GA

T: 01925 844004
E: tep@tep.uk.com

MARKET HARBOROUGH

The Reynard Suite
Bowden Business Village
Market Harborough
Leicestershire
LE16 7SA

T: 01858 383120
E: mh@tep.uk.com

GATESHEAD

Office 26 Gateshead
International Business
Centre
Mulgrave Terrace
Gateshead
NE8 1AN

T: 0191 6053340
E: gateshead@tep.uk.com

LONDON

8 Trinity Street
London
SE1 1DB

T: 020 3096 6050
E: london@tep.uk.com

CORNWALL

Nr Falmouth
Cornwall

T: 01326 240081
E: cornwall@tep.uk.com
