

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ACTION AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SCRAIP)

Committee: COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: 22 April 2013

Minute N^o: 84

Topic: Play Areas Review

Recommendationⁱ	Cabinet Memberⁱⁱ	Responseⁱⁱⁱ	Timetable^{iv}	Lead Officer^v
<p>It was recommended that:</p> <p>The Committee agrees that the Cabinet Member for Community and Leisure Services continue to investigate Option 3 and report back to the Committee with further details which should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed costings about the proposals including potential savings relating to the economies of scale that may be achieved; 	<p>Councillor John A Wilson</p>	<p>Costings Current situation</p> <p>There are currently 69 MBC Play areas across the borough. On average play areas need complete replacement at least every 15 years with the busier ones, such as Mote Park, needing major refurbishment every 7-8 years.</p> <p>Currently 51 of MBC's play areas will need work of varying degrees in the next 5 years to get to and maintain them at green standard.</p> <p>The current capital budget for replacement/ refurbishment of MBC play areas is £100,000 a year.</p> <p>To replace all of the MBC play areas would cost over £3m and with current budgets would take over 40 years. This takes no account for increases in costs of equipment or budgets.</p> <p>This demonstrates that maintaining the current number of play areas, with the current level of capital, is not a realistic</p>		<p>Jason Taylor</p>

Appendix B

		<p>option.</p> <p>Currently not all of our play areas are in a position where they need total refurbishment but 51 out of the 69 MBC play areas do need work of varying degrees to get them up to green standard. The longer it takes to get a proactive programme in place the greater the speed at which the quality of the councils play areas will decrease.</p> <p>Information on costings for proposed</p> <p>In the last meeting a number of options for managing MBC Play Areas in the future were discussed.</p> <p>The third option discussed at the meeting would mean instigating a new standard of play provision across the borough of "the majority of residents being a maximum of 12 minutes walk from an amber or green play area"</p> <p>In this option once a play area decreased to the amber standard it would then be targeted for improvement, before it dropped to red standard. These green, amber and red standards refer to the current standards detailed in the play area scoring matrix.</p> <p>The mapping exercise carried out identified that if the standard of "the majority of residents being a maximum of 12 minutes walk from an amber or green play area" were to be adopted then there would potentially be 20 MBC play areas</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix B

		<p>that were not strategically important in achieving this standard. These non Strategically Important Play Areas (SIPA's) would be offered to the community to take over or closed in time.</p> <p>The cost to bring the SIPA's from their current to green standard would be approximately £1.8m as detailed in the presentation. There is a slight variation in whether this is done in 1 or 5 years.</p> <p>This £1.8m is based on the standard of all of the play areas when they were last scored at the beginning of 2013 and further deterioration will have an effect on the cost of getting them back to green standard.</p> <p>Information showing the standard of all of the play areas across the borough when they were inspected in January this year is enclosed with this response. Information detailing what is required to bring all MBC play areas to green standard is held by the Parks section.</p> <p>The current revenue budget for play area maintenance would also need to be increased as detailed in the presentation to scrutiny.</p> <p>The 12 minute standard refers to toddler and Junior play areas. Youths facilities such as Skate Parks and Multi Use Games areas were not included, as teenagers travel further to use the facilities that they want to use rather than the one which is local to them. However all existing youth facilities will be brought up to green standard as part of this proposal.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Appendix B

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on ownership and different ownership models for play areas, this should include Parish ownership and the support through the Parish Service Scheme; 		<p>Ownership</p> <p>Currently 40 play areas in the borough belong to parish councils, KCC and housing associations. A number of the SIPA's network will belong to the parishes and these other bodies. Currently if a parish council provides a play area in an area that MBC does not, a revenue payment is given to that Parish council, as they are effectively providing play on behalf of MBC.</p> <p>If in the future MBC were to no longer provide a play area and the Parish Play area became the SIPA then the Parish Council would receive a revenue payment from MBC through the parish services scheme</p> <p>Option three also proposes that a grant of £10,000 be available to Parish Councils that provide SIPA's to be used toward new equipment.</p> <p>Currently the parishes receive no contribution from MBC towards the improvement of their play areas.</p> <p>Non-SIPA's that are owned by MBC will be offered to community groups, such as parishes, Housing Association, Community Groups, Trusts, etc, to take on. MBC cannot offer financial support to these groups, as these play areas would not be strategically important, they would provide help and support to these groups in areas such as play area management, maintenance suppliers and sources of funding. It may also be possible to carry out safety inspections.</p>		
---	--	---	--	--

Appendix B

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information on the 12 minute standard for most residents; and Clarity on which payments are from the Capital Budget and which monies are from the Revenue Budget. 		<p>These non SIPA's could be taken on either by lease from MBC or the Freehold ownership could be passed on.</p> <p>Walking Distances</p> <p>GIS mapping of all play areas was carried out to establish walking distances between play areas and homes. This identified areas of over and under provision.</p> <p>Using an average walking speed of 3 miles an hour the following distances were tested as reasonable walking times from the play areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 804m = 10 minutes walking time 965m = 12 minutes walking time <p>When mapping this out boundaries such as the river, main roads and the railways were taken into account.</p> <p>GIS maps were built showing the walking distances from play areas and the overall provision of each play area.</p> <p>Capital and Revenue</p> <p>Revenue is used for repairs of play equipment or safety surfacing</p> <p>Capital is used to refurbish, replace or renew play equipment, safety surfacing, supplementary items or whole play areas.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Notes on the completion of SCRAIP

ⁱ Report recommendations are listed as found in the report.

ⁱⁱ Insert in this box the Cabinet Member whose portfolio the recommendation falls within.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box either the acceptance or rejection of the recommendation.

If the recommendation is rejected an explanation for its rejection should be provided. The 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes can be left blank

If the recommendation is accepted an explanation of the action to be taken to implement the recommendation should be recorded in this box. Please also complete the 'timetable' and 'lead officer' boxes.

^{iv} The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box when the action in indicated in the previous box will be implemented.

^v The Officer/Cabinet Member responsible for responding to the recommendation should indicate in this box the Officer responsible for the implementation of the action highlighted in the 'response' box.