4th August 2011

PLANNING FOR PLAY TASK GROUP – 15TH AUGUST 2011

A meeting of the Planning for Play Task Group will be held at 5.30pm on Monday 15th August 2011 in Committee Room 1 at the Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor P Butlin
Chairman

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes – to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 4th July 2011.

2. Apologies - to receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of:

(a) personal interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(b) prejudicial interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and

(c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a prejudicial interest the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.

Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a personal interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.
4. Presentation by Gateway developers – Matt Gallagher and Mark Rose of Cala Homes, who, along with Bloor Homes are the housebuilders in the Gateway development, will give a short presentation on play provision in housing schemes such as this. This will be followed by a question and answer session. Please note that this is additional to the general presentation for all members that is taking place at 4.30pm.

5. Site Visit 25th July 2011 – to discuss any conclusions that may be drawn from the site visit. Planning notes for the visit together with an extract from the current Play Strategy are attached. Members may also wish to look at the full version of the Play Strategy - [http://www.rugby.gov.uk/downloads/RBC_Play_Strategy.pdf](http://www.rugby.gov.uk/downloads/RBC_Play_Strategy.pdf).

6. Revised one page strategy – attached.

7. Planning for next meeting 21st September 2011.

PART 2 – EXEMPT INFORMATION

There is no business involving exempt information to be transacted.

Membership of the Task Group:

Councillors Butlin (Chairman), G Francis, Hazelton, Miss Lawrence, Mrs New, Mrs O’Rourke and Srivastava.

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Claire Waleczek, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (Team Leader) (01788 533524 or e-mail claire.waleczek@rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.

If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.
Planning for Play Scrutiny Tour Sites

LEAP – buffer 20m, **minimum** activity area 400m², **min** size including buffer 3600m².
NEAP – buffer 30m, **minimum** activity area 1000m², **min** size including buffer 8500m²

**Willans Green – Site 1** – approx 35m x 25m total (875m²), possible triangle of usable space 15m x 21m (about 157.5m²)

**Positives**

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision

**Negatives**

Roads on two sides – main roads through estate. We know that fear of traffic is one of the major obstacles to play and is given as one of the reasons for children not being allowed to play outdoors.

Enclosed with high fencing on 2 sides toward the allotments – no escape routes in case of bullying

Not big enough to comply with minimum LEAP dimensions, and would limit play equipment

Design offered by developer does not comply with LEAP requirements for number of play opportunities and unlikely to provide for number of children on estate

Could children play/meet without being perceived as a nuisance by residents/allotments? Unlikely. We know that children are often stopped from legitimate play and accused of ASB due to conflict of adults who simply do not want children nearby, or consider the noise to be a nuisance. Larger buffer distances and areas for play reduce the risk of legitimate play being seen as ASB and avoid conflict.

**Willans Green – Site 2** – usable space only 5.5m x 29m (159.5m²)

**Positives**

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision

**Negatives**

Roads on two/three sides – main roads through estate

Not big enough to comply with minimum LEAP dimensions
Design offered does not comply with LEAP requirements for play opportunities

Extremely narrow area available severely restricts choice of play equipment ie trim trail

Could children play/meet without being perceived as a nuisance by residents? Unlikely

**Bilton Pavilions – Site 1 – No usable space (22m by minus 7.5m – buffer distances from properties overlap)**

**Positives**

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision

**Negatives**

Road on 2/3 sides – also main road through estate

Too close to houses to use for any equipped play and comply with good practice and guidelines

Some space not usable due to extreme slope leading onto pathway

Already aware of neighbours stopping children from informally playing on the site

**Bilton Pavilions site 2**

**Positives**

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision

On Public pathway for access and informal supervision

Over 30m to brook from neighbouring properties so very good buffer distances

Natural environment

**Negatives**

Very busy road next to site (Bilton Road) although some protection through hedge and ditch

On flood plain so design and also maintenance will be restricted. May also be unusable in certain weather conditions.
Cave Close - Cawston – fence 20m from boundary – approx 25m x 16m (400m²)

**Positives**

Away from Roads

On public pathways for access and informal supervision

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision – could be improved from some properties by reduction of tree canopies

Natural environment

Plenty of room and would be able to expand in future if required and cover more than minimum dimensions of criteria

**Negatives**

Poor drainage/wet area – effecting the safer surfacing and a maintenance issue for RBC.

Turchill – Cawston – fenceline 20m – (approx 17 x 20m but irregular shape, may be slightly under LEAP minimum dimensions). Prime example of a LEAP style design complying with minimum guidelines

**Positives**

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision

Planting offering some natural aspect but limited

Pathway access for access and informal supervision

**Negatives**

Busy road on one side of boundary

Could children play/meet without being perceived as a nuisance by residents? Maybe an issue to only just complying with minimum guidelines

Cawston NEAP

Note NEAP site therefore requires larger dimensions, than LEAPs. However located in a public open space several times the minimum dimensions for a NEAP.
**Positives**

Great size and great buffer distances so no limits to potential usage or design. Could become a destination park for the estate, and also for Rugby and beyond.

Pathway access for access and informal supervision

Considerable distance to roads

Next to school with likely high usage and benefits to community, and reducing barriers to play

Overlooked by properties for informal supervision

**Natural Environment**

**Negatives**

No major negative implications for play provision
PLANNING FOR PLAY IN NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

What is the broad topic area?
Provision of land for play in new housing developments in terms of quantity, location, suitability and timing.

What is the specific topic area?
There have been instances of housing developments having inappropriate land allocated for play. The purpose of the review is to find out why this has happened and how it can be prevented in future.

What is the ambition of the review?
Provision of high quality play provision in all new housing developments which meets the needs of local residents and is sustainable.

How well do we perform at the moment?
Past developments show varying levels of performance. There are some very good examples and some which are considered to be very poor in terms of play provision. This could be linked to differing governmental planning agendas over the years.

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?
The Play Partnership; a developer; residents' groups; users of current play areas. Task group members will visit developments to see examples of good and less good provision.

What other help do we need?
Officers from Planning, Recreation and Parks & Open Spaces will need to attend certain meetings. As a result of restructuring and existing workloads in these areas, there is limited officer capacity to support the review. The task group’s work programme should be designed so that attendance is selective rather than requiring blanket attendance at every meeting.

How long should it take?
To be complete by December 2011 to feed into the revised Play Strategy which is due to be published early in 2012.

What will be the outcome?
The task group will produce concise recommendations for incorporation in planning strategy and policy documents and feeding into the Play Strategy.