

Date	Originator	Question	Answer
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Why was the equipment originally removed from the OSPF 10/11 years ago and has the questions / issues underpinning that decision being resolved?	The equipment was relocated to provide one single location for children's play equipment. This was so that parents with children of different ages could visit the one site rather than having to visit two separate sites. Any site selected for the new children's playground will be expected to provide a similar single site for all age groups.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Do the emergency services [Police / Ambulance / Fire] have an input to this process?	No. There is no requirement or intention to involve Blue Light services
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	What additional features would be considered for the area if this proposal goes ahead or is it limited the play equipment?	That is yet to be decided. It depends on the site selected. If the Old School Playing Field (OSPF) were to be selected then space constraints would likely limit the facility to play equipment for younger children and perhaps some environmental facilities (trees and shrubs). But this depends on the New Playground Sub-Committee's report and recommendations to the Parish Council.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Specifically, what is within the scope of the proposal?	There is nothing specified as yet other than to provide a playground for children. The Sub-Committee noted above will make a full assessment of sites and facilities that can be provided, accommodated and funded.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	What happened to the plans for a Pond / Wildflower meadow?	This proposal has been put on hold pending the findings of the sub-committee noted above.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Is the proposal subject to Planning Consent?	The only requirement for Planning Permission would be for the erection of the Space Net central pole (as it is over 6m in height) should it be decided to move that to the chosen Playground site. At present it has not been decided whether to do that or not.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	What is the appeal process in the event that I don't agree / support the Parish Council, to UK Government?	The complaints process is threefold: Raise complaints to: (1) the Parish Clerk for consideration by the Parish Council (2) the Mid-Suffolk District Council through the Ward Councillor (currently Mrs Jessica Fleming) and finally

			<p>(3) to the Local Government Ombudsman using www.lgo.org.uk/making-a-complaint.</p> <p>Note however that the Ombudsman can only investigate cases of maladministration (i.e. a failure to follow appropriate processes) and cannot overturn Parish Council decisions if they are made in accordance with due process.</p>
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Who would be designing the proposed facility and what is their professional competence to do so?	The Parish Council is planning to contract out this activity to appropriately qualified playground equipment suppliers.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	In general terms has the Parish Council estimated the investment / usage in terms of a. What it would cost versus how many children, within the village, actually would use the facility? b. Is there a definable use statement?	The New Playground Sub-Committee will be undertaking a survey to assess the requirement, not least because this is a requirement of funding agencies. This will be expressed as a statement of need; a use case or statement is not seen as being appropriate for such a facility.
31 Jul 22	Mr M.T.	Who will be conducting the Risk Assessment for the proposal – HSE requires an ‘Approved Person’ to conduct RA’s. What are their competencies to do so?	The Parish Council will be contracting for a RoSPA-qualified assessor to undertake the Risk-Benefit Assessment (RBA). The RBA together with any actions to manage risks identified will be completed before any equipment is released for use.
31 Jul 22	Mr M.T.	Who will be appointing the quorum to conduct the Risk Assessments?	This will be covered by the RoSPA-qualified assessor
31 Jul 22	Mr M.T.	Who will approve / sign-off the Risk Assessments?	Once the RBA has been completed the Parish Council will take action to eliminate, reduce, isolate and/or control hazard identified in consultation with the RoSPA-qualified assessor.
31 Jul 22	Mr M.T.	Will the Risk Assessments be published?	Yes. The RBA and all measures taken to manage risks identified will be documented published on the Redgrave Parish Council website at http://redgrave.onesuffolk.net/
31 Jul 22		How will the area be accessed?	This depends on the site to be selected. If it is the OSPF then it would be through the access strip off Half Moon Lane.
31 Jul 22	Mr M.T.	Half Moon Lane is frequented by Large Goods Vehicles, usually due to Sat Nav error, the current ‘access path’ to the playing field leads directly onto Half Moon lane and the potential for a	All such risks will be considered as part of the RBA.

		small child to run into the path of an incoming vehicle should be considered as being significant?	
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	As the area is not visible from the road, how will it be managed from the viewpoint of use and the consequences of use / accident and the time to respond?	It is not intended to supervise use of the Playground. The current Playground is not supervised and this is the normal procedure for most Parish Council Playgrounds across the country. Management will be in accordance with the provisions of the “Managing Risk in Play Provision: Implementation Guide” issued by the Play Safety Forum which provides guidance, inter alia, for unstaffed public play areas; RoSPA guidance will also be followed. Parental supervision will be expected of younger children.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	I note that the previously vacated playing field was supported by car-parking, Half Moon Lane does not have car-parking. Also point 4b will impact on this point. Where would parents et al park if they transported children to the area to use the proposed facility?	Parents will be encouraged to walk to the Playground with their children. Should they choose to drive then they will have to find their own parking locations as for any other facility in the village.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	I note that the existing equipment was subject to a recent safety survey and some of the equipment failed said inspection, my question in this regard would be i. Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the equipment installed? ii. What maintenance / repair procedures will be enacted to ensure that the ‘new installation’ would be safe for use and would not place children at risk of injury during use?	The playground equipment will be given a full safety check by a RPII (Register of Play Inspectors International) certified inspector before release for use and then is subject to a mandatory annual safety check. Any maintenance issues identified are then contracted out to a suitably qualified equipment maintenance contractor.
	Mr. M. T.	Noise, how will the installation be managed ‘after hours’ to ensure that neighbouring properties are not impacted by unsocial behaviour i. In the event of unsociable behaviour, who on the Parish Council will be responsible for dealing with this?	There is a well-defined process for the reporting and management of Anti-Social Behaviours which is covered under Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Anti-social Behaviour Powers. This applies to children’s playgrounds as well as anywhere else within the village and defines the actions that victims can take to remedy the situation. The Parish Council will not be providing specific measures for after-hours anti-social behaviour, nor will there be any nominated individuals responsible for dealing

			with any instances of unsociable behaviour. Individuals affected will be responsible for reporting in accordance with the law above. This issue has not been a significant problem to date and is not expected to be so for any site chosen for the new facility.
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Statement: In the event of unsocial behaviour, this will impact on the value of my property as I will have to declare this in the event that I sell my property in the future. This is a key risk due to the 'privacy' offered by the proposed location	Noted and see comments above
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Who will be responsible for the maintenance of grass cutting to ensure that the area does not become a fire risk?	Grass cutting on Parish-owned land is a Parish Council responsibility and is contracted out to suitable contractors
31 Jul 22	Mr. M. T.	Who will be responsible for housekeeping in terms of rubbish collection & removal	It is anticipated that the arrangements for rubbish collection and removal used for the previous playground area will be replicated in the new facility. This involved the provision of bins in the selected playground area which were then emptied on a regular basis by volunteers and emptied in to a Suffolk County Council refuse bin for collection by the Council.
3 Aug 22	Mrs. P. C.	What preparation has the Parish Council made regarding the Old School Playing Field? a) Has the ground been prepared? b) Is their vehicular access to the field in the case of an emergency? c) Has agreement has been reached that the pond previously mentioned will be filled in?	It is not certain that we will use the Old School Playing Field (OSPF). This is one of a few possible sites (albeit possibly the most likely at the moment). As regards your specific questions on the OSPF preparations in the event this location is chosen a) No preparatory will be undertaken until it is decided that this is the site to be used (a Parish Council Working Group has been established to determine the best location (among other things)). b) There is vehicular access to that site for vehicles up to 2m wide. c) There is no pond to fill in. This proposal has been put on hold pending a decision of the location and type of Playground to be built

3 Aug 22	Mrs. P. C.	<p>What discussion has there been with the land owner requesting permission to allow the play equipment to remain?</p> <p>a) In discussion with the landowner was a request made that the licence to continuing using the field be extended on a monthly or possibly 3 monthly basis whilst the landowner decides on their course of action for the field. Good will can go along way.</p> <p>b) Upon the landowner reaching a decision the Parish Council would then have 30 days to remove the equipment – what this suggested in the course of negotiations.</p>	<p>It should be remembered that the Redgrave Amenities Trust (RAT) has had the responsibility for the lease and its extension not the Redgrave Parish Council (PC). The PC has no formal relationship with the landowner. However, in Sep 21 the Redgrave Amenities Trust (RAT) requested that the PC become engaged in negotiations to provide a solution to the problem that the lease was due to cease that month. The PC started discussions with the landowner at that time and the landowner then gave the RAT an extended Tenancy at Will (which meant that the lease on the land would continue on the same terms as before but could be ceased at any time). The PC spent a considerable amount of time discussing with the landowner the options for a compromise between the landowner’s plans for development (set out in an email on 29 Oct 21) and the village’s desire to keep the football pitch, the land on which the Green Hut sits and the children’s playground while minimising inappropriate development. This resulted in an agreed counter-proposal from interested parties in Redgrave (the PC and the RAT with Mid-Suffolk District Council input) on 14 Apr 22 which was intended to be the basis for further negotiations with the landowner. On 19 May 22 the landowner rejected the Redgrave proposals and stated that the “parties are probably too far apart for an agreement to be reached”. On 25 May 22 the landowner terminated the Tenancy at Will with the RAT and directed that all equipment be removed from their land by 26 Jun 22 because they intended to revert the land to agricultural use. We have since had indications from the landowner’s representative that they are only willing to resume discussions if we accept its development proposal of 29 Oct 21 and take the Local Green Space Designation off all of the</p>
----------	------------	---	---

			land. This is an unacceptable negotiating position. So, we have declined to negotiate further.
3 Aug 22	Mrs. P. C.	Mention has been made that the action the Parish Council has taken by removing the equipment is due to renewal of insurance. That statement implies that there is no intention by the Parish Council of providing a play area anytime soon or the policy could have been renewed – to provide cover during the period of negotiation – and then transferred to the new site. Please clarify.	There has been no mention of insurance being a factor in the PC's decisions. The issue was one of safety. A mandatory annual Safety Inspection was carried out on all of the playground equipment on Friday 22 Jun 22. Unfortunately, this required the immediate closure of three items of play equipment: 2 sets of swings and the zip wire. It also required remedial work on other equipment. The decision was taken not to undertake the identified remedial action as we had already been given legally enforceable notice to quit the recreation ground. As a result, we regrettably had to remove the equipment. There would have been an insurance issue had we not closed the 3 items of equipment: namely; we would have not been covered by our public liability insurance in the event that somebody had used the equipment and there had been an accident.
3 Aug 22	Mrs. P. C.	I am however dismayed that the Parish Council do not appear to have enlisted the support of the press to bring this matter to the front of people's attention. Please correct me if I am wrong. I fear that whilst we say we want to provide somewhere for children to play we are not prepared to fight for it and willing to allow our children and grand-children to be 'out of sight, out of mind'.	We have discussed the issue of the press in the past. But this would only have some effect if (1) the landowner was concerned about public opinion and (2) they were in the wrong from a legal point of view. Neither would appear to be applicable here. We have therefore taken the decision that it is better to move to a new site. Sadly, this will take time but it appears to be our best option.
18 Aug 22	Mr. M. T.	Has the RCP considered the field / land adjacent to the Church?	The RCP has considered all land that has been shown to be potentially available either through its ownership or land which has been shown to be potentially available through lease. There is no land adjacent to the Church that meets these criteria.
18 Aug 22	Mr. M. T.	Have discussions stopped with Llanover re options for the future of alternate locations for the Playground Equipment	Discussions between the RPC and Llanover have been stopped as there is no mutually acceptable basis for continuing them. We are aware that other third parties

			may potentially be starting discussions with Llanover and the RPC will support these if needed and requested.