

Ser No.	Originator	Question	Answer
1	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.
2	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
3	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.
4	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.
5	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.
6	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.
7	Mr. M. T.	What is the appeal process in the event that I don't agree / support the Parish Council, to UK Government?	<p>The complaints process is threefold: Raise complaints to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) the Parish Clerk for consideration by the Parish Council</li> <li>(2) the Mid-Suffolk District Council through the Ward Councillor (currently Mrs Jessica Fleming) and finally</li> <li>(3) to the Local Government Ombudsman using <a href="http://www.lgo.org.uk/making-a-complaint">www.lgo.org.uk/making-a-complaint</a>.</li> </ul> <p>Note however that the Ombudsman can only investigate cases of maladministration (i.e. a failure to follow appropriate processes)</p>

			and cannot overturn Parish Council decisions if they are made in accordance with due process.
8	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.
9	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.
10	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.
11	Mr M.T.	Who will be appointing the quorum to conduct the Risk Assessments?	This will be covered by the RoSPA-qualified assessor
12	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.
13	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 <a href="http://redgrave.onesuffolk.net/">http://redgrave.onesuffolk.net/</a>
14	Mr M.T.	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.
15	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 small child to run into the path of an incoming vehicle should be considered as being significant?	All such risks will be considered as part of the RBA.
16	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.
17	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.
18	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.
19	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.
20	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

21	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
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.
23	Mrs. P. C.	<p>What preparation has the Parish Council made regarding the Old School Playing Field?</p> <p>a) Has the ground been prepared?</p> <p>b) Is their vehicular access to the field in the case of an emergency?</p> <p>c) Has agreement has been reached that the pond previously mentioned will be filled in?</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>As regards your specific questions on the OSPF preparations in the event this location is chosen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)).</li> <li>b) There is vehicular access to that site for vehicles up to 2m wide.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
24	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>	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

			<p>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 land. This is an unacceptable negotiating position. So, we have declined to negotiate further.</p>
25	Mrs. P. C.	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

26	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.
27	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.
28	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.
29	Mr. V J	There is no mention now or anytime in the future of the provision of a football pitch, is this an oversight or is it considered that there is no interest in considering what has been a very important part of the history of the village and until the cancellation of the lease was regularly used	The Proposal paper addresses the provision of facilities for which the Parish Council is responsible. The Redgrave Amenities Trust (RAT) has had historic responsibility for provision and maintenance of a football pitch and wishes to retain this role. The RPC respects this wish. The RAT is undertaking its own negotiations for the re-provision of a football pitch in the village.
30	Mr M.T.	Location: your document, page 12 lists a 'central location' as an essential criteria, the OSPF is 0.5 miles from the centre of the village, how then to you justify the OSPF as an option?	We have deliberately not defined the term 'Central Location' relying on reasonable interpretation. But the basic criteria used were that the facility was be within the village settlement boundary plus the area of the Old Recreation Ground (which is currently outside the village boundary).
31	Mr M.T.	Site Assessment Table: can you clarify why 'Parking' is a desirable criteria? - I would have expected this to be essential so as to avoid the potential for Children to be injured road by traffic on the way too, and from, the OSPF? [see copy of my Risk Assessment]	That remains the RPC's judgement

32	Mr M.T.	The Land Behind Churchway: as you reports indicates, would appear to be a strong fit for the requirement. Why is the RCP / RCP WG not progressing this as the prime option? As it has the potential to incorporate all three Phases it makes better use of funds and reduces 're work' in terms of relocating equipment form Phase 1 to Phases 2/3??	The Parish Council is progressing this as discussed in the paper.
33	Mr M.T.	Land Options: What and where is the list of all land options considered and how were they down selected	This is described to our satisfaction in the paper.
34	Mr M.T.	Llanover: Why has the RCP ceased discussions with Llanover and what legal advice was taken to stop discussions? It is unclear as to who is not talking to who. The document refers to 'builders' [page 13]. What relationship does a 'third party builder' have with the RCP?	This has already been answered largely by our answer to your previous question (Ser No 29). No legal advice was taken or considered necessary. See Ser 35 below for the rest of the answer regarding third parties.
35	Mr M.T.	Third party Builder: Is the recreation ground now leased / owned by a 'third party builder'?	No. The property remains in the ownership of Llanover Estate. We are aware of possible discussions with a third-party builder and this may or may not change the status of (some of) the but we are not in a position to discuss any possible negotiations at this stage.
36	Mr M.T.	Redgrave Church Land: Was the land adjacent to Redgrave Church considered? It appears under-utilised, also there maybe benefit due to the proximity of Star Wings	We are not clear as to what land you mean. You would need to provide us with details/map to make that clear. However, in general most of the land in the vicinity of the Church belongs to Llanover Estate and as this body is unwilling to give us a lease on the Old Recreation Ground it seems improbable that it would do so on other land that they own. Furthermore. You raise a concern at Ser no 30 that the OSPF is not central to the village. Such land seems to be even less central and way outside the village settlement boundary. It would therefore not be considered a suitable site for the new Playground.
37	Mr M.T.	Appeal / Objection Process: Why is there no formal process, on the RCP website, for formal objections / appeals?	Policy due for adoption by RPC ats its next meeting on 6 Oct 22.
38	Mr M.T.	Lease Period: Why is a 25 year lease a limiting factor when the asset life of the play equipment, if properly maintained is 10-15 years?	Because agencies that award funding and grants demand security of tenure for 25years

39	Mr M.T.	Phasing: What is the outline for Phase 2 & Phase 3?	As indicated in the Proposals Paper this is for later consideration and no timescales or outline plans have yet been developed
40	Mr M.T.	Rickingham facilities: Was an alliance with Rickingham considered? It has parking and buildings that could be used, sharing the facilities could have financial benefits it terms of (question left unfinished?)	No. Nor will it be considered. The facilities are required to be local. Note comments about being central is serial numbers 30 and 36 above
41	Mr M.T.	Risk Assessment: Why was a Risk Assessment not completed as part of the selection process, as this will identify any safety factors before any works are executed?	Because we are not in a position to make Risk Benefit Assessment (RBA) for all sites prior to selection. We need to have a preferred site on which to make the RBA.
42	Mr M.T.	Your proposal indicates that all of my questions were answered, this is not the case and is mis-leading for anyone reading the text. Do you intend to correct?	No. We believe that we have answered all of your questions and invited you to resubmit new questions if you believe this to be the case. You agreed to do this; hence this latest raft of questions.
43	Mr M.T.	Environmental Impact: on the local wildlife [Owls / Sparrow-Hawks / Bats / Snakes / Deer etc.], has this being considered as part of the selection process?	The potential ecological effects of site playground equipment in the OSPF have been considered in the site selection process. The installation of the equipment would avoid the hedgerows and trees around the boundaries of the OSPF that are likely to be of greatest value for wildlife. The equipment will occupy approx. 1/3 <sup>rd</sup> of the grassland area, with the remaining area of the OSPF retained as grassland or planted with scrub and small trees (including orchard trees) to enhance the biodiversity value of the site while also providing additional value for local users of the OSPF. The operational use of the OSPF will involve occasional recreational use by village residents and/or visitors to the village. This use of the equipment is likely to be during daylight hours (the site will not be illuminated) and for relatively short periods of time. Therefore, the potential for disturbance to wildlife is unlikely to be significant. The planting of hedgerows in gaps along the boundary and alongside the existing hedgerows will enhance the existing habitats and provide a buffer, while creating shelter and cover for animals that use the field.
44	Mr M.T.	Access to OSPF: who owns the strip of land that connects the OSPF with Half Moon Lane? And does the RCP have authority / permission to use it?	The land is not registered and so not recognised as being owned by anyone. The RPC has "the benefit of a right with or without vehicles over the land".



45	Mr M.T.	Police Contacts: Who is the Police contact for Redgrave Village?	Eye Police
46	Mr M.T.	Maintenance: As the original play equipment failed an inspection due to lack of maintenance, how does the RCP intend to manage / maintain the new equipment so as to prevent the potential of injury to children during use and also for the protection of the asset value / investment?	See the Proposals document
47	Mr M.T.	Population of Redgrave: Annex C of the questionnaire analysis indicates that there are 150 children in Redgrave between the ages of 0 to 17, yet the National Census Records indicate a figure of 60 - why the discrepancy as I assume the National Census records to be legally correct?	Many of the respondents answered on behalf of visiting grandchildren who use the playground regularly when staying. We are content that this is a genuine reflection of the total usage and demand
48	Mr M.T.	Management: How do you intend to 'manage' the OSPF to use by children up to the age of 12 years old	Question previously answered – See Item 16 above
49	Mr M.T.	Safety of Users: If the intent is to provide an area for social gathering, then how do you allow for vehicle parking?	We do not intend to allow for parking at the OSPF
50	Mr M.T.	Justification: Usage for the proposal is 20% of the village community, if you consider 100 people responded out of a population of 240 [40%] and you state 50% [50% of 40% = 20%] indicates a 'need' - how will this justify investment?	We are content that the process described meets normal democratic survey processes
51	Mr M.T.	OSPF Location: The claim is made on the Site Assessment Table [Table 1] that the OSPF is near the Village Centre, according to Google Maps and using the outer most buildings with the Parish, the OSPF is 650 metres from the Village Centre and 350 metres from the current facilities. The statement re location is mis-leading and should be corrected.	See answer already given at Item 30 above.
52	Mr M.T.	OSPF LOCATION: your document, page 12 lists a 'central location' as an essential criteria, the OSPF is 0.5 miles from the centre of the village, how then to you justify the OSPF as an option?	We do not intend to keep answering this question. See Items 30 and 51 above
53	Mr J D	The children at Redgrave go to school at Botesdale, and consequently have friends there, coincidentally where they have a recreation area under construction. Would it not be in	That was indeed the intention with the Wildlife Friendly Garden project that we intended and got initial funding for. But we cannot ignore the demand for a children's playground. So, the current

		<p>Redgrave's interests to build a nature reserve instead of recreation ground where children could educate themselves about the wonders of nature. There is an abundance of wildlife on the above, numerous birds including endangered species such as sparrows, long tailed tits, dunlins, jays, sparrow hawks and barn owls. Not to mention other wildlife, hedgehogs, bats, toads, newts, adders, grass snakes, and assorted insects, It would be nice for children to learn about wild life instead of having to be amused all of the time. There could be picnic areas for parents, and seats so that us old folks, after all, there must be more retirees in Redgrave than children.</p>	<p>proposal, unless we can find somewhere suitable. Is to use about one third of the OSPF for the children's playground equipment but to embed it in nature. So, this would mean taking out the pond from the previous proposal but continuing to develop all of the other proposals for the Wildlife Friendly Garden, namely more trees and a wildflower meadow and an enhanced thicket to encourage birds (such as turtle doves) and other wildlife.</p> <p>We are still looking at an alternative location for the Children's Playground, as detailed in our Proposal Paper on the website, and if this can be negotiated with the landowner than that would likely be our preferred location. But in the meanwhile the OSPF remains our only practical option.</p>
--	--	---	--