

## Ingham Play Park Sleights

### Summary of Issues

#### 1. Mechanism for Delivery of Project

- Requirements of Lottery:
  - 10 year Lease from SBC to Ingham Play Park Committee
  - Service Level Agreement from SBC Parks and Countryside Services to IPPC
  - SBC undertake inspections, maintenance and repair

Meeting the above funding requirements, gave rise to delays and legal costs

- Financial squeeze on SBC (need to minimise revenue costs):
  - Agreed that IPPC would insure and parish council would reimburse SBC expense for annual and monthly safety inspections
- SBC Accountable Body and Project Management Service
  - SBC need to monitor and control capital cost of project and ensure delivery within budget.
  - Changes to details of scheme needed to be controlled and documented

Given that the IPPC raised all of the grant funding themselves and had a high level of commitment to the project, these restrictions and the time it has taken to complete the project would have been very frustrating.

#### 2. Project and Delivery

- Tight timescale for delivery (LEADER funding timetable)
- Lottery and SBC procurement requirements to comply with
- Very bad weather over winter and need for a 'drying out period' (2 months lost)
- Contractor frustration by changes made to scheme during contract period
- Changes to areas not easy to assess precisely without costly survey
- Cost control concerns
- A lot of equipment on a very tight site – issues of fit, potential impact on neighbouring residents
- No cash to be invested in improving existing footpaths and steps
  - These have since been repaired by SBC at its expense
- Quality issues:
  - General standard of workmanship very high
  - However:
    - Signs. Surface damaged but how not known
    - Quality of grass reinstatement poor, especially bank slide

- Contractor returned to remedy
- SBC Parks have taken over bank slide slope (at contractor's expense). Work ongoing.
- Size and number of rocks next to bank slide
- Ground fixing of chains on Kompan Pollux multiplay unit.  
Action: referred to Kompan. Reply awaited.

### 3. Other Issues

- **Kompan Incentives** offered but withdrawn before the equipment was ordered:

- **'Framework Agreement':**
  - To reduce some of risk of costs resulting from wear and tear or vandalism to Kompan equipment of value up to £50K
  - 'Remuneration of 20% of value of core product'
  - Claimed as either:
    - Additional Kompan product
    - Free parts and spares over 3years from supply date
    - A 50:50 split of the above

NB Cost of Kompan equipment: c.£42K (unless discount offered). Value of this could have been c.£8K

- **'Kompan Galaxy 5 Year Better Than Risk-Free Guarantee':**  
This entitles a purchaser of Kompan Galaxy equipment to free spare parts for a period of 5 years to rectify wear and tear or any damage caused by vandalism on equipment in the Kompan Galaxy range. The following wording is stated on the Guarantee Certificate: 'I understand Kompan will advise me which items of Galaxy are utilised on which sites and cannot be combined with any other package or offer....'

As there was never any contract with Kompan they were free to withdraw this offer and under no legal obligation to honour it. This is also the view of Kompan and Pennine Playgrounds.

Action: Alyson Elder has pursued with Kompan but no action is being taken by Parks and Countryside Services at present.

- **Additional fencing to the north of the site for additional safety and for visual screening for residents on Selstone Crescent:**
  - SBC Environment Services have nearly completed.

### 4. Lessons

- Greater explanation at outset from SBC Officers about:
  - processes involved
  - timescales
  - expectations

- Some form of partnership agreement for use with voluntary groups?
- More frequent site meetings might have helped
- Issue of trust. Could any more have been done to foster greater trust between all parties working on the project?

Matthew Smartt  
Landscape Architect  
Environmental Services