

www.landuse.co.uk

Shepway Play Area Review

Prepared by LUC June 2017

Project Title: Shepway Play Area Review

Client: Shepway District Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
4.0	16/06/17	Fourth issue	Sebastian West Veni Tzampoura	Matthew Parkhill	Philip Smith



www.landuse.co.uk

Shepway Play Area Review

Prepared by LUC June 2017

Planning & EIA Design Landscape Planning Landscape Management Ecology Mapping & Visualisation

LUC LONDON 43 Chalton Street London NW1 1JD T +44 (0)20 7383 5784 Iondon@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in: Bristol Glasgow Edinburgh



Land Use Consultants Ltd Registered in England Registered number: 2549296 Registered Office: 43 Chalton Street London NW1 1DD LUC uses 100% recycled paper

FS 566056 EMS 566057

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Purpose Current achievements and the future	1 4
	International, national, regional and local framework	4
	The Shepway context	9
2	Method followed for the Play Area Review	14
	Steps 1 and 2: Understanding the context and site audits	14
	Step 3: Consultation	15
	Step 4: Analysis of the findings Step 5: Development and application of standards	17 17
	Step 6: Conclusions and recommendations	18
3	Play provision in Shepway	19
	The need for play provision	19
	Quantity assessment	21
	Accessibility assessment Overall scores	29 32
	Location assessment	34
	Value assessment	36
	Quality assessment	38
	Summary of feedback from public consultation	41
	Summary of feedback from stakeholder consultation	46
4	Proposed standards	49
	Application of standards and ratings	50
	Combined assessment findings	54
5	Conclusions and recommendations	55
Арре	endix 1: Workshop attendees	56
Арре	endix 2: Ownership and management responsibilities of play areas	58
Арре	endix 3: Completed audit forms	61
Tabl		
	e 1.1: Accessibility standards for children's playing space	5
	e 3.1: Ownership and management of play areas in Shepway	21
	e 3.2: Existing provision by classification	23
	e 3.3: Provision of play areas by geographical area e 3.4: Provision by location and classification	25 25
	e 3.5: Provision for indicative age groups by location	25
	e 3.6: Designated equipped playing space by geographical area	20
	e 3.7: Accessibility benchmark standards for children's playing space	29
	2 3.8: Average overall scores by ward	32
Table	e 3.9: Average location scores by ward	34

Table 3.10: Average play value scores by ward	36
Table 3.11: Average value score by classification	36
Table 3.12: Average quality scores by ward	38
Table 3.13: Average quality score by classification	41
Table 3.14: Existing play area provision - stakeholder workshop thoughts	47
Table 3.15: Prioritising future enhancement and working with the local community – stakeholder	
workshop thoughts	48
Table 4.1: Proposed standards for play provision in Shepway	49

Figures

Figure 1.1: Location plan	3
Figure 1.2: Expected population projection in Shepway 2001-2031	10
Figure 1.3: Population of Shepway by age group	11
Figure 1.4: Proportion of children in poverty in Shepway by age group	12
Figure 2.1: Play Area Review study method	14
Figure 3.1: Play provision: Indicators of need	20
Figure 3.2: Play areas by classification	24
Figure 3.3: Fields in Trust quantity standard by ward	28
Figure 3.4: Play area accessibility (North Shepway)	30
Figure 3.5: Play area accessibility (South Shepway)	31
Figure 3.6: Overall score by site	33
Figure 3.7: Location score by site	35
Figure 3.8: Value score by site	37
Figure 3.9: Quality score by site	40
Figure 3.10: Frequency of use of equipped play provision	42
Figure 3.11: Mode of travel to equipped play facilities	43
Figure 3.12: Duration of travel to play facilities	44
Figure 3.13: Level of satisfaction with quantity and quality of equipped play facilities	45
Figure 3.14: Level of satisfaction with quantity and quality of other facilities for young people	46
Figure 4.1: Location ratings per site	52
Figure 4.2: Quality and value ratings per site	53

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Shepway District Council (SDC) recognises that the provision of free outdoor play space is seen as a vital ingredient in ensuring the all-round, healthy development of children, young people, adults and older people in an era of declining levels of physical and social interaction and activity. Parts of the District have higher rates of childhood and adult obesity, with associated risks for the population including morbidity, disability and premature death. This Strategy aims to help reduce these risks.
- 1.2 In order to develop a meaningful and robust strategy for the future of play area provision in the district, it is important to have a clear understanding of existing provision and the way in which it is delivered.
- 1.3 This Play Area Review outlines the approach taken during the assessment of provision and sets out the current situation across the district. Standards are also provided for future development. The results of the review will provide a foundation for the forthcoming *Shepway District Council Play Area Strategy 2017.*
- 1.4 The document *Planning for Play in Shepway 2007-2012* was developed by SDC and the Shepway Play Partnership (a range of organisations and agencies involved in the Play sector) in response to a commitment from central Government to raise the national profile of Play. The document provided a strategic approach to improving play provision and services in the district. Since then, partnership working has facilitated significant progress in achieving the objectives set out in the Strategy. A review of play areas and new robust standards are now required to inform the vision for play area provision in Shepway into the future.

Purpose

- 1.5 Defining the desired level of play provision across the district in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility will assist play providers in justifying continued expenditure on maintenance and enhancement of play features. It will assist with the securing of external funding streams.
- 1.6 The impetus to carry out this review and to establish standards for future play area provision also arises from a commitment in the *Shepway District Local Plan Review (2006) Saved Policies* and the emerging Places and Policies Local Plan, which identifies sites for new homes and work spaces which the district. It will also include new policies on the provision of play areas in the district, which will be informed by the play review and the play strategy.
- 1.7 An important element of this review is the development of standards for play provision. Consultation with stakeholders will ensure that standards are set at a level that is both adequate and sustainable. A key step of the process is therefore the identification and establishment of recommendations for key strategic and local sites. The results of which will enable the overall standards of play provision to be raised across the district.
- 1.8 The adopted *Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan (2013)* proposes 8,000 homes between 2006-2026 with approximately 9500-10,000 homes within the district by 2031. If clear standards for play provision are in place, this will allow the additional need arising from development to be accurately assessed. In some cases the creation of new play facilities within the development site may be required. In other cases off-site contributions to increase the capacity of existing sites may be the preferred approach.
- 1.9 The audit of local provision will provide an up to date picture of the quantity, quality and accessibility of equipped play areas in Shepway.
- 1.10 This Play Area Review aims to provide an understanding of:
 - how all play provision is distributed across the district;

- the volume of play provision for all age groups across the district;
- identify those areas of under and over provision;
- the current condition and quality of Council owned play areas;
- usage levels of play areas.
- 1.11 For reference a location plan outlining the boundary of Shepway and its Wards is shown in **Figure 1.1**.



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016 Service Layer Credits: Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2016

CB: VT EB: Tzampoura_V LUCEDI 6890_Fig3-0_Location_Plan_A4L 25/10/2016

Current achievements and the future

Achievements

- 1.12 Raising the quality of accessible and inclusive play provision was an important objective in *Planning for Play in Shepway 2007-2012*. Local authority funding for ongoing maintenance of play equipment is a challenge, with limited funds available to deliver capital improvement projects to raise standards.
- 1.13 Shepway District Council has a wide distribution of play areas largely catering for the districts settlements. The value and location values of the smaller play areas are generally good with some important community groups working at sites including Radnor Park within the centre of Folkestone. There has been recent investment through trust funds including those from The Roger De Hann Charitable Trust which have transformed play areas including those at Newchurch Playing Field and Dymchurch Recreation Ground both in Romney Marsh and The Rype in Walland and Denge Marsh.
- 1.14 A number of the larger destination play areas, particularly the play area within the Lower Leas Coastal Park are well regarded within the local community and surrounding districts. This play area incorporates natural play features with its appropriate coastal theme and is believed to be the largest free children's play area in the South East. Through consultation it is clear this site has been used as a model for good practice and it's recognised that the addition of site based wardens and gardeners enhances its site maintenance and security.

The future

- 1.15 A successful review and strategy for play area provision in Shepway takes account of and works within the parameters of constraints including finances, resources, capacity and risk.
- 1.16 Options and opportunities for changing policy and/or practice will be explored as a means of delivering positive change.

International, national, regional and local framework

1.17 This section outlines the key international, national and regional policies that have influenced the approach to this study. These should be considered when interpreting the findings of the study for the development of the Shepway Places and Policies Local Plan.

International

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

1.18 Article 31 of The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (ratified by the UK Government in December 1991) states: "*Parties recognise the right of the child to rest and leisure, engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child and to participate freely in cultural life and the arts."*

National

1.19 There are a range of national policies and strategies that impact on the provision of play areas including:

Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard, Fields in Trust, 2015

- 1.20 The document sets outs a benchmark for the provision of outdoor sport and play and, in so doing, seeks to secure the opportunities for future provision to help build healthy neighbourhoods.
- 1.21 In relation to provision of outdoor play, the document sets out a benchmark of 0.25 hectares per 1000 population for equipped/designated play areas and 0.30 hectares for other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks).
- 1.22 Designated equipped playing spaces are essentially traditional playgrounds, such as those considered in the context of this review.

Quality benchmark for children's playing space

- 1.23 The guidance states that "local authorities can set their own quality benchmark standards for play areas using the Children's Play Council's Quality Assessment Tool." Following classification of the play areas the assessment criteria consider the following aspects:
 - Involvement of children
 - Location
 - Play value
 - Quality (Care and maintenance)
- 1.24 **Table 1.1** sets out the accessibility standards or expected walking distance to reach the different categories of play areas as set out by the Fields in Trust. Definitions of these types of play area are provided within **paragraph 2.26**.

Table 1.1: Accessibility standards for children's playing space

Type of space	Walking distance (metres from dwellings)
Local Areas for Play	100
Local Equipped Areas for Play	400
Neighbourhood	1,000

National Planning Policy Framework, Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2012

1.25 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes a specific requirement for planning policy 'to be based on a robust and up to date assessment of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision' (para. 73). This research, combined with the Play Area Strategy, provides that evidence base for the purpose of the Local Plan.

Managing Risk in Play Provision, Play Safety Forum, 2012

- 1.26 The guide shows "how play providers can develop an approach to risk management that takes into account the benefits to children and young people of challenging play experiences, as well as the risks."
- 1.27 It ascertains that "children need and want to take risks when they play. Play provision aims to respond to these needs and wishes by offering children stimulating, challenging environments for exploring and developing their abilities. In doing this, play provision aims to manage the level of risk so that children are not exposed to unacceptable risks of death or serious injury". The information within the guide can be used whilst considering how a risk benefit approach could benefit play area provision across Shepway.

The Play Strategy, Department for Children's Schools & Families and Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2008

- 1.28 This strategy sets out the Government's vision and commitments for better play opportunities for children in England. It is based around a vision for play which promotes:
 - supervised and unsupervised places for play areas in every residential area, free of charge;
 - local neighbourhoods that are safe, interesting places to play, routes to children's play space that are safe and accessible for all;
 - parks and open spaces that are attractive, well maintained and well used;
 - children and young people have a clear stake in public space and their play is accepted by their neighbours;
 - children and young people play in a way that respects other people and property;

- children and young people and their families take an active role in the development of local play spaces;
- play spaces are attractive, welcoming, engaging and accessible for all local children.
- 1.29 The vision illustrates that play area provision makes a significant contribution to children and young people's play experience. A strategy for future provision in Shepway needs to consider this together with factors such as ensuring that "play spaces are attractive, welcoming, engaging and accessible for all local children".

Design for Play: A Guide to Creating Successful Play Spaces, Play England, 2008

- 1.30 The guidance sets out a framework and principles for the design of play spaces, based around the "golden rule" that "a successful play space is a place in its own right, specially designed for its location, in such a way as to provide as much play value as possible."
- 1.31 The achievement of this vision is supported by 10 core principles:
 - 1. Imagine a play space designed to enhance its setting.
 - 2. Imagine a play space in the best possible place.
 - 3. Imagine a play space close to nature.
 - 4. Imagine a play space where children can play in different ways.
 - 5. Imagine a play space where disabled and non-disabled children play together.
 - 6. Imagine a play space loved by the community.
 - 7. Imagine a play space where children of all ages play together.
 - 8. Imagine a play space where children can stretch and challenge themselves in every way.
 - 9. Imagine a play space maintained for play value and environmental sustainability.
 - 10. Imagine a play space that evolves as children grow.
- 1.32 These values and principles form a foundation for evaluating and understanding the quality and value of play area provision across Shepway.

Every Child Matters, Department for Education & Skills, 2004

- 1.33 The strategy acknowledges that play is fundamental to a healthy happy childhood and the government recognises its importance to outcomes for children.
- 1.34 There are five key principles to the policy which the government believe children should have support with. These are to:
 - be healthy;
 - stay safe;
 - enjoy and achieve;
 - make a positive contribution;
 - achieve economic well-being.

Local

- 1.35 Shepway District Local Plan Review (2006) Saved Policy LR10 relates to equipped play areas. "The District Planning Authority will currently seek by negotiation and agreement to achieve a level of provision which meets, or is equivalent to, the guidance set out below.
- 1.36 *Criteria for the provision of children's play space in developments containing 20 or more child bed spaces:-*

a) Where a deficiency in the provision of children's play space would exist, a minimum of 5sq.m. of space per child bed space should be provided;

b) Areas should be set out and located so as to minimise annoyance to nearby occupiers, maximise children's safety and be visible from neighbouring properties. Play areas should be within walking distance of all dwellings containing child bed spaces.

- 1.37 Within the above criteria, Local Areas for Play, Local Equipped Areas for Play and Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (further defined within the policy) may be provided, depending on the size and nature of the development.
- 1.38 NB Child bed spaces are calculated by subtracting all bed spaces in old people's dwellings, all bed spaces in one or two person dwellings and two bed spaces in family dwellings, from the total number of bed spaces in the scheme."¹
- 1.39 In addition the green infrastructure policy supports proposals which include new play facilities and the enhancement of play spaces.
- 1.40 The *Local Plan Review (2006)* recognises that there are a large amount of facilities such as outdoor sports grounds, parks and playspace providing for the district's population, but their quality varies substantially.
- 1.41 The plan outlines the role of planning contributions from development to address this and seeks opportunities to maximise overall green infrastructure through complementary functions. When allocating investment in play space within the district, reference should be made to the findings of this study which outlines whether there is scope for investment and/or if deficiency exists. Other relevant saved policies within the *Local Plan Review (2006)* include LR9 Protection and provision of open space and LR12 Protection of school playing fields.

Kent Children and Young People's Plan

- 1.42 The draft Kent Children and Young People's Plan Working Together to Improve Outcomes 2016-2019 sets out the shared ambition of public and voluntary sector partners to improve the lives of children and young people growing up in Kent. The following themes with supporting indicators are outlined:
 - Children and young people grow up in safe families and communities
 - Children and young people have good physical, mental and emotional health
 - Children and young people learn & have opportunities to achieve throughout their lives
 - Children and young people make safe and positive decisions²
- 1.43 The *Play Area Review* and *Play Area Strategy (2017)* can help to support some of the issues raised in the Kent Children and Young People's Plan. Increasing the amount and quality of play provision in the district will give children greater access to activities and opportunities as well as increasing the availability of physical activities. Play is widely recognised as important for health in childhood, providing for both physical and psychological wellbeing.
- 1.44 Providing quality play provision will enable children to become more confident and allow them to develop the skills they need to deal with and resolve conflicts.
- 1.45 Providing exciting play environments where children can take risks means they will be less likely to seek risk-taking activities elsewhere, such as taking drugs or abusing alcohol.
- 1.46 Appropriate concerns about children's welfare can be raised at certain play areas. Better links between Social Services and play services will help to protect children from neglect and abuse. Both open and closed-access play provision provide a secure environment where children can play while their parents are training or working.

¹ Shepway District Council, 2013. *Shepway District Local Plan Review Policies Applicable 2013 Onwards* [pdf] available at: <https://www.shepway.gov.uk/media/970/Local-Plan-Review-Policies-Applicable-2013/pdf/Local_Plan_Review_-___Policies_Applicable_2013.pdf> [Accessed 25 April 2017].

²⁰⁻²⁵ Health and Wellbeing Board & Local Children's Partnership Groups, 2016. Draft - Kent Children and Young People's Plan – Working Together to Improve Outcomes 2016-2019 [pdf] Available at:

<http://committeedmz.dartford.gov.uk/documents/s53736/Kent%20CYPP%20DRAFT%20Young%20Peoples%20Plan.pdf > [Accessed 11/01/2017].

1.47 Good play provision is child centred. Respecting and incorporating the views of children and young people is empowering and gives a sense of ownership. The more that children are able to make decisions about things that affect them, and the more choice and control they have over their everyday lives, the less likely they are to be involved in so called antisocial behaviour. Attending play provision can give children the opportunity to become part of the local community and to take an active part in the direction their local play provision takes. Empowering children leads to ownership and with this comes responsibility and improved long term interest in the local community.

Local Children's Partnership Groups

- 1.48 Local Children's Partnership Groups' primary purpose is to drive improvement in specific outcomes for local children and young people. The work of Local Children's Partnership Groups support both the development and delivery of Kent's Children and Young People's Plan which will be aligned to aims and ambitions of the Kent 0-25 Health and Wellbeing Board (Kent 0-25 HWB). LCPGs play a key role in relation to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children and young people, and as such provide an important link between the Kent Safeguarding Children Board (KSCB) and local services and organisations working with children and young people.
- 1.49 Local Children's Partnership Groups (LCPGs) ensure a consistent approach to partnership working at district level across Kent. They provide a connection between countywide strategic bodies and those working with children and young people at a local level. The work of each LCPG should be highly-focussed, data-driven and underpinned at all times by delivering a measurable improvement in selected indicators.
- 1.50 The activity of the local group will include:
 - Sharing information to provide understanding of local services and their thresholds.
 - Providing a vehicle for identifying and addressing local needs and gaps in service provision.
 - Facilitating and pooling resources to meet the needs of local children and families.³

Kent Community Safety Agreement

1.51 The Kent Community Safety Agreement 2014-17⁴ highlights priorities (updated in 2016) and cross-cutting themes including safeguarding children and young people and early intervention, prevention and education. The agreement also aims to deliver against the three countywide ambitions set out in the Vision for Kent 2012-22: to grow the economy; to tackle disadvantage; and to put citizens in control. These themes and ambitions link directly to play provision in the area.

South Kent Coast Health and Wellbeing Strategy

- 1.52 The Health and Wellbeing Strategy has been produced by South Kent Coast Health and Wellbeing Board, which consists of members from Shepway District Council, Dover District Council, Kent Public Health, South Kent Coast Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and the voluntary sector.
- 1.53 The South Kent Coast Health and Wellbeing Strategy has identified the following six priorities (from the localised Kent Joint Strategic Needs Assessment):
 - Priority 1: Tackling Health Inequalities
 - Priority 2: Urgent Care Avoiding unnecessary hospital admissions
 - Priority 3: Supporting Children and Families
 - Priority 4: Healthy Living and Quality of Life (Prevention of Illness)
 - Priority 5: Improving Long-Term Conditions

³ East Kent Housing: Outside body – Local Children's Partnership Group website, 2017. Available at:

<http://meetings.eastkenthousing.org.uk/mgOutsideBodyDetails.aspx?ID=447> [Accessed 12/01/2017].

⁴ Kent County Council Community Safety Unit, 2014 (updated 2016). *Kent Community Safety Agreement 2014-17* [pdf] Available at: https://www.kent.gov.uk/___data/assets/pdf_file/0019/6184/Kent-Community-Safety-Agreement.pdf> [Accessed 12/01/2017].

- Priority 6: Improving Mental Health and Wellbeing⁵
- 1.54 It will be important to align the relevant priorities within play provision.

Corporate Plan

- 1.55 The district Council's Corporate Plan outlines the vision and priorities for the Council through its Strategic Objectives. The Corporate Plan 2017-2020 Investing for the next generation delivering more of what matters outlines priorities based around supporting local economic growth, developing housing provision, fostering localism, maintaining an attractive district and providing local people with value for money. The six strategic objectives include:
 - More homes
 - More jobs
 - Appearance matters
 - Health matters
 - Achieving stability
 - Delivering excellence⁶
- 1.56 The objectives contribute in some way to securing the shared commitment to providing good quality play provision particularly in reference to appearance and health matters.

Shepway Play Area Strategy

1.57 The Shepway Play Area Strategy conducted in 2017 provides the strategic approach to help consider the shape of play provision in Shepway in the future. The report outlines the aspirations for play provision in the future, in the context of what is achievable and realistic. The results of this review provide a foundation for the play area strategy.

Additional relevant local strategies

- 1.58 The following documents have also informed the preparation of this report:
 - Shepway Open Space Strategy 2017
 - A Needs Assessment relating to the Provision of Natural Greenspace in areas with Low Levels of Physical Activity Shepway District Council 2016
 - Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan 2013
 - Planning for Play in Shepway 2007 2012
 - Shepway Open Spaces: Sports and Recreation Report 2011
 - Shepway LDF 'Open Space Audit' 2011
 - Green Infrastructure Report 2011
 - A Playing Pitch Strategy Update 2011
 - Shepway District Local Plan Review (2006) 'Saved' Policies

The Shepway context

Current and future population

1.59 The following section is largely drawn from key findings set out within the Shepway District Council document *Shepway in Context: A Socio-Economic and Property Analysis (2015)*.

⁵ Shepway District Council: Health and wellbeing website, 2016. Available at: <http://www.shepway.gov.uk/community/health-andwellbeing> [Accessed 12/01/2017].

⁶ Shepway District Council, 2017. *The Corporate Plan 2017-2020 – Investing for the next generation – delivering more of what matters* [pdf] Available at: <https://www.shepway.gov.uk/media/4222/corporateplan2017/pdf/Corporate_Plan_2017-2020.pdf> [Accessed 31/05/2017].

- 1.60 The population of Shepway according to the census of population in 2011 was 107,969. Of which 49.2% are males and 50.8% are females⁷. Recent population figures of 110,034 are from the most recent 2015 Mid Year Estimates from The Office for National Statistics (ONS)⁸.
- 1.61 Total population growth and working age population growth has been greater in Shepway than in all comparator areas, with the exception of Ashford, between 2001 and 2011. Population projections suggest that Shepway will see relatively low population growth up to 2037, with the working age population expected to remain fairly static (Shepway District Council, 2015). The latest population projections and demographics are also set out within the *Shepway Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017)*.
- 1.62 **Figure 1.2** reveals the expected population projections in Shepway from 2001 to 2031⁹.



Figure 1.2: Expected population projection in Shepway 2001-2031

- 1.63 The 2011 Census indicated that 48,639 Shepway residents were in employment, which was equivalent to 70% of all those aged 16-64. The percentage of residents (aged 16 to 64) who wee economically inactive was around 20%.
- 1.64 Shepway has an older age profile compared to Kent and Medway and the South East region and also a lower proportion of residents in the younger working age groups aged 16 to 44 years. The average age of people in Shepway is 42, while the medium age is 43.
- 1.65 **Figure 1.3** reveals the percentage of the population in Shepway within working age groups¹⁰.

⁷ Shepway District Council, 2015. *Shepway in Context: A Socio-Economic and Property Analysis* [pdf]. Available at:

<https://www.shepway.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s16097/rcabt20150225%20app%202%20Draft%20Final%20Shepway%20in%2 0Context%20Report.pdf> [Accessed 31 October 2016].

⁸ Office for National Statistics Website, 2016. *Ward Level Mid-Year Population Estimates*. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/wardlevelmidyearpopulationestimatesexperimental> [Accessed 27 October 2016]

⁹ Shepway District Council, 2015. Shepway in Context: A Socio-Economic and Property Analysis [pdf]. Available at:

<https://www.shepway.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s16097/rcabt20150225%20app%202%20Draft%20Final%20Shepway%20in%2 0Context%20Report.pdf> [Accessed 31 October 2016].

¹⁰ Based on 2011 Census





Socio-economic deprivation

- 1.66 A review of the latest Indices of Deprivation (IMD) 2015 data reveals that Shepway is the **third most deprived** area in Kent, ranking 113 out of 326 local authority districts nationally.¹¹
- 1.67 Shepway contains **four** Lower Super Outpost Areas within the **top 10% most deprived** within the national rank (Strategic Business Development & Intelligence, 2015). These are located within Folkestone Harvey Central ward and Folkestone East wards.
- 1.68 Folkestone Harvey Central, Folkestone Harbour, Folkestone East, Folkestone Foord, Romney Marsh, Lydd, Dymchurch & St Mary's Folkestone Harvey West wards are the **top eight** most deprived wards within Shepway, acknowledged as within the top **20% most** deprived wards in Kent. There are **no wards** in the Shepway district within the top 20% least deprived in Kent (Research & Evaluation, Business Strategy & Support, 2010).
- 1.69 **20.6% (206) of children who are in school year 6 are classified as obese**. Levels of GCSE attainment and smoking at time of delivery are worse than the England average.
- 1.70 Shepway has the third highest percentage population (approx. 5%) of Benefit Claimants, behind Swale and Thanet and above the UK average of approx. 4%.¹²
- 1.71 **21.6% of the population of children in Shepway** are being bought up in poverty; this is the third highest rank in Kent and higher than the overall average in Kent of 18.4%. **Figure 1.10** highlights the proportion of the children's population in poverty by age group. *Folkestone East* (40.1% of under-16s) is within the top ten ranked wards in Kent with the highest percentage child poverty.¹³
- 1.72 **Figure 1.4** shows the proportion of children in poverty in Shepway by age group.

<http://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/8178/Benefit-claimants-in-Kent.pdf> [Accessed 23 February 2017].

¹¹ Kent Council, 2015. Business Intelligence Statistical Bulletin – The English Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2015): Headline findings for Kent [pdf]. Available at: <https://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/7953/Indices-of-Deprivationheadline-findings.pdf> [Accessed 26 April 2017].

¹² Kent County Council, 2017. Business Intelligence Statistical Bulletin – Benefits Claimants [pdf]. Available at:

¹³ Kent County Council, 2016. *Business Intelligence Statistical Bulletin – Children living in low income families in Kent* [pdf]. Available at: http://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/7956/Children-in-poverty.pdf> [Accessed 23 February 2017].



Figure 1.4: Proportion of children in poverty in Shepway by age group

1.73 Overall, East Kent schools achieved mixed academic outcomes in 2007, reflecting local diversity. In Dover, nearly 70% of pupils achieved five or more GCSEs at A*- C grades, whilst Shepway (63%) and Canterbury (65%) exceeded the South East average of 62%¹⁴.

Mental health

- 1.74 Deprivation and chronic illness are risk factors for mental illness. Mental illness includes common mental illness (CMI), such as depression, anxiety, panic disorders and obsessive compulsive disorders; and serious and enduring mental illness (SEMI) including bipolar affective disorder and psychosis. Serious mental illness (SMI) includes psychosis, personality disorder and bipolar affective disorder.
- 1.75 In reference to the NHS South Kent Coast area out of an estimated population aged 16-74 of 146,772 the recent estimated number of individuals with a CMI is 22,559. The estimated number of individuals with a SMI in 2015 was 502.¹⁵

Planned development

- 1.76 As indicated by the East Kent Local Strategic Partnership document *Lighting the way to success The EKLSP Sustainable Community Strategy (2009)* economic growth in East Kent lagged behind both the South East and the UK throughout much of the 1990s and despite some higher rates of growth in the early 2000s, this has slowed again recently. The Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan sets requirements for housing development as follows:
 - Core long-term objective minimum 350 dwellings a year from 2006/07 to 2030/31 8,750 dwellings in total;
 - Minimum of 350 dwellings a year from 2006/07 to 2025/26 7,000 dwellings in total; and
 - Target of 400 dwellings a year from 2006/07 to 2025/26 8,000 dwellings in total.
- 1.77 Overview of key proposals in the Shepway District Spatial Strategy:
 - Develop Folkestone's centre, employment sites and deprived residential neighbourhoods, led by major opportunities on 'brownfield' land, and improved connectivity;

¹⁴ East Kent Local Strategic Partnership, 2009. *Lighting the way to success. The EKLSP Sustainable Community Strategy* [pdf]. Available at: http://www.shepway.gov.uk/webapp/lydd-

airport/CORE%20DOCS/CD11/CD11.20%20%20East%20Kent%20sustainable_community_strategy.pdf> [Accessed 31 October 2016]. ¹⁵ Kent County Council, 2016. *Mental Health – the Current Situation* [pdf]. Available at:

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/60492/The-Kent-situation-commissioning.pdf> [Accessed 26 April 2017].

- Focus major new development in Hythe on regenerating the west/south of the town, and maintain the character and vitality of the town centre;
- Regenerate Romney Marsh through a positive approach to sustainable economic development and infrastructure opportunities, and through increasing the strategic role of New Romney town in serving the area;
- Improve precious habitats, critical landscapes and efficiency of natural resource use (including water) in Shepway, and manage carbon emissions and flood risks in response to climate change;
- Aim to deliver an average of approximately one hectare per year (to 2026) of office/industrial premises;
- Accommodate new retail, leisure and an improved public environment at Folkestone, Hythe and New Romney town centres;
- Secure resources from developers for new physical and social infrastructure through developer contributions/the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- Provide public access to major new green infrastructure for Folkestone, Hythe and the district at Seabrook Valley and elsewhere.

Urban

- 1.78 The Urban analysis area has a population in the region of 65,000 people, and is where the majority of the economic activity in the district takes place. It is also where the majority of growth will take place for the period up to 2026, with the Shepway Local Plan indicating that around 75% (6,000) of the 8,000 new homes built in the district over this period are likely to come forward in this urban area.
- 1.79 This area of the district also enjoys unsurpassed connections with both Folkestone West and Folkestone Central railway stations offering HS1 services and easy access to the M20, Eurotunnel and the Port of Dover.

North Downs

- 1.80 The North Downs analysis area has approximately 20,000 people. The North Downs Area is located to the north of Folkestone, Hythe and the M20 corridor, and includes settlements such as Hawkinge, Sellindge, Lyminge, Elham and Densole. The area is characterised by the predominance of agricultural activities, its quality natural landscape, its vibrant and varied villages, and a variety of recreational activities in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 1.81 The Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan indicates that around 15% (1,200) of housing growth for the period up to 2026 will be built in this area.

Romney Marsh

- 1.82 The Romney Marsh analysis area has a distinct identity there are some very remote parts to this predominantly agricultural area, which also has a long tourist tradition. Approximately 20,000 people live in the area and housing growth is likely to be relatively modest in the period up to 2026.
- 1.83 The Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan indicates that around 800 new homes (10% of the total for the district) will be built in Romney Marsh, with many likely to be in and around the more urban areas.

2 Method followed for the Play Area Review

- 2.1 The method for this review reflects the requirements of the NPPF and draws on the evaluation guidelines developed through the latest guidance particularly:
 - Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard (2015);
 - Tools for Evaluating Local Play Provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators (2009);
 - Playable Space Quality Assessment Tool (2009);
 - Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play (2008).
- 2.2 The approach incorporates six broad tasks, which are outlined in **Figure 2.1**, below.

Figure 2.1: Play Area Review study method



Steps 1 and 2: Understanding the context and site audits

Baseline review and site context

- 2.3 The project commenced with a desk top study of existing information including quantitative data collated by SDC, annual external play area inspections routine inspection reports, insurance claims/reports, existing community consultation, and strategic documentation/policies.
- 2.4 Based on this evidence we were able to understand the 'need' for play space which was assessed by reviewing current population patterns, the socio-economic deprivation index, demographic indicators together with future development and population forecasts. Baseline information on play space in the district was obtained from the Commercial and Technical Services department at SDC.

- 2.5 Using this information and existing GIS data, a mapping exercise was undertaken to locate play areas before commencing the site audits.
- 2.6 The existing 85 play areas were assessed against the data, to demonstrate geographical areas of deficiency and excess, barriers to use and possible over provision. The assessment was based on an agreed types and hierarchies as follows:
 - Local Areas of Play (LAP);
 - Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAP);
 - Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAP);
 - Destination Play Space.
- 2.7 A review of national, regional and local policy and guidance was completed, and this has been interpreted in terms of the relevance to the study (See **Section 1**).

Site audits

- 2.8 In order to understand the existing provision of play areas across Shepway we carried out an audit of the 85 play areas. Audits were undertaken between 16 August 2016 2 September 2016 within the school summer holidays.
- 2.9 The play area audits were completed using the survey forms recommended by Play England which considers involvement of children, location, play value and quality (care and maintenance).
- 2.10 Copies of the completed forms used in the process can be found in **Appendix 3**. It should be noted that the assessment of key factors, such as quality and value, were based on the condition of the play area on the day it was visited.
- 2.11 Section 3 summarises the findings of the audit process. Figure 3.2 shows the location of the 85 sites audited and their classification, large scale copies of the maps which identify the play areas are shown in Figure 3.4 and Figure 3.5. These figures also show the Fields in Trust (FiT) Accessibility Benchmark Standards for Children's Playing Space, to identify the likely catchment areas of each play area.
- 2.12 The audits were completed using a scoring system developed from guidance set out by Play England and FiT. This enabled the assessment of:
 - Quantity
 - Accessibility
 - Quality
 - Value
 - Location
 - Audience e.g. age group/s the site is suitable for
- 2.13 The audits enabled the development of a mapping system where the locations of the play sites are accurately recorded within a GIS system. The GIS system is supported by a database that provides information on the location, size, type, quality and value of each play area.
- 2.14 As recommended by Play England, two people carried out the assessment of each play area. This alleviated any potential bias in scoring and provided opportunities for debate and creative discussion. Each person assessed each play area individually and the scores compared and discussed at the end of each assessment. Where appropriate, scores were adjusted to reflect discussion and ensure a consistent approach to the assessments. Adjustments in scoring were done through a cooperative dialogue that enabled sharing of different perspectives.

Step 3: Consultation

2.15 Community consultation is a useful way to inform the evidence base on need and demand including:

- Local people's attitudes to existing provision;
- Local expectations and identification of needs which might be 'invisible' because there is no current provision;
- A qualitative 'vision' for the type of play space facilities communities want to see in their areas.
- 2.16 For the purposes of this assessment, the district has been divided into ward areas shown in **Figure 1.1**.

Online household public survey

2.17 An online household public survey was carried out to gather the public's views (See **Section 3**). This covered topics such as users' satisfaction with current provision, modes of travel to play areas and distances travelled. There were 380 responses gathered in the four week period that the survey was live.

Telephone/email consultation with stakeholders

- 2.18 A number of internal and external stakeholders who are involved in the maintenance and management of elements of play areas in Shepway were consulted. In order to comply with the Duty to Cooperate, consultation also included active engagement with neighbouring authorities. Information on the play area standards of neighbouring districts was gathered to understand the extent of provision in those districts. The following teams and organisations were contacted through this study (list not exhaustive):
 - Councillors (including town, parish and ward councillors)
 - Folkestone Town Council
 - Shepway District Council relevant departments
 - Kent County Council relevant departments
 - Children's centres
 - Primary schools
 - Secondary schools
 - Youth clubs
 - Voluntary and community groups
 - Disability groups
 - Residents associations
- 2.19 Representatives of the organisations listed above were consulted via email and telephone. The focus of consultation with each of the groups outlined to the above included strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of play provision in Shepway and providing thoughts on factors which contribute to quality, value and accessibility of play areas.
- 2.20 Information gathered during the community consultation stage has been analysed to understand the community's demands and preferences.

Workshops with local authority officers and stakeholders

2.21 A workshop was held for local authority officers and wider stakeholders. This was held at SDC offices on 7th December 2016. The workshop included a short presentation on the Play Area Review and the initial findings of the site audits. The workshop provided attendees with an opportunity to discuss the provision of play spaces in the district and to consider options for future enhancement and management. A complete list of attendees can be found in **Appendix 1**.

A criteria for assessing value and quality

- 2.22 A key element of the Play Area Review process is the evaluation of the quality and value of current provision. This assessment will help understand if existing play spaces are "attractive, welcoming, engaging and accessible for all local children."
- 2.23 The quality of a play space considers the design of the space and how it responds to its location as well as factors relating to safety, condition and appearance.
- 2.24 Play value is more concerned with the experience of play. To an extent play value is a subjective quality, for example what for one child may be a brilliant and exciting play space, may be considered dull and unimaginative for another. Play value is not purely concerned with equipment, access or appearance. It also takes into account the contents of the site, the level and type of use and wider benefits such as the opportunities for movement, access to the natural environment and its ability to entice children to play.

Step 4: Analysis of the findings

Categorisation of sites

- 2.25 The following documents have been used to identify types of play spaces in Shepway:
 - Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play Beyond the Six Acre Standard, Fields in Trust, 2015;
 - Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play, Fields in Trust, 2008.
- 2.26 Play spaces were therefore categorised as follows:
 - Local Areas of Play (LAP) Small, low-key games area (may include "demonstrative" play features), minimum activity zone of 100sqm.
 - Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAP) Approximately five types of equipment, minimum activity zone of 400sqm.
 - **Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAP)** Approximately eight types of equipment, kickabout and/or wheeled activities;
 - **Destination Play Space** Play spaces which can attract visitors for a wider catchment, usually within larger parks they often have supporting facilities such as car parking, catering and toilets.
- 2.27 Understanding the type and hierarchy of a play space allowed appropriate assessments to be made and benchmarks to be set for quantity, quality, value, location and accessibility of the different types of play areas in Shepway. These categories are further defined in **Section 3**.

Assessment of audit findings

2.28 Following the audit process a database of existing play areas was compiled presenting information about each site including location, area, typology, accessibility, quality and value. Maps subsequently illustrated the location and reach of each existing play space.

Assessment of consultation findings

2.29 The results from the consultation methods described earlier fed into various aspects of the assessment and influenced local play performance indicators. A summary was compiled of the consultation held with key stakeholders and data compiled from the household survey obtaining information on participation and the public's views on play areas.

Step 5: Development and application of standards

2.30 This step draws together the information from the site audits and the consultation to develop locally appropriate standards for the quantity, quality, value and accessibility of play areas in Shepway (See **Section 3**).

- 2.31 In order to review the distribution and accessibility of sites, a set of maps have been produced to identify accessibility catchments, and potential areas of deficiency to play areas. The catchment buffers are guided by the standards set out in the FiT (2015) guidance. This mapping exercise highlighted the extent to which parts of Shepway are deficient in access to play space.
- 2.32 To assess the provision, each site was given a location, play value and quality (care and maintenance) score. These scores were collated and calculated utilising the Play England¹⁶ assessment guidelines and definitions document.
- 2.33 Using the ideal of a known exemplar within the district, and an expectation of what facilities local residents may reasonably expect within a certain type of site, benchmark scores were proposed which represented a 'good' standard. Another possible approach highlighted by Play England is to take the range of scores and for each aspect of the topic for all the play areas and calculate the median. For the purposes of this review in Shepway it's been proposed to proceed with the exemplar approach to allow for clear benchmarks and comparisons.
- 2.34 The range of scores has been mapped to identify areas of the district that have pockets of relatively low scoring sites.

Step 6: Conclusions and recommendations

Recommendations for addressing deficiencies and planning for growth

- 2.35 This final stage involved the translation of the findings of the research into priorities and principles for the Shepway Play Strategy (See **Section 5**). A robust understanding of deficiency and needs generated by the review in terms of quantity, location, quality, value and accessibility is also fundamental to informing policy.
- 2.36 The review will therefore also provide justification for the policy approach to play spaces in Shepway.

¹⁶ Play England, 2009. *Tools for evaluating local play provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators* [pdf] available at http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/202750/tools-for-evaluating-play-provision.pdf [Accessed 8 September 2016].

3 Play provision in Shepway

3.1 The following section describes existing play provision in Shepway. It begins with consideration of the need for play in the district before setting out the current supply of play spaces by ward.

The need for play provision

- 3.2 Shepway has a low population density and the proportion of young people is below the national average.
- 3.3 As shown in **Figure 3.1** (indicators of need) a review of the latest IMD data reveals that Folkestone Central, Folkestone Harbour, East Folkestone, and Walland and Denge Marsh wards have the highest levels of Living Environment Deprivation in Shepway. This criterion measures both the indoor living environment (quality of housing) and the outdoor living environment (levels of road accidents and air quality). There are clearly larger percentages of children and teenagers to the north-east of the district in the vicinity of Folkestone and to the south-west near Brenzett. These areas also show higher levels of deprivation.
- 3.4 There are a few pockets of high Health Deprivation and Disability Domain deprivation as shown in **Figure 3.1** (particularly in Folkestone Central, East Folkestone and Hythe wards). Levels are lower than those found in surrounding districts to the north east in Dover.
- 3.5 The over-arching IMD scores take into account the health and living environment criteria listed above, alongside the following domains: income, employment, education, crime and barriers to housing and services. The IMD data for Shepway shows a marked difference between the north and south of the district. There are higher levels of deprivation generally in the south with much lower levels of deprivation in the north.
- 3.6 78% of the population considers themselves in Very Good or Good health. However Shepway has a high rate of Coronary Heart Disease and Cancer (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer) Diagnosis within the district, linked to the obesity rates and deprivation data. Priorities in Shepway include increasing the number of **physically active children and adults**, reducing smoking in pregnancy, and reducing teenage pregnancy (Public Health England, 2015).



Quantity assessment

3.7 Data provided by SDC revealed that there are a total of 85 play areas in Shepway. **Appendix 2** details the ownership and management responsibilities by site. The majority are owned and managed by SDC as shown in **Table 3.1** below:

Table 3.1: Ownership	and management	of play areas in Shepway
----------------------	----------------	--------------------------

Ownership/management	Number of play areas
Burmarsh Parish Council	1
Dymchurch Parish Council	1
Elham Parish Council	1
Hawkinge Town Council	6
Hyde Housing	1
Hythe Town Council	4
Ivychurch Parish Council	1
Kent County Council	1
Lydd Town Council	1
Lyminge Parish Council	5
Lympne Parish Council	1
MOD	3
New Romney Town Council	2
Newchurch Parish Council	1
Newington Parish Council	1
Orbit Housing Association	1
S106 - With Developer	1
Saltwood Parish Council	1
Sandgate Parish Council	1
SDC	39
SDC Housing	8
SDC/St Mary's Community Trust	1
Sellindge Parish Council	1
St Mary in the Marsh Parish Council	1
Still SDC (unknown ownership)	1

- 3.8 As part of the play space audit process, and to enable the monitoring of supply of facilities across Shepway, each play area has been given a classification. The FiT guidance¹⁷ recommends that Equipped/ Designated Play Spaces be promoted in the form of:
 - Local Areas for Play (LAPs) aimed at very young children;
 - Locally Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) aimed at children who can go out to play independently;
 - Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs) aimed at older children.
- 3.9 These can be complemented by other facilities including Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and skateboard parks etc.
- 3.10 In consideration of the latest FiT guidance and Play England guidance¹⁸ we have defined the following for the purposes of this assessment in Shepway:
 - Type A: Local Areas for Play (LAPs).
 - Small, low-key games area (may include "demonstrative" play features);
 - Minimum activity zone of 100sqm.

¹⁷ Fields in Trust, 2015. *Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard* [pdf] available at:

<http://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/PAD/FINAL%20ONLINE%20Planning%20Guidance%20for%20Outdoor%20Sport%20and%20 Play%20Provision%20Oct%202015.pdf> [Accessed 8 September 2016].

¹⁸ Play England, 2009. *Tools for evaluating local play provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators* [pdf] available at http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/202750/tools-for-evaluating-play-provision.pdf [Accessed 8 September 2016].

- Type B: Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs).
 - Approximately five types of equipment;
 - Minimum activity zone of 400sqm.
- Type C: Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs).
 - Approximately eight types of equipment;
 - Kickabout and/or wheeled activities;
 - Minimum activity zone of 1,000sqm comprising an area for play equipment and structures;
 - Hard surfaced area of at least 465sqm (the minimum needed to play five-a-side football).
- Type D: **Destination Play Space**.
 - Play spaces which can attract visitors for a wider catchment, usually within larger parks they often have supporting facilities such as car parking, catering and toilets.
- 3.11 Photos below help depict example sites for each classification.



Atkinson Road Play Area – example LAP



Swan Lane – example LEAP



Kettle Drive Play Area – example NEAP



Lower Leas Coastal Park Fun Zone – example Destination play space

3.12 The assessment classified the play areas based on the key features and facilities described earlier although there had to be reasonable judgement made when there was some minor variation of equipment. It is worth noting some play areas were classified as LAPs and LEAPs given their size and location although may be used by older age groups. Examples include the green gyms and trim trails as shown in the photos below. Equally standalone multi-use games areas (MUGAs) and skateboard parks have not been separated out and have been categorised as NEAPs given their location and surrounds.

Examples of variations of classification features



3.13 **Table 3.2** provides information on the amount and classification of play areas currently available in Shepway.

Classification	Num	ıber	Area	(ha)
	No	%	No	%
Local Area for Play (LAP)	20	23.5%	0.58	3.3%
Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)	45	52.9%	8.33	46.7%
Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)	17	20.0%	8.59	48.2%
Destination	3	3.5%	0.32	1.8%
TOTAL	85	100%	17.83	100%

Table 3.2: Existing provision by classification

NB: Please note the areas above refer only to space used by the equipped area for play, not for example the entire park.

- 3.14 In relation to provision of outdoor play, the FiT document¹⁹ sets out a benchmark of 0.25 hectares per 1000 population for equipped/designated play areas and 0.30 hectares for other outdoor provision (MUGAs and skateboard parks). Designated equipped playing spaces are essentially play areas, such as those considered in the context of this assessment.
- 3.15 The guidance states that quantity guidelines should not be interpreted as maximum levels of provision, and it is recommended that these are adjusted to take account of local circumstances.
- 3.16 **Figure 3.2** overleaf shows the location of the 85 sites audited. It can be seen that the majority of the play areas including the larger destination sites are situated closer to the coastline. These areas are more densely populated due to the popular coastal towns.

¹⁹ Fields in Trust, 2015. *Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard* [pdf] available at:

<http://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/PAD/FINAL%20ONLINE%20Planning%20Guidance%20for%20Outdoor%20Sport%20and%20 Play%20Provision%20Oct%202015.pdf> [Accessed 8 September 2016].



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016

Figure 3.2: Play areas by classification



Shepway boundary

Shepway ward boundary

Classification



- Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)
- Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)
- Local Area for Play (LAP)

Map Scale @ A3: 1:125,000





- 3.17 The 85 play areas cover a total area of 16.94 hectares. The Shepway district covers an area of approximately 35,670 hectares; therefore equipped play areas for children cover 5% of the district's total land area. With 45 sites, Local Equipped Areas for Play (LEAPs) are the most common type of play space and NEAPs also take up the largest area (48.2%) compared to other classifications.
- 3.18 **Figure 3.2** shows the geographical spread of play provision across the district with higher levels of provision in more heavily populated areas such as Folkestone, Hythe and Hawkinge. **Table 3.3** below summarises the provision of play by geographical area.

Area	Nu	mber	Area (ha)		
Ward	No	%	No	%	
Broadmead	3	3.5%	0.18	1.0%	
Cheriton	8	9.4%	1.03	5.8%	
East Folkestone	5	5.9%	2.25	12.6%	
Folkestone Central	2	2.4%	0.32	1.8%	
Folkestone Harbour	2	2.4%	0.25	1.4%	
Hythe Rural	6	7.1%	1.64	9.2%	
Hythe	9	10.6%	1.57	8.8%	
New Romney	4	4.7%	1.25	7.0 %	
North Downs East	17	20.0%	2.35	13.2%	
North Downs West	8	9.4%	1.45	8.1%	
Romney Marsh	8	9.4%	1.74	9.8%	
Sandgate and West Folkestone	2	2.4%	1.57	8.8%	
Walland and Denge Marsh	11	12.9%	2.24	12.5%	
TOTAL	85	100.0%	17.83	100.0%	

Table 3.3: Provision of play areas by geographical area

- 3.19 **Table 3.3** shows that there are two play areas in Folkestone Central ward, which equates to 2.4% of the provision in terms of number and 1.8% of the area. North Downs East is the ward with the highest number of play areas 17 (20%) covering an area of 2.35 hectares.
- 3.20 Two sites could not be assessed (Dallas Brett Crescent and St Mary's in Folkestone) as these play areas were closed at the time of the audit and could not be viewed. A few of the sites which were undergoing maintenance and closed for use but viewable were assessed as seen. Further detail is provided within the site audit forms.
- 3.21 **Table 3.4** summarises the available provision by type and geographical location.

Table 3.4: Provision by location and classification

Word	Number of sites					
Ward	Total	LAPs	LEAPs	NEAPs	Destination	
Broadmead	3	2	1	0	0	
Cheriton	8	3	4	1	0	
East Folkestone	5	2	1	2	0	
Folkestone Central	2	0	1	0	1	
Folkestone Harbour	2	1	1	0	0	

Ward		I	Number of site	S	
Hythe Rural	6	1	5	0	0
Hythe	9	1	3	3	2
New Romney	4	0	2	2	0
North Downs East	17	5	9	3	0
North Downs West	8	1	6	1	0
Romney Marsh	8	2	4	2	0
Sandgate and West Folkestone	2	0	1	1	0
Walland and Denge Marsh	11	2	7	2	0
TOTAL	85	20	45	17	3

3.22 **Table 3.5** below highlights play area provision for indicative age groups by location.

Table 3.5: Provision for indicative age groups by location

		Number of sites					
Ward	Total	0-5 years	5-11 years	11+			
Broadmead	3	3	1	0			
Cheriton	8	8	8	2			
East Folkestone	5	5	4	2			
Folkestone Central	2	2	2	1			
Folkestone Harbour	2	2	2	0			
Hythe Rural	6	4	5	2			
Hythe	9	7	9	5			
New Romney	4	4	4	2			
North Downs East	17	14	13	8			
North Downs West	8	8	6	1			
Romney Marsh	8	8	7	4			
Sandgate and West Folkestone	2	2	2	2			
Walland and Denge Marsh	11	9	10	6			
TOTAL (No)	85	76	73	35			
TOTAL (%)	100%	89.4%	86.8%	41.2%			

- 3.23 **Table 3.5** shows that while 86.8% of play areas have provision suitable for 5-11, only 41.2% have equipment that would appeal to older children/ young people (11+). However, it should be noted that older children/ young people are likely to be more able to travel further to access suitable play provision such as Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) and skate parks.
- 3.24 At the time of the 2011 Census, the district of Shepway had a population of 107,969. Therefore in order to achieve the FiT benchmark for designated equipped playing space, 26.99 hectares of equipped play space would be required.
- 3.25 **Table 3.6** uses the FiT quantity benchmark referring to 0.25 hectares to assess the provision of play areas at district and ward level. The population figures which have been used are from the

most recent 2015 Mid Year Estimates from The Office for National Statistics (ONS)²⁰. This data has been used to allow for analysis given changes to boundaries and wards prior to 2014. It shows that the current provision is 0.09 hectares per 1,000 population below the required quantity standard for equipped playing space, with generally small shortfalls in most wards.

Ward	Hectares per `000	+/- FiT Standard
Broadmead	0.05	-0.20
Cheriton	0.08	-0.17
East Folkestone	0.19	-0.06
Folkestone Central	0.03	-0.22
Folkestone Harbour	0.04	-0.21
Hythe Rural	0.28	0.03
Hythe	0.14	-0.11
New Romney	0.17	-0.08
North Downs East	0.20	-0.05
North Downs West	0.23	-0.02
Romney Marsh	0.24	-0.01
Sandgate and West Folkestone	0.28	0.03
Walland and Denge Marsh	0.27	0.02
Shepway DC	0.16	-0.09

- 3.26 **Table 3.6** shows that there are ten wards that fail to meet the FiT quantity benchmark. The location of these wards is shown on **Figure 3.3** overleaf. This suggests that there may be additional demand for provision in these wards, however it should be noted that the FiT standard approach considers the total population of all ages. Three wards Walland and Denge Marsh, Hythe Rural and Sandgate and West Folkestone meet the FiT quantity standard.
- 3.27 This analysis considers play areas that are largely managed and maintained by SDC, housing associations and parish and town councils and does not take into account other provision such as that offered by schools, community centres and businesses.

²⁰ Office for National Statistics Website, 2016. *Ward Level Mid-Year Population Estimates*. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/wardlevelmidyearpopulationestimatesexperimental> [Accessed 27 October 2016]



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017



Accessibility assessment

3.28 FiT guidance²¹ provides a benchmark for accessibility, which is shown in **Table 3.7** below. In addition we have incorporated a straight line distance catchment of 1,000 metres for destination play areas.

Table 3.7: Accessibility benchmark standards for children's playing space

Classification	Distance criteria (metres)	
	Walking distance	Straight line distance
Local Area for Play (LAP)	100	60
Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)	400	240
Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)	1,000	600
Destination Play Space	-	1,000

- 3.29 **Figure 3.4** and **Figure 3.5** show the current play area provision in Shepway, with a buffer based on the above FiT benchmark.
- 3.30 **Figure 3.4** and **Figure 3.5** illustrates that play area provision reflects the demography of its core audience, children and young people, suggesting that accessibility responds to the needs of users because there are a greater number of play areas in areas with a greater population. In addition the value assessment considers "ease of getting to and accessing the site" and "opportunities for meeting children on route", both of which are areas in which those play spaces assessed in the audit tended to generally score highly.

²¹ Fields in Trust, 2015. *Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard* [pdf] available at:

<http://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/PAD/FINAL%20ONLINE%20Planning%20Guidance%20for%20Outdoor%20Sport%20and%20 Play%20Provision%20Oct%202015.pdf> [Accessed 8 September 2016].



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016 Shepway District Council 100019677 Service Layer Credits: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

CB:VT EB:Tzampoura_V LUCEDI 6890_Fig3-4_Play_area_accessibility_North_A3L 26/04/2017 Source: SDC



Figure 3.4: Play area accessibility (North Shepway)



Shepway ward boundary Play sites

Accessibility buffers

Destination

Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)



Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)

Local Area for Play (LAP)

NB Committed development with planned play area provision at Shorncliffe Garrison and Radnor Park is shown in blue text





Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016 Shepway District Council 100019677 Service Layer Credits: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community
Overall scores

3.31 The play area assessments carried out as part of this Play Area Review drew on the recommendations within the Play England guidance²². The overall percentage scores were calculated with consideration given to all three key aspects of play provision such as location, value and quality (care and maintenance). These are assessed in greater detail in the following sections.

Overall scores by ward

3.32 **Table 3.8** sets out the average overall scores by ward, the mean average % score for quality is 57.58%.

Table 3.8: Average overall scores by ward

Ward	Average overall score (%)
Broadmead	56.6%
Cheriton	51.9%
East Folkestone	53.0%
Folkestone Central	71.3%
Folkestone Harbour	56.3%
Hythe Rural	52.7%
Hythe	59.9%
New Romney	62.7%
North Downs East	54.6%
North Downs West	53.6%
Romney Marsh	55.5%
Sandgate and West Folkestone	62.9%
Walland and Denge Marsh	57.6%

- 3.33 **Table 3.8** highlights that Folkestone Central achieves the highest overall score of 71.3% and Cheriton the lowest at 51.9%.
- 3.34 **Figure 3.6**, overleaf highlights the overall scores of each site.
- 3.35 The destination site Lower Leas Coastal Park has the highest average overall score of 80.83% and Fairfield Recreation Ground has the second highest score with 76.67%.

²² Play England, 2009. *Tools for evaluating local play provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators* [pdf] available at http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/202750/tools-for-evaluating-play-provision.pdf [Accessed 8 September 2016].



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016



	Figure 3.6: Overall score by site
Jan 1 3	Shepway boundary Shepway ward boundary Overall Score (%)
	 Less than 40% 41% - 50%
	 51% - 60% 61% - 70%
	• 71% - 80%
	 81% - 90% 91% - 100%
	Map Scale @ A3: 1:125,000
	Folkestone Hythe & Romney Marsh Shepway District Council

Location assessment

3.36 The location assessment carried out as part of the Play Area Review draws on the recommendations within the Play England guidance²³. Factors such as safety and security, accessibility (including disabled access) and extent of use were considered.

Location scores by ward

3.37 **Table 3.9** sets out the average location scores by ward, the mean average % score for quality is 65.95%.

Table 3.9:	Average	location	scores	by ward	
-------------------	---------	----------	--------	---------	--

Ward	Average location score (%)
Broadmead	62.9%
Cheriton	63.6%
East Folkestone	60.6%
Folkestone Central	80.0%
Folkestone Harbour	65.7%
Hythe Rural	63.3%
Hythe	65.7%
New Romney	71.4%
North Downs East	66.2%
North Downs West	60.7%
Romney Marsh	61.1%
Sandgate and West Folkestone	70.0%
Walland and Denge Marsh	66.2%

- 3.38 **Table 3.9** highlights that Folkestone Central ward achieves the highest location score of 80% which would be expected partly due to the available infrastructure and increased population within the area. North Downs West had the lowest score of 60.7%.
- 3.39 This Play Area Review considers a range of factors that impact on children and young people's ability to access play provision, 77 of sites assessed during the audit where unrestricted and therefore accessible by children and young people 24 hours a day.
- 3.40 **Figure 3.7**, overleaf, compares the location scores for each site.
- 3.41 Lower Leas Coastal Park has the highest average location rating of 85.71% which is the highest scoring facility in the district.

²³ Play England, 2009. *Tools for evaluating local play provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators* [pdf] available at http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/202750/tools-for-evaluating-play-provision.pdf [Accessed 8 September 2016].



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016



Value assessment

- 3.42 Play value is a subjective assessment, based on children's opinions of particularly areas, ranging from 'dull and unimaginative' to 'exciting and interesting'. For the purposes of this assessment we have followed recommendations within the Play England guidance²⁴. Play value considers factors such as provision of equipment offering a variety of challenging play and movement incorporating natural features and offering value to a range of age groups and abilities.
- 3.43 Undertaking a value assessment of the play spaces in Shepway enables SDC to plan strategically for the future in order to ensure that play provision is challenging, stimulating and engaging.
- 3.44 **Appendix 3** provides details of the value scores of the 85 sites which were assessed for play value during the play area audit. These results are summarised in **Table 3.10** which compares the average play value scores of the existing play area provision by ward.

Ward	Average play value score (%)
Broadmead	54.7%
Cheriton	50.6%
East Folkestone	55.7%
Folkestone Central	73.0%
Folkestone Harbour	52.3%
Hythe Rural	53.3%
Hythe	62.7%
New Romney	66.5%
North Downs East	53.5%
North Downs West	55.3%
Romney Marsh	58.8%
Sandgate and West Folkestone	66.0%
Walland and Denge Marsh	59.5%

Table 3.10: Average play value scores by ward

3.45 **Table 3.10** and **Figure 3.8**, show that there is limited access to play area provision of high value generally within the south-west of Shepway and coastal areas within Romney Marsh suggesting this should be considered in recommendations for the future. **Table 3.11** below compares play areas by classification, again destination play spaces score highest because they have the capacity, design, equipment and approach to provide stimulating and inviting play area provision. It is important to acknowledge that some wards with less play areas are more likely to have a higher average score. For example Folkestone Central has the highest average value score by ward, but only has two sites within the ward one of which is the destination site Lower Leas Coastal Park. By contrast North Downs East has 17 sites of which 4 (LAPs) are among the lowest scoring sites in the district.

Table 3.11: Average value score by classification

Classification	Average value score (%)
Destination Play Space	74.0%
Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)	73.6%
Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)	55.4%
Local Area for Play (LAP)	44.4%

²⁴ Play England, 2009. *Tools for evaluating local play provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators* [pdf] available at http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/202750/tools-for-evaluating-play-provision.pdf [Accessed 8 September 2016].



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016



- 3.46 At the time of the assessment The Green and Fairfield Road Recreation Ground were the sites assessed to have the highest play value, with both having a score of 86%.
- 3.47 The value assessment of play areas is critical to understanding the role and function of each site and how it contributes to play in the wider context of the district. In considering the overall value, distinction can be made from quality and a greater understanding of each site's potential can be explored.
- 3.48 In summary, the value assessment highlights the limited contribution, in terms of play value, made by LAPs and LEAPs. This also reduces the overall value of provision at a district level. It also highlights the limited provision of equipment that could be used by children and young people with disabilities and the potential for added play value to complement the basic experience.

Quality assessment

- 3.49 The quality or care and maintenance assessment carried out as part of this Play Area Review draws on the recommendations within the Play England guidance²⁵. Each of the sites visited during the audits were assessed in relation to quality. It should be noted that there is an element of cross over between the factors that are used to assess quality and value.
- 3.50 This section summarises the findings of the play area quality assessment and complete details of the scores for each site can be found in **Appendix 3**. Please note that two sites (Dallas Brett Crescent and St Mary's in Folkestone) were not assessed as the sites were either closed for improvements/development (including not viewable) and/or did not currently have play equipment on site. A few of the sites which were undergoing maintenance and closed for use but viewable were assessed as seen. Further detail is provided within the site audit forms.
- 3.51 This scoring process enables the comparison of sites throughout the district, with higher scoring sites being of a better quality. The assessment captured the quality of each play area together with any play opportunities in the vicinity of the site.
- 3.52 Although the quality assessment provides a robust method for assessing overall quality, it should be noted that smaller sites, specifically LAPs are by their nature likely to score lower as they do not have the available space, and to an extent, the need for some features and facilities.
- 3.53 What the quality audit does achieve is a comparable baseline assessment to identify general patterns in provision across the district, which in turn will help address shortcomings in resources and plan future management strategies.

Quality scores by ward

3.54 **Table 3.12** sets out the average quality scores by ward, the mean average % score for quality is 47%.

Table 3.12: Average quality scores by ward

Ward Average quality score	
Broadmead	51.4%
Cheriton	39.9%
East Folkestone	40.2%
Folkestone Central	60.0%
Folkestone Harbour	51.7%
Hythe Rural	40.8%
Hythe	49.8%
New Romney	48.6%

²⁵ Play England, 2009. *Tools for evaluating local play provision: A technical guide to Play England local play indicators* [pdf] available at http://www.playengland.org.uk/media/202750/tools-for-evaluating-play-provision.pdf [Accessed 8 September 2016].

Ward	Average quality score (%)
North Downs East	42.8%
North Downs West	44.0%
Romney Marsh	44.6%
Sandgate and West Folkestone	51.4%
Walland and Denge Marsh	45.9%

- 3.55 **Figure 3.9**, overleaf, uses a map to visually compare the quality scores of each site.
- 3.56 The general overview shows that quality levels are relatively low throughout the district and quality should be considered when planning for future enhancements. Folkestone Central and Folkestone Harbour have the highest average quality rating of 60% and 51.7% respectively. It's worth noting these wards have fewer play areas and one of which is, the destination site, Lower Leas Coastal Park which is the highest scoring facility in the district within Folkestone Central.



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016



3.57 **Table 3.13** below details the average quality score by classification.

Table 3.13: Average quality score by classification

Classification	Average quality score (%)	
Destination play space	61.0%	
Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP)	49.9%	
Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP)	41.0%	
Local Area for Play (LAP)	47.6%	

- 3.58 As previously stated, LAPs by their nature, design and role are likely to score lower in a quality based assessment than larger play areas with a range of equipment and features. As a result they suffer in a direct comparison of the quality of play areas by type.
- 3.59 **Appendix 3** provides the score for each play area assessed for quality during the site audit process. The highest scoring site was the newly installed Megan Close LAP with 72% followed closely by Lower Leas Coastal Park, a destination play space with a wide variety of play provision which scored 71.43%. At the other end of the scale, the lowest scoring play area was the Pond Hill Road LAP and Roman Way LEAP which both achieved a quality score of 22.86%. This is 24.14% below the average quality score for a play area in Shepway.
- 3.60 In conclusion the audit suggests that play area provision across the district of Shepway is of a relatively low quality (care and maintenance), with five sites (5.8%) having a quality score above 61%. It should be noted that older weathered equipment, litter, poor planting and to a lesser extent graffiti had a consistent impact on quality scores at sites across the district. However it's worth recognising play areas throughout Shepway are generally safe and located in areas which are accessible for children and young people.

Summary of feedback from public consultation

- 3.61 Public consultation was undertaken through an online survey via a web service called 'SurveyMonkey'. The scope of this questionnaire covered the frequency of use, perceived value and satisfaction with the quality and quantity of open spaces and play areas within the district. In addition, a confidential section on the profile of the respondent was included, to enable us to ensure that the survey captured responses from a reasonable sample of the Shepway population.
- 3.62 The survey elicited responses from 380 people. Those that completed the gender question highlighted that 25% were male and 74% were female.
- 3.63 For those that don't use parks and open spaces regularly **19% of respondents cited lack play of facilities** and similarly 19% felt litter, anti-social behaviour and not liking the appearance of the park or open space deterred visits. Around 43% highlighted other reasons for not visiting including poor weather, time at work and general lack of time.
- 3.64 Just over 60% of respondents confirmed the use of equipped play facilities in Shepway. Figure 3.10 shows 24% using equipped play equipment once a week; 23% 2-3 times a week and 20% once a fortnight. Figure 3.11 highlights that the majority of respondents access local play facilities on foot and Figure 3.12 indicates that for 80% of respondents it takes less than 15 minutes to travel to the play facility they visit most often.

Figure 3.10: Frequency of use of equipped play provision



Figure 3.11: Mode of travel to equipped play facilities

Q22 What mode of transport do you use for the majority of your journey when going to the play facility you visit most often? Please tick one option

Answered: 177 Skipped: 203

On foot By bicycle By moped/motorbike By car By bus By coach By taxi By train 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Shepway Play Area Review

Figure 3.12: Duration of travel to play facilities



- 3.65 The play facilities that respondents visited most often included: Lower Leas Coastal Park, Radnor Park and Cheriton Park.
- 3.66 Responses to the survey indicate high levels of satisfaction with the amount and quality of play overall, however responses for play for 11+ years indicates an area for improvement. Details about satisfaction of respondents with play equipment is shown in **Figure 3.13** and **Figure 3.14**.



Q25 Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount and quality of equipped play facilities in Shepway ?

Shepway Play Area Review

45

Figure 3.14: Level of satisfaction with quantity and quality of other facilities for young people

Q26 Overall, how satisfied are you with the amount and quality of other facilities for young people in Shepway? (e.g. skate parks, teen shelters, bmx tracks, climbing walls, green gyms etc.)



3.67 Respondents were provided with the opportunity to provide further comments on play facilities. Many of the comments cited local site specific issues however general comments included:

- A recommendation to provide increased play facility provision for 11+ age groups and under 5's.
- Improved toilet facility provision at sites.
- Improved speed in responding to maintenance issues.
- Lower Leas Coastal Park and Brockhill Country Park are recognised as good sites for play.

Summary of feedback from stakeholder consultation

- 3.68 The stakeholder consultation focussed on the targeted consultation of a number of internal and external stakeholders who are involved in the maintenance and management of elements of Shepway's play areas. The following teams and organisations were contacted through this study (list not exhaustive):
 - Councillors (including town, parish and ward councillors)
 - Folkestone Town Council
 - Shepway District Council relevant departments
 - Kent County Council relevant departments
 - Children's centres

- Primary schools
- Secondary schools
- Youth clubs
- Voluntary and community groups
- Disability groups
- Residents associations
- 3.69 Representatives of the organisations listed above were consulted via email and telephone. The focus of consultation with each of the groups outlined to the above included strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to play provision in Shepway and providing thoughts on factors which contribute to quality, value and accessibility of play areas.
- 3.70 In general there were positive comments regarding a few of the high scoring sites although issues including litter and vandalism were a common theme with one respondent noting "Parents seem to prefer play areas which are safe, not strewn with litter (especially dog waste and needles) and where the play equipment is not broken or otherwise rendered unsafe."
- 3.71 Some further interesting key opportunities from the stakeholders are summarised below:
 - Utilising local ward grants and trust funds to improve play areas such as The Roger De Haan Charitable Trust.
 - Funding needed for monitoring by CCTV or supervisors.
 - Improved lighting along the coastline.
 - Community groups to take responsibility for supervising and maintaining play areas alongside community fundraising.

Workshops

3.72 The headline findings from this consultation are outlined below in **Table 3.14** which looks at existing provision and **Table 3.15** which looks at prioritising future enhancement and working with the local community.

Table 3.14: Existing play area provision - stakeholder workshop thoughts

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Community wants to get	Lack of equipment	Clear processes	Continuing funding
involved Coastal Parks Radnor Park (community group) Number of outdoor gyms Level of provision generally Consultation Picnics / different needs	replacements Lack of continuity in areas Ageing equipment Barriers to access Negativity to certain proposals (skate parks) Vandalism No clear way involving communities Cleanliness	Access for other areas and spaces Play Area Strategy Potential to zoom into isolated pockets of deficiency (kids per play area) – Example E. Folkestone Funding streams Contributions locally - Older children in remote areas need to be catered for Taking ownership Capital plan for ageing equipment Consider seasonal aspects and variation of use	Play areas ignored If decommissioning sites, consultation will be required

Table 3.15: Prioritising future enhancement and working with the local community – stakeholder workshop thoughts

4 Proposed standards

- 4.1 The proposed standards for play provision are set out in **Table 4.1** below. Proposed standards were calculated using the population figures of 110,034 which are from the most recent 2015 Mid Year Estimates from The Office for National Statistics (ONS)²⁶.
- 4.2 The Fields in Trust recommended benchmark quantity standard is 0.25 hectares per 1000 population for equipped/designated play areas. Shepway standards as a whole fall below this as indicated below. However there a number of local factors which explain this, including Shepway's older population and rural character. The Fields in Trust standards have been criticised because they are often seen as undeliverable, and can result in a proliferation of play areas that can be difficult to maintain, as well as setting unrealistic aspirations in the urban context where insufficient land is available.
- 4.3 The standards below propose quantities of play space by play area classification which should be delivered on site through development over 10 dwellings where feasible. In addition funding should be provided to ensure off-site provision is made to these standards for destination NEAP, LEAP and LAP sites. *The Places and Policies Local Plan, Preferred Options (2016)*²⁷ contains Policy C4 Formal play space provision; which highlights current requirements for developer contributions, these closely relate to the latest Fields in Trust guidance²⁸. The standards aim to ensure any deficiencies are met, as well as providing for an increase in population with development.
- 4.4 Any developer with a development over 10 dwellings should refer to these standards in addition to Shepway District Council's Planning Policy Teams latest contribution requirements and the local demographic. On smaller residential developments, of up to about 10 dwellings or within town centres, because of the limitations on providing satisfactory on-site provision, part or all of the play area may be best provided for in the form of a financial contribution, of equivalent value to on-site provision, towards the enhancement and management of play areas. Reference should be made to the *Shepway Play Area Strategy (2017)* as well as the evidence within this review.

Type of standard	Proposed standard	Justification
Quantity	Destination: 0.003 hectares per 1,000 population NEAP: 0.080 hectares per 1,000 population LEAP: 0.077 hectares per 1,000 population LAP:	This is based on the current provision of play spaces in Shepway. Setting the standard at this level of provision will ensure that provision should (as a minimum) not fall below the existing quantity per 1,000 population as the population grows. Guided by the Fields in Trust guidance <i>Guidance</i> <i>for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre</i> <i>Standard</i> ²⁹

Table 4.1: Proposed standards for play provision in Shepway

²⁶ Office for National Statistics Website, 2016. *Ward Level Mid-Year Population Estimates*. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/wardlevelmidyearpopulationestimatesexperimental> [Accessed 27 October 2016].

²⁷ Shepway District Council, 2016. The Places and Policies Local Plan, Preferred Options [pdf] available at:

<https://www.shepway.gov.uk/media/3897/Places-and-Policies-Local-Plan-Oct-

^{2016/}pdf/Places_and_Policies_Local_Plan_Final_Plan_2.pdf> [Accessed 2 May 2017].

²⁸ Fields in Trust, 2015. *Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard* [pdf] available at:

<http://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/PAD/FINAL%20ONLINE%20Planning%20Guidance%20for%20Outdoor%20Sport%20and%20 Play%20Provision%20Oct%202015.pdf> [Accessed 8 September 2016].

²⁹ Fields in Trust, 2015. *Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard* [pdf] available at:

<http://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/PAD/FINAL%20ONLINE%20Planning%20Guidance%20for%20Outdoor%20Sport%20and%20 Play%20Provision%20Oct%202015.pdf> [Accessed 8 September 2016].

Type of standard	Proposed standard	Justification
	0.005 hectares per 1,000 population	
Accessibility	Destination 1000m (15 minute walk)	Straight line distance outlined by the Fields in Trust guidance <i>Guidance for Outdoor Sport and</i>
	NEAP 600m (10 minute walk)	Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard ³⁰
	LEAP 240m (5 minute walk)	
	LAP 60m (1 minute walk)	
Location	Destination 85.71% - Exemplar: Lower Leas Coastal Park Fun Zone	Expected score for a good well located site
	NEAP 74.29% - Exemplar: Canterbury Road Recreation Ground	
	LEAP 62.86% - Exemplar: Tayne Field (adjacent public house)	
	LAP 62.86% - Exemplar: Blenheim Drive	
Value	Destination 74% - Exemplar: Brockhill Country Park	Expected score for a good value site
	NEAP 72% - Exemplar: Canterbury Road Recreation Ground	
	LEAP 68% - Exemplar: Elmfields	
	LAP 55% - Exemplar: Megan Close	
Quality	Destination 65.71% - Exemplar: Brockhill Country Park	Expected score for a good quality site
	NEAP 60% - Exemplar: Cheriton Recreation Area	
	LEAP 54.29% - Exemplar: Newington Village Hall	
	LAP 52% - Exemplar: Atkinson Road Play Area	

Application of standards and ratings

- 4.5 After determining the appropriate standards and benchmarks it is possible to ascertain whether certain sites achieve the required scores in respect of location, quality and value.
- 4.6 **Figure 4.1** highlights the location rating per site (high and low) alongside showing accessibility buffers by classification. Those sites shown in red ideally require improvements to factors such as safety and security, accessibility (including disabled access), design and extent of use. Higher scores/ratings are particularly found within Folkestone Central and North Downs East. Noticeable lower scores/ratings are identified within East Folkestone, Hythe and Romney Marsh.

³⁰ Fields in Trust, 2015. *Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond the Six Acre Standard* [pdf] available at:

<http://www.fieldsintrust.org/Upload/file/PAD/FINAL%20ONLINE%20Planning%20Guidance%20for%20Outdoor%20Sport%20and%20 Play%20Provision%20Oct%202015.pdf> [Accessed 8 September 2016].

4.7 **Figure 4.2** similarly shows the quality and value ratings per site (high and low). Both plans indicate those sites with potential for enhancement particularly with regards to quality and value



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017





Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017

& Play Strategy

Figure 4.2: Quality and Value Ratings Per Site



Shepway boundary Shepway ward boundary Quality / Value rating

- High Quality / High Value
- High Quality / Low Value 0
- Low Quality / High Value •
- Low Quality / Low Value

Map Scale @ A3: 1:125,000





Combined assessment findings

- 4.8 **Appendix 3** shows the full list of sites with their scores for all audited sites.
- 4.9 Play provision throughout Shepway is generally good in terms of distribution with some evident lack of provision for the 11+ age group in terms of quantity. As expected, play areas are predominately located within or adjacent to larger open spaces (e.g. parks and gardens) and the district's residents are not all within easy walking distance of a suitable facility. This was highlighted as an issue through stakeholder consultation alongside maintenance issues and confirmed by the mapping of accessibility catchments.
- 4.10 This is likely to be of greatest significance to families with young children who may wish to have access to more local provision.
- 4.11 As can be seen in **Figure 3.4** and **Figure 3.5** for older children served by NEAPs and destination sites (which attract visitors for a wider catchment and offer supporting facilities e.g. car parking and toilets), there is a wide distribution of sites across the district. Provision in the north of Shepway is particularly good in terms of quantity, location and value. There is a lack of provision of destination play space in the southern half of Shepway compared to the three located in the northern half of Shepway. However, the condition of the destination play spaces was generally good.
- 4.12 For the middle age category, largely served by LEAPs, again, levels of provision and distribution are generally good. Provision within the district is reasonable in terms of quantity and accessibility, but the quality of the majority of sites is average to very poor.
- 4.13 There is a lack of provision for the youngest age category (LAPs) in the southern half of the district. Adding to this, the condition of the existing sites are mainly average, poor or very poor throughout the district.

5 Conclusions and recommendations

- 5.1 Despite possessing a good overall amount of open space, the western half of the district away from the more densely populated coastal towns experiences some lack of provision of play facilities, with sections of the community not within walking distance of an equipped local play space. Notabe deficiencies in play areas can be seen within the centre of New Romney, intermittent areas along coastal residential areas in Romney Marsh, to the south-east of Folkestone Harbour and within Broadmead. Opportunities to provide play facilities within the wider open space network should be considered to address deficiency e.g. provision of natural play features within natural and semi-natural green spaces.
- 5.2 In summary, the play area audit and accompanying desktop research has raised a range of issues for consideration in the development of a strategic approach to play area provision across Shepway which will also be explored further within the accompanying Play Area Strategy. Key findings include:
 - The constraints and opportunities associated with national, regional and local policies and strategies.
 - The community and stakeholders value play areas and the positive contribution they make, but provision is at risk because it is not a statutory service.
 - The results of the audit show that Shepway has a variety of play areas, with better location and play values when compared to quality which was generally of a lower standard.
 - The application of the Fields in Trust (FiT) accessibility criteria shows that play areas are generally accessible and there is a good spread of provision across the district.
 - At district level Shepway is generally not meeting the FiT Quantity Standard. However, there are three wards which meet the FiT standard including Walland and Denge Marsh, Hythe Rural and Sandgate and West Folkestone.
 - Maintenance of provision is restricted by an insufficient budget which will, over time, reduce play value and quality.
 - A reliance on Section 106 commuted sums and Friends Groups and Parish Councils applying for external funding to support enhancement and development projects. There is potential to utilise scores by ward contained within this report and link with CIL revenue for the benefit town and parish councils.

Appendix 1: Workshop attendees

Name	Organisation
Cllr; Berry, Ann	SDC
Cllr; Dearden, Malcolm	SDC
Cllr; Hollingsbee, Jenny	SDC
Cllr; Lawes, Mary	SDC
Karen Lewis	Dymchurch Parish Council
Neil Jones	Folkestone Town Council
Lynne Martin	Hawkinge Town Council
Nick Hilditch	Hythe Town Council
Ben Geering	SDC- Head of Planning
Andy Blaszkowicz	SDC- Head of Commercial and Technical Services
Sarah Robson	SDC- Head of Communities
Karen Weller	SDC- Environmental Protection
Jess Harman	SDC- Communities Officer
Laura Pinkham	SDC- Grounds Maintenance Manager
Piran Cooper	SDC- Landscape and Urban Design Officer
Rebecca Chittock	SDC- Planning Policy
Isabelle Hills	SDC- Planning Policy
Jo Clifford	Folkestone Sport Centre
Ivan Rudd	KCC- Public Health Specialist
Brigitte Orasinski	Strange Cargo
Jon Clarke	East Folkestone Together
Matthew Parkhill	LUC
Sebastian West	LUC

Appendix 2: Ownership and management responsibilities of play areas

Site ID	Site name	Classification	Ownership/Management
1	Atkinson Road Play Area	Type A: LAP	Hawkinge Town Council
2	Blenheim Drive	Type A: LAP	SDC
3	Brabner Park	Type C: NEAP	SDC
4	Brockhill Country Park	Type D: Destination	Kent County Council
5	Buffs Avenue	Type B: LEAP	MOD
6	Burmarsh Recreation Ground Play Area	Type C: NEAP	Burmarsh Parish Council
7	Campbell Road Play Area	Type B: LEAP	Hawkinge Town Council
8	Canterbury Road Recreation Ground	Type C: NEAP	SDC
9	Cheriton Recreation Area	Type C: NEAP	SDC
10	Coniston Road (Summer Lees)	Type A: LAP	SDC
11	Corbett Road Play Area	Type B: LEAP	Hawkinge Town Council
12	Country's Field	Type A: LAP	Orbit Housing Association
13	Daglish Close	Type B: LEAP	SDC Housing
14	Densole Way	Type B: LEAP	SDC Housing
15	Downs Road	Type A: LAP	SDC
16	Dymchurch Recreation Ground	Type C: NEAP	Dymchurch Parish Council
	Elmfields	Type B: LEAP	SDC Housing
18	Enbrook Valley Play Area	Type B: LEAP	SDC
19	Etchinghill Cricket Field	Type B: LEAP	Lyminge Parish Council
20	Fairfield Recreation Ground	Type C: NEAP	New Romney Town Council
21	The Rype	Type C: NEAP	Lydd Town Council
	Firs Lane	Type A: LAP	SDC
23	George Gurr Crescent	Type B: LEAP	SDC
24	Grange Road Play Park	Type C: NEAP	Saltwood Parish Council
25	Greatstone Car Park	Type C: NEAP	SDC
	Harvest Way	Type B: LEAP	SDC
	Heron Forstall Avenue	Type B: LEAP	SDC
28	Horn Street	Type B: LEAP	Hythe Town Council
29	Hythe Skate Park	Type C: NEAP	Hythe Town Council
	Ivychurch Play Area	Type B: LEAP	Ivychurch Parish Council
31	Jefferstone Lane	Type B: LEAP	St Mary in the Marsh Parish Council
32	Jocks Pitch	Type A: LAP	SDC
	Jubilee Field	Type C: NEAP	Lyminge Parish Council
34	Kettle Drive Play Area	Type C: NEAP	Hawkinge Town Council
	King George V Playing Field	Type C: NEAP	Elham Parish Council
36	Lade Fort	Type B: LEAP	SDC
37	Lower Leas Coastal Park Fun Zone	Type D: Destination	SDC
38	Lower Radnor Park Play Area	Type B: LEAP	SDC
-	Lympne Village Hall	Type B: LEAP	Lympne Parish Council
	Manor Farm Close	Type B: LEAP	SDC
	McKenzie Drive	Type B: LEAP	MOD
	Meads Way	Type A: LAP	SDC
43	Megan Close	Type A: LAP	SDC
	Megone Close Play Area	Type A: LAP	S106 - With Developer (overgrown/disused)
	Meriden Walk	Type B: LEAP	SDC
	Millfield	Type A: LAP	SDC Housing
	Moore Close	Type A: LAP	SDC Housing
48	Morehall Recreation Ground	Type B: LEAP	SDC
49	Mount Pleasant Close	Type A: LAP	SDC
	Naseby Avenue	Type A: LAP	SDC
-	Newchurch Playing Field	Type B: LEAP	Newchurch Parish Council
51		.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	

52	Newington Village Hall	Type B: LEAP	Newington Parish Council
53	Oak Drive	Type B: LEAP	SDC
54	Oakham Drive	Type B: LEAP	SDC
55	Oaklands	Type B: LEAP	Hythe Town Council
56	Palmarsh (St George's Place Play Area)	Type B: LEAP	SDC Housing
57	Pannell Drive Play Area	Type C: NEAP	Hawkinge Town Council
58	Payers Park	Type B: LEAP	SDC
59	Peregrine Close	Type A: LAP	SDC
60	Pine Way	Type B: LEAP	SDC
61	Pond Hill Road	Type A: LAP	MOD
62	Queensway	Type B: LEAP	SDC
63	Reachfields	Type B: LEAP	SDC Housing
64	Rhodes Minnis Recreation Ground	Type B: LEAP	Lyminge Parish Council
65	Roman Way	Type B: LEAP	SDC
66	Royal Military Canal Play Area	Type D: Destination	SDC
67	Salthouse Close	Type B: LEAP	SDC Housing
68	Sandgate Recreation Ground	Type C: NEAP	Sandgate Parish Council
69	St. Luke's Walk Play Area	Type A: LAP	Still SDC (unknown ownership)
70	Station Road	Type B: LEAP	SDC
71	Stombers Lane	Type B: LEAP	SDC
72	Swan Lane	Type B: LEAP	Sellindge Parish Council
73	Tayne Field	Type B: LEAP	Lyminge Parish Council
74	Tayne Field (adjacent public house)	Type B: LEAP	Lyminge Parish Council
75	The Waltons	Type A: LAP	Hyde Housing
76	The Danni & James Community Friendship Park	Type B: LEAP	SDC/St Mary's Community Trust
77	The Derrings	Type B: LEAP	SDC
78	The Green	Type C: NEAP	Hythe Town Council
79	The Greens	Type C: NEAP	New Romney Town Council
80	The Ridgeway Trim Trail	Type B: LEAP	SDC
81	Turnpike Hill	Type A: LAP	SDC
82	Underwood Play Area	Type B: LEAP	Hawkinge Town Council
83	Upper Radnor Park	Type A: LAP	SDC
84	Widgeon Walk	Type B: LEAP	SDC
85	Wraightsfield Play Area	Type B: LEAP	SDC

Appendix 3: Completed audit forms

Site I D 1	Site Name Atkinsor	n Road Play Area
Type of play area or fa	acility Type A: LAP	
Ward North	Downs East	
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley and S West	
Date of assessment:	17/08/2016	
Time: 15:17	7	Weather: Overcast, warm.



Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (two pieces of equipment).

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Very compact play area with surrounding green space. Pedestrian route runs alongside. Could use more equipment considering the size of the surrounding field.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

No No Yes

Unrestricted

8. Does it have a toilet?
9. Does it have refreshments?
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?
11. To serve to site:

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	1	Si	ite Na	me	Atkinson	Road Play Area
Type of p	lay area oi	facility	-	Type A: LA	λP	
Ward	No	rth Downs E	East			
Location	(max scor	e A=35, B	=35, (C=35, D=	35)	Score: 26
16. Inform	nal oversigi	nt:				Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:					
Good view	v from surro	ounding hou	uses.			
18. Well u	ised by chil	dren:				Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:					
20. Gettin	-					Good (4)
21. Comm	nents:					
		ighting and	securi	ity:		Good (4)
23. Comm		along path	W2V FI	inning beg	ido it	
	ility access:		wayit	unning bes	side it.	Good (4)
25. Comm	-					
26. Meetir	ng other ch	ildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	nents:					
	ned for the	citor				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comm		site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Play valu	ie (max sc	ore A=40,	B=50	, C=50, E)=50)	Score: 16
30. Enticir	ng to childro	en to play:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comm	nents:					
22. 84.0		- C		-		Westmannes immunents and (2)
32. Play o 33. Comm		s for disable	ed child	dren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
	ients:					
34. Plav n	eeds of diff	erent ages	(Type	B. C and I	D only):	
35. Comm		j	х <i>7</i> г -	,		
36. Mover	ment:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comm	nents:					
20 Im:	native alex	2000 (Tem-	R C	and D and	·)•	
38. Imagi 39. Comm		ages (Type	р, С а	and D only	·)•	
40. Ball ga	ames:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
41. Comm						(-)
		a but plenty	in sur	rounding	green spa	ice.

Site ID 1	Site N	lame <mark>At</mark> l	kinson Road Play	Area
Type of play area	or facility	Type A: LAP		
Ward	North Downs East			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural environmer	nt:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	lren to sit:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max scor	e A=25, B=35	5, C=35, D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments: Litter and graffiti.	d:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:				Good (4)
One bench. Enoug	h for this sized pla	y area.		
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
One bin with no bi	n bag.			
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	::			Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	Type B, C and D)	
62. Toilets/changir 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type I	3, C and D only):	
Final Score:	55			

3

Site ID	2	Site N	lame	Blenheim Drive
Type of pla	ay area	or facility	Type A: L	_AP
Ward	N	lorth Downs East		
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley a	and S West	:
Date of ass	essment	: 17/08/2010	6	

Time:

11:51



Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area with one large multi-action unit.

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Currently closed for maintenance. Play area is run-down and rusted. Not very friendly looking.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	No access

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

Currently closed for maintenance but easily viewable from outside fence.

13. Survey site access:	No access
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1





Weather: Sunny, hot.



Serious weaknesses, improvement need

Site I D 2		Site N	ame	Blenheim D	Drive
Type of play are	ea or facility		Type A: LA	AP	
Ward	North Down	s East			
Location (max	score A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 22
16. Informal ove	ersight:				Good (4)
17. Comments:					
Can be viewed b	y some surro	unding	houses.		
18. Well used by	children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:				_	
20. Getting there	e:				Good (4)
21. Comments:					
22. Personal safe	ety lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments:	ety, nghting u		iicy.		
No lighting insid	e play area.				
24. Disability ac	cess:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments:					
26. Meeting othe	er children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments:					
28. Designed for	the site:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
29. Comments:					
Play value (ma			0, C=50, E	D=50)	Score: 18
30. Enticing to c 31. Comments:	hildren to play	/:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
51. comments.					
32. Play opportu	nities for disa	bled ch	ildren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments:					
34. Play needs o	f different age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):	
35. Comments:					
36. Movement:				Γ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comments:				L	Average, needs some improvement (3)
38. Imaginative	play ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):	
39. Comments:					
40. Ball games:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comments:					
Space but no sp	ecific area.				

Site ID	2	Si	te Name	Blenheim	Drive	
Type of play	y area c	or facility	Type A:	: LAP		
Ward	No	orth Downs E	ast			
42. Loose pa 43. Commer					Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access t 45. Commer		tural enviror	nment:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places fo 47. Commer		en to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added p 49. Commer	-	e:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and m	nainten	ance (max s	score A=25,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35)) Score: 11
50. Well ma 51. Commer		:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Currently clo	osed for	maintenance	э.			
52. Health a 53. Commer		ty:				
54. Seating 55. Commer One bench.		ts:				Good (4)
56. Litter bir 57. Commer					Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free 59. Commer						Good (4)
60. Presence only): 61. Commer		ervisory adul	ts (Type B, C	C and D		
62. Toilets/c 63. Commer		facilities (T_{i})	/pe B, C and	D only):		
Final Score	:	51				
Site ID	3	Site	Site Name			
----------------------------	----------------------	-------------	-----------	--		
Type of pla	y area	Type C:	NEAP			
Ward	Nard East Folkestone					
Name of assessor: S Wikele		and S Wes	st			
Date of assessment: 15/		:: 15/08/20	16			

Time:

11:12



Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Two equipped play areas, MUGA and hard basketball court.

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice open space. Variety of activities/terrain.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	Т
9. Does it have refreshments?	No	

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Yes

Unrestricted

Site ID	3		Site Na	ame	Brabner F	Park
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type C: Ni	EAP	
Ward		East Folkest	one			
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score: 24
16. Inform	nal overs	sight:				Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:					
Can be vie	ewed fro	m some hou	ises and	l next to m	ain road.	
18. Well u	used by c	:hildren:				Good (4)
19. Comm	-					
Signs of u	ise on ec	uipment an	d surfac	es.		
20. Gettin	g there:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm	nents:					
Main acce	ss requi	res crossing	of busy	road.		
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:					
Lighting o	only alon	g one side.				
24. Disabi	ility acce	ss:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm						
-			ace is n	ot smooth a	and may ca	ause problems for some.
26. Meetir 27. Comm	-	children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	ients.					
28. Desigi	ned for t	he site:				Good (4)
29. Comm	nents:					
Equipmen	it placem	ent depend	s on ter	rain. Logs ι	used as pla	ay equipment.
Play valu	ie (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, C	D=50)	Score: 37
	-	ldren to play	<i>'</i> :			Good (4)
31. Comm	nents:					
22. Dlavi a			اماماما	d.u.a.u.a.		Westweenen improvements needed (2)
-		ties for disa	blea chi	laren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm	ients:					
34 Play n	eeds of	different age	e (Type	BCand		Excellent (5)
35. Comm			.s (19pc		D only).	
36. Mover	ment:					Good (4)
37. Comm	nents:					
-	-	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	<i>י</i>):	Good (4)
39. Comm	nents:					
40. Ball ga						Good (4)
41. Comm						
Spaces av	/ailable f	or variety of	ball ga	mes. Marki	ngs taded.	

Site I D 3	Site N	ame <mark>I</mark>	Brabner Parl	< Comparison of the second sec
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: NE	٩P	
Ward E	ast Folkestone			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmer	t:		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Good (4)
48. Added play valı 49. Comments:	Je:			Good (4)
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, B=	35, C=35, I	D=35) Score: 13
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Basketball court ma	arkings faded. Two	o swings mis	sing. Graffit	•
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C and	I D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type E	3, C and D or	nly):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	74			

Site ID 4		Site Na	ame	Brockhill	Country P	Park
Type of play ar	cility	Type D:	Destination			
Ward	Hythe					
Name of assess	S West					
Date of assessn	nent:	01/09/2016				
Time:	09:18				Weather:	: Cloudy, dry



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Tranquil woodland setting for play area in the corner of the park. Variety of play equipment and seating in good condition.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes
9. Does it have refreshments?	Yes
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable

Park open 9am until dusk. Whole site 13. Survey site access: Involvement of children 14. Involvement of children: Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)

15. Comments:

Tbc

Yes	
Limited	
gates:	



Site I D	4		Site N	ame	Brockhill C	Country Park
Type of pl	ay area	- or facility		Type D: De	estination	
Ward	H	lythe				
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=3	35)	Score: 25
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:			Γ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	ents:				L	
18. Well u	sed by cł	nildren:				Good (4)
19. Comm	ents:				L	
20. Getting	g there:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm	ents:					
22 Porcon		, lighting a		ritv.	Г	Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	-	, ngnung a	nu secu	iity.	L	Average, needs some improvement (5)
	ents.					
24. Disabil	lity acces	s:			Γ	Good (4)
25. Comm	-				L	
Ramps, wi	ide paths	and car pa	rking.			
26. Meetin	ng other o	children:				Good (4)
27. Comm	ents:					
29 Decign	ad for th	o citor				Good (4)
28. Design 29. Comm		e site.			L	
Play value	e (max s	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, D	=50)	Score: 37
-		dren to play			ſ	Excellent (5)
31. Comm	ents:					
		ies for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comm	ents:					
34 Play no	oods of d	ifferent and	e (Type	e B, C and D		Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comm		inerent age	s (Type		onny).	
36. Movem	nent:				Γ	Good (4)
37. Comm	ents:				L	
38. Imagir	native pla	y ages (Ty	ре В, С	and D only)):	Good (4)
39. Comm	ents:					
40 0-11						
40. Ball ga					L	Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comm	ents:					
1						

Site ID	4	Site Name	Brockhill C	Country Park
Type of pla	ay area or fac	ility Type D: I	Destination	
Ward	Hythe			
42. Loose 43. Comm			[Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access 45. Commo	to the natural ents:	environment:	[Good (4)
46. Places 47. Commo	for children to ents:	sit:	[Good (4)
48. Added 49. Commo	play value: ents:			Good (4)
Care and	maintenance	(max score A=25, E	3=35, C=35	5, D=35) Score: 23
50. Well m 51. Comm				Good (4)
52. Health 53. Comm	and safety: ents:			
54. Seating 55. Comm	g for adults: ents:		[Excellent (5)
56. Litter b 57. Commo Bins near o	ents:		[Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog fre 59. Comm	e zones:		[Good (4)
60. Presen only): 61. Commo		ry adults (Type B, C a	and D	Average, needs some improvement (3)
Rangers of	ccasionally pres	sent.		
62. Toilets, 63. Comm		ties (Type B, C and D	only):	Good (4)
Final Scor	re: 85	5		

12

Site ID 5	Site Name Buffs Avenue
Type of play area or fa	acility Type B: LEAP
Ward Hythe	
Name of assessor:	S West and S Wikeley
Date of assessment:	24/08/2016
Time: 09:51	1 Weather: Sunny, dry



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Located within grassed open space opposite housing and surrounded by trees. Equipment of a weathered appearance.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	1

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:15. Comments:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
Tbc		

Yes

No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site I D 5	Site Nar	me	Buffs Avenue	2
Type of play area or facility	Т	ype B: LE	AP	
Ward Hythe				
Location (max score A=35	, B=35, C	C=35, D=	35)	Score: 22
16. Informal oversight:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comments:				
Screened by trees and hedge	5.			
18. Well used by children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:				
20. Getting there: 21. Comments:				Good (4)
22. Personal safety, lighting a	nd securi	ty:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments:				
24. Disability access:				Good (4)
25. Comments:				
26. Meeting other children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments:				
28. Designed for the site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments:				
Play value (max score A=4	0, B=50,	, C=50, D)=50)	Score: 28
30. Enticing to children to pla 31. Comments:	y:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
32. Play opportunities for disa	bled child	Iren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments:				
34. Play needs of different ag35. Comments:	es (Type I	B, C and D	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
36. Movement:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comments:				
38. Imaginative play ages (Ty	vpe B, C a	nd D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comments:				
40. Ball games:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
41. Comments:				

Site ID 5		Site Name	Buffs Ave	nue	
Type of play area	or facility	Туре В:	LEAP		
Ward	Hythe				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Ą	verage, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	natural env	ronment:		Δ	verage, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	dren to sit:			Δ	verage, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play va 49. Comments:	lue:			Д	verage, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainte	nance (ma	ax score A=25,	B=35, C=3!	5, D=35)	Score: 16
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:			β	verage, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and sat 53. Comments:	fety:				
54. Seating for ad 55. Comments:	ults:				Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Α	verage, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zone 59. Comments:	s:				Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	ipervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changi 63. Comments:	ng facilities	(Type B, C and I) only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	66				

Site I D 6	Site Name	Burmarsh Recreation Ground Play Area
Type of play area	or facility Type C:	NEAP
Ward R	omney Marsh	
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley and S Wes	st
Date of assessment	: 18/08/2016	
Time: 1	2:40	Weather: Overcast, light rain.





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Fairly large equipped play area with variety of equipment, youth shelter and MUGA structure

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice open sight with variety of equipment, situated in open green space with houses along one side.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

General Information about the site		
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	

Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Type of play area or facility Type C: NEAP Ward Romney Marsh Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 20 16. Informal oversight: Average, needs some improvement (3) 17. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 19. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvement (3) 25. Comments: Weaknesses, improvement (3) 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 20. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Comments: Good (4) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. May needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Averag	Site ID	6	Site Nam		Burmarsh Recr	reation Ground Play Area
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 20 16. Informal oversight: Average, needs some improvement (3) 17. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 19. Omments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 10. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Omments: Weaknesses, improvement (3) 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Good (4) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Comments: Good (4) 33. Comments: Good (4)	Type of play	area or facility	Ту	pe C: NI	EAP	
16. Informal oversight: Average, needs some improvement (3) 17. Comments: Wide open space and viewable from houses along one side. 18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 19. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: Verage, needs some improvement (3) 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: Verage, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 20. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Comments: Good (4) 33. Comments: Good (4) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Avera	Ward	Romney Ma	rsh			
17. Comments: Wide open space and viewable from houses along one side. 18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 19. Comments: 20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Downents: 29. Designed for the site: 29. Designed for different to play: 31. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 21. 22. Play opportunities for disabled children: 29. Play opportunities for disabled children: 20. Soments: 21. 22. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 30. Comments: 31. Comments: 32. Comments:	Location (n	nax score A=35	, B=35, C=	=35, D=	35)	Score: 20
Wide open space and viewable from houses along one side. 18. Well used by children: 19. Comments: 20. Getting there: 21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: 23. Comments: 24. Disability access: 24. Disability access: 25. Comments: 26. Meeting up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Desgined for the site: 29. Comments: 20. Fitcing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 30. Suments: 31. Comments: 32. Comments: 33. Comments: 34. May needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 30. Movement: 30. Movement: 31. Comments: 32. Onoments: 33. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 34. May needs some improvement (3) 35. Comments: 36. Movem	16. Informal	oversight:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 19. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Comments: Good (4) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments:	17. Commen	ts:				
19. Comments: 20. Getting there: 21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: 23. Comments: 24. Disability access: 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Forting to children to play: 20. Enting to different ages (Type B, C and D only): 28. Orwents: 29. Comments: 20. Enting to play ages (Type B, C and D only): 20. Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: 22. Play ages (Type B, C and D only): 30. Comments: 20. Comments: 21. Comments: 22. Play ages (Type B, C and D only): 31. Traginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 32. Comments: 23. Comments: 24. Play needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Movement: 27. Comments: 28. Maginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Comments: 31. Ma	Wide open s	pace and viewabl	e from hou	ses alon	g one side.	
19. Comments: 20. Getting there: 21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: 23. Comments: 24. Disability access: 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Forting to children to play: 20. Enting to different ages (Type B, C and D only): 28. Orwents: 29. Comments: 20. Enting to play ages (Type B, C and D only): 20. Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: 22. Play ages (Type B, C and D only): 30. Comments: 20. Comments: 21. Comments: 22. Play ages (Type B, C and D only): 31. Traginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 32. Comments: 23. Comments: 24. Play needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Movement: 27. Comments: 28. Maginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Comments: 31. Ma						
20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3) 21. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: <td>18. Well use</td> <th>d by children:</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Average, needs some improvement (3)</td>	18. Well use	d by children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: No lighting. 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39.	19. Commen	ts:				
21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: No lighting. 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39.						
22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3) 23. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Score: 34 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 33. Imaginative play ages (Type B,	20. Getting t	here:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments: No lighting. 24. Disability access: 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Entricing to children to play: 31. Comments: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: 41. Comments: 42. Comments: 43. Comments: 44. Comments: 45. Comments: 45. Comments: 46. Movement: 47. Comments: 47. Comments: 47	21. Commen	ts:				
23. Comments: No lighting. 24. Disability access: 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Entricing to children to play: 31. Comments: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: 41. Comments: 42. Comments: 43. Comments: 44. Comments: 45. Comments: 45. Comments: 46. Movement: 47. Comments: 47. Comments: 47						
No lighting. 24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 30. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comments: Good (4) 39. Comme			nd security	' :		Average, needs some improvement (3)
24. Disability access: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Good (4) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: 4verage, needs some improvement (3) 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)		ts:				
25. Comments: No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: 22. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments:						
No path leading up to gate. 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 22. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Entricing to children to ages (Type B, C and D only): 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:	-					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: Good (4) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)						
27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: 41. Comments:	-					Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) Score: 34 30. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:	-					
29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:						
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) Score: 34 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)	28. Designed	l for the site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments: Steringe, needs some improvement (3)	29. Commen	ts:				
30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4) 31. Comments: Good (4) 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: Good (4) 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments: Steringe, needs some improvement (3)		· · · ·	0 0 00			
31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:	•			C=50, L)=50)	
33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:	-	-	y:			G000 (4)
33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:						
34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Good (4) 35. Comments: Good (4) 36. Movement: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 37. Comments: Good (4) 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3) 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)	32. Play opp	ortunities for disa	bled childro	en:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: 41. Comments:	33. Commen	ts:				
35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: 41. Comments:						
36. Movement:Good (4)37. Comments:36. Movement:38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):Average, needs some improvement (3)39. Comments:41. Comments:	-	-	es (Type B,	C and I	D only):	Good (4)
37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)	35. Commen	ts:				
37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)	36 Movemer	nt·				Good (4)
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Average, needs some improvement (3) 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments: 41. Comments:		-				3000 (4)
39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 41. Comments:						
40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3) 41. Comments:	38. Imaginat	ive play ages (Ty	pe B, C an	d D only	<i>י</i>):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comments:	39. Commen	ts:				
41. Comments:						
	40. Ball gam	es:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
No hard court or markings.	41. Commen	ts:				
	No hard cour	t or markings.				

Site I D 6 Site Name Burmars	sh Recreation Ground Play Area
Type of play area or facility Type C: NEAP	
Ward Romney Marsh	
42. Loose parts43. Comments:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the natural environment:45. Comments:	Good (4)
46. Places for children to sit: 47. Comments:	Good (4)
Space youth shelter.	
48. Added play value:49. Comments:	Good (4)
Care and maintenance (max score A=25, B=35, C=3	35, D=35) Score: 14
50. Well maintained: 51. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and safety: 53. Comments:	
54. Seating for adults: 55. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
Two bins, both without bin bags.	
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of supervisory adults (Type B, C and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
61. Comments:	

Site I D 7	Site N	Name Campbell Road Play Area	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP	
Ward	North Downs East		
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley a	and S West	
Date of assessmer	nt: 17/08/2016	6	
Time:	10:52	Weather: Hot but overcast.	





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (multi-action unit, swing set and spinning pole).

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice local play area. Appears to be well maintained and friendly atmosphere.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

, i boob le nave an autoneure playground.	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	7	Site Name	e Ca	mpbell Road P	lay Area
Type of pl	ay area or facili	ty Typ	e B: LEAP		
Ward	North Dov	vns East			
Location	(max score A=3	5, B=35, C=	35, D=35))	Score: 24
16. Inform	al oversight:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	ents:				
Viewed by main road		open space w	ith trees ar	nd hedges alor	ng one side, separating play area from
18. Well u	sed by children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	ents:				
20. Gettin	g there:				Good (4)
21. Comm	ents:				
	al safety, lighting	and security	:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm					
	ong road but Not	in play area.			
	lity access:				Good (4)
25. Comm	ents:				
26. Meetin	g other children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	-				
28. Design	ed for the site:				Good (4)
29. Comm	ents:				
-	e (max score A=		=50, D=5	0)	Score: 29
30. Enticin 31. Comm	ig to children to p	lay:			Good (4)
	ents.				
32. Play or	oportunities for di	sabled childre	n:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm					
34. Play ne	eeds of different a	ages (Type B,	C and D or	nly):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comm					
36. Moven	nent:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm	ents:				
-	native play ages (Type B, C and	I D only):		Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comm	ents:				
40.5."					
40. Ball ga					Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comm					
Space but	no specific court.				

Site ID 7	Site Nam	e Campbell	Road Play Area
Type of play area of	or facility Ty	vpe B: LEAP	
Ward N	orth Downs East		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the na 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for childr 47. Comments:	en to sit:		Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	e:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainten	ance (max score A	=25, B=35, C=3	5, D=35) Score: 16
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	1:		Good (4)
Some litter.			
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ty:		
54. Seating for adul 55. Comments:	ts:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:			Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adults (Type	e B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changing 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B, C	Cand D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	69		

Site ID 8	Site N	ame Can	iterbury Road Recr	eation Ground	
Type of play are	a or facility	Type C: NEAP			
Ward	East Folkestone				
Name of assessor	: S West and	S Wikeley			
Date of assessme	nt: 15/08/2016	ò			
Time:	14:30		Weather:	Sunny, dry	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Two equipped play areas and two MUGAs

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Large open space between equipped areas, well used and welcoming.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No

9	Does	it	have	refreshments?
э.	DUES	IL.	nave	renesinnents:

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site ID 8 Site Name Canterbury	v Road Recreation Ground
Type of play area or facility Type C: NEAP	
Ward East Folkestone	
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 26
16. Informal oversight:	Good (4)
17. Comments:	
18. Well used by children:	Good (4)
19. Comments:	
20. Getting there:	Good (4)
21. Comments:	
22. Personal safety, lighting and security:	Good (4)
23. Comments:	
24. Disability access:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments:	
26. Meeting other children:	Good (4)
27. Comments:	
28. Designed for the site:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments:	
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)	Score: 36
30. Enticing to children to play:31. Comments:	Good (4)
32. Play opportunities for disabled children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comments:	
34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):	Excellent (5)
35. Comments:	
36. Movement:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comments:	
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comments:	
40. Ball games:	Excellent (5)

Site I D 8	Site N	lame Can	terbury Road	Recreation Ground
Type of play are	a or facility	Type C: NEAP		
Ward	East Folkestone			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	e natural environme	nt:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for ch 47. Comments:	ildren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play v 49. Comments:	alue:			Good (4)
Care and maint	enance (max scor	e A=25, B=35,	C=35, D=35	5) Score: 19
50. Well maintain 51. Comments:	ned:			Good (4)
52. Health and s 53. Comments:	afety:			
54. Seating for a 55. Comments:	dults:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zon 59. Comments:	es:			Good (4)
60. Presence of s only): 61. Comments:	supervisory adults (Гуре В, C and D		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
62. Toilets/chang 63. Comments:	ging facilities (Type	B, C and D only):	Seri	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	81			

Cheriton Recreation Area
IEAP
Weather: Sunny.





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Large site with two equipped play areas and hard basketball court.

First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Large variety of equipment on offer. Friendly environment with many people using the area. Equipment well distributed.

Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups

- -

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	Yes	٦
General Information about the site		
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	9		Site N	ame	Cheriton	Recreatio	n Area					
Type of pla	ay area	or facility		Type C: NE	EAP							
Ward	C	Cheriton										
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)		Score:	29				
16. Inform	nal overs	ght:									Good (4	4)
17. Comm	ents:											
18. Well us		nildren:								Exc	cellent (5)
19. Comm	ents:											
20. Getting	g there:										Good (4	4)
21. Comm	ents:											_
22. Person	al safetv	, lighting a	nd secu	ritv:							Good (4	4)
23. Comm		, <u></u>		,.							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
24. Disabil	lity acces	s:									Good (4	4)
25. Comm	ents:											
26 Maatin	a athar	bildrop.									Good (4	4)
26. Meetin 27. Comm		initaren:									G000 (*	+)
28. Design	ned for th	e site:									Good (4	4)
29. Comm	ents:					-						
Play value	e (may	score A-A	0 B-5	0, C=50, C)-50)		Score:	37				
-		dren to play		0, 0-30, L	-30)		500re.	37		Exc	ellent (5	5)
31. Comm	-		-									
	~~~**	ion for dian	blad abi	ldron .			Average,	noodo	somo ir	205010	mont (	2)
33. Comm		ies for disa		luren:			Average,	neeus	somen	nprove	ement (	5)
	ents.											
34. Play ne	eeds of d	ifferent age	es (Type	B, C and I	O only):						Good (4	4)
35. Comm	ents:											
36. Movem 37. Comm											Good (4	+)
57. Comm	ents.											
38. Imagir	native pla	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	·):						Good (4	4)
39. Comm	ents:											
									-			
40. Ball ga							Average,	needs	some ir	nprove	ement (3	3)
41. Comm One baske		n										
Une Daske		Υ·										

Site I D 9		Site Name	Cheriton R	ecreatio	n Area
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: N	IEAP		
Ward C	Cheriton				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:			[		Good (4)
Natural environme 46. Places for child	-	teu into piay spac	ce.		Good (4)
47. Comments:	Ten to sit:				G000 (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:		[		Good (4)
Care and mainter	nance (max	score A=25, B	=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 21
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Some equipment n	nissing.				
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		[		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:		[		Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[		Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		[		Good (4)
<ul><li>60. Presence of sup only):</li><li>61. Comments:</li></ul>	pervisory ad	ults (Type B, C a	nd D		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Space is surveyed	by wardens.				
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ig facilities (	Type B, C and D	only):	Seriou	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	87				

Site ID	10	Site Name	Coniston Road
Type of pla	y area	or facility Type	e A: LAP
Ward	В	roadmead Ward	
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley and S	West
Date of ass	essment	:: 16/08/2016	

Weather:

Time:

16:06



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (slide, swings and rocking horse).

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Grassy area with a few pieces of play equipment. Quite attractive space but equipment fairly worn. Area surrounded by trees so shaded.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	
9 Deep it have a tailet?	No	

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Sunny, hot.

Site I D 10		Site Na	me	Coniston Roa	ad and a second s
Type of play a	rea or facility	-	Type A: LA	λP	
Ward	Broadmead	Ward			
Location (max	x score A=35	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)	Score: 22
16. Informal ov	/ersight:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comments	:				
Can be seen by	v some surroun	ding hou	ses and qu	uiet pathway i	runs alongside.
18. Well used b	y children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:	:				
20. Getting the					Good (4)
21. Comments	:				
22 Demonstration	fotu lighting o		:+		Average poods some improvement (2)
22. Personal sa 23. Comments:		na secur	ity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
No lighting and		at front			
24. Disability a			•		Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments:					
Path leading up	to area but no	ot inside.			
26. Meeting oth	ner children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments:					
28. Designed for	or the site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (s)
Play value (m	ax score A=4	0, B=50	), C=50, C	D=50)	Score: 21
30. Enticing to	children to pla	y:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comments					
22. Dia		1. I I I.	-		Weelingener, immunity and (2)
32. Play opport 33. Comments:		bled child	dren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
55. Comments					
34. Play needs	of different ag	es (Type	B. C and I	D only):	
35. Comments:	-	( · /	_,		
36. Movement:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comments:	:				
	·				
38. Imaginative		ре В, Са	and D only	/):	
39. Comments:					
40. Ball games	:				Good (4)
41. Comments:					

Site ID 10	Site N	lame	Coniston Road	
Type of play area	- or facility	Type A: LA	۱P	
Ward B	Broadmead Ward			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:		nt:		Good (4)
Good amount of tre				
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
One bench.				
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max scor	e A=25, B=	=35, C=35, D=3	35) Score: 11
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
Quite a bit of litter.				
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments: One bench.	ilts:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Se	rious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (1	Гуре В, С an	d D	
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type I	B, C and D o	only):	
Final Score:	54			

Site ID 11		Site Name		Corbett Road Play Are	a	
Type of play a	rea or fa	acility	Type B: Ll	EAP		
Ward	North	Downs East				
Name of asses	sor:	S Wikeley a	nd S West			
Date of assess	ment:	17/08/2016	,			
Time:	15:03	3		Weather:	Overcast, warm.	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped local play area (4 pieces of equipment).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Popular local play area. Equipment quite modern. Friendly atmosphere. Within grassed open space.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Site ID	11		Site Na	ame	Corbett R	oad Play	Area	
Type of pla	ay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP			
Ward	N	orth Downs	East					
Location	(max sco	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score: 28	
16. Inform	al oversi	ght:						Good (4)
17. Comm	ents:							
Open area	. Play are	a viewed by	y many	/ houses. S	urrounded	by publi	ic paths.	
18. Well us	sed by ch	ildren:						Good (4)
19. Comm	ents:							
Currently I	In use by	many.						
20. Getting	g there:							Good (4)
21. Comm	ents:							
22. Person	al safety.	, lighting an	d secu	ritv:				Good (4)
23. Comm				,.				
Surroundir		well lit.						
24. Disabil								Good (4)
25. Comm	-							
26. Meetin	g other c	hildren:						Good (4)
27. Comm	ents:							
28. Design		e site:						Good (4)
29. Comm	ents:							
Play value	e (max s	core A=40	, B=5	0, C=50, [	D=50)		Score: 29	
30. Enticin	g to child	lren to play:	:					Good (4)
31. Comm	ents:							
32 Play or	portuniti	es for disab	lod chi	ildron			Average, needs some im	provement (3)
33. Comm	-			ildi citi.				provement (5)
	ciită.							
34. Play ne	eds of di	fferent ages	s (Type	B. C. and	D only):		Average, needs some im	provement (3)
35. Comm		include ages	.,,,,		5 6111771			
36. Movem	nent:						Average, needs some im	provement (3)
37. Comm	ents:							
38. Imagin	ative pla	y ages (Typ	e B, C	and D only	/):		Average, needs some im	provement (3)
39. Comm	ents:							
40. Ball ga							Average, needs some im	provement (3)
41. Comm	ents:							

Site ID 11	Site N	ame Corbe	tt Road Play Area
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP	
Ward N	lorth Downs East		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	ance (max score	e A=25, B=35, C	=35, D=35) Score: 16
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:		Good (4)
Some litter surrour	iding.		
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments: One bench.	lts:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	73		

Site ID	12	Site	Name	Country's Field
Type of pla	ay area o	or facility	Type A:	LAP
Ward	R	omney Marsh		
Name of as	ssessor:	S Wikeley	and S Wes	st
Date of ass	sessment	: 18/08/201	.6	

Weather:

Time: 14:28



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (multi-action unit, swings).

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Tired looking play area located in small green space, opposite residential houses and down road from school.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Yes

Unrestricted

Overcast, mild.

Site I D 12		Site N	ame	Country's	Field					
Type of play ar	ea or facility		Type A: LA	٩P						
Ward	Romney Ma	rsh								
Location (max	score A=35	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)		Score:	21			
16. Informal ov	ersight:					Average,	needs	some i	mprove	ment (3)
17. Comments:										
Trees partly obs	curing view fr	om hou	ses.							
18. Well used b	y children:					Average,	needs	some i	mprove	ment (3)
19. Comments:										
20. Getting ther 21. Comments:	e:					Average,	needs	some ii	mprove	ment (3)
22. Personal saf 23. Comments:	ety, lighting a	nd secu	rity:	[		Average,	needs	some ii	mprove	ment (3)
24. Disability ac 25. Comments:	cess:			[		Average,	needs	some ii	nprove	ment (3)
26. Meeting oth 27. Comments:	er children:									Good (4)
Near school.										
<ul><li>28. Designed fo</li><li>29. Comments:</li></ul>	r the site:					Weakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)
Play value (ma	ax score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	19			
30. Enticing to a 31. Comments:	children to play	/:				Average,	needs	some ii	mprove	ment (3)
32. Play opportu	unities for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Weakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)
33. Comments:										
34. Play needs of 35. Comments:	of different age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):						
36. Movement:						Weakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)
37. Comments:										
38. Imaginative 39. Comments:	play ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	/):						
40. Ball games: 41. Comments:						Weakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)

Site ID 12	Site	Name	Country's Fie	eld	
Type of play area	or facility	Type A: L	AP		
Ward R	omney Marsh				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environm	ent:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	Je:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max sc	ore A=25, B	=35, C=35, I	D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Equipment rusted a	and worn.				
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults	(Туре В, С а	nd D		
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type	e B, C and D	only):		
Final Score:	53				

Site ID 13	Site Name Daglish Close
Type of play area o	or facility Type B: LEAP
Ward Ne	ew Romney
Name of assessor:	S West and S Wikeley
Date of assessment:	21/08/2016
Time: 15	5:23 Weather: Sunny, dry



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (closed for maintenance).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play area in poor condition, closed for maintenance. Located within grassed open space between housing.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1

9. Does it have refreshments?       No         10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?       No	No	8. Does it have a toilet?
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	No	9. Does it have refreshments?
	No	10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?
11. Is access to site: No access	No access	11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

Closed for maintenance.	
13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)

15. Comments:

Tbc





Site ID	13	Site Na	ame	Daglish Close					
Type of pla	y area or facili	ty	Type B: LE	EAP					
Ward	New Rom	ney							
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 22									
16. Informa	al oversight:		Good (4)						
17. Comme	ents:								
	ed by children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)				
19. Comme	Ints:								
20. Getting	there:				Good (4)				
21. Comme	ents:								
22 Persona	al safety, lighting	and secu	ritv		Average, needs some improvement (3)				
23. Comme			iley.						
24. Disabili	-				Average, needs some improvement (3)				
25. Comme	ents:								
26. Meeting	other children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)				
27. Comme	nts:								
28. Designe	ed for the site:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
29. Comme									
-	(max score A=		0, C=50, L	<b>D=50)</b>	Score: 23 Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
31. Comme	g to children to p ents:	ldy:			weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
	portunities for di	sabled chi	ldren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
33. Comme	ints:								
34. Play ne	eds of different a	iges (Type	B, C and I	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)				
35. Comme	ents:								
36. Moveme	ont				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
37. Comme					weakiesses, improvements needed (2)				
38. Imagina	ative play ages (	Туре В, С	and D only	/):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
39. Comme	ents:								
40. Ball gar	nes'				Average, needs some improvement (3)				
41. Comme					Average, needs some improvement (3)				

Site ID 13	Site	e Name	Daglish Cl	ose
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: L	LEAP	
Ward N	lew Romney			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environn	nent:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max so	ore A=25, E	3=35, C=35	5, D=35) Score: 9
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults	s (Type B, C a	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ıg facilities (Typ	e B, C and D	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	54			

Site ID	14	Site Name		Densole Way		
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP						
Ward	Vard North Downs East					
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West						

Weather:

Date of assessment: 17/08/2016

Time:

10:26



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (7 pieces of equipment).

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Good variety of equipment considering the size and location. Colourful apparatus. Small open green space next to play area.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes						
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years? Yes							
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No						
General Information about the site							
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No						
8. Does it have a toilet?	No						
9. Does it have refreshments?	No						

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Yes

Unrestricted

Sunny, warm.

Site ID	14		Site N	ame	Densole V	Way			
Type of pla	ay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP				
Ward	N	orth Downs	East						
Location	Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 25								
16. Inform	16. Informal oversight: Excellent (5								
17. Comm	17. Comments:								
Clear view from a number of houses. Fence along one side. Unlikely people who aren't residents nearby would be walking past.									
18. Well us	18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3)								
19. Comm	ents:								
20. Getting	-					Good (4)			
21. Comm	ents:								
22. Damaan		l'abtin a au	d			Cood (4)			
22. Person 23. Comm		, lighting an	u secu	rity:		Good (4)			
		but not in p	olav ar	ea					
24. Disabil	_		Juy ur			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
25. Comm	-	5.							
No path lea	ading up	to gate. Ne	ed to c	ross grass.					
26. Meetin	g other c	hildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
27. Comm	ents:								
28. Design 29. Comm		e site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
25. comm	cm3.								
Play value	e (max s	core A=40	), B=5	0, C=50, E	)=50)	Score: 29			
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play:				-,, -	,	Average, needs some improvement (3)			
31. Comments:									
32. Play op	oportuniti	es for disab	led chi	ldren:		Good (4)			
33. Commo	ents:								
Merry-go-r	round at a	same level a	as grou	ind so whee	elchair acc	cessible.			
-		ifferent age	s (Type	e B, C and I	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)			
35. Commo	ents:								
36. Movem	ont:					Average, needs some improvement (3)			
37. Comm						Average, needs some improvement (5)			
38. Imagin	ative pla	y ages (Typ	e B, C	and D only	/):	Average, needs some improvement (3)			
39. Commo	-	/ F	, -	/					
40. Ball ga	mes:					Average, needs some improvement (3)			
41. Comm									

Site ID 14	Site N	ame	Densole W	'ay	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LE	EAP		
Ward N	North Downs East				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:	[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, B=	=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 16
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		[		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:		[		Good (4)
One bench.			r		
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		[		Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C ar	nd D	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ıg facilities (Type B	, C and D c	only):	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	70				
Site ID 15 Type of play area	Site Na a or facility	ame Downs Type A: LAP	Kudu		
---------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	----------	---------------	
Ward	East Folkestone				
Name of assessor	: S Wikeley a	nd S West			
Date of assessme	nt: 15/08/2016				
Time:	11:48		Weather:	Sunny, clear.	
			-		

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (multi-play unit and swings).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Enclosed and secluded area. Not very attractive and worn equipment.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	ч.

No

Yes

Unrestricted

9	Does	it	have	refreshmen	tsī
э.	DUES	IL.	nave	renesimen	ι.э :

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	15		Site N	ame	Downs Ro	ad			
Type of play	area	or facility		Type A: LA	AP				
Ward		East Folkest	one						
Location (n	nax s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	19	
16. Informal	overs	sight:					Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
17. Commer	ts:								
Few passers	by. C	an be viewe	d by so	me residen	its.				
18. Well use	d by c	hildren:					Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
19. Commer	ts:								
20. Getting t 21. Commer							Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
22. Personal	safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)
23. Commer					ļ				
No lighting.									
24. Disability	acce	ss:			[		Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
25. Comments:									
26. Meeting	other	children:					Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
27. Commer					L				
28. Designed 29. Commer		he site:			[		Weakness	es, in	nprovements needed (2)
Play value	(max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50)		Score:	16	
30. Enticing 31. Commer		ldren to play	/:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
32. Play opp	ortuni	ties for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Serio	us weaknes	ses, i	mprovement needed (1)
33. Commer								,	
34. Play nee 35. Commer		different age	es (Type	B, C and	D only):				
36. Moveme	nt:						Weakness	es, in	nprovements needed (2)
37. Commer	ts:								
38. Imaginat		ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	/):				
39. Commer	15:								]
40. Ball gam	es:				[		Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
41. Commer					l				
Small space	availa	ble but surf	ace Not	suited.					

Site ID 15	Sit	e Name	Downs Road	
Type of play area	or facility	Type A: L	AP	
Ward <mark>E</mark>	ast Folkestone			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the needed. 45. Comments:	atural environr	nent:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
<ul><li>46. Places for childr</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
One bench.				
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainten	ance (max so	core A=25, B	8=35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 11
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	1:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Litter, worn/rusted	equipment, da	maged surfac	æs.	
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
One bench in play a	area and two o	utside but stil	l in view.	
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adult	s (Type B, C a	ind D	
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Typ	be B, C and D	only):	
Final Score:	46			

Site I D 16 Site Name I	Dymchurch Recreation Ground						
Type of play area or facility Type C: NEAP							
Ward Romney Marsh							
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West							
Date of assessment: 18/08/2016							
Time: 15:01	Weather: Overcast, mild.						





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Two equipped play areas, one for ages 0-7 the other 7+ , MUGA and small skateboard ramp.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Well equipped play area with many people of different ages using it.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7 Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

The boost in a contract of play ground.	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	16	Site	Name	Dymchurch R	ecreation Ground
Type of pl	lay area	or facility	Type C: N	EAP	
Ward	I	Romney Marsh			
Location	(max so	ore A=35, B=3	5, C=35, D:	=35)	Score: 25
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	ents:				
At edge of is well free			unded by tree	es and shrubbe	ry with little view from outside. Green space
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:			Excellent (5)
19. Comm	ents:				
20. Gettin					Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm					
L		road and some		cross railway tr	
	-	, lighting and se	curity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm		hut waat daaa na	L		
1		but rest does no	τ.		Average needs come improvement (2)
24. Disabi 25. Comm	-	55:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm	ients.				
26. Meetir	ng other	children:			Good (4)
27. Comm	ents:				
28. Desigr		ne site:			Good (4)
29. Comm	ients:				
Diaxyalu	- (m				Secret 40
•		<pre>score A=40, B= dren to play:</pre>	=50, C=50, I	D=50)	Score: 40 Good (4)
31. Comm	-	dien to play.			
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disabled o	children:		Good (4)
33. Comm	ents:				
		lifferent ages (Ty	pe B, C and	D only):	Excellent (5)
35. Comm	ents:				
36. Moven					Good (4)
37. Comm	ients:				
38, Imagir	native pla	ay ages (Type B,	C and D only	v):	Good (4)
39. Comm	-	-, - <u>-</u> , -, pe D,		, ,·	
40. Ball ga	ames:				Good (4)
41. Comm					
Markings i	in MUGA	very faded.			

Site ID	16	Site Name	Dymchurch	Recreation Ground
Type of play	area or facili	Type C:	NEAP	
Ward	Romney M	larsh		
42. Loose pa 43. Commer				Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to 45. Commen	o the natural en its:	vironment:		Good (4)
46. Places fo 47. Commen	or children to sit its:	:		Good (4)
48. Added pl 49. Commen				Good (4)
Care and m	aintenance (n	nax score A=25,	B=35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 18
50. Well mai 51. Commer				Good (4)
Some litter.				
52. Health a 53. Commer	-			
54. Seating 1 55. Commer				Good (4)
56. Litter bir 57. Commer				Excellent (5)
58. Dog free 59. Commer				Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence only): 61. Commen		adults (Type B, C	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/c 63. Commer		s (Type B, C and I	D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score	: 83			

Site ID	17	Site N	lame	Elmfields
Type of play area or facility		or facility	Type B: L	.EAP
Ward Walland & Denge			1arsh	
Name of assessor:		S West and	l S WIkeley	,
Date of assessment:		t: 22/08/2016	5	

Time:

13:38



## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play area located within grass verge opposite housing with fairly new equipment. Quiet area.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	L

8. Does it have a toilet? No	
9. Does it have refreshments? No	
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people? Yes	5
11. Is access to site: Unre	restricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Weather: Sunny, dry



Site I D	17		Site Name	Elmfields							
Type of pl	lay area	- or facility	Туре Е	B: LEAP							
Ward	V	/alland & De	enge Marsh								
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 21						
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:		Average, needs some improvement (3)							
17. Comm	nents:										
18. Well u	ised by ch	nildren:			Average, needs some improvement (3)						
19. Comm	19. Comments:										
20. Gettin	-				Average, needs some improvement (3)						
21. Comm	ients:										
22 Porcor	al cafoty	, lighting ar	d cocurity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)						
23. Comm	-	, nghùng ar	a security.		Average, needs some improvement (5)						
24. Disabi	lity acces	s:			Average, needs some improvement (3)						
25. Comm	nents:										
26. Meetir 27. Comm		children:			Average, needs some improvement (3)						
27. Comm	ients.										
28. Desigr	ned for th	e site:			Average, needs some improvement (3)						
29. Comm	ents:										
-	-		), B=50, C=5	50, D=50)	Score: 34						
30. Enticir 31. Comm	-	lren to play	:		Good (4)						
32. Play o	pportunit	ies for disat	led children:		Good (4)						
33. Comm	ents:										
34. Play no 35. Comm		ifferent age	s (Type B, C a	and D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)						
55. Comm	ients.										
36. Moven	nent:				Average, needs some improvement (3)						
37. Comm											
38. Imagir	native pla	y ages (Typ	e B, C and D	only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)						
39. Comm	ents:										
40											
40. Ball ga 41. Comm					Average, needs some improvement (3)						
1											

Site I D 17	Site N	lame	Elmfields	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: L	EAP	
Ward V	/alland & Denge N	1arsh		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environme	nt:		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:		[	Good (4)
Care and mainter	ance (max scor	e A=25, B	=35, C=35	, D=35) Score: 15
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	1:			Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ty:		[	
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		[	Good (4)
<ul><li>60. Presence of sup only):</li><li>61. Comments:</li></ul>	pervisory adults (T	Гуре В, С а	nd D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type	B, C and D	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	70			

Site ID	18	Site Name	Enbrook Valley Play Area			
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP						
Ward Sandgate & West Folkestone						
Name of assessor: S W		S Wikeley and S West				
Date of assessment:		16/08/2016				

Time:

13:45



## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Weather: Sur

Sunny, hot.



Small play area featuring swings, slide and small multi-action unit. Adjacent goal posts and kickabout area.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Friendly atmosphere in fairly populated residential area. Some equipment missing.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	
Tbc	

Site ID	18		Site Name	Enbrook	Valley Pla	y Area				
Type of p	lay area	or facility	Type B:	LEAP						
Ward	S	andgate &	West Folkestone	9						
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35, C=35,	D=35)		Score:	23			
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:				Average,	needs	some impr	rovement (3)	
17. Comm	nents:									
Can be se	en from a	few house	s. Quiet street r	runs beside.						
18. Well u	used by ch	ildren:				Average,	needs	some impr	rovement (3)	
19. Comments:										
20. Gettin	-								Good (4)	
21. Comm	nents:									
22. Persor	nal safetv	, lighting ar	id security:			Average	needs	some impr	ovement (3)	
23. Comm	-	,			<u> </u>			epi	(0)	
		et but not ir	iside play area.							
24. Disabi	_		. ,						Good (4)	
25. Comm	-									
26. Meetir	ng other o	hildren:				Average,	needs	some impr	rovement (3)	
27. Comm	nents:									
28. Desigi	ned for th	e site:				Average.	needs	some impr	ovement (3)	
29. Comm						5 - ,				
Play valu	ie (max s	core A=40	), B=50, C=50	, D=50)		Score:	26			
	-	lren to play	:			Average, needs some improvement (3)				
31. Comm	nents:									
32 Play o	nnortunit	ies for disat	led children:			Weakness	es im	nrovement	s needed (2)	
33. Comm			neu ciliuren.			Weakiless	es, III	provement	s needed (2)	
	ients.									
34. Play n	eeds of d	ifferent age	s (Type B, C an	d D only):					Good (4)	
, 35. Comm		5	( ) ( )	,,,						
36. Mover	ment:					Weakness	es, im	provement	s needed (2)	
37. Comm	nents:									
20 [m==]	notive -l-					Wookoos	00 1	DROVOM OF	c pooded (2)	
38. Imagi 39. Comm		y ages (Typ	e B, C and D o	iiiy):		weakness	es, im	provement	s needed (2)	
59. COUIII	ients.									
40. Ball ga	ames:								Good (4)	
41. Comm									2000 (1)	
Grass are		al posts								
	5									

Site ID 18	Site Name Enbrook Valley Play Area						
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LE	EAP				
Ward S	Sandgate & West F	olkestone					
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)		
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmer	nt:	[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)		
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)		
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:				Average, needs some improvement (3)		
Care and mainter	nance (max scor	e A=25, B=	=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 15		
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)		
Sign says equipme	nt is regularly che	cked for saf	fety.				
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:						
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ilts:				Average, needs some improvement (3)		
Two benches. One	outside area and	facing away	· -				
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)		
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Good (4)		
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	⊽pe B, C an	nd D	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)		
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type I	3, C and D c	only):	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)		
Final Score:	64						

Site ID 1	.9	Site N	lame	Etchinghill (	Cricket F	ield
Type of play	area or f	acility	Type B: L	EAP		
Ward	North	n Downs West				
Name of asse	ssor:	S Wikeley a	and S West			
Date of asses	sment:	24/08/201	5			
Time:	15:0	8		W	Veather:	Sunny, hot.





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (swings, slide, small climbing frame).

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Tired looking site located at edge of cricket field.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

11. Is access to site:

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	
9. Does it have refreshments?	No	

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	



Tbc

0	0			
0				
	0			

Unrestricted

Yes

1000		an faith		
Sec. 1				
distantian in the				
-	Contraction of	Serie .		
and the second se			enthistar Geographics, Cl er Community	

Site I D 19 Site Name Etchingh	ill Cricket Field
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP	
Ward North Downs West	
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 20
16. Informal oversight:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comments:	
Located at far edge of field. Unlikely to be viewed by anyo	one Not in the cricket field.
18. Well used by children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:	
20. Getting there:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comments:	
22. Personal safety, lighting and security:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments:	
24. Disability access:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments:	
Need to cross field.	
26. Meeting other children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments:	
28. Designed for the site:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments:	
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)	Score: 26
30. Enticing to children to play:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comments:	
32. Play opportunities for disabled children:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments:	
34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):	vement (Average, needs some improvement (3))
35. Comments:	
36. Movement:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comments:	
29 Imaginative play ages (Type P. C and D anhy):	Wooknosses improvements pooded (2)
<ul><li>38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):</li><li>39. Comments:</li></ul>	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
59. comments.	
40. Ball games:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comments:	

Site ID 19	te I D 19 Site Name Etchinghill Cricket Field							
Type of play area	or facility Typ	e B: LEAP						
Ward N	lorth Downs West							
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)					
44. Access to the na 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Good (4)					
46. Places for childr 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Average, needs some improvement (3)					
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)					
Care and mainten	ance (max score A=	25, B=35, C=35, D:	=35) Score: 11					
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)					
Swing broken. Equi 52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	-							
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments: One bench.	lts:		Average, needs some improvement (3)					
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:		S	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)					
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)					
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (Type	3, C and D S	erious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)					
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B, C a	nd D only): S	erious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)					
Final Score:	57							

Site ID	20	Site	Name	Fairfield Recreation G	round	
Type of play area or facility Type C: NEAP				NEAP		
Ward New Romney						
Name of assessor: S West and S Wikeley			d S Wikele	у		
Date of assessment: 16/08/2016						
Time:	14	:49		Weather:	Sunny, dry	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Various play equipment within grassed open space including youth shelters, MUGA (grass), skate park, gym structure, climbing frames and swings. Space heavily used.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8.	Does	it	have	а	toilet?
۰.	0000		11010	~	conce.

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site I D	20		Site N	ame	Fairfield I	Recreation	Ground					
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type C: Ni	EAP							
Ward	ſ	New Romney	/									
Location	(max so	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	29				
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:									Good (	4)
17. Comm	ents:											
18. Well u	sed by c	hildren:								Exc	ellent (	5)
19. Comm	ents:											_
20. Gettin	q there:										، Good	4)
21. Comm	-											,
							•					
		r, lighting ar	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs s	some ir	nprove	ment (	3)
23. Comm	ents:											
24. Disabi	lity acces	SS:									Good (4	4)
25. Comm												
26. Meetir		children:								Exc	ellent (	5)
27. Comm	ents:											_
28. Desigr	ned for th	ne site:									، Good (	4)
29. Comm												,
-		score A=4		0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	43				
30. Enticir 31. Comm	-	dren to play	:								Good (4	4)
	citto:											
32. Play o	pportunit	ties for disal	oled chi	ldren:						Exc	ellent (	5)
33. Comm	ents:											
Swings an	d carous	el for exam	ple.									
		lifferent age	s (Type	e B, C and I	D only):					Exc	ellent (	5)
35. Comm	ents:											_
36. Moven	nent:									Exce	ellent (!	5)
37. Comm										_//0		-1
38. Imagir	native pla	ay ages (Ty	be B, C	and D only	/):						، Good (	4)
39. Comm	ents:											
40 Ball co	meet									Eve	allent (	5)
40. Ball ga 41. Comm										LXC	ellent (!	5)

Site ID 20	S	ite Name	Fairfield R	ecreatio	n Ground
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: N	NEAP		
Ward	lew Romney				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural enviro	nment:	[		Good (4)
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:				Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:		[		Good (4)
Care and mainter	nance (max	score A=25, B	=35, C=35	, D=35	) Score: 20
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ilts:		[		Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[		Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		[		Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adu	lts (Type B, C a	nd D	Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (T	ype B, C and D	only):	Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	92				

Site I D 21	Site N	ame The	Rype				
Type of play area or facility Type C: NEAP							
Ward	Walland & Denge N	1arsh					
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West							
Date of assessme	nt: 22/08/2010	5					
Time:	11:04		Weather:	Sunny, hot.			



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area, youth shelter and trim trail.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice site with wide variety of equipment and good integration into the environment. Equipment is more interesting than standard play area. Located in public green space with mostly houses around the edge.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Site ID	21	S	ite Name	The Rype	
Type of pl	lay area	or facility	Туре С	: NEAP	
Ward		Walland & Der	nge Marsh		
Location	(max so	core A=35, B	=35, C=35,	D=35)	Score: 26
16. Inforn					Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:				
Open space	ce, viewa	able from all a	ngles.		
			-		
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren			Good (4)
19. Comm	-				
20. Gettin	g there:				Good (4)
21. Comm	nents:				
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting and	security:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm					
No lighting	g.				
24. Disabi	-	SS:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm	nents:				
26. Meetir	na other	children:			Good (4)
27. Comm	-				
28. Desigr		he site:			Good (4)
29. Comm	nents:				
Discussion					Q
-		<pre>score A=40, ldren to play:</pre>	B=50, C=5	0, D=50)	Score: 37 Good (4)
31. Comm	-	iuren to play.			
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disable	ed children:		Good (4)
33. Comm	nents:				
34. Play n 35. Comm		different ages	(Туре В, С а	nd D only):	Good (4)
33. Comm	ients.				
36. Mover	nent:				Good (4)
37. Comm					
38. Imagi	native pl	ay ages (Type	B, C and D	only):	Good (4)
39. Comm	nents:				
40. Ball ga					Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comm		maa aras			
No specifi	c ball ga	mes dred.			

Site I D 21	Site N	lame	The Rype	
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: N	EAP	
Ward W	/alland & Denge M	1arsh		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the needed. 45. Comments:	atural environmer	it:		Good (4)
46. Places for childr 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:			Good (4)
Care and mainten	ance (max scor	e A=25, B:	=35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 16
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	1:			Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ty:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adults (T	ype B, C ar	nd D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type E	3, C and D o	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	79			

Site ID 22	Site N	lame Firs La	ine	
Type of play are	a or facility	Type A: LAP		
Ward	Cheriton			
Name of assesso	r: S Wikeley a	and S West		
Date of assessme	ent: 16/08/201	6		
Time:	11:50		Weather:	Hot and sunny.
				1155



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small play area for local residents. Features multi-action set, swings and swivel seats.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Lacklustre appearance. Fairly well used. Small field next to it and surrounding area residential.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7 Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	22		Site N	ame	Firs Lan	e				
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type A: L	.AP					
Ward		Cheriton								
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	=35)		Score:	20		
16. Inforr	nal over	sight:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
17. Comm	nents:									
Can be se	en by so	ome houses.	Surrou	nding stre	ets are qu	iiet.				
	,			5	·					
18. Well ι	ised by	children					Average	noods	some improvement (3)	
19. Comm	-	ciliur cili.					Average,	needs	some improvement (5)	
19. Comm	ients.									
20. Gettin	ng there								Good (4)	
21. Comments:										
22. Persoi	22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)									
23. Comm	23. Comments:									
No lightin	g.									
24. Disabi	ility acce	ess:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
25. Comm	nents:									
	-	p to entranc	es.							
26. Meetii		children:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
27. Comm	nents:									
28. Desigi	ned for I	he site:					Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)	
29. Comm		ine site.						es, m		
Play valu	ıe (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50,	D=50)		Score:	18		
30. Entici	ng to ch	ildren to play	/:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
31. Comm	nents:									
		ities for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)	
33. Comm	nents:									
			·							
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):					
	icites.									
36. Mover	ment:						Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)	
37. Comm								•		
38. Imagi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D onl	ly):					
39. Comm	nents:									
40. Ball g	ames:						Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)	
41. Comm	nents:									

Site ID 22		Site Name	Firs Lane		
Type of play area	or facility	Type A:	LAP		
Ward	Cheriton				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural envi	ronment:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	dren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play va 49. Comments:	lue:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainte	nance (ma	x score A=25,	B=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Graffiti.					
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	rety:				
54. Seating for ad 55. Comments: One bench.	ults:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
One bin but outsid	le play area	•			
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	s:				Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	ipervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D		
62. Toilets/changii 63. Comments:	ng facilities	(Type B, C and I	D only):		
Final Score:	51				

Site ID	23	Site Name George Gurr Crescent
Type of pla	ay area	or facility Type B: LEAP
Ward	E	ast Folkestone
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley and S West
Date of assessment: 15/08/2016		: 15/08/2016

Time:

12:19





## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (multi-action play unit and swings) and small grass football area (one goal).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Fairly secluded area at end of road. Site is quite worn down. Attractive backdrop.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	

<ol><li>Does it have an adventure playground?</li></ol>	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	No
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole site	
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improveme	nt needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D 23	Site	Site Name George Gurr Crescent					
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LE	AP				
Ward B	East Folkestone						
Location (max so	ore A=35, B=3	5, C=35, D=	35)	Score: 16			
16. Informal overs	ight:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
17. Comments:							
Slight view from re	esidential street.	Otherwise vei	ry secluded.				
18. Well used by children:Average, needs some improvement (3)							
19. Comments:							
20. Getting there:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
21. Comments:							
Only one entrance							
22. Personal safety	, lighting and se	curity:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
23. Comments:							
No lights. Secluded							
24. Disability acces	SS:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
25. Comments:							
26. Meeting other	children:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
27. Comments:							
28. Designed for th	ne site:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
29. Comments:							
Play value (max		50, C=50, D	D=50)	Score: 25			
30. Enticing to chil 31. Comments:	dren to play:			Good (4)			
31. Comments:							
32. Play opportunit	ties for disabled (	hildren		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
33. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
34. Play needs of c	lifferent ages (Ty	pe B, C and I	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)			
35. Comments:							
36. Movement:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
37. Comments:							
38. Imaginative pla	ay ages (Type B,	C and D only	′):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
39. Comments:							
40. Ball games:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
41. Comments:							
Small area for foot	ball with no marl	kings and one	e goal.				

Site I D 2	3		Site Name George Gurr Crescent					
Type of play	area o	r facility	·	Type B: L	EAP			
Ward	Eas	st Folkesto	ne					
42. Loose par 43. Comment						Seriou	s weaknesses, impr	ovement needed (
44. Access to 45. Comment		ural envir	onment	:			Average, needs so	me improvement (3
46. Places for 47. Comment		n to sit:					Average, needs so	me improvement (3
Small space for	or child	ren to sit.						
48. Added pla 49. Comment		::					Weaknesses, impro	ovements needed (2
Care and ma	intena	nce (max	score	A=25, B	=35, C=3	5, D=35)		Score: 9
50. Well main 51. Comment							Weaknesses, impro	ovements needed (2
Litter and sur		a planting	overar	owina. Gr	affiti. Bin c	overflowing	a.	
52. Health an 53. Comment	d safety							
54. Seating fo 55. Comment No seating.		s:				Seriou	s weaknesses, impr	rovement needed (
56. Litter bins 57. Comment						Seriou	is weaknesses, impr	rovement needed (
One bin that i	s overf	lowing.						
58. Dog free z 59. Comment							Average, needs so	me improvement (:
60. Presence only): 61. Comments		rvisory ad	ults (Ty	rpe B, C ai	nd D	Seriou	s weaknesses, impr	rovement needed (
62. Toilets/ch 63. Comment		facilities (	Type B,	C and D	only):	Seriou	s weaknesses, impr	rovement needed (
Final Score:		50						

Site I D 24 Site N	ame <mark>Grang</mark>	je Road Play Par	k
Type of play area or facility	Type C: NEAP		
Ward Hythe			
Name of assessor: S Wikeley a	nd S West		
Date of assessment: 23/08/2016	1		
Time: 11:17		Weather:	Sunny, hot.
		N.	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area, trim trail, MUGA structure and two table tennis tables.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice site surrounded by trees and shrubbery. Lots of space. Wide variety of equipment, mostly in good condition and modern looking.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

7. Does it have an adventure playground:	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	24		Site Name Grange Road Play Park			
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type C: NE	EAP	
Ward	H	ythe				
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)	Score: 23
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comm	ents:					
Viewable f	rom top 1	loors of a co	ouple o	f houses b	ut elsewhere su	rrounded by trees and shrubbery.
18. Well u	sed by ch	ildren:				Good (4)
19. Comm	ents:					
20. Gettin	-					Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm	ients:					
22, Person	nal safetv	, lighting an	d secu	ritv:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	-	,		,.		
No lighting	g. Only or	ne entrance,	'exit.			
24. Disabi	lity acces	s:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm	ents:					
Access by	dirt path					
26. Meetir	ng other o	hildren:				Good (4)
27. Comm	ents:					
28. Desigr	ned for th	e site:				Good (4)
29. Comm						
Play valu	e (max s	core A=40	B=5	0. C=50. F	)=50)	Score: 37
-		lren to play		0,0-00,2		Good (4)
31. Comm	-					
		es for disab	led chi	ldren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comm	ents:					
34 Play p	oods of d	ifferent ages		B C and [		Excellent (5)
35. Comm		inerent ages	s(iyhe	: D, C anu I	D offiy).	
36. Moven	nent:					Good (4)
37. Comm	ents:					
			_			
		y ages (Typ	e B, C	and D only	·):	Good (4)
39. Comm	ents:					
40. Ball ga	ames:					Good (4)
41. Comm						
	-					

Site ID 24	Site Name	Grange Road Play Park
Type of play area	or facility Type C	NEAP
Ward H	lythe	
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment:	Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valı 49. Comments:	ue:	Good (4)
Care and mainter	nance (max score A=25	B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 15
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
	ment broken but clearly m	arked off. Some vandalism.
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:	
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:	Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (Type B, C	and D Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
	ig facilities (Type B, C and	O only): Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments: Final Score:	g facilities (Type B, C and	O only): Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)

Site ID 25	Site Name	Greatstone Car Park
Type of play ar	a or facility Type C: N	EAP
Ward	Walland & Denge Marsh	
Name of assess	: S West and S Wikeley	

Date of assessment:

Time:

15:46



21/08/2016

## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

ΜI	JGA

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

MUGA adjacent car park. Fairly new structure.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No				
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes				
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes				
General Information about the site					
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No				
8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes				
9. Does it have refreshments?	No				

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Weather: Sunny, dry



Unrestricted				
e gates:				

Yes

Site I D	25		Site Na	ame	Greatston	e Car Park
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type C: N	EAP	
Ward	V	/alland & D	enge M	arsh		
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 24
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:				Good (4)
17. Comm	ents:					
18. Well u	sed by cł	ildren:				Good (4)
19. Comm	-				L	
20. Gettin	g there:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm	ents:					
22. Persor	al safety	, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Good (4)
23. Comm	ents:					
24. Disabi	lity acces	s:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm	ents:					
26. Meetir	ng other o	hildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	ents:					
28. Desigr	ned for th	e site:			[	Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comm	ents:					
Play valu	e (max s	core A=4	D, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50)	Score: 30
	-	lren to play	:		[	Good (4)
31. Comm	ients:					
32. Play o	pportunit	es for disa	oled chi	ldren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comm	ents:					
34 Play n	eeds of d	ifferent age	s (Type	BCand	D only).	Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comm		inci ciic ugo	.5 (Type	, b, c and	B only j.	
36. Moven	nenti					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
36. Moven 37. Comm						weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
38. Imagir	native pla	y ages (Ty	be B, C	and D only	y):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comm	ents:					
40. Ball ga	ames:					Excellent (5)
41. Comm	ents:				L	

Site ID 25	Site N	ame	Greatston	ne Car Park
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: NE	EAP	
Ward	Walland & Denge M	larsh		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural environmen	t:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	Iren to sit:			Good (4)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainte	nance (max score	e A=25, B=	=35, C=35	5, D=35) Score: 19
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:			Good (4)
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for add 55. Comments:	ults:			Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	5:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C an	id D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changir 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type B	3, C and D o	only):	Good (4)
Final Score:	73			

Site I D 26	Site N	lame Harv	vest Way		
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP					
Ward	North Downs East				
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West					
Date of assessmer	nt: 17/08/2016	5			
Time:	12:09		Weather:	Overcast, warm.	





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (swings, multi-action unit, see-saw, merry-go-round and rocking horses).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Quite worn and rusted area with fairly limited equipment. Seems mostly designed for younger children due to size of apparatus. Located at top of sloped open grass area, surrounded by houses.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7 Doos it have an adventure playaround?	No

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	26		Site N	ame	Harvest Way						
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type B: LE	AP						
Ward		North Down	s East								
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score: 22					
16. Informal oversight: Goo											
17. Comm	ents:										
Open space	ce viewa	ble from all	sides. S	Surrounded	by houses.						
18. Well u	ised by a	-hildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)					
19. Comm	-										
20. Gettin	g there:					Good (4)					
21. Comm	ents:										
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting ai	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)					
23. Comm	ents:										
No lighting	g and av	vay from the	roads	so would be	e dark at nigh	t.					
24. Disabi	lity acce	ess:				Average, needs some improvement (3)					
25. Comm	ents:										
No path le	-										
26. Meetir	-	children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)					
27. Comm	ients:										
28. Desigr	hed for t	ha sita:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)					
29. Comm						(=)					
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, C	)=50)	Score: 26					
30. Enticir	ng to chi	ldren to play	<b>':</b>			Average, needs some improvement (3)					
31. Comm	ents:										
		ities for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)					
33. Comm	ents:										
			<i>(</i> <b>—</b>								
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	e B, C and L	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)					
		aimed at vo	ounger	children, alt	though 5-11 c	could also use certain apparatus.					
36. Moven			J			Average, needs some improvement (3)					
37. Comm											
38. Imagir	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	·):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)					
39. Comm	ents:										
40. Ball ga	ames:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)								
41. Comm	ents:										
No specifi	c area b	ut space sur	roundin	g.							

Site ID 26	Site N	lame	Harvest W	ау		
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: Ll	EAP			
Ward N	North Downs East					
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[	Serious weakn	esses, improvem	ent needed (1)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmer	it:	[	Averag	e, needs some in	nprovement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		[	Averag	e, needs some in	nprovement (3)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:		[	Averag	e, needs some in	nprovement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (max scor	e A=25, B	=35, C=35	D=35)	Sco	ore: 14
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:			Averag	e, needs some in	nprovement (3)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		[			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:		[			Good (4)
Two benches. 56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[	Serious weakn	iesses, improven	nent needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		[			Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C ar	nd D	Serious weakn	esses, improven	nent needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type E	3, C and D	only):	Serious weakn	esses, improven	nent needed (1)
Final Score:	62					
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP   Ward North Downs East   Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West   Date of assessment: 17/08/2016	Site I D 27	Site Name Heron Forstall Avenue				
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------				
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West	Type of play area	or facility Type B: LEAP				
	Ward	North Downs East				
Date of assessment: 17/08/2016	Name of assessor	S Wikeley and S West				
	Date of assessme	nt: 17/08/2016				

Time:

13:58





# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (swings, multi-action unit and rocking horses).

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice looking play area for local residents within grassed area.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	

Tbc

Site ID 27 Site Name Heron Fo	orstall Avenue
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP	
Ward North Downs East	
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 27
16. Informal oversight:	Good (4)
17. Comments:	
Can be viewed by some houses. Located in public green s	space through which people often walk.
18. Well used by children:	Good (4)
19. Comments:	
20. Getting there: 21. Comments:	Good (4)
<ul><li>22. Personal safety, lighting and security:</li><li>23. Comments:</li></ul>	Good (4)
Lighting along pathway running next to play area.	
24. Disability access:	Good (4)
25. Comments:	
<ul><li>26. Meeting other children:</li><li>27. Comments:</li></ul>	Average, needs some improvement (3)
<ul><li>28. Designed for the site:</li><li>29. Comments:</li></ul>	Good (4)
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)	Score: 28
30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
32. Play opportunities for disabled children:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments:	
<ul><li>34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):</li><li>35. Comments:</li></ul>	Average, needs some improvement (3)
36. Movement:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comments:	
<ul><li>38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):</li><li>39. Comments:</li></ul>	Average, needs some improvement (3)
40. Ball games:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comments:	

Site I D 27	Site N	ame Heron	Forstall Aver	nue
Type of play area of	or facility	Type B: LEAP		
Ward N	orth Downs East			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the na 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for childr 47. Comments:	en to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	e:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainten	ance (max score	e A=25, B=35, C⊧	=35, D=35)	Score: 15
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Lots of litter. Rust of	on equipment.			
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ty:			
54. Seating for adul 55. Comments:	lts:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:				Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adults (T	ype B, C and D	Seriou	is weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changing 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D only):	Seriou	is weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	70			

Final Score:

70

Site ID	28	Site	Name	Horn St	reet	
Type of pla	y area o	or facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward	H	ythe				
Name of as	sessor:	S West ar	nd S Wikeley	у		
Date of asse	essment	: 21/08/20	16			
Time:	1	4:15			Weather:	Sunny, dry



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Metal trim trail.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Trim trail located to the edge of grass field at the bottom of the slope.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

9. Does it have refreshments?No10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?Yes	
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people? Yes	
, 51 1	
11. Is access to site: Unrestricted	

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	28		Site N	ame	Horn Stree	et						
Type of pl	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	AP							
Ward		Hythe										
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)		Score:	19				
16. Inforn	nal over	sight:			[		Average,	needs	some	mprov	ement	: (3)
17. Comm	nents:											
18. Well u	ised by	children:					Average,	needs	some i	mprov	ement	:(3)
19. Comm	nents:				L							
20. Gettin	-	:					Average,	needs	some i	mprov	ement	(3)
21. Comm	nents:											
22 Dorsor		v lighting o		rity			Weakness	os im	nrover	onte n	ممطمط	(2)
22. Person 23. Comm		ty, lighting a	nu secu	iity.	ļ		Weakiless	es, iiii	proven	ients n	eeueu	(2)
25. com	ienes.											
24. Disabi	lity acce	ess:			[		Weakness	es, im	proven	nents n	eeded	(2)
25. Comm	nents:				L							
26. Meetir		children:					Average,	needs	some	mprov	ement	: (3)
27. Comm	ients:											
28. Desigr	ned for t	the site:					Average,	needs	some i	mprov	ement	: (3)
29. Comm					L							
Play valu	ie (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, C	D=50)		Score:	25				
30. Enticir 31. Comm	-	ildren to play	/:				Average,	needs	some i	mprov	ement	(3)
51. Comm	ients.											
32. Play o	pportun	ities for disa	bled chi	ldren:			Weakness	es, im	proven	nents r	eeded	(2)
33. Comm	• •				L							
		different age	es (Type	B, C and I	O only):		Average,	needs	some	mprov	ement	:(3)
35. Comm	nents:											
36. Mover	mont						Weakness	oc im	provon	onte r	oodod	(2)
37. Comm					l		WEakness	es, im	proven	ients i	eeueu	(2)
38. Imagi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	'):		Weakness	es, im	proven	nents n	eeded	(2)
39. Comm	nents:				L							
40. Ball ga					[		Weakness	es, im	proven	nents n	eeded	(2)
41. Comm	nents:											

Site ID 28	Sit	e Name	Horn Stre	et
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: I	LEAP	
Ward H	lythe			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environr	nent:		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (max so	core A=25, E	3=35, C=35	
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:			Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adult	s (Type B, C a	and D	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Typ	e B, C and D	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	58			

Site ID 2	9	Site Name Hythe Skate Park						
Type of play	area or fa	acility	Type C: N					
Ward	Hythe	2						
Name of assessor: S West and S Wikeley								
Date of assess	sment:	21/08/2010	5					
Time:	13:49	9			Weather:	Sunny, dry		
					4			



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

1		F	-	1	
1			- 1:10		
1-1			A CONTRACT	anter .	- the
-		- ASA			
	and the second				
Servi	ice Layer Credits: Sour Naciums, Aerogris, IGN	run: Esri, Digita)Globe 4, EGP, Swisstopo, and	r, Geollye, Karthster 1 the GIS User Comm		itau DS. USDA, USGS, Al

Skate park

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Located within corner of field screened by hedge. Heavily used.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

, i boos le nave an daventare playground.	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	29		Site N	ame	Hythe Ska	ite Park			
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type C: N	IEAP				
Ward		Hythe							
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35	, C=35, D:	=35)		Score:	24	
16. Inforn	nal over	sight:					Weaknesse	es, in	provements needed (2)
17. Comm	nents:				L				
18. Well u	ised by	children:							Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:				L.				
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-								Good (4)
	ienes.								
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	irity:			Average, r	needs	s some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:				L				
24. Disabi	-	ess:							Good (4)
25. Comm	nents:								
26. Meetir	ng other	children:							Good (4)
27. Comm					L				
					ſ		•		
28. Desigr 29. Comm		the site:					Average, r	needs	s some improvement (3)
25. com	ienes.								
Play valu	ie (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50,	D=50)		Score:	25	
30. Enticir	ng to ch	ildren to play	<i>'</i> :		[				Good (4)
31. Comm	nents:								
32 Play o	nnortun	ities for disa	hled ch	ildren:			Average, r	reeds	s some improvement (3)
33. Comm					l		, werage, i	leeue	
34. Play n	eeds of	different age	es (Typ	e B, C and	D only):		Average, r	needs	s some improvement (3)
35. Comm	nents:								
36. Mover							Weaknesse	es, im	provements needed (2)
37. Comm	nents:								
38. Imaqi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D onl	y):		Average, r	needs	some improvement (3)
39. Comm			. , -						
40. Ball ga	ames:					Seriou	us weakness	ses, i	mprovement needed (1)
41. Comm	nents:								

Site ID	29	Site Name	Hythe Ska	te Park	
Type of pla	ay area or facility	Type C: N	NEAP		
Ward	Hythe				
42. Loose p 43. Comme				Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access 45. Comme	to the natural env ents:	ironment:	[	1	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places 47. Comme	for children to sit: ents:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added 49. Comme			[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and i	maintenance (m	ax score A=25, B	3=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 17
50. Well m 51. Comme			[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health 53. Comme	and safety: ents:		[		
54. Seating 55. Comme	g for adults: ents:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter b 57. Comme			[		Excellent (5)
58. Dog fre 59. Comme			[		Good (4)
60. Presend only): 61. Comme		adults (Type B, C a	and D	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/ 63. Comme		(Type B, C and D	only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Scor	e: 66				

Site ID	30	Site N	Site Name			
Type of play area or facility			Type B: LE	EAP		
Ward	V	Valland & Denge M	d & Denge Marsh			
Name of assessor: S West and S Wikele			S Wikeley			
Date of assessment: 22/08/2016						

Weather:

Time:

13:59



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Circular swing, trim trail, basketball hoop and 2 No goals.

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Under used space within grassed area. New trim trail and swing, the other equipment is weathered. A local resident commented the site is rarely used since the new equipment has been installed. The old equipment was more popular.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No

ο.	Dues	īι	nave	d	tone	369	
-	_				~		

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Sunny, dry

Site I D	30		Site Na	ame	Ivychurch	Play Area
Type of pla	ay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP	
Ward	V	/alland & D	enge M	arsh		
Location (	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 20
16. Inform	al oversi	ght:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comme	ents:					
18. Well us	sed by ch	nildren:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
19. Comme	ents:					
20. Getting 21. Commo	-				L	Average, needs some improvement (3)
	chto.					
22. Person	al safety	, lighting ar	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comme	-				L	
24. Disabil	ity acces	s:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comme	ents:					
26. Meetin	a other (	hildron				Average, needs some improvement (3)
20. Meetin 27. Comme		iniuren.				
28. Design	ed for th	e site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comme	ents:				_	
-				0, C=50, E	D=50)	Score: 24 Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
31. Comm	-	lren to play	•		L	weaknesses, implovements needed (2)
32. Play op	portunit	ies for disal	oled chi	ldren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comme	ents:					
			<i>.</i>		- · · · · ·	A
34. Play ne 35. Comme		ifferent age	s (Type	e B, C and I	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
36. Movem	nent:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comme	ents:				L	
		y ages (Ty	be B, C	and D only	y):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comme	ents:					
40. Ball ga	mes				Г	Good (4)
40. Ball ga					L	G000 (4)

Site ID 30	Site Name	e Ivychurcl	n Play Area	
Type of play area	or facility Typ	be B: LEAP		
Ward V	Valland & Denge Marsl	h		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			V	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		V	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:		V	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max score A=	=25, B=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 11
50. Well maintainer 51. Comments:	d:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ilts:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		V	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (Type	B, C and D	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B, C	and D only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	55			

Site ID	31	Site	Name	Jeffersto	ne Lane		
Type of p	lay area or f	facility	Type B: I	LEAP			
Ward	Rom	ney Marsh					
Name of a	issessor:	S West ar	nd S Wikeley	/			
Date of as	sessment:	11/08/20	16				
Time:	15:2	28			Weather:	Sunny, dry	
							1





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Multi activity play unit, swings, basketball hoop and goal posts.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Rural setting with play equipment to the margins of grassed field. Fairly well used.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7 Deep it have an adventure playeround?	No

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	INO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	31		Site N	ame	Jefferston	ie Lane	
Type of pl	lay area	a or facility		Type B: L	EAP		
Ward		Romney Mai	rsh				
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35	, C=35, D:	=35)		Score: 18
16. Inforn	nal over	sight:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comm	nents:						
18. Well u	ised by	children:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	nents:						
							Augusta and a series increase (2)
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-						Average, needs some improvement (3)
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	irity:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:						
24. Disabi		ess:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
25. Comm	ients:						
26. Meetir	ng other	children:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
27. Comm							
28. Desigr 29. Comm		he site:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. com							
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50,	D=50)		Score: 29
30. Enticir	ng to ch	ildren to play	<i>'</i> :				Good (4)
31. Comm	nents:						
32 Play o	pportup	ities for disa	blod ch	ildron			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm				nuren.			weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
34. Play n	eeds of	different age	es (Typ	e B, C and	D only):		Good (4)
35. Comm	nents:						
36. Mover							Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comm	ients:						
38. Imagii	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D onl	y):		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comm		,	-				
40. Ball ga	ames:						Good (4)
41. Comm	nents:						

Site I D 31	Site	Name	Jefferstone	Lane
Type of play area	- or facility	Type B: l	EAP	
Ward R	tomney Marsh			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environme	ent:		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max sco	ore A=25, E	3=35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 13
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (	(Type B, C a	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type	B, C and D	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	60			

Site ID	32	Site	Name	Jocks Pi	tch	
Type of pl	ay area or f	acility	Type A: I	LAP		
Ward	Folke	stone Harbo	our			
Name of a	ssessor:	S West a	nd S Wikeley	/		
Date of as	sessment:	15/08/20	16			
Time:	10:2	2			Weather:	Sunny, clear day. Quite windy.
					1000	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small playground (3 features) surrounded by fence.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Looks a little worn but good location. Located in a large open space with housing to one side.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

<ol><li>Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?</li></ol>	Yes			
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes			
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No			
General Information about the site				
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No			

8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Score: 20 Good (4)
Good (4)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
(=)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Score: 17
Good (4)
Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Average, needs some improvement (3)

Site ID 32		Site Name	Jocks Pitc	h	
Type of play are	a or facility	Туре А	: LAP		
Ward	Folkestone	Harbour			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	e natural envi	ronment:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for ch 47. Comments:	ildren to sit:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
One bench.					
48. Added play v 49. Comments:	alue:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and maint	enance (ma	ix score A=25	, B=35, C=35	5, D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintai 51. Comments:	ned:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
No litter but equ	ipment quite	worn and weed	ls growing.		
52. Health and s 53. Comments:	afety:				
54. Seating for a 55. Comments: One bench.	dults:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zon 59. Comments:	es:				Good (4)
Sign for no dog :	zone.				
60. Presence of s only): 61. Comments:	supervisory a	dults (Type B, (	C and D		
62. Toilets/chang 63. Comments:	ging facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):		
Final Score:	50				

Site I D 33	Site N	ame Jubile	e Field	
Type of play area of	or facility	Type C: NEAP		
Ward N	orth Downs West			
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley a	nd S West		
Date of assessment	: 23/08/2016			
Time: 1	0:16		Weather:	Sunny, warm.





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area, skate park, trim trail, green gym, youth shelter, small football goal and MUGA.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Good site with variety of equipment located in large green space. Space surrounded by trees and shrubbery and next to village hall. Friendly atmosphere and in use.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

General Information about the site	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers? Yes	

<ol><li>Does it have an adventure playground?</li></ol>	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID 33	Site Name Jubilee	e Field
Type of play area or facility	Type C: NEAP	
Ward North Down	s West	
Location (max score A=35,	B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 23
16. Informal oversight:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comments:		
Open space but quite secluded busy.	d. Not viewed by anyone ι	unless they are in the area but seems to be fairly
18. Well used by children:		Good (4)
19. Comments:		
20. Getting there: 21. Comments:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
22. Personal safety, lighting a	nd security:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments:		5-,
No lighting.		
24. Disability access:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments:		
Path leading up to play area is	s uneven gravel so may po	ose issue for some.
26. Meeting other children:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments:		
28. Designed for the site:		Good (4)
29. Comments:		
Some play area integrated integra	o terrain	
Play value (max score A=4		Score: 39
30. Enticing to children to play		Good (4)
31. Comments:		
32. Play opportunities for disa	bled children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comments:		
34. Play needs of different age	as (Type B. C and D only)	: Excellent (5)
35. Comments:		
36. Movement:		Good (4)
37. Comments:		
38. Imaginative play ages (Ty	pe B, C and D only):	Good (4)
39. Comments:		
40. Ball games:		Good (4)
41. Comments:		

Site ID 33	Site	Name	Jubilee Fi	ield	
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: I	NEAP		
Ward N	lorth Downs Wes	st			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environme	ent:			Good (4)
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:				Good (4)
Youth shelter in ba	d condition. Ben	ches broken	and lots of	litter.	
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:				Good (4)
Care and mainter	nance (max sco	ore A=25, E	8=35, C=3	5, D=35	5) Score: 15
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Lots of litter. Broke	n glass. Graffiti.	Broken ber	ich in youth	shelter.	Gate broken.
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:				Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Good (4)
Recycling bin but o	nly in one locatio	on. May nee	d more for	site of th	iis size.
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults	(Type B, C a	ind D	Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type	B, C and D	only):	Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	77				

Site ID	34	Site Name	Kettle Drive Play Area
Type of play area or facility			C: NEAP
Ward	N	orth Downs East	
Name of assessor: S We		S West and S Wik	keley
Date of assessment:		21/08/2016	

Time:

10:56



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area, youth shelter and MUGA.

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play equipment set within grassed open space between housing. Equipment of a newer appearance.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7 Does it have an adventure playground?	No	Т

	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Site I D	34		Site N	ame	Kettle D	rive Play	Area			
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type C: Ni	EAP					
Ward	1	lorth Down	s East							
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	25		
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:							Good	i (4)
17. Comm	ents:									
18. Well u	sed by c	nildren:							Good	i (4)
19. Comm	ents:									
20. Gettin	-								Good	1 (4)
21. Comm	ents:									
22 Damaar		. linking a					Average 1	noodo	como improvoment	- (2)
22. Persor 23. Comm		, lighting a	na secu	rity:			Average, I	neeus	some improvement	. (3)
23. Comm	ients.									
24. Disabi	lity acces	s:							Good	1(4)
25. Comm	-									. ,
26. Meetir		children:					Average,	needs	some improvement	t (3)
27. Comm	ents:									
28. Desigr	ned for th	e site:					Average,	needs	some improvement	t (3)
29. Comm										
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, C	D=50)		Score:	35		
	-	dren to play	<b>/:</b>						Good	l (4)
31. Comm	ents:									
32 Play of	nnortunit	ies for disa	hled ch	ildren			Weakness	es im	provements needed	1(2)
33. Comm				iluren.			WCakiiC35	cs, m	provements needed	(2)
34. Play n	eeds of d	ifferent age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):				Excellent	t (5)
35. Comm										
36. Moven	nent:								Good	l (4)
37. Comm	ents:									
38 Imagir	native pla		ne R C	and D only	<i>(</i> ).		Average	neede	some improvement	t (3)
39. Comm		, uges (1y	рс D, С				, we raye, i	cus		. (3)
40. Ball ga	ames:								Good	l (4)
41. Comm										

Site ID 34	Site Nar	ne Kettle Dri	ive Play Area
Type of play area	or facility	ype C: NEAP	
Ward N	lorth Downs East		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	Je:		Good (4)
<b>Care and mainter</b> 50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	nance (max score / d:	A=25, B=35, C=3	5, D=35) Score: 15 Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments: 54. Seating for adu			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
55. Comments:			
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Good (4)
<ul><li>60. Presence of sup only):</li><li>61. Comments:</li></ul>	pervisory adults (Typ	be B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B,	C and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	75		

Site ID	35	Site Name	King George V Playing Field
Type of pla	y area o	or facility Type	e C: NEAP
Ward	N	orth Downs East	
Name of as	keley		
Date of assessment: 24/08/2016			

Time:

12:29



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area within field.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Various interesting and numerous timber play equipment within grass field including goal posts/kickabout area.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes		
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes		
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes		
General Information about the site			
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1	
8. Does it have a toilet?			

9	Does	it	have	refres	hmen	ts?
э.	DUES	ιu	nave	101105	unnen	its:

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site ID	35		Site N	ame	King Geo	orge V Pla	ying Field		
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type C: N	NEAP				
Ward		North Down	s East						
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	=35)		Score:	25	
16. Inforn	nal overs	sight:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
17. Comm	nents:								
18. Well u	ised by o	children:							Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:								
20. Gettin	g there:						Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
21. Comm	nents:								
22 Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity.			Average.	needs	some improvement (3)
23. Comm		y, nghàng đi		integ i			, we age,	neede	
24. Disabi	ility acce	ss:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
25. Comm	nents:								
26. Meetir		children:							Good (4)
27. Comm	ients:								
28. Desigr	ned for t	he site:							Excellent (5)
29. Comm									
Diaxwalu			0 D E	0 0 50			E a a mai	41	
-		score A=4 Idren to play		0, C=50,	D=50)		Score:	41	Excellent (5)
31. Comm	-		•						
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
33. Comm	nents:								
			-						
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):				Good (4)
36. Mover	nent:								Good (4)
37. Comm	nents:					L			
		ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D onl	y):				Good (4)
39. Comm	nents:								
40. Ball ga	ames:								Good (4)
41. Comm						[			

Site ID 35	Site Na	ame King Geo	rge V Pla	ying Field
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: NEAP		
Ward N	lorth Downs East			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:		Excellent (5)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:			Excellent (5)
Care and mainter	ance (max score	A=25, B=35, C=3	5, D=35	) Score: 19
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:			Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (Ty	ype B, C and D		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D only):		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Final Score:	85			

Site ID 36	Site Name Lade Fort	
Type of play area	or facility Type B: LEAP	
Ward	Walland & Denge Marsh	
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley and S West	
Date of assessmen	nt: 21/08/2016	
Time:	16:09 Weather: Sunny, warm.	

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (multi-action unit), MUGA structure and trim trail.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Site located in large fenced green space with residential houses around the edge. Play equipment fairly worn and limited.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	36		Site Na	ame	Lade Fort	
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP	
Ward	V	/alland & De	enge Ma	arsh		
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)	Score: 21
16. Inforn	nal oversi	ght:			[	Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	nents:				L	
Area fairly	/ secluded	l as is fence	d off, b	out some vi	iew from ga	rdens of houses surrounding.
18. Well u	ised by ch	ildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	-				L	
20. Gettin	g there:					Good (4)
21. Comm	nents:					
	-	, lighting an	d secu	rity:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
23. Comm						
24. Disabi		te secluded.			Γ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm	-	5.			L	Average, needs some improvement (s)
26. Meetir	ng other o	hildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	nents:					
28 Decis	and for th	o oito :			Γ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
28. Desigr 29. Comm		e site:			L	Average, needs some improvement (3)
Play valu	ie (max s	core A=40	), B=50	0, C=50, C	D=50)	Score: 28
30. Enticir	ng to child	lren to play	:		Γ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comm	nents:					
22. Diau a			امام ام	1	Γ	Weekneed improvements needed (2)
32. Play o 33. Comm		ies for disab	nea chi	laren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
55. Comm	ients.					
34. Play n	eeds of d	ifferent age	s (Type	B, C and I	D only):	Good (4)
35. Comm		5	( <i>)</i>	•		
36. Mover						Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm	nents:					
38 Imagi	nativo pla	y ages (Typ		and D only	<i></i> ۲	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comm		γ αγες (ΤΥμ	с D, С			weakingses, improvements needed (2)
40. Ball ga	ames:					Good (4)
41. Comm					L	

Site ID	36		Site Na	ame	Lade For	t		
Type of pla	y area o	or facility		Type B: L	_EAP			
Ward	W	alland & De	enge M	arsh				
42. Loose pa 43. Comme						Serious	weaknesses, improvem	ent needed (1)
44. Access t 45. Comme		atural envir	onment	t:			Average, needs some in	nprovement (3)
46. Places fo 47. Comme		en to sit:					Average, needs some in	nprovement (3)
48. Added p 49. Comme	-	e:					Average, needs some in	nprovement (3)
Care and n 50. Well ma			score	e A=25, E	3=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Sco	ore: 16 Good (4)
51. Comme		·						0000 (+)
52. Health a 53. Comme		ty:						
54. Seating 55. Comme		ts:						Good (4)
56. Litter bi 57. Comme							Weaknesses, improveme	ents needed (2)
58. Dog free 59. Comme								Good (4)
60. Presenc only): 61. Comme	-	ervisory ad	ults (Ty	/pe B, C a	and D	Serious	weaknesses, improvem	nent needed (1)
62. Toilets/o 63. Comme		) facilities (	Туре В	, C and D	only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvem	nent needed (1)
Final Score	»:	65						

Site ID	37	Site Name Lower Leas Coastal Parl	c Fun Zone		
Type of play area or facility Type D: Destination					
Ward	Fo	Ikestone Central			
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley and S West			
Date of ass	sessment:	17/08/2016			

Weather:

Time:

09:23



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Overcast/cloudy, mild.

Crashed pirate ship model, large adventure playground, various smaller coastal, fantasy themed play equipment.

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Large scale play area with large variety of equipment. Well designed and attractive equipment available to all ages. Many people using it.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	Yes	٦

1 75	
8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes
9. Does it have refreshments?	Yes
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID 37 Site Name Lower Le	eas Coastal Park Fun Zone
Type of play area or facility Type D: Destination	1
Ward Folkestone Central	
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 30
16. Informal oversight:	Good (4)
17. Comments:	
Situated along popular beachside pathway. Many dog wal	kers and runners.
18. Well used by children:	Excellent (5)
19. Comments:	
20. Getting there:	Good (4)
21. Comments:	
Multiple access/exit points. Safe pedestrian only paths lea	ading up to it.
22. Personal safety, lighting and security:	Good (4)
23. Comments:	
Lighting along pathway but surrounded by trees.	
24. Disability access:	Good (4)
25. Comments:	
<ul><li>26. Meeting other children:</li><li>27. Comments:</li></ul>	Good (4)
28. Designed for the site:	Excellent (5)
29. Comments:	
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)	Score: 42
30. Enticing to children to play:	Excellent (5)
31. Comments:	
32. Play opportunities for disabled children:	Good (4)
33. Comments:	
<ul><li>34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):</li><li>35. Comments:</li></ul>	Good (4)
36. Movement:	Good (4)
37. Comments:	
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):	Excellent (5)
39. Comments:	
40. Ball games:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comments:	
No specific ball game area but some space and next to be	each.

Site I D	37		Site Na	ame	Lower Lea	as Coasta	al Park Fun	Zone			
Type of play	area c	or facility		Type D: D	estination						
Ward	Fo	olkestone	Central								
42. Loose pa 43. Commen										Goo	od (4)
Children able	e to play	y with san	d using	equipment	. Various i	nteractiv	e apparatu	s.			
44. Access to 45. Commen		atural envi	ronmen	t:						Goo	od (4)
46. Places fo 47. Commen		en to sit:								Goo	od (4)
48. Added pl 49. Commen	-	e:								Excelle	nt (5)
Care and m 50. Well mai 51. Commen	ntained		x score	e A=25, B∶	=35, C=3!	5, D=35)	)		Scor		od (4)
52. Health ar 53. Commen 54. Seating f	ts:									Excelle	nt (5)
55. Commen											- (- )
56. Litter bin 57. Commen										Excelle	nt (5)
58. Dog free 59. Commen							Average,	needs s	ome imp	proveme	nt (3)
60. Presence only): 61. Commen		ervisory a	dults (Ty	ype B, C ar	nd D		Average,	needs s	ome imp	oroveme	nt (3)
Site checked	by par	k wardens									
62. Toilets/cl 63. Commen		facilities	(Туре В	, C and D o	only):					Excelle	nt (5)
Final Score:	:	97									

Site ID 38 Site Name Lower Radnor Park Play Area						
Type of play area o	r facility	Type B: LEAP				
Ward Bro	oadmead Ward					
Name of assessor: S West and S Wikeley						
Date of assessment:	15/08/2016					
Time: 15	:42		Weather:	Sunny, dry		







No

Yes

Unrestricted

# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Secluded shaded play area, well used.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No

			-		
9.	Does	it	have	refrest	ments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	
Tbc	

Site ID	38		Site N	ame	Lower Radn	or Park Play Are	э			
Type of pl	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	EAP					
Ward		Broadmead	Ward							
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)	Score	: 22	1		
16. Inforn				·				nprovements needed (2)		
17. Comm		-								
10		- 1- 11 - 11 - 12 - 12 - 12								
18. Well u	-	children:						Good (4)		
19. Comm	ients:									
20. Gettin	a there					Average	. need	s some improvement (3)		
20. Comm	-					, we age	, need	some improvement (s)		
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Weaknes	ses, ir	mprovements needed (2)		
23. Comm	nents:									
24. Disabi	ility acce	ess:				Average	, need	s some improvement (3)		
25. Comm	nents:									
26. Meetir		children:						Excellent (5)		
27. Comm Near scho										
28. Design	-	ha sita.				Average	need	s some improvement (3)		
29. Comm		the site.								
Play valu	ie (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, C	D=50)	Score	: 32	]		
30. Enticir	ng to ch	ildren to play	<i>'</i> :					Good (4)		
31. Comm	nents:									
-		ities for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Average	, need	s some improvement (3)		
33. Comm	nents:									
			<i>(</i> <b>—</b>			A				
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):	Average	, need	s some improvement (3)		
	ienes.									
36. Mover	nent:					Average	, need	s some improvement (3)		
37. Comm							,			
38. Imagi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	/):			Good (4)		
39. Comm	nents:									
40. Ball ga	ames:					Weaknes	ses, ir	mprovements needed (2)		
41. Comm	nents:									

Site I D 38 Site Name Lower Ra	adnor Park Play Area		
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP			
Ward Broadmead Ward			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)		
44. Access to the natural environment: 45. Comments:	Good (4)		
46. Places for children to sit: 47. Comments:	Good (4)		
48. Added play value: 49. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)		
Care and maintenance (max score A=25, B=35, C=3	35, D=35) Score: 19		
50. Well maintained: 51. Comments:	Good (4)		
52. Health and safety: 53. Comments:			
54. Seating for adults: 55. Comments:	Excellent (5)		
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)		
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:	Good (4)		
60. Presence of supervisory adults (Type B, C and D only): 61. Comments:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)		
Site ID 39	Site Name	Lympne Village Hall	
------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------
Type of play area or f	acility Type B: L	EAP	
Ward Hyth	e Rural		
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley and S West		
Date of assessment:	16/08/2016		
Time: 12:2	24	Weather:	Sunny, hot.





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (trim trail, swings, multi-action unit, rocking horses).

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Fenced off green space with main road running next to it. Village hall next to it with sports grounds. Nice play area but Not much variety in equipment.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7 Doos it have an adventure playaround?	No	

7. Does it have an adventare playground.	110
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	39		Site N	ame	Lympne Village	Hall		
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type B: LE	AP			
Ward	H	lythe Rural						
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score: 23		
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:				Average, needs some improvement (3		
17. Comm	ents:							
Can be see	en from v	village hall t	out not	that busy o	of an area.			
18. Well u	sed by cł	nildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3		
19. Comments:								
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-					Average, needs some improvement (3		
		cross main	road					
<u> </u>		, lighting ar		ritv:		Average, needs some improvement (3		
23. Comm		, nghàng đi	la seca	iicy.				
No lighting								
24. Disabi		s:				Good (4		
25. Comm	-							
26. Meetin		hildren:				Good (4		
27. Comm								
Near villag	-							
28. Desigr 29. Comm		e site:				Average, needs some improvement (3		
25. comm	ciită.							
Play valu	e (max s	score A=40	), B=5	0, C=50, D	)=50)	Score: 27		
-		dren to play			-	Good (4		
31. Comm	ents:							
32. Play o	pportunit	ies for disal	oled chi	ldren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2		
33. Comm	ents:							
			·			A		
34. Play no 35. Comm		ifferent age	s (Type	B, C and E	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3		
	ciită.							
36. Moven	nent:					Average, needs some improvement (3		
37. Comm								
38. Imagir	native pla	y ages (Ty	be B, C	and D only	):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2		
39. Comm	ents:							
40. Ball ga	ames:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2		
41. Comm	ents:				L			

Site I D 39		Site Name	Lympne \	/illage Hall
Type of play ar	ea or facility	Type B:	LEAP	
Ward	Hythe Rural			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to th 45. Comments:	e natural envi	ronment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for ch 47. Comments:	ildren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play 49. Comments:	value:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
<b>Care and main</b> 50. Well maintai 51. Comments:		x score A=25,	B=35, C=3!	5, <b>D=35)</b> Score: 15 Good (4)
52. Health and s 53. Comments:	safety:			
54. Seating for a 55. Comments:	adults:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zor 59. Comments:	nes:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of only): 61. Comments:	supervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/chan 63. Comments:	ging facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	65			

Site ID	40	Site	Name	Manor Farm Close
Type of pla	ay area c	or facility	Type B:	LEAP
Ward	Hy	ythe Rural		
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and			and S Wes	st
Date of assessment: 18/08/2016			16	

Time: 12:07

# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (5 pieces of equipment).

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice local play area with nicely designed equipment. Located within dip of grassed area near housing.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	٦
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	_

9.	Does	it	have	refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site I D	40		Site N	ame	Manor Farm C	Close			
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	EAP				
Ward		Hythe Rural							
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score:	24		
16. Inforn	nal over	sight:						Good (4)	
17. Comm	nents:								
Good view	Good view from surrounding houses.								
18. Well u	ised by	children:				Average.	needs	some improvement (3)	
19. Comments:									
20. Gettin	ng there	:						Good (4)	
21. Comm	nents:								
		y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
23. Comm									
		ad but not in	play ar	ea.		A			
24. Disabi 25. Comm	-	ess:				Average,	neeas	some improvement (3)	
23. Comm	ients.								
26. Meetir	ng other	children:				Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
27. Comm	nents:								
28. Design		the site:						Good (4)	
29. Comm									
Nice wood				0 0 50 5		Cooner	20		
-		score A=4		U, C=50, L	J=5U)	Score: 28 Average, needs some improvement (3)			
31. Comm	-					Average,	necus	some improvement (5)	
32. Play o	pportun	ities for disa	bled chi	ildren:		Weakness	ses, im	provements needed (2)	
33. Comm	nents:								
-		different age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):	Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
35. Comm	ients:								
36. Mover	ment					Δνετασε	neede	some improvement (3)	
37. Comm						Average,	neeus	some improvement (3)	
38. Imagi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	/):	Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
39. Comm									
40. Ball ga	ames:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
41. Comm	nents:								

Site I D 40	Site	Name	Manor Fa	rm Close	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: L	EAP		
Ward H	lythe Rural				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environme	ent:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ie:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	ance (max sco	re A=25, B	8=35, C=3!	5, D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Some litter and one	e piece of equipn	nent missin <u>c</u>	].		
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (	Туре В, С а	ind D	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type	B, C and D	only):	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	65				

Site I D 41	Site N	ame <mark>McK</mark>	enzie Drive	
Type of play are	a or facility	Type B: LEAP		
Ward	Cheriton			
Name of assesso	r: S West and	S Wikeley		
Date of assessme	ent: 24/08/2016	<b>i</b>		
Time:	09:33		Weather:	Sunny, dry

# 1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped	play	area

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Largely run-down play area with weathered play equipment, some newer equipment in places. Site has several breaches in fencing with vandalism and litter evident. Not appealing.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	l

r boes it have an adventare playground.	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
<ol> <li>14. Involvement of children:</li> <li>15. Comments:</li> </ol>	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
Tbc		

Site ID	41		Site N	ame	McKenzie	Drive						
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	EAP							
Ward		Cheriton										
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	21				
16. Inforr	mal over	sight:			[		Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	nt (3)
17. Comm	nents:											
18. Well u	used by	children:					Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	it (3)
19. Comm	nents:											
20. Gettir 21. Comm	-										Goo	d (4)
21. Comm	nents.											
22. Perso	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Weakness	es, im	proven	nents r	neede	d (2)
23. Comm	nents:				L							
24. Disabi	ility acce	ess:			[						Goo	d (4)
25. Comm	nents:											
26. Meeti	na other	children:					Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	nt (3)
27. Comm					l		5,			•		
28. Desig		he site:					Weakness	es, im	proven	nents i	neede	d (2)
29. Comm	nents:											
Play valu	le (max	score A=4	0. B=5	0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	27				
-	-	ildren to play	-	-, ,			Weakness		proven	nents i	neede	d (2)
31. Comn	-				L							
					Г							
		ities for disa	bled chi	ildren:			Average,	needs	some	Impro	/emen	it (3)
33. Comm	nents:											
34. Play n	needs of	different age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):		Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	ıt (3)
, 35. Comm		5		,	,, I					-		
36. Mover							Average,	needs	some	improv	vemen	it (3)
37. Comm	nents:											
38. Imagi	native n	lay ages (Ty	pe B. C	and D only	():		Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	t (3)
39. Comm		,					, cruge,		20110			
40. Ball g	ames:						Average,	needs	some	improv	vemen	t (3)
41. Comm	nents:				L							

Site ID 41		Site Name	McKenzie	e Drive
Type of play area	or facility	Type B:	LEAP	
Ward	Cheriton			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	natural envi	ronment:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	dren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play va 49. Comments:	lue:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainte	nance (ma	x score A=25,	B=35, C=35	35, D=35) Score: 12
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
52. Health and sat 53. Comments:	fety:			
54. Seating for ad 55. Comments:	ults:			Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Good (4)
58. Dog free zone 59. Comments:	s:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	ipervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changi 63. Comments:	ng facilities	(Type B, C and I	D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	60			

Site I D	42	Site	e Name	Meads Way		
Type of pla	ay area oi	facility	Type A: L	АР		
Ward	Roi	mney Marsh				
Name of as	sessor:	S West a	nd S Wikeley			
Date of ass	essment:	25/08/20	016			
Time:	11	:03		Weather:	Sunny, dry	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Weathered equipment including multi-activity play unit and swings located behind housing and garages and adjacent Romney Hythe and Dymchurch railway.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1
		п.

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children	Conience modeline econo	immune and a data (1)
<ul><li>14. Involvement of children:</li><li>15. Comments:</li></ul>	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
Tbc		

Type of play area or facility Type A: LAP   Ward Romney Marsh   Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 19   16. Informal oversight: Average, needs some improvement (3)   17. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)   18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3)   19. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)   20. Getting there: Average, needs some improvement (3)   21. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)   22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some improvement (3)   23. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)   24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3)   25. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)   26. Meeting other children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)   27. Comments: Ball gamest   28. Designed for the site: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)   30. Comments: Ball games:   31. Comments: Ball games:   32. Play output (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) Score: 18   33. Comments: Ball games:   34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): Ball games:   35. Comments: Ball games:	Site ID 42	2	Site N	ame	Meads W	/ay
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)       Score: 13         16. Informal oversight:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         17. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         18. Well used by children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         19. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         20. Getting there:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         21. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         23. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Improvements:         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Improvements:         31. Comments:       Improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Improvements:         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements:         36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed	Type of play a	area or facility		Type A: L	_AP	
16. Informal oversight:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         17. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         18. Well used by children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         19. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         20. Getting there:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         21. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         23. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Average, needs some improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Ball games:         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Ball games:         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Ball games:         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Ball games:	Ward	Romney Ma	rsh			
17. Comments:         18. Well used by children:         19. Comments:         20. Getting there:         20. Getting there:         21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:         23. Comments:         24. Disability access:         25. Comments:         26. Meeting other children:         27. Comments:         28. Designed for the site:         29. Comments:         21. Comments:         22. Play opportunities for disabled children:         29. Comments:         20. Play opportunities for disabled children:         20. Play opportunities for disabled children:         20. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         29. Comments:         20. Comments:         21. Comments:         22. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         23. Comments:         24. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         25. Comments:	Location (ma	ix score A=35	, B=35,	C=35, D	=35)	Score: 19
18. Well used by children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         19. Comments:	16. Informal o	versight:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:         20. Getting there:         21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:         23. Comments:         24. Disability access:         25. Comments:         26. Meeting other children:         27. Comments:         28. Designed for the site:         29. Comments:         21. Toticing to children to play:         31. Comments:         22. Play opportunities for disabled children:         31. Comments:         32. Comments:         33. Comments:         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         35. Comments:         36. Movement:         37. Comments:         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):	17. Comments	5:				
19. Comments:         20. Getting there:         21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:         23. Comments:         24. Disability access:         25. Comments:         26. Meeting other children:         27. Comments:         28. Designed for the site:         29. Comments:         21. Toticing to children to play:         31. Comments:         22. Play opportunities for disabled children:         31. Comments:         32. Comments:         33. Comments:         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         35. Comments:         36. Movement:         37. Comments:         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):						
19. Comments:         20. Getting there:         21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:         23. Comments:         24. Disability access:         25. Comments:         26. Meeting other children:         27. Comments:         28. Designed for the site:         29. Comments:         21. Torign to children to play:         31. Comments:         22. Play opportunities for disabled children:         31. Comments:         32. Comments:         33. Comments:         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         35. Comments:         36. Movement:         37. Comments:         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):						
20. Getting there:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         21. Comments:	18. Well used	by children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         23. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         20. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Improvements         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements         35. Comments:       Improvements         36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Improvements         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements         39. Comments:       Improvements         39. Comments:       Improvements         39. Comments:       Improvements	19. Comments	5:				
21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         23. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Improvements         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements         35. Comments:       Improvements         36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Improvements         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements         39. Comments:       Improvements         40. Ball games:       Average, needs some improvement (3)						(2)
22. Personal safety, lighting and security:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         23. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         21. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         23. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:	-					Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments: 24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 30. Enticing to children to play: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2) 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)						
24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         26. Meeting other children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         30. Enticing to children to play:       Score: 18         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         35. Comments:       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         39. Comments:       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         39. Comments:       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         39. Comments:       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)	22. Personal s	afety, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 33. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 30. Enticing to children to play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 30. Enticing to children to play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 30. Enticle to the topic to	23. Comments	5:				
25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments:						
26. Meeting other children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         27. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Improvements needed (2)         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Improvements needed (2)         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):       Improvements needed (2)         39. Comments:	-					Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 30. Movement: 30. Movement: 31. Comments: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 39. Comments: 30. Ball games: 30. Ball games: 30. Average, needs some improvement (3)	25. Comments	5:				
28. Designed for the site:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         29. Comments:       Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         35. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Meaknesses, improvements needed (2)         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):       1         39. Comments:       1         40. Ball games:       Average, needs some improvement (3)	26. Meeting ot	her children:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments: 32. Play opportunities for disabled children: 33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: 40. B	27. Comments	5:				
29. Comments:         Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)         30. Enticing to children to play:         31. Comments:         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:         33. Comments:         33. Comments:         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):         35. Comments:         36. Movement:         37. Comments:         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):         39. Comments:         30. Source:         30. Source:	20 Decigned (	ion the eiter				Weakpaccas improvements peeded (2)
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)       Score: 18         30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):       Scomments:         36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         39. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)						weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
30. Enticing to children to play:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         31. Comments:						
31. Comments:   32. Play opportunities for disabled children:   33. Comments:   34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):   35. Comments:   36. Movement:   37. Comments:   38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):   39. Comments:   40. Ball games:   Average, needs some improvement (3)	Play value (n	nax score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50,	D=50)	Score: 18
32. Play opportunities for disabled children:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         33. Comments:	30. Enticing to	children to pla	y:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)	31. Comments	5:				
33. Comments: 34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only): 35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)	32. Play oppor	tunities for disa	bled ch	ildren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)						
35. Comments: 36. Movement: 36. Movement: 37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)						
36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)         37. Comments:	34. Play needs	s of different ag	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):	
37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)	35. Comments	5:				
37. Comments: 38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)	36 Movement	•				Weaknesses improvements needed (2)
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): 39. Comments: 40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)						weakiesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comments:         40. Ball games:         Average, needs some improvement (3)						
40. Ball games: Average, needs some improvement (3)	38. Imaginativ	ve play ages (Ty	vpe B, C	and D onl	ly):	
	39. Comments	5:				
41. Comments:	_					Average, needs some improvement (3)

Site ID 42		Site Name	Meads Wa	,	
Type of play area	or facility	Type A:	LAP		
Ward	Romney Mars	h			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, imp	provements needed (2)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural enviro	onment:		Average, needs	some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	Iren to sit:			Weaknesses, imp	provements needed (2)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:			Weaknesses, imp	provements needed (2)
Care and mainter		score A=25,	B=35, C=35		Score: 9 some improvement (3)
51. Comments:					
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ults:			Serious weaknesses, im	provement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, im	provement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	5:				Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory ad	ults (Type B, C	and D		
62. Toilets/changir 63. Comments:	ng facilities ( ⁻	Гуре B, C and I	O only):		
Final Score:	46				

Site ID	43	Site	Name	Megan Close			
Type of play area or facility Type A: LAP							
Ward	Wall	and & Denge	Marsh				
Name of ass	sessor:	S Wikeley	and S West				
Date of asse	essment:	22/08/201	16				
Time:	10:4	46		Weather:	Sunny, hot.		



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (swings, rocking horse, swivel seat, slide).

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Small fenced-off play area with quite modern equipment. Situated in green space surrounded by residential streets.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	

9	Does	it	have	refreshments?
э.	DUES	ιu	nave	renesinnents:

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site ID	43		Site N	ame	Megan Cl	ose
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type A: L	AP	
Ward		Walland & D	enge M	arsh		
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	=35)	Score: 25
16. Inform	nal overs	sight:				Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:					
Viewable	from ma	ny houses.				
18. Well u	used by c	children:				Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:					LI
20. Gettin	-					Good (4)
21. Comm	nents:					
22. Damas		. linking a				Average needs come improvement (2)
22. Person 23. Comm		y, lighting a	na secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
No lightin						
24. Disabi		ss:				Good (4)
25. Comm	-					
26. Meetir		children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	nents:					
28. Desigi	ned for t	he site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comm						
Play valu	ie (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50,	D=50)	Score: 22
	-	ldren to play	/:			Good (4)
31. Comm	nents:					
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disa	bled chi	ildren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm	• •					
34. Play n	eeds of	different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):	
35. Comm	nents:					
36. Mover						Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm	ients:					
38. Imaqi	native pl	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):	
39. Comm			. , -			
40. Ball ga	ames:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
41. Comm	nents:					

Site ID	43		Site Na	ame	Megan Cl	ose	
Type of pla	ay area	or facility		Type A: L	AP		
Ward	V	/alland & D	enge M	arsh			
42. Loose   43. Commo							Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access 45. Commo		atural envi	ronment	t:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places 47. Comme		en to sit:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added 49. Comme		ie:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and	mainten	ance (ma	x score	e A=25, B	=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 18
50. Well m 51. Comm		1:					Excellent (5)
52. Health 53. Commo		ty:					
54. Seating 55. Commo		lts:					Good (4)
56. Litter b 57. Commo							Excellent (5)
58. Dog fre 59. Comme							Good (4)
60. Presen only): 61. Comme		ervisory a	dults (Ty	уре B, C a	nd D		
62. Toilets, 63. Commo		g facilities	(Туре В	, C and D	only):		
Final Scor	e:	65					

Site ID	44	Site I	Name	Megone Close Pla	ay Area
Type of pla	y area	a or facility	Type A: L	AP	
Ward		North Downs East			
Name of assessor: S West		: S West			
Date of assessment:		nt: 10/10/201	6		

Time:



09:11

# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area.

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Overgrown play area of tired appearance with removal of bench and some equipment.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Sunny, cool

Site ID	44		Site N	ame	Megone Clos	se Play Area			
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type A: LA	ΛP				
Ward		North Down	s East						
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score:	23		
16. Inform	nal overs	sight:						Good (4)	
17. Comm	nents:								
18. Well u	ised by c	children:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)	
19. Comm	nents:								
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-							Good (4)	
21. Comm	ients.								
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)	
23. Comm		,, 5 5		,					
24. Disabi	lity acce	ss:				Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
25. Comm	nents:								
26. Meetir	na other	children				Average	needo	s some improvement (3)	
27. Comm		children.							
28. Desigr		he site:				Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
29. Comm	ients:								
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0 B-5	0 0-50 0	)-50)	Score:	15		
-		ldren to play		0,0-00,0	/=00)	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
31. Comm	-								
-		ties for disa	bled chi	ildren:		Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)	
33. Comm	ients:								
34. Play n	eeds of	different age	es (Type	B. C and I	Conly):				
35. Comm									
36. Moven	nent:					Serious weaknes	ses, i	mprovement needed (1)	
37. Comm	nents:								
38. Imagir	native nl	ay ages (Ty	ne R C	and D only	·):				
39. Comm		ay ages (Ty	рс D, С		<i>.</i>				
	•								
40. Ball ga	ames:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)	
41. Comm	nents:								

Site I D 44	Site N	ame	Megone Clo	ose Play A	Area
Type of play area	or facility	Type A: LA	١P		
Ward N	North Downs East				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Overgrown grass					
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:			Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, B=	=35, C=35,	D=35)	Score: 9
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:			Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C an	nd D		
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	8, C and D o	only):		
Final Score:	47				

Site I D	45	Site Name	
Type of pla	y area o	or facility Type	
Ward	N	orth Downs West	
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S W			
Date of ass	: 17/08/2016		

Time:

16:22



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (multi-action unit, swings, slide and 2 rocking horses).

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice local play area. Wooden equipment gives it a good feel. Friendly atmosphere. Surrounded by trees and grass.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	٦

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Site ID 4	5	Site Name	Meriden Walk	
Type of play	area or facility	Type B:	EAP	
Ward	North Downs	s West		
Location (ma	ax score A=35,	B=35, C=35, [	=35) Sco	re: 23
16. Informal o	oversight:		Avera	ge, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comment	s:			
Can be viewe	d by some house	s but passers-by	are few.	
18. Well used	by children:		Avera	ge, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comment	s:			
			A	
20. Getting th 21. Comment			Avera	ge, needs some improvement (3)
	ed to cross main i	road		
	afety, lighting ar		Avera	ge, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments				<i>3-7</i> ,
	, road running al	ongside but not	n play area.	
24. Disability	_			Good (4)
25. Comment				
26. Meeting o	ther children:		Avera	ge, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comment	s:			
29 Decigned	for the citer			Good (4)
<ol> <li>28. Designed</li> <li>29. Comments</li> </ol>				0000 (+)
Nice wooden a				
Nice wooden a	annaratus			
		0. B=50. C=50	D=50) Sco	re: 26
Play value (r	max score A=40		D=50) Sco	re: 26 Good (4)
Play value (r	max score A=40		D=50) Sco	re: 26 Good (4)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to	max score A=40		D=50) Sco	
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment	max score A=40	/:		
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal	/:		Good (4)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s:	v: bled children:	Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s: s of different age	v: bled children:	Weakr	Good (4)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s: s of different age	v: bled children:	Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s: s of different age s:	v: bled children:	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2) nesses, improvements needed (2)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment 36. Movement	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disat s: s of different age s: t:	v: bled children:	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disat s: s of different age s: t:	v: bled children:	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2) nesses, improvements needed (2)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment 36. Movement 37. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disat s: s of different age s: t:	v: bled children: es (Type B, C and	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2) nesses, improvements needed (2)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment 36. Movement 37. Comment	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s: s of different age s: t: s: ve play ages (Typ	v: bled children: es (Type B, C and	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2) nesses, improvements needed (2) ge, needs some improvement (3)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment 36. Movement 37. Comment 38. Imaginatio	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s: s of different age s: t: s: ve play ages (Typ	v: bled children: es (Type B, C and	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2) nesses, improvements needed (2) ge, needs some improvement (3)
Play value (r 30. Enticing to 31. Comment 32. Play oppo 33. Comment 34. Play need 35. Comment 36. Movement 37. Comment 38. Imaginatio	max score A=40 o children to play s: rtunities for disal s: s of different age s: t: s: ve play ages (Typ s:	v: bled children: es (Type B, C and	D only): Weakr	Good (4) nesses, improvements needed (2) nesses, improvements needed (2) ge, needs some improvement (3)

Site ID	45	Site	Name	Meriden	Walk	
Type of pla	ay area	or facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward	Ν	orth Downs Wes	t			
42. Loose p						Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
43. Comme	ents:					
44. Access	to the n	atural environme	ent:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
45. Comme	ents:					
46. Places	for child	ion to cit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
40. Flaces 47. Comme		en to sit.				Average, needs some improvement (5)
48. Added	play valu	ie:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
49. Comme	ents:					
Care and	mainten	ance (max sco	re A=25,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 17
50. Well m	aintaineo	1:				Good (4)
51. Comme	ents:					
52. Health	and safe	ty:				
53. Comme	ents:					
54. Seating	g for adu	lts:				Good (4)
55. Comme	ents:					
56. Litter b	oins:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
57. Comme						
58. Dog fre						Good (4)
59. Comme						
60 Presen	ce of sur	ervisory adults (	Type B. C	and D	Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
only): 61. Comme			1,900,0			
62. Toilets, 63. Comme		g facilities (Type	B, C and D	only):	Seriou	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Scor	e:	66				

Site ID	46	Site N	Name	Millfield
Type of pla	y area o	or facility	Type A: I	_AP
Ward	N	orth Downs East		
Name of as	sessor:	and S West	t	
Date of assessment:		: 17/08/201	6	

Time:

11:34



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small green gym (6 pieces of equipment).

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Small green gym for local residents. Seems fairly new and well maintained. Seems a bit baron and rarely used.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	
15. Comments:	





Sunny, warm.

Site I D	46		Site N	ame	Millfield				
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type A: L	AP				
Ward		North Down	s East						
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	=35)		Score:	21	
16. Inform	nal overs	sight:					Average,	needs	s some improvement (3
17. Comm	nents:								
Can be vie	ewed by	some surro	unding	houses. Pa	ssers by wi	ll be few.			
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:					Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2
19. Comm	ents:								
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-								Good (4
21. Comm	lents.								
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	ritv:			Average,	needs	some improvement (3
23. Comm		,, 5 - 5 -		- 1					
24. Disabi	lity acce	ss:							Good (4
25. Comm	ents:								
26 Maatir	a athau	abilduan					Average	noode	some improvement (
26. Meetir 27. Comm		children:					Average,	neeus	s some improvement (3
28. Desigr	ned for t	he site:					Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2
29. Comm	ents:								
-		score A=4		0, C=50, I	D=50)		Score:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
30. Enticir 31. Comm	-	ldren to play	:				Average,	neeas	s some improvement (3
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disa	bled chi	ildren:			Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2
33. Comm	ents:								
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):				
55. Comm	ients.								
36. Moven	nent:						Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2
37. Comm								•	
38. Imagir	native pl	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):				
39. Comm	ents:								
40. Ball ga						Serious	s weaknes	ses, iı	mprovement needed (1
41. Comm	ents:								

Site ID	46		Site Na	ame	Millfield			
Type of pl	ay area o	or facility		Type A: l	_AP			
Ward	N	orth Down	s East					
42. Loose 43. Comm						Serious	weaknesses, improvement need	ed (1)
44. Access 45. Comm		atural envi	ronment	:		Serious	weaknesses, improvement need	ed (1)
46. Places 47. Comm		en to sit:					Weaknesses, improvements need	ed (2)
48. Added 49. Comm		e:					Weaknesses, improvements need	ed (2)
Care and 50. Well m 51. Comm	aintained		x score	A=25, E	3=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 12 Go	] ood (4)
52. Health 53. Comm		ty:						
54. Seatin 55. Comm	-	ts:				Serious	s weaknesses, improvement need	ed (1)
56. Litter l 57. Comm							Average, needs some improveme	ent (3)
58. Dog fr 59. Comm							Go	od (4)
60. Presen only): 61. Comm		ervisory a	dults (Ty	vpe B, C a	and D			
62. Toilets 63. Comm		g facilities	(Type B,	, C and D	only):			
Final Sco	e:	47						

Site ID	47	Site N	Site Name		
Type of play area or facility			Type A: LA	٩P	
Ward					
Name of assessor:		S West and	S Wikeley		
Date of assessment:		: 22/08/2016	5		

Time:

14:20



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?



Equipped play area

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Multi-action play unit and swings of weathered appearance within grassed open space.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
	•	ť.

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	47		Site Na	ame	Moore Clo	se							
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type A: LA	٩P								
Ward		Walland & D	enge M	arsh									
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	24					
16. Inforn	nal overs	sight:			[						G	ood (	4)
17. Comm	nents:												
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:					Average,	needs	some	e impr	ovem	ent ()	3)
19. Comm	-				L		5 /						
					r								
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-										Go	ood (	4)
21. Comm	ients.												
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Average, I	needs	some	impr	ovem	ent (	3)
23. Comm					L								
24. Disabi	-	SS:									Go	ood (	4)
25. Comm	ients:												
26. Meetir	ng other	children:					Average,	needs	some	e impr	ovem	ent (	3)
27. Comm	nents:												
28. Desigr	ned for t	he site:					Average, I	needs	some	impr	ovem	ent (	3)
29. Comm					L		,					0	- /
-		score A=4		0, C=50, C	D=50)			19					
30. Enticir 31. Comm	-	ldren to play	<b>'</b> :				Weaknesse	es, im	prove	ments	s need	ded (2	2)
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disa	bled chi	ldren:	[		Weakness	es, im	prove	ments	s need	ded (	2)
33. Comm	nents:												
	oodo of	different age		R C and I									4
35. Comm		different age	s (Type	e D, C allu I	D Only):								
36. Mover	nent:				[		Weaknesse	es, im	prove	ments	s need	ded (2	2)
37. Comm	nents:												
38 Imaci	nativo ol			and D only	<u>ر</u> ،								
38. Imagii 39. Comm		ay ages (Ty	ре в, С		·)·								
40. Ball ga	ames:				[		Average, I	needs	some	impr	ovem	ent (	3)
41. Comm	nents:				L								

Site ID	47		Site Na	ame	Moore Clo	ose	
Type of pla	ay area	or facility		Type A: L	AP		
Ward	V	/alland & D	enge M	arsh			
42. Loose p							Average, needs some improvement (3
43. Comme	ents:						
44. Access	to the n	atural envir	onmen	t:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
45. Comme	ents:						
46. Places	for childı	ren to sit:					Average, needs some improvement (3
47. Comme	ents:						
48. Added	play valu	ie:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
49. Comme							
Care and	mainter	ance (ma	« score	A=25, B	=35, C=3!	5, D=35)	Score: 16
50. Well m				·			Average, needs some improvement (3
51. Comme							
52. Health	and safe	ety:					
53. Comme	ents:						
54. Seating	g for adu	lts:					Good (4
55. Comme	ents:						
56. Litter b	oins:						Excellent (5
57. Comme	ents:						
58. Dog fre	ee zones	:					Good (4
59. Comme							
60. Presen	ce of sup	ervisory ad	ults (Ty	/pe B, C a	nd D		
only): 61. Comme							
60 Tollat	/chan-in				ophy) -		
62. Tollets, 63. Comme		g facilities (	туре в	, c and D	only):		
Final Scor	e:	59					

Site ID 48	Site	Name Mor	ehall Recreation G	Ground	
Type of play are	ea or facility	Type B: LEAP			
Ward	Cheriton				
Name of assesso	or: S West an	d S Wikeley			
Date of assessm	ent: 15/08/201	16			
Time:	16:37		Weather:	Sunny, dry	
			18		



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area and basketball hoop.

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play area within corner of large open field, fairly well used.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
General Information about the site 7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

9.	Does	it	have	refreshn	nents?
----	------	----	------	----------	--------

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

142

48	Site Na	ame	Morehall Re	creation Ground	
y area or facility		Type B: LE	AP		
Cheriton					
max score A=35	, B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score:	21
al oversight:				Average,	needs some improvement (3)
nts:					
ed by children:					Good (4)
nts:					
				Average,	needs some improvement (3)
nts:					
l safety, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average,	needs some improvement (3)
nts:					
cy access:				Weaknesse	es, improvements needed (2)
nts:					
other children:				Average,	needs some improvement (3)
nts:					
d for the site:				Average,	needs some improvement (3)
nts:					
(max score A=4	0, B=50	D, C=50, D	=50)	Score:	20
to children to play	y:			Average,	needs some improvement (3)
nts:					
portunities for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Serious weaknes	ses, improvement needed (1)
nts:					
eds of different aq	es (Type	B, C and D	) only):	Average,	needs some improvement (3)
-					
					1
ent:				Weakness	es, improvements needed (2)
ent: nts:				Weakness	es, improvements needed (2)
nts:	гре В <i>.</i> С	and D only	):		
	pe B, C	and D only	):		es, improvements needed (2) es, improvements needed (2)
nts: ative play ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	):	Weakness	
	y area or facility Cheriton max score A=35, al oversight: nts: ed by children: nts: there: nts: il safety, lighting a nts: cy access: nts: other children: nts: d for the site: nts: ed for the site: nts: cy access for disa nts: cy access for disa nts: cy access for disa nts: cy access for disa	y area or facility Cheriton max score A=35, B=35, al oversight: nts: ed by children: nts: there: nts: il safety, lighting and secur nts: cy access: nts: o ther children: nts: o ther children: nts: conter children: nts: conter children: nts: conter children: nts: conter children: nts: conter children: nts: conter children: nts: conter children to play: nts: portunities for disabled chil nts: conter children to play: nts: conter children to play: conter children to play:	y area or facility Type B: LE Cheriton max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D= al oversight: nts: ed by children: nts: there: nts: u safety, lighting and security: nts: u safety, lighting and security: nts: u other children: nts: o ther children: nts: d for the site: nts: (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D t o children to play: nts: portunities for disabled children: nts: eds of different ages (Type B, C and D	y area or facility Type B: LEAP Cheriton max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) al oversight: nts: ed by children: nts: ed by children: nts: there: nts: u safety, lighting and security: nts: u safety, lighting and security: nts: cy access: nts: u other children: nts: d for the site: nts: (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) u to children to play: nts: portunities for disabled children: nts: eds of different ages (Type B, C and D only):	y area or facility Type B: LEAP Cheriton max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) al oversight: Average, nts:  d by children: nts:  d safety, lighting and security: Average, nts:  d safety, lighting and security: Average, nts:  d other children: Average, nts: Average, Nt

Site I D	48		Site Na	me	Moreh	all Recreation	ion Ground
Type of pla	y area o	r facility		Type B: I	EAP		
Ward	Ch	eriton					
42. Loose p 43. Comme						Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access 1 45. Comme		tural envir	onment:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places f 47. Comme		en to sit:				Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
48. Added p 49. Comme		2:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and n	naintena	ance (ma	k score	A=25, E	3=35, C	=35, D=35	5) Score: 13
50. Well ma 51. Comme		:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health a 53. Comme		y:					
54. Seating 55. Comme		:s:				Seric	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bi 57. Comme							Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog fre 59. Comme							Good (4)
60. Presenc only): 61. Comme		ervisory ac	lults (Tyj	oe B, C a	and D	Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/ 63. Comme		facilities (	Туре В,	C and D	only):	Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score	<b>e</b> :	54					

Site I D 49	Site I	lame	Mount Pleasant Close
Type of play are	a or facility	Type A: L	LAP
Ward North Downs West			
Name of assessor: S Wikeley		and S West	t
Date of assessment: 17/08/202		6	

Time:

16:03



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (one multi-action unit).

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice site but very run-down equipment. Very rusty. Set within grassed area.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes					
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years? No						
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No					
General Information about the site						
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No					
8 Does it have a toilet?	No					

9.	Does	it	have	refrest	ments?
2.	DUCS	IL.	nuvc	I CH CSI	in include:

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Overcast, mild.

Site ID	49		Site Na	ame	Mount Plea	isant Close	9				
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type A: LA	\P						
Ward	N	orth Down	s West								
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)		Score:	21			
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:				ŀ	Average,	needs	some ir	nprove	ement (3)
17. Comm	ents:										
Limited vi	Limited view from surrounding houses.										
18. Well u	sed by ch	ildren:				V	Veakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)
19. Comm	-							•	·		( )
20. Gettin	-										Good (4)
21. Comm	ents:										
		lighting a	nd secu	rity:		A	Average,	needs	some ir	nprove	ment (3)
23. Comm		(fool upca	fo at niv	aht Ono lia	ht but most	thy obscure	od by troc				
24. Disabi			ie at my	giit. One lig				:5.			Good (4)
25. Comm	-										0000 (4)
26. Meetir	26. Meeting other children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)							eded (2)			
27. Comm	ents:										
	ad far th						Worago	nooda	como ir	nnrovo	ment (3)
28. Desigr 29. Comm		e site:			L	F	average,	neeus	somen	nprove	ment (3)
Play valu	e (max s	core A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, D	)=50)		Score:	16			
30. Enticir	ng to chilo	ren to play	<b>/:</b>			W	Veakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)
31. Comm	ents:										
		c II									
-		es for disa	bled chi	ldren:	L	V	Veakness	es, im	iprovem	ents ne	eded (2)
33. Comm	ients:										
34. Plav n	eeds of di	fferent age	es (Type	B, C and E	) only):						
35. Comm				,							
36. Moven	nent:					V	Veakness	es, im	provem	ents ne	eded (2)
37. Comm	ents:										
20 1	antina -l-			and D and	\. ٢						
38. Imagii 39. Comm	-	y ages (Ty	ре в, С	and D only	<u>،</u>						
55. Comm											
40. Ball ga	ames:				Γ	Serious	weaknes	ses. ir	nproven	nent ne	eded (1)
41. Comm					L			/ 11			(-)
Ball game	s prohibit	ed.									

Site ID	Site ID 49 Site Name Mount Pleasant Close								
Type of pla	ay area o	or facility	Type A:	LAP					
Ward	N	orth Downs We	st						
42. Loose ( 43. Comm						Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
44. Access 45. Comm		atural environm	ent:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
46. Places 47. Commo		en to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
48. Added 49. Commo		e:			Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
Care and	mainten	ance (max sco	ore A=25,	B=35, C=3	35, D=35)	Score: 13			
50. Well m 51. Comm		1:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
52. Health 53. Comm		ty:							
54. Seating 55. Comm		lts:				Good (4)			
One bench	but prob	ably sufficient f	or this size	play area.					
56. Litter b 57. Comm						Average, needs some improvement (3)			
58. Dog fre 59. Comme						Good (4)			
60. Presen only): 61. Commo		ervisory adults	(Туре В, С	and D					
62. Toilets, 63. Comm		g facilities (Type	B, C and I	D only):					
Final Scor	·e:	50							

Site ID	50	Site N	lame	Naseby Avenue	
Type of play area or facility Type			Type A: L	AP	
Ward	C	Cheriton	ton		
Name of assessor: S Wikeley		and S West			
Date of assessment: 16/08		t: 16/08/201	6		

Time:

14:07



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small play area with 4 pieces of equipment.

# First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Located in small grassed open space surrounded by residential streets. Seems friendly and fairly well used by local residents. Colourful and inviting.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes					
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes					
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No					
General Information about the site						
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No					
8. Does it have a toilet?	No					

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Sunny, hot.

Type of play area or facility Type A: LAP   Ward Cheriton   Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 24   16. Informal oversight: Good (4)   17. Comments: In view of a number of houses.   18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3)   19. Comments: In view of a number of houses.   20. Getting there: Good (4)   21. Comments: Good (4)   22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Good (4)   23. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3)   25. Comments: Average, needs some improvement (3)   26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3)   27. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3)   29. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   29. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   29. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3)   29. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   29. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   29. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3)   29. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   20. Average, needs some improvement (3)   20. Comments: In view of a lighting and security:   20. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3)   29. Comments: I
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)Score: 2416. Informal oversight:Good (4)17. Comments:Inview of a number of houses.18. Well used by children:Average, needs some improvement (3)19. Comments:Inview of a number of houses.20. Getting there:Good (4)21. Comments:Good (4)22. Personal safety, lighting and security:Good (4)23. Comments:Inview of a number of houses.24. Disability access:Average, needs some improvement (3)25. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)26. Meeting other children:Average, needs some improvement (3)27. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)28. Designed for the site:Average, needs some improvement (3)29. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)20. Entitiong to children to play
16. Informal oversight:       Good (4)         17. Comments:       In view of a number of houses.         In view of a number of houses.       Average, needs some improvement (3)         18. Well used by children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         19. Comments:       Good (4)         20. Getting there:       Good (4)         21. Comments:       Good (4)         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:       Good (4)         23. Comments:       Good (4)         24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         27. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         28. Designed for the site:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Improvement (3)         20. Ensigned for the site:       Score: [20]         30.
17. Comments:         In view of a number of houses.         18. Well used by children:         19. Comments:         20. Getting there:         20. Personal safety, lighting and security:         21. Comments:         22. Personal safety, lighting and security:         23. Comments:         24. Disability access:         25. Comments:         26. Meeting other children:         27. Comments:         28. Designed for the site:         29. Comments:         29. Comments:         29. Comments:         29. Comments:         20. Designed for the site:         20. Designed for the site:         20. Comments:         21
In view of a number of houses. 18. Well used by children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 19. Comments: 20. Getting there: Good (4) 21. Comments: 22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Good (4) 23. Comments: Lighting just outside play area. Open area with many exit routes. 24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: 20. This for the site: Comments: 20. This for the site: Comments: 20. Designed for the site: Comments: 20. This for the site: Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
18. Well used by children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         19. Comments:
19. Comments:   20. Getting there:   21. Comments:   22. Personal safety, lighting and security:   23. Comments:   24. Disability access:   25. Comments:   26. Meeting other children:   27. Comments:   28. Designed for the site:   28. Designed for the site:   29. Comments:     Average, needs some improvement (3)   29. Comments:     Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)   30. Enticing to children to play:     Good (4)
19. Comments:   20. Getting there:   21. Comments:   22. Personal safety, lighting and security:   23. Comments:   24. Disability access:   24. Disability access:   25. Comments:   26. Meeting other children:   27. Comments:   28. Designed for the site:   29. Comments:     29. Comments:     20. Enticing to children to play:     20. Enticing to children to play:
20. Getting there:Good (4)21. Comments:Good (4)22. Personal safety, lighting and security:Good (4)23. Comments:Good (4)23. Comments:Good (4)24. Disability access:Average, needs some improvement (3)25. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)26. Meeting other children:Average, needs some improvement (3)27. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)28. Designed for the site:Average, needs some improvement (3)29. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)29. Comments:Good (4)20. Enticing to children to play:Good (4)
21. Comments:   22. Personal safety, lighting and security:   23. Comments:   Lighting just outside play area. Open area with many exit routes.   24. Disability access:   25. Comments:   26. Meeting other children:   27. Comments:   28. Designed for the site:   29. Comments:   29. Comments:   29. Comments:   29. Designed for the site:   29. Comments:   29. Comments:   20. Enticing to children to play:   30. Enticing to children to play:
22. Personal safety, lighting and security:Good (4)23. Comments:Lighting just outside play area. Open area with many exit routes.24. Disability access:Average, needs some improvement (3)25. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)26. Meeting other children:Average, needs some improvement (3)27. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)28. Designed for the site:Average, needs some improvement (3)29. Comments:Average, needs some improvement (3)29. Comments:Score:20. Enticing to children to play:Good (4)
23. Comments: Lighting just outside play area. Open area with many exit routes. 24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
23. Comments: Lighting just outside play area. Open area with many exit routes. 24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 29. Comments: 20. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
Lighting just outside play area. Open area with many exit routes. 24. Disability access: Average, needs some improvement (3) 25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3) 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: Average, needs some improvement (3) 29. Comments: 20
24. Disability access:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         25. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         26. Meeting other children:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         27. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         28. Designed for the site:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Good (4)
25. Comments: 26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
27. Comments: 28. Designed for the site: 29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
28. Designed for the site:       Average, needs some improvement (3)         29. Comments:       Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)         Score:       20         30. Enticing to children to play:       Good (4)
29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) Score: 20 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
29. Comments: Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) Score: 20 30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
30. Enticing to children to play: Good (4)
31. Comments:
32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments:
34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):
35. Comments:
36. Movement:       Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comments:
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):
39. Comments:
40. Pall campos
40. Ball games: Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
40. Bail games.     Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)       41. Comments:     ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••

Site I D 50		Site Name	Naseby Ave	nue			
Type of play ar	ea or facility	Type A:	LAP				
Ward	Cheriton						
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
44. Access to th 45. Comments:	e natural env	ironment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)			
46. Places for cl 47. Comments:	nildren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
One bench.							
48. Added play 49. Comments:	value:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
Care and mair	itenance (m	ax score A=25,	B=35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 14			
50. Well mainta 51. Comments:	ined:			Good (4)			
Equipment fairl	y worn but no	litter and grass	cut.				
52. Health and 53. Comments:	safety:						
54. Seating for 55. Comments: One bench.	adults:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
58. Dog free zo 59. Comments:	nes:			Good (4)			
60. Presence of only): 61. Comments:	supervisory a	adults (Type B, C	and D				
62. Toilets/char 63. Comments:	nging facilities	(Type B, C and I	D only):				
Final Score:	58						
Site ID 5	1	Site N	ame	Newchur	ch Playing Fi	eld	
--------------------------------------------	--------	------------	-----	---------	---------------	-------------	--
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP							
Ward	Romn	ey Marsh					
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West							
Date of assess	sment:	23/08/2016	•				
Time:	13:58	3			Weather:	Sunny, hot.	





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area, basketball hoop, small football pitch and youth shelter.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice site located in green space with trees and shrubbery around the perimeter. Equipment seems well maintained and offers a variety of activities. Rural location by village hall.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7 Deep it have an adventure playeround?	No

7. Does it have an adventure playground:	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	51		Site Na	ame	Newchurch	Playing	Field					
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP							
Ward	1	Romney Mar	sh									
Location	(max so	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	22				
16. Inforn	nal overs	ight:					Average,	needs	some	impro	veme	ent (3)
17. Comm	nents:											
Site Not v	riewable	from the out	side.									
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:					Average,	needs	some	impro	veme	ent (3)
19. Comm	-											. ,
20. Gettin	g there:						Average,	needs	some	impro	veme	ent (3)
21. Comm	nents:											
	-	, lighting ar	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs	some	impro	veme	ent (3)
23. Comm												
No lighting							A			•••••		at (2)
24. Disabi 25. Comm	-	SS:					Average,	neeas	some	Impro	veme	ent (3)
		play area. I	lood to	crocc grac	26							
26. Meetir	-		veeu to	cross gras	55.		Average,	needs	some	impro	veme	ent (3)
27. Comm	-						5,			•		( )
28. Desigr		ne site:									Go	od (4)
29. Comm	ients:											
Dlay valu	le (max	score A=40	) B-5	0 0-50 0	D-50)		Score:	37				
•		dren to play		0, 0-30, L	D=30)		<b>Score</b> .	57			Go	od (4)
31. Comm	-		•		L							ou ( . )
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disal	oled chi	ldren:							Go	od (4)
33. Comm	nents:											
Merry-go-	round de	signed to be	e wheel	chair acces	ssible.							
-		lifferent age	s (Type	B, C and I	D only):						Go	od (4)
35. Comm	nents:											
											_	
36. Mover											Go	od (4)
37. Comm	ients:											
38. Imadii	native pl	ay ages (Tyj	be B, C	and D only	y):		Average,	needs	some	impro	veme	ent (3)
39. Comm		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, ,	,			5-1		-	•		<b>、</b> - 7
40. Ball ga	ames:										Go	od (4)
41. Comm					L							

Site ID 51	Site Na	me Newchurch	Playing Field
Type of play area o	or facility T	ype B: LEAP	
Ward Ro	omney Marsh		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the na 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Good (4)
<ul><li>46. Places for childr</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	en to sit:		Good (4)
Seating area incorp	prated into multi-ad	ction unit.	
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	e:		Good (4)
Care and mainten	ance (max score	A=25, B=35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 18
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	:		Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ty:		
54. Seating for adul 55. Comments:	ts:		Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:			Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adults (Typ	be B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changing 63. Comments:	facilities (Type B,	C and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	77		

Site ID 52	S	ite Name	Newington Village Hal	I		
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP						
Ward	North Downs	East				
Name of assessor: S West and S Wikeley						
Date of assessm	ient: 24/08,	/2016				
Time:	11:05		Weather:	Sunny, dry		



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area and goal posts/kickabout area.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Climbing equipment, slide and swings positioned on new surfacing within grass area to the periphery of grass field in rural location near village hall. Football area adjacent to fenced area.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	52		Site N	ame	Newington	Village	Hall		
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type B: L	EAP				
Ward		North Downs	s East						
Location	(max se	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	<u>I</u>	Score:	21	
16. Inforn	nal overs	sight:					Weaknesse	es, in	nprovements needed (2)
17. Comm	nents:								
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:							Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:								
20. Gettin	g there:						Average, r	needs	s some improvement (3)
21. Comm	-								
22 Dorsor		( lighting or		urity (			Average	noode	s some improvement (3)
22. Persor 23. Comm		y, lighting ar	iu secu	inity.			Averaye, I	reeus	
25. Comm	ients.								
24. Disability access:						Average, r	needs	s some improvement (3)	
25. Comm	-						5,		,
26. Meetir	ng other	children:					Average, I	needs	s some improvement (3)
27. Comm	nents:								
28. Desigr	ned for t	ha cita:					Average r	need	s some improvement (3)
20. Design 29. Comm		le site.					Average, 1	iccu.	some improvement (5)
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	D, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50)		Score:	28	
30. Enticir	ng to chi	ldren to play	:						Good (4)
31. Comm	nents:								
32. Plav o	pportuni	ties for disal	oled ch	ildren:			Weaknesse	es, in	nprovements needed (2)
33. Comm								,	
34. Play n	eeds of o	different age	s (Type	e B, C and	D only):				Good (4)
35. Comm	nents:								
36. Mover							Weaknesse	es, in	nprovements needed (2)
37. Comm	nents:								
38 Imagi	native nl	ay ages (Ty	ne R C	and D only	v).		Weakness	as in	nprovements needed (2)
39. Comm		מי מעכי (דען	ле D, С		y).			, 11	ipiovements needed (2)
40. Ball ga	ames:						Average, r	needs	s some improvement (3)
41. Comm									

Site ID 52	Site N	ame <mark>Newi</mark> r	ngton Village H	Hall
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP		
Ward N	lorth Downs East			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, B=35, C	C=35, D=35)	Score: 19
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:			Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:			Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C and D		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D only):		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Final Score:	68			

Site ID	53	Site	e Name	Oak Driv	/e		
Type of pla	ay area c	or facility	Type B:	LEAP			
Ward	Ro	omney Marsh					
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West							
Date of ass	sessment	18/08/20	016				
Time:	1	5:35			Weather:	Overcast, windy.	





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (multi-action unit, climbing frame, slide, swings).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Quite a large area on residential street. Run-down and unfriendly looking.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes				
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes				
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No				
General Information about the site					
General Information about the site					

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses,	improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		

Site ID	53		Site N	ame	Oak Drive							
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	EAP							
Ward		Romney Mai	rsh									
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	23				
16. Inforr	nal over	sight:			[		Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	t (3)
17. Comm	nents:				L							
18. Well u	used by	children:			[		Average,	needs	some	impro	/emen	t (3)
19. Comments:												
20. Gettin	-	:									Good	d (4)
21. Comm	nents:											
					Г		A					+ (2)
22. Persoi 23. Comm		y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Average,	neeas	some	Improv	emen	t (3)
No lightin												
24. Disabi		266.									Good	1 (4)
25. Comm	-				L							
26. Meetii	ng other	children:									Good	d (4)
27. Comm	nents:											
28. Desigi	ned for I	he site:			[		Weakness	es im	proven	nents r	reeder	1(2)
29. Comm		ine site.			L		Weakiness	co, iii	proven		leeuee	a (2)
Play valu	ıe (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	25				
	-	ildren to play	/:		[		Average,	needs	some	improv	vemen	t (3)
31. Comm	nents:											
32 Play o	pportup	ities for disa	blod ch	ildron	Г		Weakness	os im	nrover	nonte i	noodo	1 (2)
33. Comm				nuren.	l		Weakiiess	es, ini	prover	ilents i	leeueu	u (2)
	icines.											
34. Play n	needs of	different age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):		Average,	needs	some	impro	/emen	t (3)
35. Comm	nents:				L							
36. Mover							Average,	needs	some	improv	/emen	t (3)
37. Comm	nents:											
38. Imagi	native n	lay ages (Ty	ре В С	and D only	<i>(</i> ):		Weakness	es. im	proven	nents	needer	1 (2)
39. Comm		ישי שענש (דע	рс D, С				Treakiness	, ini	PIOVCI		lecuel	~ (~)
40. Ball g	ames:						Average,	needs	some	improv	vemen	t (3)
41. Comm	nents:				L							

Site ID 53	Site	Name	Oak Drive		
Type of play area o	or facility	Type B: L	.EAP		
Ward Ro	omney Marsh				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				۷	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the na 45. Comments:	itural environme	ent:		۷	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for childro 47. Comments:	en to sit:			ļ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
<ul><li>48. Added play valu</li><li>49. Comments:</li></ul>	e:			۷	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainten	ance (max sco	re A=25, B	=35, C=35,	D=35)	Score: 15
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	:			V	Veaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Equipment very wor	n and rusted.				
52. Health and safet 53. Comments:	ty:				
54. Seating for adul 55. Comments:	ts:				Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				ļ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:					Good (4)
60. Presence of supe only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adults (	Type B, C a	nd D	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changing 63. Comments:	facilities (Type	B, C and D	only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	63				

Site ID	54	Site	Name	Oakham Drive		
Type of pla	ay area d	or facility	Type B: LE	EAP		
Ward	W	alland & Denge	Marsh			
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley	and S West			
Date of ass	essment	: 22/08/201	6			
Time:	1	0:28		Weather:	Sunny, hot.	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?



Equipped play area (swings, multi-action unit, swivel seat, 3 person rocking horse), and single football goal.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice site with modern equipment. Located in green space with residential streets surrounding.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes				
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes				
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No				
General Information about the site					
7 Deep it have an adventure playaround?	No				

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

ve
Score: 25
Good (4)
Good (4)
Good (4)
Good (4)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Score: 32
Good (4)
Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Good (4)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Average, needs some improvement (3)
Good (4)

Site I D 54	Sit	te Name	Oakham I	Drive	
Type of play are	a or facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward	Walland & Den	ge Marsh			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	e natural environ	ment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for ch 47. Comments:	ildren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play v 49. Comments:	alue:				Good (4)
Care and maint	enance (max s	core A=25,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35	
50. Well maintain 51. Comments:	ned:				Good (4)
52. Health and s 53. Comments:	afety:				
54. Seating for a 55. Comments:	dults:				Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
One bin, overflow	wing.				
58. Dog free zon 59. Comments:	es:				Good (4)
60. Presence of s only): 61. Comments:	supervisory adult	s (Type B, C	and D	Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/chang 63. Comments:	ging facilities (Ty	pe B, C and I	D only):	Serio	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	74				

Site ID 5	5	Site I	Name	Oakland	S		
Type of play	area or f	acility	Type B: L	_EAP			
Ward	Hythe	9					
Name of asses	ssor:	S West and	d S Wikeley	/			
Date of assess	sment:	21/08/201	6				
Time:	12:1	9			Weather:	Sunny, dry	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area and green gym.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play area and green gym to the corner of grassed recreational open space. Well used near cafe.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	]

8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes
9. Does it have refreshments?	Yes
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Site ID	55		Site Na	ime	Oakland	ls
Type of p	lay area o	or facility		Type B:	LEAP	
Ward	н	ythe				
Location	(max sco	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	9=35)	Score: 25
16. Inform	nal oversig	ght:				Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:					
18. Well u	ised by ch	ildren:				Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:					
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-					Average, needs some improvement (3)
22. Persor	nal safety,	lighting ar	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:					
24. Disabi	ility access	5:				Good (4)
25. Comm	-					
26 Meetir	ng other c	hildren				Good (4)
27. Comm						
Near libra	ry and caf	e.				
28. Desigi	ned for the	e site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comm	nents:					
Plav valu	ie (max s	core A=4	0, B=50	D, C=50,	D=50)	Score: 34
-	ng to child	ren to play		-, ,		Good (4)
32. Play o	oportuniti	es for disal	bled chi	dren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comm						
24		<b></b>	(7			Evcollent (E)
34. Play n 35. Comm		fferent age	es (Type	B, C and		Excellent (5)
36. Mover	ment:					Good (4)
37. Comm	nents:					
38. Imaqi	native pla	y ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D on	lly):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comm			. , -			
40. Ball ga	ames:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comm						

Site I D 55		Site Name	Oaklands	
Type of play area	a or facility	Type B:	LEAP	
Ward	Hythe			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	natural envi	ronment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for chil 47. Comments:	dren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play va 49. Comments:	alue:			Good (4)
Care and mainte	enance (ma	x score A=25,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35) Score: 23
50. Well maintain 51. Comments:	ed:			Good (4)
52. Health and sa 53. Comments:	fety:			
54. Seating for ac 55. Comments:	lults:			Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Good (4)
58. Dog free zone 59. Comments:	es:			Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	upervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changi 63. Comments:	ing facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):	Excellent (5)
Final Score:	82			

Site ID	56	Si	te Name	Palmars	h		
Type of pla	iy area o	or facility	Type B:	LEAP			
Ward	Hy	the Rural					
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikel	ey and S We	st			
Date of ass	essment:	18/08/2	2016				
Time:	1	1:01			Weather:	Light rain.	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Quite secluded grass area between housing. Not very friendly looking but some equipment more interesting than usual.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Yes

Unrestricted

Site I D	56		Site Na	ame	Palmarsh	
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type B: LE	AP	
Ward	H	ythe Rural				
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score: 20
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:			[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comm	ents:				-	
Very seclu	ded. One	small entr	ance an	d fences sı	ırrounding.	
18. Well u	sed by ch	ildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	ents:					
20. Gettin	-				[	Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm						
<u> </u>		cross busy				
	-	, lighting a	nd secur	rity:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
23. Comm						
No lighting		<u>.</u> .			Γ	Average poods some improvement (2)
24. Disabil 25. Comm	-	5:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. comm	ents.					
26. Meetin	ng other o	hildren:				Good (4)
27. Comm	ents:					
28 Decign	ad far th	o cito.				Average, needs some improvement (3)
28. Desigr 29. Comm		e site.			L	Average, needs some improvement (5)
Play value	e (max s	core A=4	0, B=50	D, C=50, D	)=50)	Score: 26
30. Enticin	ng to child	lren to play	/:		[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
31. Comm	ents:					
32 Play or	nnortunit	ies for disa	bled chil	dren :		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm					L	
34. Play ne	eeds of d	ifferent age	es (Type	B, C and I	O only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comm	ents:				L	
36. Moven	nent:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm	ents:					
38. Imagir	native nla	y ages (Ty	ne B. C.	and D only	):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comm		, ageo (1)	r C D, C		,.	
40. Ball ga	ames:				[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
41. Comm					L	

Site I D 56		Site Name	Palmarsh		
Type of play are	a or facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward	Hythe Rural				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				M	leaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the 45. Comments:	natural envi	ronment:		ŀ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for chi 47. Comments:	ldren to sit:			ŀ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play va 49. Comments:	alue:			ŀ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainte	enance (ma	x score A=25,	B=35, C=35	i, D=35)	Score: 14
50. Well maintair 51. Comments:	ied:			ŀ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
Large amount of	litter.				
52. Health and sa 53. Comments:	afety:				
54. Seating for ad 55. Comments:					Good (4)
One picnic bench	•				
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zone 59. Comments:	es:				Good (4)
60. Presence of s only): 61. Comments:	upervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/chang 63. Comments:	ing facilities	(Type B, C and I	D only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	60				

Site ID	57		Si	e Nan	ne	Pannell Drive	Play Are
Type of pla	ay are	a or fa	acility	Ту	ype C: NE	EAP	
Ward		North	Downs E	ast			
Name of a	ssesso	r:	S West	and S	WIkeley		
Date of as	sessme	ent:	21/08/2	016			

Time:

11:08



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area and MUGA.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Multi activity timber play unit within fenced area and MUGA sited within grassed open space between housing. Equipment in good condition.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No

9	Does	it	have	refreshn	nents?
J.	DUCS	IL.	nuvc	1 CH C3HH	iciics:

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Cloudy, dry

Site I D	57		Site N	ame	Pannell D	Drive Play	Area					
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type C: N	EAP							
Ward		North Downs	East									
Location	(max so	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)		Score:	26				
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:									Good	(4)
17. Comm	ents:											
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:									Good	(4)
19. Comm	ents:											
20. Gettin	a thora:										Good	(A)
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-										Good	(4)
22. Persor	nal safety	, lighting ar	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs	some i	nprov	ement	(3)
23. Comm	ents:											
											<u> </u>	
24. Disabi		SS:									Good	(4)
25. Comm	ients:											
26. Meetir	ng other	children:					Average,	needs	some i	mprov	ement	(3)
27. Comm	ents:											
28. Desigr	ood for t	na sita:									Good	(4)
20. Design 29. Comm		le site.									0000	(-)
Play valu	e (max	score A=40	), B=5	0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	36				
	-	dren to play	:								Good	(4)
31. Comm	ents:											
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disal	oled chi	ldren:			Average,	needs	some i	mprov	ement	(3)
, 33. Comm										•		
		different age	s (Type	B, C and I	D only):					Ex	cellent	(5)
35. Comm	ents:											
36. Moven	nonti						Average,	needs	some i	mnrov	ement	(3)
37. Comm							Average,	neeus	somen	nprov	ement	(5)
38. Imagir	native pl	ay ages (Typ	be B, C	and D only	/):						Good	(4)
39. Comm	ents:											
40. Ball ga											Good	(4)
41. Comm	ients:											

Site ID 57	Site Name	Pannell D	rive Play Area
Type of play area	or facility Typ	e C: NEAP	
Ward N	North Downs East		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:		Good (4)
Care and mainter 50. Well maintaine	nance (max score A= d:	25, B=35, C=3!	5, D=35) Score: 15 Good (4)
<ul><li>51. Comments:</li><li>52. Health and safe</li><li>53. Comments:</li></ul>	ety:		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Good (4)
<ul><li>60. Presence of sup only):</li><li>61. Comments:</li></ul>	pervisory adults (Type I	B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type B, C a	and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	77		

Site ID	58	Site Na	Site Name		
Type of play area or facility		Type B: LE	EAP		
Ward	F	olkestone Central			
Name of as	sessor:	S West and	S Wikeley		
Date of assessment: 21/08/2010					

Time:

10:02



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Play equipment amongst pedestrian route along bank.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Newly constructed site with unusual play equipment using gradient. Situated within town centre.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	٦

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site ID	58	Site Na	ame	Payers Park	(
Type of play	area or facil	lity	Type B: Ll	EAP	
Ward	Folkesto	ne Central			
Location (n	nax score A=	35, B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 26
16. Informal	oversight:				Good (4)
17. Commen	its:				
10 Wall use	d by obildroom				Average people come improvement (2)
19. Commen	d by children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Commen					
20. Getting t	here:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Commen					
22. Personal	safety, lightin	g and secu	rity:		Good (4)
23. Commen	its:				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
					2 1/0
24. Disability					Good (4)
25. Commen	its:				
26. Meeting	other children	:			Good (4)
27. Commen	its:				
28. Designed 29. Commen	for the site:				Good (4)
29. Commen					
Play value	(max score A	=40, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50)	Score: 31
-	to children to				Good (4)
31. Commen	its:				
	ortunities for a	lisabled chi	ldren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Commen	its:				
34 Play nee	ds of different		BCand		Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Commen		ages (Type	. D, C ana	D only).	
36. Moveme	nt:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Commen	its:				
		/		、	
	tive play ages	(Гуре В, С	and D only	y):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Commen	its:				
40. Ball gam	es:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
41. Commen				Ĺ	

Site ID 58	Site N	ame <mark>P</mark>	ayers Park	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEA	P	
Ward F	olkestone Central			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:		Good (4)
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:			Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter		e A=25, B=3	35, C=35,	D=35) Score: 17 Good (4)
51. Comments:				
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ilts:			Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C and	D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D on	ly):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	74			

Site ID	59	Site	Name	Peregrine Close
Type of pla	y area o	or facility	Type A:	LAP
Ward				
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley	/ and S Wes	st
Date of ass	essment	: 18/08/20	16	

Time:

11:21



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area with one multi-action unit.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Square fenced area located within grassed area between housing. Quite run down. Not much equipment.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	
15. Comments:	



Light rain.

Site I D	59		Site N	ame	Peregrine C	ose	
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type A: LA	٩P		
Ward		Hythe Rural					
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score:	24
16. Inform	nal over	sight:					Good (4
17. Comm	nents:						
18. Well ι	ised by i	children				Average	needs some improvement (3
19. Comm	-						(-
20. Gettin	ng there:	:					Good (4
21. Comm	nents:						
22. Persoi	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average, i	needs some improvement (3
23. Comm	nents:						
No lightin	g in play	/ area.					
24. Disabi	-	ess:					Good (4
25. Comm	nents:						
26. Meetii	na other	children.				Average, i	needs some improvement (3
27. Comm						5 - ,	
28. Desig	ned for t	the site:				Average, i	needs some improvement (3
29. Comm	nents:						
-		score A=4		0, C=50, L	J=50)		<b>19</b> needs some improvement (3
31. Comm	-	ildren to play	/.			Average, 1	neeus some improvement (5
32. Play o	pportun	ities for disa	bled ch	ildren:		Weaknesse	es, improvements needed (2
33. Comm	nents:						
		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):		
35. Comm	nents:						
26 Mayrar	mont.					Weekneed	a improvements needed (2
36. Mover 37. Comm						Weaknesse	es, improvements needed (2
37. Comm	ients:						
38. Imadi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	/):		
39. Comm		, 5-()	. , -	/			
40. Ball g	ames:					Serious weakness	ses, improvement needed (1
41. Comm	nents:						

Site ID 59		Site Name	Peregrine	e Close	
Type of play area	or facility	Туре А	A: LAP		
Ward	Hythe Rura	I			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural envi	ronment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	Iren to sit:				Good (4)
Small area for sitti	ng under m	nulti-action unit	t.		
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainte	nance (ma	ax score A=25	5, B=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 14
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Some litter. Rust.					
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for add 55. Comments:	ults:				Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	5:				Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory a	dults (Type B,	C and D		
62. Toilets/changir 63. Comments:	ng facilities	(Type B, C and	l D only):		
Final Score:	57				

Site ID 60	Site Na	ime Pine W	/ay	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP		
Ward C	heriton			
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley an	nd S West		
Date of assessment	: 16/08/2016			
Time: 1	1:23		Weather:	Sunny, hot.
		the state of the		



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area with six small pieces of equipment.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Fairly nice looking local play area but with chain link fence. Seems to be quite well maintained (plants and cut grass).

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
	Provide the second s	
General Information about the site		
General Information about the site 7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	_

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Unrestricted

Site ID	60		Site N	ame	Pine Way			
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	EAP			
Ward		Cheriton						
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score:	22	
16. Inforr	nal over	sight:						s some improvement (3)
17. Comn	nents:							
Next to so	ome hou	ses. Quiet st	reet.					
		-						
18. Well used by children:						Average	needo	s some improvement (3)
19. Comments:						 , weitige,	neeue	some improvement (s)
20. Gettir	ng there:							Good (4)
21. Comm	nents:				L			
22. Perso	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:	[	Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)
23. Comm	nents:							
	-	but Not in p	lay area	Э.				
24. Disab	-	ess:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
25. Comm	nents:							
26. Meeti	na other	children:						Good (4)
27. Comm					L			
Near scho	ool.							
28. Desig	ned for t	he site:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
29. Comm	nents:							
	_							
-		score A=4		0, C=50, [	D=50)	Score:	23	
30. Enticii 31. Comn	-	ildren to play	/:		L	Average,	neeas	s some improvement (3)
32. Play o	pportun	ities for disa	bled ch	ildren:		Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)
33. Comm	nents:							
-		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):	Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)
35. Comm	nents:							
26 Мания						) / /	!	
36. Mover						weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)
37. Comm	ients:							
38. Imaqi	native p	lay ages (Ty	ре В <i>.</i> С	and D only	/):	Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)
39. Comm		, 5 (-)	, , ,	,				
40. Ball g	ames:					Weakness	es, in	provements needed (2)
41. Comm	nents:				L			

Site I D 60		Site Name	Pine Way		
Type of play a	rea or facility	Туре В:	LEAP		
Ward	Cheriton				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to t 45. Comments		ronment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for c 47. Comments					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play 49. Comments					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and main	ntenance (ma	ix score A=25,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 12
50. Well mainta 51. Comments					Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and 53. Comments	-				
54. Seating for 55. Comments				Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments	:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zo 59. Comments					Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence o only): 61. Comments		dults (Type B, C	and D	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/cha 63. Comments		(Type B, C and	D only):	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	57				

Site I D 61	Site Name	Pond Hill Road
Type of play are	ea or facility Type A:	A: LAP
Ward	Cheriton	
Name of assesso	r: S West	
Date of assessm	ent: 10/10/2016	
Time:	15:36	Weather: Sunny, cool

# 1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Grass mounds for play

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Secluded shaded area with grass mounds by fencing on MOD property.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

# Age groups4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?Yes5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?Yes6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?NoGeneral Information about the site

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Limited

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

On MOD property. Ministry of Defence property and access.

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	61		Site N	ame	Pond Hill	Road					
Type of p	lay are	a or facility		Type A: L	AP						
Ward		Cheriton									
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	20			
16. Inform	nal over	sight:					Average,	needs	some in	nproven	nent (3)
17. Comm	nents:										
18. Well u	used by	children:					Average,	needs	some in	nproven	nent (3)
19. Comm	nents:										
20 Cettin		_					A	noodo	aamaa in		ant(2)
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-	:					Average,	neeas	some in	iproven	hent (3)
22. Persoi	nal safe	ty, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs	some in	nprovem	nent (3)
23. Comm	nents:										
24. Disabi	-	ess:					Average,	needs	some in	nproven	nent (3)
25. Comm	nents:										
26. Meetii	ng othei	children:					Weakness	es, im	proveme	ents nee	eded (2)
27. Comm	nents:										
28 Decia	nod for	the cite					Average,	noode	somo in	provon	rant(3)
28. Desigi 29. Comm		the site.					Average,	neeus	some m	proven	lent (5)
Play valu	ıe (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50)		Score:	19			
	-	ildren to play	/:				Average,	needs	some in	nproven	nent (3)
31. Comm	nents:										
32. Play o	opportur	ities for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Average,	needs	some in	nproven	nent (3)
33. Comm							5,			•	
		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):						
35. Comm	nents:										
36. Mover	ment:						Weakness	es, im	proveme	ents nee	ded (2)
37. Comm								,			(-)
		lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):						
39. Comm	nents:										
40. Ball g	ames						Average,	neede	some in	nrover	nent (3)
40. Dan 9							Average,	iccus	Joine III	19101611	

Site I D 61		Site Name	Pond Hill	Road	
Type of play area	or facility	Type A:	LAP		
Ward C	Cheriton				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural envi	ronment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:			Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Care and mainter 50. Well maintaine		x score A=25,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35	) Score: 8 Good (4)
51. Comments: 52. Health and safe	ety:				
<ul><li>53. Comments:</li><li>54. Seating for adu</li><li>55. Comments:</li></ul>	ılts:			Seric	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D		
<ul><li>62. Toilets/changin</li><li>63. Comments:</li></ul>	g facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):		
Final Score:	47				

Site ID	62	Site N	lame	Queensway
Type of play area or facility			Type B: L	EAP
Ward				
Name of assessor: S Wikeley		and S West		
Date of assessment:		t: 22/08/2016	5	

Time:

09:54



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (multi-action unit, swings, slide) and one football goal.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Quite run-down, fenced off play area situated in open green space, surrounded by residential streets.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7 Doos it have an adventure playeround?	No	٦

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	t? No No No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Sunny, warm.

Site ID	62		Site Na	ame	Queenswa	ау
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type B: Ll	EAP	
Ward		Walland & D	enge M	arsh		
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 23
16. Inform	nal over	sight:				Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:					
Can be vi	ewed fro	m many hou	ises.			
18. Well u	used by a	children:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	-					
20. Gettin	ng there:					Good (4)
21. Comm	nents:					
		y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm						
No lightin						Augusta and some improvement (2)
24. Disabi 25. Comm	-	SS:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
		p to play are	12			
26. Meetii			.a.			Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm						
28. Desig		he site:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comm	nents:					
Play valu	ie (may	score A=4	0 B-5	0 0-50 1	D-50)	Score: 28
•		Idren to play		0,0-00,1	2-00)	Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comm	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-			
32. Play o	pportun	ities for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm	nents:					
			<i>.</i>			
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):	Good (4)
	icitto.					
36. Mover	ment:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm						
38. Imagi	native p	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comm	nents:					
40. Ball g						Good (4)
41. Comm	nents:					

Site ID 62	Site N	ame	Queenswa	,			
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: L	EAP				
Ward V	Valland & Denge M	arsh					
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvement	s needed (2)		
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:	[	Weaknesses, improvement	s needed (2)		
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		[	Average, needs some impr	ovement (3)		
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:		[	Average, needs some impr	ovement (3)		
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, E	3=35, C=35	D=35) Score	: 11		
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:		[	Weaknesses, improvement	s needed (2)		
Gate missing, some	e litter, graffiti.						
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:						
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:		[	Average, needs some impr	ovement (3)		
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[	Serious weaknesses, improvemen	t needed (1)		
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Average, needs some impr	ovement (3)		
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C a	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvemen	t needed (1)		
<ul><li>62. Toilets/changin</li><li>63. Comments:</li></ul>	g facilities (Type B	6, C and D	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvemen	t needed (1)		
Final Score:	62						
Site I D 6	3	Site	Name	Reachfie	lds		
---------------	------------	-----------	------------	----------	----------	-------------	--
Type of play	area or fa	acility	Type B: L	.EAP			
Ward	Hythe	Rural					
Name of asse	ssor:	S Wikeley	and S West	:			
Date of asses	sment:	16/08/201	6				
Time:	15:0	7			Weather:	Sunny, hot.	
					M. C.C.		



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

MUGA, youth shelter and small green gym.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Large fenced-off area for older children and youths.

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

11. Is access to site:

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	
9. Does it have refreshments?	No	

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	
Tbc	



Yes

Site ID	63		Site N	ame	Reachfields					
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type B: LE	AP					
Ward		Hythe Rural								
Location	(max s	core A=35	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Score:	23			
16. Inforn	nal over	sight:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
17. Comm	nents:									
Can be se	Can be seen from quiet street and houses along street.									
18. Well u	ised by o	children:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
19. Comm	nents:									
20. Gettin	-							Good (4)		
21. Comm	ients:									
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	ritv:		Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
23. Comm		.,, 5 - 5 -		-7		<u> </u>				
No lightin	g. Few e	exits.								
24. Disabi	lity acce	ess:						Good (4)		
25. Comm	nents:									
26. Meetir 27. Comm		children:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
27. Comm	ients.									
28. Desigr	ned for t	he site:				Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
29. Comm	nents:									
Play valu	ie (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, C	D=50)	Score:				
	-	ildren to pla	y:			Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
31. Comm	ients:									
32. Play o	pportun	ities for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
, 33. Comm						<u> </u>				
34. Play n	eeds of	different ag	es (Type	e B, C and I	O only):	Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
35. Comm	nents:									
						<b>A</b>				
36. Mover 37. Comm						Average,	needs	s some improvement (3)		
57. Comm	ients.									
38. Imagi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	<i>'</i> ):	Serious weaknes	sses, i	mprovement needed (1)		
39. Comm			-							
40. Ball ga	ames:							Good (4)		
41. Comm	nents:									
MUGA wit	h no ma	rkings.								

Site ID 63		Site Name	Reachfi	elds	
Type of play area	or facility	Туре В	: LEAP		
Ward H	lythe Rural				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural envii	ronment:			Good (4)
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
One youth shelter.					
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (ma	x score A=25	, B=35, C=	35, D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Some litter.					
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
No benches. Only y	outh-shelte	er.			
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Good (4)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory ac	lults (Type B, C	C and D	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	65				

Site ID	64	Site Name	Rhodes Minnis Recreation Ground
Type of play area or facility			3: LEAP
Ward	N	lorth Downs West	
Name of assessor: S West and		S West and S Wike	eley
Date of assessment: 24/08/2016		:: 24/08/2016	

Weather:

Time:

11:45



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Brightly coloured metal play equipment including swings, and slide located to the edge of rural field. Fairly remote.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Site ID 64 Site Name Rhodes Minnis	s Recreation Ground
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP	
Ward North Downs West	
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 19
16. Informal oversight:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comments:	
18. Well used by children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:	
20. Getting there:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comments:	
22. Personal safety, lighting and security:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments:	
24. Disability access:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comments:	
26. Meeting other children: 27. Comments:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
28. Designed for the site:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments:	
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)	Score: 27
30. Enticing to children to play: 31. Comments:	Good (4)
32. Play opportunities for disabled children:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comments:	
34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comments:	
36. Movement:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comments:	
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comments:	
40. Ball games: 41. Comments:	Average, needs some improvement (3)

Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP	
Nard North Downs West	
42. Loose parts Weaknesses, impro 43. Comments:	ovements needed (2)
44. Access to the natural environment: 45. Comments:	Good (4)
46. Places for children to sit:Average, needs so47. Comments:	ome improvement (3)
48. Added play value: Weaknesses, impro 49. Comments:	ovements needed (2)
Care and maintenance (max score A=25, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 15
50. Well maintained: 51. Comments:	Good (4)
52. Health and safety: 53. Comments:	
54. Seating for adults: 55. Comments:	Good (4)
56. Litter bins: Serious weaknesses, imp 57. Comments:	rovement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:	Good (4)
60. Presence of supervisory adults (Type B, C and D Serious weaknesses, impondent): 61. Comments:	rovement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changing facilities (Type B, C and D only): Serious weaknesses, imp 63. Comments:	rovement needed (1)

Site ID	55	Site	Name	Roman \	Nay		
Type of play	area or fa	acility	Type B: l	_EAP			
Ward	Cheri	ton					
Name of asse	essor:	S Wikeley	and S West	t			
Date of asses	sment:	16/08/201	.6				
Time:	12:1	2			Weather:	Sunny, hot.	
					4.4.1.3		



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (multi-action unit, metal rockers, swings and combined basketball hoop/football goal).

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Quite worn looking area next to main road but with hedge separating.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes						
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes						
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes						
General Information about the site							
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1					
		т.					

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole s	ite
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improv	ement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP	
Ward Cheriton	
Location (max score A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 21	
16. Informal oversight:	Good (4)
17. Comments:	
Viewed by some houses.	
viewed by some nouses.	
18. Well used by children:   Average, needs some impro	vement (3)
19. Comments:	
Worn down grass.	
20. Getting there: Average, needs some impro	vement (3)
21. Comments:	
Main road will need to be crossed by some people.	
22. Personal safety, lighting and security: Average, needs some impro	vement (3)
23. Comments:	
No lighting.	
24. Disability access: Average, needs some impro	vement (3)
25. Comments:	
Path runs alongside play area but does not run up to gate. Need to cross grass.	
26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some impro	ovement (3)
27. Comments:	
Residential street.	
28. Designed for the site:   Weaknesses, improvements	needed (2)
29. Comments:	
Play value (max score A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50) Score: 24	
	$x_{0}$
30. Enticing to children to play:   Average, needs some impro     31. Comments:   Average and the source of the source	vement (5)
32. Play opportunities for disabled children: Weaknesses, improvements	needed (2)
33. Comments:	
34. Play needs of different ages (Type B, C and D only):	Good (4)
35. Comments:	
36. Movement: Average, needs some impro	vement (3)
37. Comments:	
38. Imaginative play ages (Type B, C and D only): Weaknesses, improvements	needed (2)
39. Comments:	. ,
40. Ball games: Average, needs some impro	vement (3)
41. Comments:	(-)

Site ID 65	Site Name	Roman Way
Type of play area or fac	ility Type B: Li	P
Ward Cherito	า	
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
<ul><li>44. Access to the natural</li><li>45. Comments:</li></ul>	environment:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for children to 47. Comments:	sit:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
No benches.		
48. Added play value: 49. Comments:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and maintenance	(max score A=25, B	35, C=35, D=35) Score: 8
50. Well maintained: 51. Comments:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Graffiti, rust, some litter.		
52. Health and safety: 53. Comments:		
54. Seating for adults: 55. Comments: No benches.		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
No bins.		
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
60. Presence of superviso only): 61. Comments:	ry adults (Type B, C ar	D Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
<ul><li>62. Toilets/changing facili</li><li>63. Comments:</li></ul>	ties (Type B, C and D o	Ily): Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score: 53		

Site ID 66	Site Name	Royal Military Canal Play Area
Type of play area or facilit	y Type D: De	estination
Ward Hythe		
Name of assessor: S N	West and S Wikeley	
Date of assessment: 24,	/08/2016	
Time: 10:20		Weather: Sunny, dry
	-2	and the second second



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Timber adventure play area with various play equipment.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Fairly new timber play equipment sited near car park within grassed open space near coastal main road and the Royal Military Canal. Well used.

#### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

- -

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	Yes

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children 14. Involvement of children:	Sorious wookpossos	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	Serious weakitesses	, improvement needed (1)
Tbc		

Site ID	66	Site N	ame	Royal Milita	ary Canal Play Area
Type of pl	lay area or fa	cility	Type D: D	estination	
Ward	Hythe				
Location	(max score A	A=35, B=35	, C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 26
16. Inform	nal oversight:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	ients:				
	ised by childrei	n:			Good (4)
19. Comm	ients:				
20. Gettin	g there:				Good (4)
21. Comm	ients:				
22. Persor	nal safety, light	ting and secu	ırity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm		5	,	L	
	lity access:				Good (4)
25. Comm	ients:				
26. Meetir	ng other childre	en:			Good (4)
27. Comm	ients:				
28. Desigr	ned for the site	2:			Good (4)
29. Comm				L	
Play valu	e (max score	A-40 B-5	0 C-50 I	D-50)	Score: 32
-	ng to children t		, 0 <u>-</u> 30, 1	5-30)	Good (4)
31. Comm	-	, e p , .			
32 Play or	pportunities fo	r disabled ch	ildren	Γ	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm			ildi citi.	L	
	eeds of differe	nt ages (Typ	e B, C and	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comm	ients:				
36. Moven	nent:			Γ	Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm	ients:				
38. Imaoir	native plav age	es (Type B. C	and D only	y):	Good (4)
39. Comm		、 / F / C			
					Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comm	ients:				
34. Play no 35. Comm 36. Moven 37. Comm 38. Imagir	eeds of differe nents: nent: nents: native play age nents: ames:				Average, needs some improvement Good

Site I D 66		Site Name	Royal Milit	ary Canal Play Area
Type of play ar	ea or facility	Type D	: Destination	
Ward	Hythe			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to th 45. Comments:	e natural env	ironment:		Good (4)
46. Places for cl 47. Comments:	nildren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play 49. Comments:	value:			Good (4)
Care and mair	itenance (ma	ax score A=25,	B=35, C=35	, D=35) Score: 16
50. Well mainta 51. Comments:	ined:			Good (4)
52. Health and 53. Comments:	safety:			
54. Seating for 55. Comments:	adults:			Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zo 59. Comments:	nes:			Good (4)
60. Presence of only): 61. Comments:	supervisory a	dults (Type B, C	and D	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
62. Toilets/char 63. Comments:	iging facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	74			

Site I D	67	Site	Name	Salthouse Close		
Type of pla	ay area	- or facility	Type B: I	EAP		
Ward	V	Valland & Denge	Marsh			
Name of a	ssessor:	S West an	d S Wikeley	/		
Date of as	sessment	22/08/201	.6			
Time:	1	14:41		Weather:	Sunny, dry	



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area, basketball hoop, MUGA and youth shelter.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play area in a tucked away location in grassed open space near housing.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	67		Site N	ame	Salthouse	e Close	
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type B: L	EAP		
Ward	١	Walland & D	enge M	arsh			
Location	(max so	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score: 24
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	ents:						
18. Well u	sed by c	hildren:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	ents:						
20 Cotting	a thora:						Good (1)
20. Getting 21. Comm							Good (4)
22. Person	al safety	, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	ents:						
24. Disabil		SS:					Good (4)
25. Comm	ents:						
26. Meetin	ig other	children:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comm	ents:						
28. Design	ed for t	na sita:					Good (4)
29. Comm		ie site.					
Play value	e (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50)		Score: 38
	-	dren to play	<b>/:</b>				Good (4)
31. Comm	ents:						
32. Play or	pportuni	ties for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Good (4)
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							
		lifferent age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):		Excellent (5)
35. Comm	ents:						
36. Movem	nent:						Good (4)
37. Comm							
38. Imagir	native pl	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):		Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comm	ents:						
40.5."							
40. Ball ga							Good (4)
41. Comm	ents.						
1							

Site I D 67	Site Name	Salthouse Clo	ose
Type of play area	or facility Type B:	LEAP	
Ward V	Valland & Denge Marsh		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Good (4)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	Je:		Good (4)
Care and mainter	nance (max score A=25,	B=35, C=35, C	0=35) Score: 12
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Litter, graffiti and h	neavy wear.		
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (Type B, C	and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
<ul><li>62. Toilets/changin</li><li>63. Comments:</li></ul>	g facilities (Type B, C and I	D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	74		

Site ID	68	Site	Name	Sandgate	e Recreatio	on Ground
Type of pla	ay area or	facility	Type C: N	IEAP		
Ward	Sand	dgate & West	Folkestone			
Name of as	ssessor:	S West an	d S Wikeley			
Date of ass	sessment:	23/08/202	16			
Time:	15:	52			Weather:	: Sunny, dry





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area including green gym, trim trail, kickabout area/football posts and MUGA.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Large open space by main road and on hillside, well used and wide ranging equipment.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	
Tbc	

Site I D	68		Site Na	ame	Sandgate	Recreati	on Ground						
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type C: Ni	EAP								
Ward		Sandgate &	West Fo	olkestone									
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	26					
16. Inform	nal overs	sight:									Go	) boc	4)
17. Comm	nents:												
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:									Excell	ent (!	5)
19. Comm	nents:												_
20 Cattin							A. (	naada		i na na n		ant (	2)
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-						Average,	neeas	some	Impr	ovem	ent (.	3)
22. Persor	nal safet	y, lighting aı	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs	some	impr	ovem	ent (3	3)
23. Comm	nents:												
24. Disabi	-	ss:					Average,	needs	some	impr	ovem	ent (3	3)
25. Comm	nents:												_
26. Meetir	ng other	children:									G	،) boc	4)
27. Comm													
28. Desigr		he site:									Go	4) boc	4)
29. Comm	ients:												_
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	40					
		ldren to play									Excell	ent (!	5)
31. Comm	nents:												
							•			•			2)
-		ties for disa	olea chi	laren:			Average,	neeas	some	Impr	ovem	ent (.	3)
33. Comm	ients:												
34. Plav n	eeds of	different age	s (Type	B, C and I	D only):						Excell	ent (!	5)
, 35. Comm		5		,	,,,							-	
36. Moven	nent:										Excell	ent (!	5)
37. Comm	nents:												
38 Imagir	native n	ay ages (Ty	ne R C	and D only	<i>\</i> ).						G	ے 4) boc	4)
39. Comm			ыс D, С		· · ·							(-	• /
	'												
40. Ball ga	ames:										Excell	ent (!	5)
41. Comm	nents:												1

Site I D 68		Site Na	me	Sandgate	Recreatio	on Ground
Type of play area	or facility	·	Type C: N	EAP		
Ward	Sandgate &	West Fo	lkestone			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:						Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural envir	ronment	:			Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	Iren to sit:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:					Good (4)
Care and mainte	nance (ma	x score	A=25, B:	=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 21
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:					Good (4)
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ety:					
54. Seating for add 55. Comments:	ults:					Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:						Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	5:					Excellent (5)
Specific area for d	ogs.					
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory ac	lults (Ty	pe B, C ar	nd D	Seriou	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changir 63. Comments:	ng facilities (	(Туре В,	C and D o	only):	Seriou	us weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	87					

Site ID	69	Site Name St. Luke's Walk Play Area
Type of pla	ay area d	or facility Type A: LAP
Ward	N	orth Downs East
Name of as	ssessor:	S Wikeley and S West
Date of assessment: 17/08/2016		: 17/08/2016

Weather:

Time:

15:36



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small equipped play area (multi-action unit, small merry-go-round, swings).

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Currently closed for maintenance. Very run-down, unfriendly looking. Equipment rusty and covered in graffiti.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

Tbc

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	No
11. Is access to site:	No access

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

Currently closed for maintenance but viewable from outside fence.

13. Survey site access:		No access
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		



Site ID	69		Site N	ame	St. Luke's	Walk Pla	ay Area		
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type A: LA	٩P				
Ward		North Downs	s East						
Location	(max so	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	21	
16. Inform	nal overs	sight:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
17. Comm	ents:								
Viewable f	from sur	rounding ho	uses bı	t few passe	ers-by.				
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:					Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
19. Comm	ents:								
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-								Good (4)
22. Persor	nal safety	y, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
23. Comm	ents:								
No lights i	n play a	rea.							
24. Disabi	-	ss:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
25. Comm	ents:								
26. Meetir 27. Comm		children:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
28. Desigr 29. Comm		ne site:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0 B-5	0 C-50 F	2-50)		Score:	15	
•	ng to chi	dren to play		0,0-00,2	5-00)				provements needed (2)
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disa	bled chi	ldren:			Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
33. Comm	ents:								
34. Play n 35. Comm		lifferent age	es (Type	B, C and I	D only):				
36. Moven	nent:						Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
37. Comm									
38. Imagir	native nl	ay ages (Ty	ne R C	and D only	():				
39. Comm		-, .gcs (iy			· / ·				
40. Ball ga	ames:						Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
41. Comm								,	

Site ID 69	Site Name	St. Luke's Walk Play Area
Type of play area or	facility Type A:	LAP
Ward Nor	th Downs East	
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
<ul><li>44. Access to the nat</li><li>45. Comments:</li></ul>	ural environment:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for children 47. Comments:	n to sit:	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play value 49. Comments:	:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Care and maintena	nce (max score A=25,	B=35, C=35, D=35) Score: 11
50. Well maintained: 51. Comments:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Currently closed for r	naintenance.	
52. Health and safety 53. Comments:	<i>י</i> :	
54. Seating for adults 55. Comments: One bench.	5:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones: 59. Comments:		Good (4)
60. Presence of super only): 61. Comments:	rvisory adults (Type B, C	and D
62. Toilets/changing 63. Comments:	facilities (Type B, C and I	D only):
Final Score:	47	

Site ID	70	Site I	Name	Station Road
Type of pla	ay area o	or facility	Type B:	LEAP
Ward	N	ew Romney		
Name of as	sessor:	S West and	d S Wikele	У
Date of assessment: 21/08/201		6		

Weather:

Time:

15:07



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Two equipped play areas (one fenced).

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Located within grassed field near clinic and main road. One play area appeared newer.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Sunny, dry

Site I D	70		Site N	ame	Station Ro	ad				
Type of pla	iy area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP					
Ward	1	lew Romne	y	<u>-</u>						
Location (	max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	-35)		Score:	22		
16. Informa	al overs	ght:			[		Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
17. Comme	ents:									
18. Well us	ed by cl	nildren:					Average,	needs	s some improveme	ent (3)
19. Comme	ents:				L					
20. Getting							Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
21. Comme	ents:									
22. Persona	al safety	lighting a	nd secu	rity			Average.	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
23. Comme	-	, nghing a		iricy.	ļ		, weilage,	needs		(5)
24. Disabili	ty acces	s:			[				Go	od (4)
25. Comme	ents:									
DC Mastin							A. (	naada		nt (2)
26. Meeting 27. Comme		children:					Average,	neeas	some improveme	ent (3)
28. Designe	ed for th	e site:					Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
29. Comme	ents:				L					
Play value				0, C=50, E	D=50)		Score:	31		od (4)
30. Enticing 31. Comme	-	aren to play	/:						Go	od (4)
32. Play op	portunit	ies for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
33. Comme	ents:									
					r					. (5)
34. Play ne 35. Comme		ifferent age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):		Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
36. Movem	ent:						Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
37. Comme	ents:				l					
38. Imagina		ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	<i>י</i> ):		Average,	needs	some improveme	ent (3)
39. Comme	ents:									
40. Ball gar	mesi						Average	neede	some improveme	ant(3)
40. Ball gal 41. Comme							Averaye,	neeus		.nc (3)

Site ID 70		Site Name	Station Ro	bad	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward N	lew Romney	/			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural envir	onment:			Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (max	score A=25,	B=35, C=35	5, D=35)	Score: 18
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Two swings missing	g.				
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:				Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Excellent (5)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory ad	ults (Type B, C	and D	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (	Type B, C and	D only):	Serious	weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	71				

Site ID	71	Site N	lame	Stombers Lane
Type of pla	ay area	or facility	Type B: L	EAP
Ward	ſ	North Downs East		
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley a	and S West	
Date of ass	sessmen	t: 17/08/2016	6	

11:13





# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (4 pieces of equipment) and two small football goals.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play area very rundown. Unwelcoming, equipment missing and rusted. Located in remote corner of grassed area.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	NO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole	site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, impro	vement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	71		Site N	ame	Stombers	Lane	
Type of pl	ay area o	r facility		Type B: LE	AP		
Ward	No	orth Downs	s East				
Location	(max sco	re A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)		Score: 14
16. Inform	nal oversig	ht:			[	Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
17. Comm	ents:						
Can only b	oe viewed	from smal	l entrar	nce way. Ot	herwise su	rrounde	ed by trees and shrubbery.
18. Well u	sed by chi	ldren:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
19. Comm	ents:				L		
Swings ho	oked up s	uggesting	No use	recently.			
20. Gettin	g there:				[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm	ents:				L		
Many will	need to cr	oss fairly b	ousy ro	ad.			
22. Persor	nal safety,	lighting ar	nd secu	rity:	[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
23. Comm	ents:				-		
No lighting	g. Seclude	d area.					
24. Disabi	lity access	:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
25. Comm	ents:				L		
No path. N	leed to cro	oss grass.					
26. Meetin	ng other ch	nildren:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
27. Comm	ents:						
28. Desigr 29. Comm		site:			[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Play valu	e (max so	core A=40	), B=5	0, C=50, C	)=50)		Score: 22
30. Enticin					-		Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comm	-	. ,			L		
32. Play o	pportunitie	es for disat	oled chi	ildren:		Serio	ous weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
33. Comm	ents:						
34. Play no 35. Comm		ferent age	s (Type	e B, C and I	D only):		Good (4)
36. Moven	nent:				[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm	ents:				L		
38. Imagir	native play	ages (Typ	be B, C	and D only	'):		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comm	ents:				L		
40. Ball ga	ames:				[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comm					L		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Two small	goals but	no markin	gs.				

Site ID 71	Site Na	nme <mark>Stor</mark>	nbers Lane
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP	
Ward N	lorth Downs East		
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment	:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	Je:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Care and mainter	ance (max score	A=25, B=35,	C=35, D=35) Score: 10
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Equipment missing	. Lots of litter. Very	v rusted equipm	ent. Broken glass.
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments: No seating.	lts:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Signs but dogs cou	ld easily enter.		
<ul><li>60. Presence of sup only):</li><li>61. Comments:</li></ul>	pervisory adults (Ty	vpe B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
<ul><li>62. Toilets/changin</li><li>63. Comments:</li></ul>	g facilities (Type B,	, C and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	46		

Site ID	72	Site N	lame	Swan Lane
Type of pla	ay area o	or facility	Type B: I	_EAP
Ward	N	orth Downs West	:	
Name of as	ssessor:	S Wikeley a	and S West	t
Date of ass	sessment	: 24/08/2016	6	

15:58

# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (6 pieces of equipment).

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Colourful, fenced-off site located in corner of sports club field. Equipment looks modern and has variety. Generally in good condition.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Yes

Site ID 72		Site Name	Swan Lar	ne				
Type of play a	rea or facility	Туре	B: LEAP					
Ward	North Downs	s West						
Location (ma	x score A=35,	B=35, C=3	5, D=35)	So	core:	23		
16. Informal o	versight:			Ave	erage, i	needs	some improvement (3)	
17. Comments	:							
Only visible to	people in the sp	orts club.						
18. Well used	oy children:						Good (4)	
19. Comments								
20. Getting the	ere:			Ave	erage, I	needs	some improvement (3)	
21. Comments	:							
	fety, lighting ar	nd security:		Ave	erage, i	needs	some improvement (3)	
23. Comments								
No lighting.				<b>A</b> 110		d .	come improvement (2)	
<ol> <li>24. Disability a</li> <li>25. Comments</li> </ol>				Ave	erage, i	leeus	some improvement (3)	
	g up to gate. Ne	ed to cross f	ield.					
26. Meeting ot							Good (4)	
27. Comments								
28. Designed f				Ave	erage, I	needs	some improvement (3)	
29. Comments								
Play value (m	ax score A=40	) R-50 C-	50 D-50)	S/	core:	28		
-	children to play		50, D=50)	30	core.	20	Good (4)	
31. Comments								
32. Play oppor	cunities for disal	oled children:		Ave	erage, I	needs	some improvement (3)	
33. Comments	:							
				-				
<ul><li>34. Play needs</li><li>35. Comments</li></ul>	of different age	s (Type B, C	and D only):	Ave	erage, I	needs	s some improvement (3)	
	•							
36. Movement				Ave	erage, i	needs	some improvement (3)	
37. Comments	:				5.			
38. Imaginativ	e play ages (Ty	be B, C and D	only):	Wea	aknesse	es, im	provements needed (2)	
39. Comments	:							
40. Ball games				Serious we	akness	ses, ir	mprovement needed (1)	
41. Comments								
Bacall games p	n onibilea.							

Site ID 72	Site Na	ame	Swan Lan	e
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LE	AP	
Ward N	lorth Downs West			
42. Loose parts				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
43. Comments:				
44. Access to the n	atural environment	t:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
45. Comments:				
46. Places for child	ren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
47. Comments:				
48. Added play val	ue:			Good (4)
49. Comments:				
Equipment more in	teresting than star	idard play a	area.	
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, B=	=35, C=35	
50. Well maintaine	d:			Good (4)
51. Comments:				
52. Health and safe	ety:			
53. Comments:				
54. Seating for adu	ılts:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
55. Comments:				
56. Litter bins:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
57. Comments:				
58. Dog free zones	:			Good (4)
59. Comments:				
60. Presence of su	pervisory adults (Ty	vne B. C.an	d D	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
only): 61. Comments:		,pe b, e un		(_)
Next to sports club				
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D o	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	68			

Site ID	73	Site Nam
Type of pla	ay area	or facility Ty
Ward	Ν	lorth Downs West
Name of as	sessor:	S West and S
Date of ass	essmen	t: 21/08/2016

11:36

## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Play equipment within grassed area.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Play equipment within rural village grassed open space by stream. Some weathered play equipment. Separate fenced off area with play equipment for younger children near public house.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No

	8.	Does	it	have	а	toilet?	
--	----	------	----	------	---	---------	--

9. Does it have refreshments?

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



No

Yes

Site ID	73		Site Na	ame	Tayne Fiel	d
Type of pla	ay area	- or facility		Type B: LE	EAP	
Ward	N	lorth Down	s West			
Location (	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)	Score: 19
16. Informa	al oversi	ght:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comme	ents:					
18. Well us	ed by cl	nildren:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comme	ents:				-	
					r	
20. Getting 21. Comme						Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
21. Comme						
22. Persona	al safety	, lighting ai	nd secu	rity:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comme	ents:				Ļ	
24. Disabili	ity acces	s:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
25. Comme	ents:					
26. Meeting	a other a	hildren				Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comme					L	
28. Designed for the site:					Average, needs some improvement (3)	
29. Comme	ents:					
Play value	) (max	score $\Delta = 4$	) B=5	0 C=50 F	<b>)</b> =50)	Score: 28
30. Enticing				0, 0-00, 2	5-00)	Good (4)
31. Comme	-	. ,			L	
32. Play op	-	ies for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comme	ents:					
34. Play ne	eds of d	ifferent age	s (Type	BCandl	D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
35. Comme		increate age	.5 (1) pc			
36. Movem	ent:				[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comme	ents:					
38. Imagin	ativo pla			and D only	<u>ر</u> ٠	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comme		iy ages (iy	ыс D, С			weakiesses, improvements needed (2)
40. Ball gai	mes:				[	Average, needs some improvement (3)
41. Comme	ents:				L	

Site ID 73	Site N	ame	Tayne Fiel	d
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: L	EAP	
Ward N	lorth Downs West			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:	[	Good (4)
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	Je:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter 50. Well maintainer 51. Comments:		e A=25, B	=35, C=35	, <b>D=35)</b> Score: 15 Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:			
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:		[	Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C ai	nd D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	62			

Site ID	74	Site Name Tayne Field (adjacent public house)		
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP				
Ward	N	orth Downs West		
Name of as	sessor:	S West and S Wikeley		
Date of ass	sessment	21/09/2016		

11:52

# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Located adjacent to public house car park, provision of metal swings, slide and climbing frame unit and seesaw. Fairly good condition.

# Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes			
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years? Yes				
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No			
General Information about the site				
7. Does it have an adventure playground? No				
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	1		

9	Does	it	have	refres	hmer	nts?
9.	DUES	IL.	nave	161163	IIIIEI	103:

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
tbc		



No

Yes

Site ID 74	Site Name Tayne Field (a	adjacent public house)
Type of play area or f	acility Type B: LEAP	
Ward North	n Downs West	
Location (max score	A=35, B=35, C=35, D=35)	Score: 22
16. Informal oversight:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comments:		
18. Well used by childr	en:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comments:		
20. Getting there: 21. Comments:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. comments.		
22. Personal safety, lig	hting and security:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comments:		
24. Disability access:		Good (4)
25. Comments:		
26. Meeting other child	ren:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
27. Comments:		
28. Designed for the sit	te:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
29. Comments:		
Play value (max scor	e A=40, B=50, C=50, D=50)	Score: 27
30. Enticing to children		Good (4)
31. Comments:		
32. Play opportunities f	or disabled children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
32. Play opportunities f 33. Comments:	or disabled children:	Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comments:		Average, needs some improvement (3) Average, needs some improvement (3)
33. Comments:	for disabled children:	
<ul><li>33. Comments:</li><li>34. Play needs of differ</li></ul>		
<ul><li>33. Comments:</li><li>34. Play needs of differ</li><li>35. Comments:</li></ul>		Average, needs some improvement (3)
<ul> <li>33. Comments:</li> <li>34. Play needs of differ</li> <li>35. Comments:</li> <li>36. Movement:</li> <li>37. Comments:</li> </ul>	rent ages (Type B, C and D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3) Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
<ul> <li>33. Comments:</li> <li>34. Play needs of differ</li> <li>35. Comments:</li> <li>36. Movement:</li> <li>37. Comments:</li> </ul>		Average, needs some improvement (3)
<ul> <li>33. Comments:</li> <li>34. Play needs of differ</li> <li>35. Comments:</li> <li>36. Movement:</li> <li>37. Comments:</li> <li>38. Imaginative play age</li> </ul>	rent ages (Type B, C and D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3) Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)

Site ID 74	Site Name Tayne Field (adjacent public house)					
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP				
Ward N	lorth Downs West					
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment	:	Average, needs some improvement (3)			
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:		Average, needs some improvement (3)			
Care and mainter		A=25, B=35, C=3				
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	1:		Good (4)			
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
TBC 54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Good (4)			
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory adults (Ty	pe B, C and D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B,	C and D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
Final Score:	64					
Site ID	75	Site I	Name	The	Waltons	
---------------------------------------------	----------------------	-------------	------	-----	---------	--
Type of play area or facility   Type A: LAP						
Ward	Ward East Folkestone					
Name of assessor: S West an		d S Wikele	ey			
Date of assessment: 21/0		: 21/08/201	6			

Weather:

Cloudy, dry

Time:

10:23



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area.

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Multi-play unit on hard standing area, some equipment removed. Bleak and tired site.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	No
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	75		Site N	ame	The	Waltons			
Type of p	lay are	a or facility		Type A: L	AP				
Ward		East Folkest	one						
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	21	
16. Inforr	nal over	sight:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
17. Comm	nents:								
18. Well u	used by	children:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
19. Comm	nents:								
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-	:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
21. Comm	lents.								
22. Persoi	nal safe	ty, lighting a	nd secu	rity:			Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:								
24. Disabi	ility acco	ess:							Good (4)
25. Comm	nents:								
26. Meetii	ng othei	children:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
27. Comm									
28. Desigi 29. Comm		the site:					Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
29. Comm	ients.								
Play valu	ıe (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50, I	D=50	))	Score:	17	
30. Enticii	ng to ch	ildren to play	<i>'</i> :				Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
31. Comm	nents:								
22 Play o	poortur	ition for dica	blad chi	ildron			Woakposs	oc im	provements needed (2)
33. Comm		ities for disa		ilui en.			Weakitess	cs, in	provements needed (2)
34. Play n	needs of	different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D onl	y):			
35. Comm	nents:								
36. Mover							Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
37. Comm	ients:								
38. Imagi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	y):				
39. Comm									
40. Ball g							Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
41. Comm	nents:								

Site I D	75		Site Nam	ne	The	Walton	S					
Type of pla	ay area	or facility	Ту	/pe A: L/	٩P							
Ward	E	ast Folkest	one									
42. Loose 43. Comm							Serious	s weakness	es, impr	ovemen	t needed (	1)
44. Access 45. Commo		atural envi	onment:					Weaknesse	es, impro	vement	s needed (	2)
46. Places 47. Commo		en to sit:						Average, r	needs sor	ne impr	ovement (	3)
48. Added 49. Commo		e:						Weaknesse	es, impro	vement	s needed (	2)
Care and	mainten	ance (ma	x score A	λ=25, Β∶	=35,	C=35, I	D=35)			Score	: 10	
50. Well m 51. Comm		1:						Weaknesse	es, impro	vement	s needed (	2)
52. Health 53. Comm		ty:										
54. Seating 55. Comm	-	lts:						Average, r	needs sor	me impr	ovement (	3)
56. Litter b 57. Comm								Average, r	needs sor	me impr	ovement (	(3)
58. Dog fre 59. Comm								Weaknesse	es, impro	vement	s needed (	2)
60. Presen only): 61. Commo		ervisory ac	lults (Type	e B, C ar	nd D							
62. Toilets, 63. Comm		g facilities	(Type B, C	C and D o	only):							
Final Scor	e:	48										

Site ID 76		Site Name		The Danni & James Community Friendship Park				
Type of play ar	rea or fa	cility	Type B: LE	AP				
Ward	Folkes	tone Harbour						
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S West			nd S West					
Date of assessn	nent:	15/08/2016	,					
Time:	13:50	)		Weather:	Sunny, clear, moderate wind.			



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Fairly large equipped play area with variety of equipment. Next to residential street and main road.

#### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Lots of kids using the play area. Friendly atmosphere and clearly popular. Equipment has a bit more variety compared to other playgrounds of this size.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

#### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7 Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

7. Does it have all adventare playground:	110
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Limited

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

Closes at 8pm.	
13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	

Tbc

Site ID	76	Site Name The Danni & James Community Friendship Park						
Type of pl	ay area	or facility	Type B: LEA	٩P				
Ward	F	olkestone Harbour						
Location	(max sc	ore A=35, B=35,	C=35, D=3	35)	Score:	26		
16. Inform	nal oversi	ght:				Good (4)		
17. Comm	ents:							
Residentia	l street lo	ooks onto it. Open	area and vie	ewable from a	ll sides.			
18. Well u	sed by ch	ildren:				Good (4)		
19. Comm	ents:							
20. Gettin						Good (4)		
21. Comm								
L		ig one side. Plenty		utes to access				
		, lighting and secu	rity:		Average, r	eeds some improvement (3)		
23. Comm			Net the relation					
		ounding streets but	t Not in play	v area.				
24. Disabi 25. Comm		5:				Good (4)		
25. Comm	ents.							
26. Meetir	ig other c	hildren:				Good (4)		
27. Comm	ents:							
28. Desigr 29. Comm		e site:			Average, r	needs some improvement (3)		
Play valu	e (max s	core A=40, B=50	D, C=50, D:	=50)	Score:	31		
	-	lren to play:				Good (4)		
31. Comm	ents:							
		c			<b>A</b>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		es for disabled chi	ldren:		Average, r	needs some improvement (3)		
33. Comm	ents:							
34. Play no 35. Comm		fferent ages (Type	B, C and D	only):	Average, r	needs some improvement (3)		
36. Moven	nont:				Averace r	needs some improvement (3)		
37. Comm					Average, I			
38. Imagir	native pla	y ages (Type B, C	and D only)	:	Average, r	needs some improvement (3)		
39. Comm	ents:			L				
40. Ball ga	imes:				Weaknesse	s, improvements needed (2)		
41. Comm	ents:							
Space for	ball game	es but no purpose l	built areas.					

Site ID 76	Site Name The Danni & James Community Friendship Park						
Type of play area	or facility Ty	vpe B: LEAP					
Ward F	olkestone Harbour						
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)				
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environment:		Average, needs some improvement (3)				
<ul><li>46. Places for child</li><li>47. Comments:</li></ul>	ren to sit:		Good (4)				
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:		Good (4)				
Care and mainter	nance (max score A	=25, B=35, C=3					
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:		Average, needs some improvement (3)				
Some equipment b	roken and fenced off.						
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:						
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:		Good (4)				
4 benches. 56. Litter bins:			Average, needs some improvement (3)				
57. Comments:							
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		Good (4)				
<ul><li>60. Presence of sup only):</li><li>61. Comments:</li></ul>	pervisory adults (Type	e B, C and D	Average, needs some improvement (3)				
Trustee of play are	a present.						
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B, C	Cand D only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)				
Final Score:	75						

Site ID 77	Site N	Name The Derrings
Type of play area	a or facility	Type B: LEAP
Ward	Walland & Denge N	Marsh
Name of assessor	: S Wikeley a	and S West
Date of assessme	nt: 22/08/2010	16
Time:	10:12	Weather: Sunny, hot.





1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (swings, small multi-action unit, slide, see-saws and rocking horse).

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Fairly large fenced-off play area situated in residential area. Quite run-down and uninteresting.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes					
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes					
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No					
General Information about the site						
7 Deep it have an adventure playeround?	No					

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	INO
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	77		Site Na	ame	The Derring	IS			
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type B: LE	AP				
Ward		Walland & D	enge Ma	arsh					
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	35)	Sco	re:	22	
16. Inforr	nal over	sight:				Avera	ge,	needs some improv	ement (3)
17. Comm	nents:								
Can be vi	ewed fro	m street on	two side	es.					
18. Well u	used by a	children:				Avera	ge,	needs some improve	ement (3)
19. Comm	nents:								
20. Gettir 21. Comm	-								Good (4)
21. Comm	lents:								
22. Perso	nal safet	y, lighting a	nd secu	ritv:	Γ	Avera	qe, I	needs some improve	ement (3)
23. Comm		,,		,			5,		
No lightin	g.								
24. Disab	ility acce	ss:				Avera	ge, I	needs some improve	ement (3)
25. Comm	25. Comments:								
26 Maati	26. Meeting other children: Average, needs some improvement (3)								
26. Meetii 27. Comm		children:				Avera	ge,	needs some improve	ement (3)
28. Desig	ned for t	he site:				Avera	ge,	needs some improve	ement (3)
29. Comm	nents:								
	-							[]	
•		score A=4		D, C=50, D	9=50)	Sco		25	mont(2)
30. Enticii 31. Comn	-	ldren to play	:			Avera	ge, i	needs some improve	ement (3)
32. Play o	pportun	ties for disa	bled chi	ldren:		Weakr	ness	es, improvements n	eeded (2)
33. Comm	nents:								
34. Play n 35. Comm		different age	es (Type	B, C and D	only):	Avera	ge,	needs some improve	ement (3)
36. Mover	ment:					Avera	ge, I	needs some improve	ement (3)
37. Comm	nents:								
		ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	):	Weakr	ness	es, improvements n	eeded (2)
39. Comm	nents:								]
40. Ball g	ameer				Γ	Serious wool	nec	ses, improvement n	ended (1)
40. Ball g					L	Jenous wedk	1162	ses, improvement n	
Ball game		ited.							
_									

Site ID 77	Site N	ame	The Derri	ngs	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: I	LEAP		
Ward V	Valland & Denge M	arsh			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (max score	e A=25, E	3=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 12
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Gate missing.					
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C a	and D	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type B	, C and D	only):	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	59				

Site ID 78		Site Name	The Green	
Type of play are	a or facility	Type C:	: NEAP	
Ward	Hythe			
Name of assessor	: S W	est		
Date of assessme	nt: 11/2	10/2016		
Time:	10:34		Weather:	Sunny, cool
				and a start of the



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area and MUGA.

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Large open area with fairly new equipment to edge of grassed space.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes					
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes					
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes					
General Information about the site						
7. Does it have an adventure playground? No						
8. Does it have a toilet?	No	T				

No

Yes

Unrestricted

0	Deee	it hour		freshments?	
Ч.	DOes		- re	resoments?	

- -

10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?

11. Is access to site:

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	
Tbc	

Site ID	78		Site Na	ame	The Gree	en			
Type of p	lay area d	or facility		Type C: I	NEAP				
Ward	H	ythe							
Location	(max sco	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	=35)		Score:	28	
16. Inform	nal oversi <u>o</u>	jht:							Good (4)
17. Comm	nents:								
18. Well u	ised by ch	ildren:							Good (4)
19. Comm	nents:								
20 Cottin	athora								Good (4)
20. Gettin 21. Comm	-								 G000 (4)
22. Persoi	nal safety,	lighting ar	nd secu	rity:					Good (4)
23. Comm	nents:								
	ility access	5:							Good (4)
25. Comm	nents:								
26. Meetii	ng other cl	hildren:							Good (4)
27. Comm	nents:								
28. Desigi 29. Comm		e site:							Good (4)
29. 001111									
Play valu	ie (max s	core A=40	), B=50	0, C=50,	D=50)		Score:	43	
30. Entici	ng to child	ren to play	:						Good (4)
31. Comm	nents:								
		aa far diaak	lad abi	Iduani					
32. Play o 33. Comm		es for disat	nea chi	laren:					Good (4)
55. Comm	ients.								 
34. Play n	eeds of di	fferent age	s (Type	e B, C and	D only):				Excellent (5)
35. Comm	nents:								
36. Mover									Excellent (5)
37. Comm	ients:								
38. Imagi	native play	y ages (Typ	oe B, C	and D on	ly):				Good (4)
39. Comm	nents:								
40. Ball g									Good (4)
41. Comm	nents:								
1									

Site ID 78	Site N	Name	The Green	
Type of play area	or facility	Type C: N	EAP	
Ward H	lythe			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[	Good (4)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	natural environme	nt:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:		[	Excellent (5)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:		[	Excellent (5)
Care and mainter	nance (max scor	re A=25, B:	=35, C=35	, D=35) Score: 19
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:			Good (4)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		[	
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ults:		[	Excellent (5)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[	Good (4)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	::		[	Good (4)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (	Туре В, С ar	nd D	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type	B, C and D o	only):	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	90			

Site ID 79		Site N	ame	The Gree	ens	
Type of play ar	ea or fa	acility	Type C: N	EAP		
Ward	New F	Romney				
Name of assess	or:	S Wikeley,a	nd S West			
Date of assessn	nent:	22/08/2016	,			
Time:	11:39	9			Weather:	Sunny, hot.



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area and green gym.

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice site next to the beach featuring a variety of equipment. Main road runs next to it.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	

7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Limited

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

Open	8am	until	dusk.	Opening	hours	only	on	green	gym	sign,	Not or	n play	area.	

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)

15. Comments:

Tbc

Site ID	79		Site N	ame	The Green	IS			
Type of pl	ay area	or facility		Type C: N	EAP				
Ward	I	New Romne	у						
Location	(max so	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	27	
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:							Excellent (5)
17. Comm	ents:				L				
Open space	e with m	nany people	passin	g by.					
		,							
18. Well u	cod by c	hildron							Excellent (5)
19. Comm	-	iniuren.							Excellent (5)
20. Gettin	a there:						Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
21. Comm	-								(-)
Some will	need to	cross main	road.						
22. Persor	al safety	/, lighting a	nd secu	irity:			Average, I	needs	some improvement (3)
23. Comm	ents:			-	ļ				
No lighting	j.								
24. Disabi	lity acce	ss:			[		Average, I	needs	some improvement (3)
25. Comm	ents:				L				
No path le	ading up	to gates.							
26. Meetir	ng other	children:							Good (4)
27. Comm	ents:								
	ad for th								Good (4)
28. Desigr 29. Comm		ie site:							G000 (4)
Play valu	e (max	score A=4	0. B=5	0. C=50. [	(2 = 50)		Score:	36	
-		dren to play		0,0-00,1			000101		Good (4)
31. Comm	-				l				
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disa	bled ch	ildren:					Good (4)
33. Comm	ents:								
Features s	swing spe	ecifically des	signed f	or children	with disab	ilities.			
-		lifferent age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):				Good (4)
35. Comm	ents:								
36. Moven									Good (4)
37. Comm	ents:								
38 Imagir	native pl	ay ages (Ty	ne R C	and D only	/)·				Good (4)
39. Comm		מי משכי (דע	рс D, С		· )·				3000 (+)
40. Ball ga	ames:						Weaknesse	es. im	provements needed (2)
41. Comm					l			-,	,
No specific									

Site ID	79		Site Name	The Gr	eens	
Type of pla	ay area or	facility	Туре С	C: NEAP		
Ward	Nev	v Romney				
42. Loose ( 43. Commo						Average, needs some improvement (3)
44. Access 45. Comme		ural envir	onment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places 47. Comme		to sit:				Good (4)
48. Added 49. Comme						Good (4)
Care and	maintenar	nce (max	score A=25	5, B=35, C=	=35, D=3	
50. Well m 51. Comme						Good (4)
52. Health 53. Comm	and safety ents:	:				
54. Seating 55. Commo		:				Good (4)
56. Litter b 57. Commo						Excellent (5)
58. Dog fre 59. Comme						Good (4)
60. Presen only): 61. Commo	-	visory ad	ults (Type B,	C and D	Se	rious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
63. Comme	ents:		Гуре В, C and			Average, needs some improvement (3)
Quite a wa		y area an 84	d only in OK o	condition.		

Site I D 80	Site Name The Ridg	geway Trim Trail
Type of play area or fac	cility Type B: LEAP	
Ward Hythe	Rural	
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley and S West	
Date of assessment:	18/08/2016	
Time: 11:43		Weather: Light rain.



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Large trim trail scattered throughout the woods.

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice location but very secluded due to woodland location.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No

8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
<ul><li>14. Involvement of children:</li><li>15. Comments:</li></ul>	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
Tbc		



Site ID	80	Site Name	The Ridg	eway Trim Trail
Type of pla	y area or facili	ty Type I	B: LEAP	
Ward	Hythe Rur	al		
Location (	max score A=3	5, B=35, C=35	5, D=35)	Score: 19
16. Informa	al oversight:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comme	nts:			
Located alo	ng public path th	rough woods bu	ıt No oversight	t from sides.
18. Well us	ed by children:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comme	nts:			
20. Getting 21. Comme				Average, needs some improvement (3)
22 Persona	l safety, lighting	and security:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
22. Persona 23. Comme		and Security.		
	and very seclude	ed.		
24. Disabilit	-			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
25. Comme	nts:			
26. Meeting 27. Comme	other children:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
28. Designe	ed for the site:			Good (4)
29. Comme	nts:			
Play value	(max score A=	=40, B=50, C=5	50, D=50)	Score: 26
30. Enticing 31. Comme	to children to p nts:	lay:		Average, needs some improvement (3)
32. Play op	portunities for di	sabled children:		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comme	nts:			
34. Play neo 35. Comme	eds of different ants:	nges (Type B, C a	and D only):	Average, needs some improvement (3)
36. Moveme	ent:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comme	nts:			
	ative play ages (	Type B, C and D	only):	Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
39. Comme	nts:			
40. Ball gar 41. Comme				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)

Type of play ar Ward 42. Loose parts 43. Comments:	ea or facility Hythe Rura		: LEAP		
42. Loose parts	Hythe Rura				
-					
					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to th 45. Comments:	e natural env	ronment:			Good (4)
46. Places for cl 47. Comments:	nildren to sit:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
No benches but	could sit on s	ome equipment	•		
48. Added play 49. Comments:	value:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mair	itenance (ma	ix score A=25	, B=35, C=3	35, D=35)	Score: 11
50. Well mainta 51. Comments:	ined:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and 53. Comments:	safety:				
54. Seating for 55. Comments:	adults:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zo 59. Comments:	nes:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of only): 61. Comments:	supervisory a	dults (Type B, (	C and D	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/char 63. Comments:	iging facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)

Site I D 81	Site Name	Turnpike Hill
Type of play area	or facility Type A: L	LAP
Ward H	lythe	
Name of assessor:	S Wikeley and S West	st
Date of assessmen	t: 16/08/2016	
Time:	14:42	Weather: Sunny, hot.

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Small play area with see-saw, swivel seats and elevated rotating wheel.

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Quite secluded area at the bottom of a small slope. Uninviting and run-down.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

Age groups	
4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No
General Information about the site	
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No
8 Doos it have a toilet?	No

8. Does it have a tollet?	NO
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	No
11. Is access to site:	Limited

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

One gate is missing with a barrier across it and the other requires walking through nettles.

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)

15. Comments:

Tbc

Site ID	81		Site N	ame	Turnpike H	Hill				
Type of p	lay area	a or facility		Type A: l	_AP					
Ward		Hythe		-						
Location	(max s	core A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D	=35)	Sc	ore:	15		
16. Inforr	nal over	sight:			[	Aver	rage, r	needs	some impro	vement (3)
17. Comn	nents:				L					
Viewed by	y some ł	nouses. Near	quiet r	oad.						
18. Well ι	used by	children:				Weal	knesse	es, in	provements	needed (2)
19. Comn	nents:				L					
20. Gettir	-	:				Aver	rage, r	needs	some impro	vement (3)
21. Comn	nents:									
22 Dorco	nal cafot	by lighting a	nd cocu	rity		Weal	knocco	ac im	provements	needed (2)
22. Person 23. Comm		ty, lighting a	nu secu	nty:	ļ	Wear	KIIESSE	5, III	iprovements	needed (2)
		te borders w	ith a de	nse wood	•					
24. Disab					[	Serious wea	akness	ses, ii	mprovement	needed (1)
25. Comn	-				L					
26. Meeti		children:				Weal	knesse	es, in	provements	needed (2)
27. Comn	nents:									
28. Desig	ned for t	the site:				Weal	knesse	es, im	provements	needed (2)
29. Com					L				•	
Play valu	ıe (max	score A=4	0, B=5	0, C=50,	D=50)	Sc	core:	17		
	-	ildren to play	/:			Weal	knesse	es, im	provements	needed (2)
31. Comn	nents:									
32. Play o	oportun	ities for disa	bled chi	ildren:		Serious wea	akness	ses, i	mprovement	needed (1)
33. Comn					l			,		(-)
34. Play r	needs of	different age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):					
35. Comn	nents:									
36. Mover						Weal	knesse	es, im	provements	needed (2)
37. Comn	nents:									
38. Imaqi	native p	lay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D on	ly):					
39. Com	-	, 5(-)	. , 2		.,					
40. Ball g	ames:					Weal	knesse	es, im	provements	needed (2)
41. Comn	nents:				L					

Site I D 81		Site Name	Turnpike	Hill	
Type of play area	- or facility	Туре А	: LAP		
Ward H	lythe				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural envi	ronment:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	le:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainter	nance (ma	x score A=25	, B=35, C=3	5, D=35)	Score: 10
50. Well maintained 51. Comments:	d:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Missing gate. Over	grown plan	ting.			
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	lts:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
One bench. 56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Surrounded by fend	ce but no s	igns.			
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	ervisory a	dults (Type B, C	Cand D		
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities	(Type B, C and	D only):		
Final Score:	42				

Site ID	82	Site N	ame	Underwo	ood Play Are	ea
Type of pla	ay area or f	facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward	Nort	h Downs East				
Name of as	ssessor:	S West				
Date of ass	sessment:	10/10/2016				
Time:	08:4	18			Weather:	Sunny, cool



1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area.

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Remote basketball hoop and hardstanding in corner of grassed field near sports fields.

### Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes	
General Information about the site		
7 Does it have an adventure playground?	No	٦.

7. Does it have all adventare playground.	110
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site I D	82		Site N	ame	Underwood	d Play A	rea		
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP				
Ward	I	North Downs	s East						
Location	(max so	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	23	
16. Inform	nal overs	ight:			[				Good (4
17. Comm	ents:								
18. Well u	ised by c	hildren:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
19. Comm	ents:				L				
20. Gettin	-								Good (4)
21. Comm	ents:								
		, liabting of					Average	noodo	some improvement (3)
22. Person 23. Comm		r, lighting ar	iu secu	nuy:	L		Average,	neeus	some improvement (5)
25. comm									
24. Disabi	lity acce	SS:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
25. Comm	ents:				L				
26. Meetir		children:					Average,	needs	some improvement (3
27. Comm	ients:								
28. Desigr	ned for tl	ne site:			Γ		Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
29. Comm					L		5 7		
Play valu	e (max	score A=40	0, B=5	0, C=50, D	D=50)		Score:	26	
	-	dren to play	<b>'</b> :						Good (4)
31. Comm	ients:								
32. Play o	pportuni	ties for disal	bled ch	ildren:	Γ		Average,	needs	some improvement (3
33. Comm					L		5 - ,		
34. Play n	eeds of a	lifferent age	es (Type	e B, C and I	D only):		Average,	needs	some improvement (3)
35. Comm	ents:								
36. Moven							Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
37. Comm	ients:								
38. Imagir	native pl	ay ages (Ty	pe B, C	and D only	/):		Weakness	es, im	provements needed (2)
39. Comm		/	,		L				
40. Ball ga	ames:								Good (4)
41. Comm	ents:								

Site I D 82	Site N	ame	Under	wood Play Area	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B:	LEAP		
Ward	North Downs East				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Serious w	eaknesses, improvement needed (1)
44. Access to the 1 45. Comments:	natural environmen	t:			Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	lren to sit:			Serious w	eaknesses, improvement needed (1)
48. Added play va 49. Comments:	lue:			We	eaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainte	nance (max score	e A=25,∣	B=35, C	=35, D=35)	Score: 12
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:				Good (4)
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ēty:				
Tbc					
54. Seating for ad 55. Comments:	ults:			Serious w	reaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Serious w	veaknesses, improvement needed (1)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	5:				Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C	and D	Serious w	veaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type B	, C and D	only):	Serious w	veaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	61				

Site I D	83	Site Nam	ne Upper Radnor	Park	
Type of pla	ay area o	r facility Ty	ype A: LAP		
Ward	Bro	oadmead Ward			
Name of as	sessor:	S West and S	Wikeley		
Date of ass	sessment:	15/08/2016			

Weather:

Sunny, dry

Time:

15:13



# Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area with multi-play unit.

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Small area within wider large open space near busy road. Well used.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

## Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	No	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7 Does it have an adventure playground?	No	

7. Does it have an adventare playground.	110
8. Does it have a toilet?	Yes
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole site
Involvement of children	
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:	
Tbc	

Site I D	83		Site N	ame	Upper Ra	adnor Park	<
Type of pl	lay area	or facility		Type A: L	_AP		
Ward	B	roadmead	Ward				
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	, C=35, D	=35)		Score: 22
16. Inforn	nal oversi	ght:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
17. Comm	nents:						
18. Well u	-	ildren:					Good (4)
19. Comm	ients:						
20. Gettin	g there:						Average, needs some improvement (3)
21. Comm	nents:						
22. Persor	nal safety	, lighting aı	nd secu	irity:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:						
24. Disabi	lity acces	s:				vement	(Average, needs some improvement (3))
25. Comm							
26. Meetir	ng other c	hildren:					Good (Good (4))
27. Comm	nents:						
28. Desigr	ned for th	e site:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
29. Comm							
Plav valu	ie (max s	core A=4	0, B=5	0. C=50.	D=50)		Score: 19
•		lren to play		-,,			Good (4)
31. Comm	-	. ,					
32. Play o	pportuniti	es for disa	bled ch	ildren:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm							
34. Play n	eeds of d	ifferent age	es (Type	e B, C and	D only):		
35. Comm	nents:						
26 Мания							Weeks and a decide (2)
36. Mover							Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
37. Comm	ients:						
38. Imadii	native pla	y ages (Ty	pe B <i>.</i> C	and D on	ly):		
39. Comm		, - , - , - , - , - , - , - , - , - , -	, 0		. /	L	
40. Ball ga	ames:						Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
41. Comm	nents:						

Site ID 83	Site	Name	Upper Radr	nor Park	
Type of play area	or facility	Type A: I	LAP		
Ward	Broadmead Ward	1			
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the r 45. Comments:	natural environm	ent:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	lren to sit:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	lue:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
Care and mainte	nance (max sc	ore A=25, E	B=35, C=35,	D=35)	Score: 14
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	ed:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and saf 53. Comments:	ety:				
54. Seating for add 55. Comments:	ults:				Good (4)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	5:				Good (4)
60. Presence of su only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults	(Type B, C a	and D		
62. Toilets/changir 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type	e B, C and D	) only):		
Final Score:	55				

Site ID	84	Site N	ame	Widgeon Walk
Type of pla	y area	or facility	Type B: LE	EAP
Ward	N	lorth Downs East		
Name of as	sessor:	S Wikeley a	nd S West	
Date of ass	essment	:: 17/08/2016		

Time:



14:21



## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Variety of wooden fitness equipment/trim trail scattered around the edge of large field. Mounds throughout the grass.

## First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Nice open space but Not much equipment. Mounds in the ground are a nice addition.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	No
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	Yes
General Information about the site	

<ol><li>Does it have an adventure playground?</li></ol>	No
8. Does it have a toilet?	No
9. Does it have refreshments?	No
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people?	Yes
11. Is access to site:	Unrestricted

13. Survey site access:	Whole	site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses, impro	vement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		

Site ID	84	:	Site N	ame	Widgeon	Walk	
Type of p	lay area	or facility		Type B: LE	EAP		
Ward	Ν	lorth Downs	East				
Location	(max sc	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score: 21
16. Inforr	nal oversi	ght:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
17. Comm	nents:						
Surrounde	ed by tree	es and shrub	bery o	n all sides.	Some peo	ple passi	ng through.
18. Well u	used by cl	nildren:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
19. Comm	nents:						
20. Gettin	-						Good (4)
21. Comm	lents.						
22. Persoi	nal safety	, lighting an	d secu	rity:			Average, needs some improvement (3)
23. Comm	nents:						
No lights.							
24. Disabi	ility acces	s:					Average, needs some improvement (3)
25. Comm	nents:						
26. Meetii	ng other o	children:					Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
27. Comm	nents:						
28. Desigi	ned for th	e site:					Good (4)
29. Comm							
							a [20]
-		score A=40 dren to play		U, C=50, L	J=50)		Score: 28 Average, needs some improvement (3)
31. Comm	-	lien to play	•				Average, needs some improvement (5)
		ies for disab	led chi	ldren:			Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
33. Comm	nents:						
34. Play n 35. Comm		ifferent ages	s (Туре	e B, C and I	D only):		Average, needs some improvement (3)
36. Mover	ment						Average, needs some improvement (3)
37. Comm							, a cruge, needs some improvement (J)
38. Imagi	native pla	iy ages (Typ	e B, C	and D only	/):		Average, needs some improvement (3)
39. Comm	nents:						
40. Ball g	ames:						Average, needs some improvement (3)
40. Dan 9							, werage, needs some improvement (5)
		no specific	areas.				

Site I D 84	Site N	ame	Widgeon V	Valk	
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LE	EAP		
Ward N	North Downs East				
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:			[		Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environmen	t:	[		Good (4)
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)
48. Added play val 49. Comments:	ue:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
Care and mainter	nance (max score	è A=25, B⊧	=35, C=35	, D=35)	Score: 13
50. Well maintaine 51. Comments:	d:				Average, needs some improvement (3)
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:		[		
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ılts:		[	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:			[		Good (4)
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:		[		Average, needs some improvement (3)
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (T	ype B, C ar	nd D	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	ng facilities (Type B	, C and D c	only):	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)
Final Score:	62				

Site ID	85	Site Name Wraightsfield Play Area		
Type of play area or facility   Type B: LEAP				
Ward	R	omney Marsh		
Name of assessor: S Wikeley and S W		S Wikeley and S West		
Date of assessment: 18/08/2016		: 18/08/2016		

Weather:

Time:



14:10

## Description of the site and its surroundings

1. Which aspects of the site are being assessed?

Equipped play area (multi-action unit, swings, rocking horse and balance beam).

### First impressions of the site

2. Include first impressions about the site, including location, hazards, overall look and feel, for example does it look and feel friendly?

Small, grassed local play area situated on residential street. Equipment wooden and fairly worn.

## Judgements for planning (to be completed after the assessment)

3. What needs to be considered for this site when making future planning decisions?

### Age groups

4. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 0 to 5 years?	Yes	
5. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range of 5 to 11 years?	Yes	
6. Presence of features or equipment with a primary range for teenagers?	No	
General Information about the site		
7. Does it have an adventure playground?	No	1

8. Does it have a toilet? No	0
9. Does it have refreshments? No	0
10. Is it accessible to disabled children and young people? Yes	es
11. Is access to site: Unit	nrestricted

12. If limited or no access, please provide details e.g. opening hours, presence of lockable gates:

13. Survey site access:		Whole site
Involvement of children		
14. Involvement of children:	Serious weaknesses	, improvement needed (1)
15. Comments:		
Tbc		



Overcast, mild.

Site I D	85		Site N	ame	Wraightsfi	ield Play Are	a					
Type of play area or facility Type B: LEAP												
Ward	Ro	omney Mar	sh									
Location	(max sco	ore A=35,	B=35,	C=35, D=	=35)		Score:	23				
16. Inform	al oversig	jht:			[						Good	d (4)
17. Comm	ents:				L							
Right acros	ss from ro	w of house	es.									
18. Well us	sed by chi	ldren:									Good	1 (4)
	18. Well used by children: Good (4)   19. Comments: Good (4)											
20. Getting	g there:					A	verage,	needs	some	mprov	/ement	t (3)
21. Comm	ents:											
Some will	need to c	ross main i	road.									
22. Person	al safety,	lighting ar	nd secu	rity:		A	verage,	needs	some i	mprov	/ement	t (3)
23. Comm												
Lighting al	ong stree	t running r	next to	it.								
24. Disabil	-	:				A	verage,	needs	some i	mprov	/ement	t (3)
25. Comm	ents:											
26. Meetin	a other cl	nildren:				A	verage,	needs	some	mprov	vemen	t (3)
27. Comm					l		5 - 1					- (-)
28. Design	ed for the	e site:				A	verage,	needs	some i	mprov	/ement	t (3)
29. Comm	ents:											
Play value				0, C=50, [	D=50)			24				- (2)
30. Enticin 31. Comm	-	ren to play	:			A	verage,	neeus	some	mprov	emen	L (3)
32. Play op	oportunitie	es for disat	oled chi	ldren:		W	eakness	es, im	proven	nents	needeo	d (2)
33. Comments:												
34. Play ne		ferent age	s (Type	B, C and	D only):	A	verage,	needs	some	mprov	vemen	t (3)
35. Comm	ents:											
26 Мана	oont:				r	147	ookoos	oo i~		onta	nood -	1 (2)
36. Movem 37. Comm						VV	eakness	es, im	proven	ients	ieedeo	1(2)
57. Comm	ents.											
38. Imagin	native play	/ ages (Tvi	be B, C	and D only	/):	W	eakness	es, im	proven	nents	needeo	1 (2)
39. Comm		/ 1		,	l							
40. Ball ga	mes:					Serious v	veaknes	ses, in	nprove	ment	needec	l (1)
41. Comm	ents:				L							
Ball games	s prohibite	ed.										

ite I D 85 Site Name Wraightsfield Play Area							
Type of play area	or facility	Type B: LEAP					
Ward R	Romney Marsh						
42. Loose parts 43. Comments:				Weaknesses, improvements needed (2)			
44. Access to the n 45. Comments:	atural environme	nt:		Average, needs some improvement (3)			
46. Places for child 47. Comments:	ren to sit:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
48. Added play valu 49. Comments:	ue:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
Care and mainter	nance (max scor	e A=25, B=35, C	=35, D=35)	Score: 16			
50. Well maintainer 51. Comments:	d:			Average, needs some improvement (3)			
52. Health and safe 53. Comments:	ety:						
54. Seating for adu 55. Comments:	ilts:			Good (4)			
56. Litter bins: 57. Comments:				Average, needs some improvement (3)			
58. Dog free zones 59. Comments:	:			Good (4)			
60. Presence of sup only): 61. Comments:	pervisory adults (1	Гуре B, C and D	Seriou	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
62. Toilets/changin 63. Comments:	g facilities (Type I	B, C and D only):	Serious	s weaknesses, improvement needed (1)			
Final Score:	63						