

**ST CLEER PARK COUNCIL
SKATE PARK REFURBISHMENT**

SITUATION

The Stake Park was decommissioned on 4.7.19 and there was a great amount of dismay within the community evidenced on social media; a survey monkey to harness the emotion has been set up, it will further provide a fulcrum for opinion. The asset register will be amended accordingly there is no identified reason at this stage to advise the Insurer.

A crowdfunding site with JustGiving has also been set up, following offers of fundraising from the parish to enable this¹.

In 24 hours, the Facebook post has 38 comments and 10 shares and 23 survey engagements. This is against less than 50 over the NDP consultation in its last phase². 1 comment is noted against replacement from a regular source of dissent. The survey monkey proved useful in directing his ire.

BACKGROUND

The park was end of life and had been managed proactively to mitigate injury for a number of months; actions have been taken to generate quotes since April 2019 with limited success to date

The decommissioned skate park was of wood construction; newer parks are often concrete, metal or composite and initial indications from a number of sources suggest that concrete installations are the most popular with users. Survey to date reinforces this.

Concrete parks also work on an 'install and forget' basis as they generally have no ongoing maintenance requirements meaning that any inspection is for graffiti and sharps. The replacement rate is much longer than metal or wooden installations where 15 years seems to be the norm; composite 25 years. Concrete longer³.

ASSESSMENT

The Lead Industry Body is SAPCA (The Sport & Play Construction Association <https://sapca.org.uk/>). Initial enquiries on 1.5.19 were so unsuccessful that SPACA was contacted and **all** providers of skate parks on their website were asked to quote. Using the LIB protects Council from concerns on purchasing. All of the companies listed below have been asked to provide evidence of their work with other Parishes who will be contacted for reference purposes. A specific question set within the ITT will need to include:

- The contractors risk assessment and method statements⁴
- Safety management during construction⁵
- Insurance levels and guarantees⁶
- Time management
- Quality of work

The results are below. Of the 15 companies approached a stunning 7 companies have declined to quote with a further 2 not providing any response. This represents a 60% fail.

SAPCA provides an up to date funding information for people using its members – this can be found at:

<https://sapca.org.uk/funding/>

Concrete providers fall into two main ground – over ground and underground or a mix of the two. Underground projects offer significant landscaping requirements (such as the build of a swimming pool). An underground project would be an engineering project and likely require Planning Permission (Motion 3)

¹ Local Government Act 1972, s.139 (Power to accept gifts)

² Indicator of Community Engagement this is also formally identified in the project plan and motion

³ Indicator of long-term sustainability through low maintenance considerations and a long lead in time to create an ear marked reserve for replacement

^{4,5,6} Indicator of management of RAMS / asks for evidence of Health and Safety

Provider	Park Type	Quote	Date Approached	Status
Rhino	Plastic composite	£92K	2018-2019	Previous contractor
Maverick	Concrete – below ground		1.5.19	Visited and unable to quote for less than £150K
Blakedown		Declined	1.5.19	
Fearless	Metal	£48-50K	1.5.19	
Playcrete/Bendcrete	Concrete	£53.4k	1.5.19	
Sport and Play		Declined	1.5.19	
Oz-uk	Metal	No reply	1.5.19; 2.5.19 & 4.7.19	
TJM Skateparkbuilders	Concrete	From £65K	1.5.19	Reluctant to commit time to quote
Wheelscape		Ceased Trading	1.5.19	
Calloo	Metal and wood	£61K	22.5.19	
Grimshaw group		Declined	22.5.19	
Brambledown		Declined	22.5.19	
Smithsportcivils		Declined	22.5.19	
Dalesports	Wood	No reply	22.5.19; 4.7.19	
Hellens		Declined	22.5.19	

An Earmarked Reserve for £27K is in place against a likely minimum requirement for at least £65K meaning a current shortfall of +£38K. Prices are at this stage still theoretical as contractors have been asked to provide quotes on a like for like basis with the existing model which is now very dated in skate park terms. Once provider stated 'I will quote as you have for the basis of gaining contract, however on the basis of professional pride we would no longer install such a park'. This seems common

None of the concrete providers are keen to install on tarmac; they are considered incompatible. Therefore, some resurfacing seems likely, a simple resurfacing on a like for like basis would mitigate planning permission. The amount of spend falls within the requirement for St Cleer under it's Financial Regulations to require a tender process⁷ As with all capital projects the ITT will outline a monitoring element with a 10% retention for a minimum of 3 months post installation⁸

There will be logistics issues for any contractor due to site and access and these will need to be addressed⁹. These issues may require Planning Permissions being sought (Cornwall Council and Fields in Trust) or a Temporary Traffic Order to enable access¹⁰

Parish has a power to spend on this arena as it relates to the provision of building for athletic, social or recreational objectives, additionally this project will potentially contribute to crime reduction and antisocial behaviour¹¹

RECOMMENDATION

Parish are asked to consider the project plan appended to this paper and the 6 Motions related. Specifically, the timeline¹² proposed (which may be shortened dependent on the effectiveness of fundraising); Motion 3 which deals with Planning Permission¹³

Whilst there appears to be a will at Parish for a new park, no recorded vote has been taken to resolve this, hence Proposal 1¹⁴. Proposals 2-6, if Proposal 1 progresses, relate to taking the matter forward. Individuals will need to be given delegated authority for some of the tasks outlined in the project plan¹⁵ Should Proposal 1 not be progressed a plan to manage community expectations will need to be incepted and may require an EXO

Roni Jones
4.7.19

⁷ Lawful Procurement – use of financial regulations

⁸ Indicator of quality assurance / contract monitoring

⁹ Problem mitigation / problem solving

¹⁰ Indicator of responsibilities of Parish to work within the law

¹¹ Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 s.19 & Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (as amended)

¹² Indicator of Time Management – Gantt chart appended

¹³ Indicator of consideration of the need for Planning Permission

¹⁴ Indicator of decision making

¹⁵ This includes delegated responsibility to the Clerk

**St Cleer Parish Council
Skate Park Motion**

Date of Document:	4.7.19
Committee / Sub Committee the motion is intended for:	Parish
Date of that Meeting:	24 July 19
Proposer:	
Seconder:	
Situation / Background / Assessment – As per appended paper	
Proposed Motion 1 To confirm that Parish wishes to progress development of a new skate park	
Proposed Motion 2 - Should #1 be affirmative That councillors are asked on the basis of evidence available to them to vote, by proportional representation if necessary, for:	
A Concrete Park	Long life, median cost, environmental impact, no maintenance
OR	
B Metal or Wood Park	Short Life, least up-front cost, potentially lower environmental impact, inspection and maintenance regime required
OR	
C Composite Park	25 Year life, high up-front cost, sustainable ¹⁶ , inspection and maintenance regime required
Proposed Motion 3 - Should #1 be affirmative If the proposal is for works of repair and maintenance to an existing hard surface including the replacement of surfacing materials on a like for like basis then this would not require permission. If the proposal were for extensive regrading of, this is may constitute an engineering operation which may require planning permission. That clarification on this matter be progressed and if required applied for by the Clerk under delegated authority to Cornwall and Fields in Trust	
Proposed Motion 4 - Should #1 be affirmative That an individual(s) be given delegated authority to apply for grant funding to meet the shortfall in finance; this to address any groundwork requirement issues raised by the contractor chosen (and may require resurfacing)	
Proposed Motion 5 - Should #1 be affirmative That the clerk be given delegated authority to invite the appropriate 2 suppliers identified (to be named at the meeting) to make presentations to the Parish to enable community engagement in:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider choice • Design choice 	
Proposed Motion 6 - Should #1 be affirmative That 2 Councillors be delegated authority to work with the Clerk on community engagement outlined in (4 and 5) above	
Date received: 4.7.19	
Action taken or motion rejected (under SO9h):	
Signature of Clerk / Officer receiving the motion:	

¹⁶ Evidence of consideration of environmental concerns

