

Great Waltham Play Area Working Group

Notes of Meeting 11th November 2024

Attendees: Matthew Bradley, Steve Gilbert, Peter Jackson, (2 parent representatives), Roger Stephenson.

Unavailable: Will Adshead-Grant, Jim Jenkins, Alan Martin, Jo Palmer

Parish councillors welcomed the two parent representatives to their first WG meeting.

1. Update on consultation sessions - GW School, Pre-School, cubs/scout groups.

- The event at GW school went ahead and really useful input and insight was obtained.
- In JP's absence there was not an update on similar events at the preschool and cubs/scouts' group. It was agreed these additional sessions will still be useful both in terms of getting further ideas and showing the wide breadth of consultation. JP to provide update on progress.
- Consideration should be given to an event at Ford End school.
- During the discussion these further ideas for the new area were put forward:
 - Having a more clearly marked out (fenced?) area within the site for the toddlers play items – this will help parents/guardians when monitoring children of different ages.
 - The absence of monkey bars and the train has been commented on by users.
 - The use of soft surfaces at other play area was noted – this seems to be ubiquitous now for new installations.
- It was agreed that the current absence of feedback from other groups should not stop an initial review of the output from the GW school session to create a provisional assessment of preferred items. This can always be revised when informed by other events. On the night the WG could not get access to the GW school output, so a further session will be needed to make the initial assessment.

2. Update on ITT (Invitation to Tender) document.

- Attendees were generally content with the wording. These comments were noted or put forward:
 - The content in the draft from p.16 onwards is probably unnecessary for our purposes. The Parish Clerk can provide procurement expertise on the most appropriate format.
 - WA-G has offered some initial feedback, and it was acknowledged that further work on some sections of the document will be required as requirements are refined. Further drafts to be circulated as amendments are made. SG to action as necessary.
 - The list of items of equipment will be expanded as choices are made (see previous section).
 - It was queried whether the budget price should be included. This was a feature of other ITTs which has been used to inform the draft, and should help suppliers tailor their offerings.
 - The need to ensure that the distinction between equipment/surfacing costs and installation charges is clear was noted. Also, the requirement to address post-implementation 'snagging' and robust warranties was discussed.

3. Discuss and agree the proposed questions for the SurveyMonkey questionnaire.

- The format of the survey was noted – explanation, followed by quantitative data collection, and then requests for qualitative comments and ideas.
- The proposed questions were agreed.
- An additional question to secure views on whether to have a 'segregated' toddlers' area was agreed.
- WA-G to confirm SurveyMonkey tool has been renewed and ready to go. The survey link is required so that suitable comms. can begin

- In particular, an article in December's Parish News citing the link will be useful. It was noted that if the December edition is missed there will be a two-month hiatus as there is no January issue. An article for December is therefore important. SG to action once details of link are available.
- The link should be shared with as many organisations and in as many places as possible (e.g. at the schools (potentially using their MyChild communications tool), the preschool, on parish noticeboards, at local shops etc.)
- The survey's response rate and quality of submissions will offer insight into the strength of feeling about the proposed revamp.

4. Discuss Justin's (grant consultants) template requirements.

- Attendees noted the information required. Agreed that we will need to be guided by Justin on the optimal way to provide information, which could vary between different grant applications.
- SG to share a draft taking into account any relevant aspects discussed during the meeting.
- *[After the meeting SG & AM agreed to arrange their next catch up session with Justin to let him know the current position of the project].*

5. Agree a completion target date

- SG suggested a target project completion date of 1st June 2024. While this was felt to be ambitious, it was agreed that to avoid drift the project does now need more focus on dates.
- Agreed SG/AM to identify likely workstream timings (and whether they are consecutive or not) so that they can be collated to understand whether 1st June is indeed a realistic, albeit challenging, goal.

6. Discuss when and how we will interpret consultation feedback and agree a preferred design.

- As indicated above, it will be useful to have a review of consultation feedback to date (i.e. that from GW school) even if events at other groups are outstanding. That will help to develop a provisional assessment of the equipment items required and view on how that corresponds with the indicative designs we have obtained already. This in turn will inform the detail needed for the next draft of the ITT document.
- An assessment meeting within the next two weeks would ensure project momentum is maintained in this area. SG/AM/WA-G to arrange next meeting.

7. Discuss when and how we will manage an open day at the pavilion to display plans/take feedback.

- It was confirmed that we should have such an event, and that it should be at the Pavilion.
- It was acknowledged that more work is required to firm up the format (given that it will be informed by some of the other workstreams) and a date or dates (probably a Saturday or Sunday in daylight hours).

8. Other topics?

- While it would be controversial, the project should keep in mind the possibility of funding from sources such as National Grid if its pylons project does go ahead and community compensation is available. However, it was recognised that timing-wise the play area is likely to have been built before such an opportunity becomes available for consideration.