

MANAGING THE ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

15 JANUARY 2013

AGENDA ITEM: 7

PLAY AREA REPORT

Cabinet Member Cllr Ray Radford
Responsible Officer Head of Environmental Services

Reason for Report: PDG remitted the previous report to the Head of Environmental services as it considered it required further information. The appendices provide the data required.

RECOMMENDATION to Cabinet:

1. That the Open Space and Play Area Strategy be reviewed after the Green Infra Structure Strategy has been agreed as part of the Local Plan Development Plan Documents
2. That timely collection of outstanding Section 106 commuted sums is followed where adoption of areas has been agreed and that each sum is ring fenced for specific play areas based on 20 years including decommissioning.
3. That for those play areas where the term for maintenance has passed, no further maintenance money is spent unless a business case establishes a need for the facility and separate funds can be found.
4. That no play area offered for adoption by virtue of a new development is adopted and in future is left in the hands of the developer for maintenance.
5. That in principle, closing small play areas to concentrate on refurbishment and maintenance of larger parks become the normal route; and that in any closure, consultation on the specific site be made with the Parish/town Council and residents regarding take over or future use of the land.
6. That the Head of Environmental Services recommend those play areas to be closed in accordance with the dilapidation schedule and subsequent consultation with Parish/town councils be undertaken.

Relationship to Corporate Plan:

None from this report

Financial Implications:

None from this report

Legal Implications:

None from this report

Risk Assessment:

None from this report

1.0 Introduction

PDG received my report on 20 November 2012 following recommendations from the Play Area Working Group, but wanted the detail of costs associated before it could agree any recommendation.

At appendix 1 please find my initial report to PDG 17th January 2012 which highlighted the needs and cost analysis in respect of play area and future budget and at appendix 2 the report to the previous PDG which recommends the solutions.

Contact for more Information: Paul N Williams

Circulation of the Report: Management Team, Cabinet Member,

Play Area Maintenance Budget

Cabinet Member Cllr R F Radford
Responsible Officer Head of Environmental Services

Reason for Report: To inform members of the need for an increase in spending on play area maintenance over the next five years, to identify areas of additional funding and highlight the financial shortfall and potential risks.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. That the results of the latest Play Area condition survey are noted.
2. That the potential consequences of under funding the current play area budget are noted.
3. That a working group of Members and officers be convened to examine and report back to this PDG and to the Cabinet on a sustainable solution to the future funding of play areas and maintenance.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: The open space and play area strategy and the play strategy independently link to the corporate plan and support our aim to provide good quality and healthy activities for the health and well being of our community.

Financial Implications: Any additional funding will need to be added to the existing revenue base budget or found from the 106 Open Space funds. CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) money may be potentially available in future to maintain open spaces and play areas.

Legal Implications: The Council must have an inspection and maintenance regime for its play areas to comply with its obligations under the Health and safety at Work Act etc. 1974.

Risk Assessment: There is a potential cost of litigation should the Council be found negligent with regards to maintenance of its play areas. Equipment found to be defective will be removed and potentially play areas with little equipment of play value are likely to close. Without sufficient funding for maintenance the likelihood of little value and closure becomes greater. A sustainable option needs to be found between District and Parish Councils to prevent this from occurring now or in the future.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 A report to review the play maintenance budget was produced for the Managing the Environment Policy Development Group's November 2011 meeting.
- 1.2 One of the recommendations was to produce a more detailed report showing the anticipated demand for spending on play areas over the next 5 years, together with details of available funding.

- 1.3 As a result of this recommendation, meetings have been held between the Finance, Planning and Environmental Services to consider alternative means of funding.
- 1.4 The method of carrying out the annual condition survey of the Council's play areas has been reviewed and updated to give a more effective snapshot of the play areas. There are now separate scores for equipment and safety surfacing; this was considered necessary to ensure that future results would be more detailed and to enable targeted spending of the maintenance budget.

2.0 Condition Survey – December 2011

- 2.1 A second Annual Condition Survey was completed in early December 2011 using the reviewed method; the results can be seen in annex 1.
- 2.2 **Equipment** - The survey shows that over the whole of Mid Devon there are currently 47 items of equipment that, due to poor condition, will require replacement within 1 year. This represents 11.6% of the total equipment and a total replacement cost is anticipated to be in the region of £303,500. As shown in annex 2.
- 2.3 There is currently 25.4% of equipment that requires painting within 1 year at a cost of £30,450. As shown in annex 3.
- 2.4 It further shows that 39% is considered to be in good condition with 49.4% of equipment requiring maintenance at a cost of £29,400, as can be seen in annex 4.
- 2.5 **Safety surfacing** – The surfacing under each piece of equipment was graded from 1 to 4 (where 1 is the worst). This has shown that 5.8% of surfacing requires replacement within 1 year at a cost of £50,400.
- 2.6 72% of surfaces were considered to be in a satisfactory condition with 22.2% of surfacing requiring maintenance within the next 2 years.
- 2.7 A breakdown of results can be seen in annex 5.

3.0 Available Funding

- 3.1 The annual Play area budget consists of:

Responsive maintenance	£3,200
Planned maintenance	£12,450
Equipment	£8,200
TOTAL	£23,850

- 3.2 This budget is being allocated for the ongoing repairs and upkeep of current play areas.
- 3.3 An additional £20,000 has been made available from capital to revenue maintenance budgets for 2012/13, with a further £30,000 anticipated to come from Section 106 open space funds.

- 3.4 There is also an opportunity to bid for funding from section 106 open space parish funds for the improvement and replacement of play equipment and safety surfaces, along with other bodies, such as Parish Councils. This funding is only available to make improvements to play area sites and not for their maintenance. For example an old slide could be replaced with a new swing and safety tiles could be replaced with wet pour safety surfacing, these examples show an improvement to the play area.
- 3.5 A project funded from capital at Knightswood play area Cullompton is underway (2011/12) which will offset the need for the replacement of one climbing frame, a saving of £12,000.
- 3.6 There is £50,000 of capital funding allocated for removal of a wall and fence replacement at Cotteylands play area Tiverton in 2012/13.

4.0 Means of tackling the budget deficit

- 4.1 The equipment that potentially requires replacement within 1 year at an estimated cost of £303,500, if replaced on a 'like for like' basis. Ongoing review of this equipment will identify priorities for replacement.
- a) It is suggested that the sites at which this potentially end of life equipment is installed are individually identified and enquiries made for any section 106 open space parish funding available. For those sites where funding is available an application can be made for funding to remove the old pieces of equipment and to replace them with different pieces of equipment. It may be that an old climbing frame with a replacement cost of £12,000 may be replaced with a smaller less expensive item.
 - b) Where funding is not available the equipment will be regularly inspected with a view to removal when it becomes a danger.
 - c) Where funding is not available from the Section 106 money, the Parish Council will be canvassed for any funds they may be able to access. Notwithstanding that the moment a piece of equipment is deemed dangerous it will be removed by the District Council's inspection team
- 4.2 The equipment that requires painting within 1 year at an estimated cost of £30,400.
- a) This work will be part funded by the additional £20,000 which has been found from capital and transferred to revenue maintenance budgets for 2012/13 and supplemented from the current maintenance budget.
- 4.3 The equipment that requires painting at an estimated cost of £29,400, the painting of this equipment is not urgent and will form part of the maintenance programme over the next 3 or 4 years.
- 4.4 The replacement of safety surfacing at an estimated total cost of £109,550.
- a) Safety surface technology has improved and wet pour surfacing instead of safety tiles falls within the improvement category. The estimated

£50,400 therefore could be bid for from the Section 106 open space parish funding - where available. If funding is not forthcoming and the site becomes unsafe it will be closed until funding has been found.

- b) Repair of tiled safety surfacing, £46,800; these repairs can not be considered as improvements, some work may be able to be carried out in house by staff whilst the remaining will have to be part funded from the £20,000 found from the capital to revenue maintenance budgets for 2012/13 and supplemented from the current maintenance budget.
- c) Wet pour repairs £12,300; this work again can not be described as improvements and will have to be taken from the current maintenance budget. If there is insufficient funding and the site becomes unsafe it will be closed until funding is available.

4.5 It is recognised that the current budget is insufficient to cover all of the above works; however there is a strong commitment to manage the maintenance of play areas budget wisely. This will include collaboration with town and parish councils and other interested parties.

5.0 Consequences of an underfunded Play area budget

- 5.1 As unmaintained equipment becomes unsafe for use it will be removed and not replaced, rendering some play areas unviable as play spaces. The cost of removal will also further deplete the maintenance budget with no discernable benefit.
- 5.2 Poorly maintained equipment will attract a higher risk assessment score which in turn can lead to more regular inspections and an inevitable strain on the officers available hours of work.
- 5.3 There is the likelihood of an increase in reported injuries when equipment comes to the end of its useful life. There are some pieces of equipment in current use in excess of 30 years old with many play areas in excess of 20 years of age.
- 5.4 At the present time therefore whilst the budget has stretched to cover all play equipment and all play areas irrespective of the original 'set up , maintain and decommission' arrangements, it is now apparent that decommissioning of some areas or some equipment will be required in the near future to ensure that what is provided can be maintained to a good standard.
- 5.5 In conclusion, we have a situation where we have over 100 areas to maintain and the growth of new housing development has brought with it a growth in play area provision. The initial funding mechanisms were never designed to provide for replacement in perpetuity. As a consequence, the Council now needs to consider a range of potential options.

- a) Gradual removal of facilities.

- b) Accepting the cost of future provision needs to be borne by current tax payers once developers contributions are exhausted.
- c) Supplementing ongoing costs through the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- d) Encouraging greater contributions from parish and town councils, either with or without a joint strategy on the use of CIL.
- e) Opportunities for additional income, Lottery funding, capital programme allocation, sponsorship, etc.

5.6 A Working Party of this PDG is recommended as the most appropriate method of examining these issues and bringing forward more detailed proposals.

Contact for more Information: Adrian Cook 01884 234339
(acook@middevon.gov.uk)

Circulation of the Report: Cllr R F Radford, Cabinet Member, Members of the Managing the Environment PDG, Management Team

Play Areas Refurbishment Summary Dec 2011 ^{Annex 1}

Site	Town Village	Site Name	Average Score	
			Equipment	Surface
101	Bampton	Shillingford	1.7	3.3
301	Bow	Godfrey Gardens	2.5	2.0
302	Bow	St. Martins Close	2.0	2.0
303	Bow	Village Hall	3.0	3.7
304	Bow	Iter Park	3.1	4.0
401	Bradninch	Townlands	2.0	1.0
402	Bradninch	Barnes Close	2.0	2.0
601	Burlescombe	Brays Close	4.0	4.0
602	Westleigh	Westleigh	3.1	4.0
1101	Cheriton Bishop	Glebelands	2.9	3.8
1701	Coleford	Coleford	2.9	4.0
1801	Crediton	Greenaway	1.0	2.0
1802	Crediton	Beech Park	2.0	3.0
1803	Crediton	Newcombes Meadow	1.7	3.5
1804	Crediton	Barnfield	4.0	3.8
1805	Crediton	Tuckers Meadow	2.5	3.3
1806	Crediton	Lords Meadow	3.0	4.0
1807	Crediton	Walnut Drive	1.0	3.0
1808	Crediton	Spinningpath Gardens	1.0	4.0
1809	Crediton	Queen Elizabeth Drive (1)	2.5	2.5
1810	Crediton	Beacon Park	2.0	3.8
1811	Crediton Town	Lords Meadow "In Line Skating"	2.0	2.0
1812	Crediton	Fulda Crescent <i>(not equiped)</i>	0.0	3.0
1813	Crediton	Queen Elizabeth Drive (2) (not equiped)	0.0	0.0
1814	Crediton	Cromwells Meadow	4.0	4.0
1815	Crediton	Monks Close	3.7	4.0
1901	Copplestone	Sunnymead	2.9	3.0
1902	Copplestone	Fernworthy Park	1.3	3.0
2101	Cullompton	Knightswood	1.5	3.0
2102	Cullompton	Rivermead	4.0	2.0
2103	Cullompton	Ash drive	3.0	4.0
2104	Cullompton	Conifer Close	3.0	4.0
2105	Cullompton	Linden Road	3.0	4.0
2106	Cullompton	Headweir Road	1.0	4.0
2107	Cullompton	Ploudal Road	3.3	3.8
2108	Cullompton	Stoneyford	3.0	3.6
2109	Cullompton	Tufty Park	2.0	2.6
2110	Cullompton	Bockland Close	2.8	4.0
2111	Cullompton	Meadow Lane " In Line Skating"	4.0	4.0
2112	Cullompton	Clover Drive	2.0	2.0
2113	Cullompton	Spindlebury	4.0	3.3
2114	Cullompton	Siskin Chase	4.0	4.0
2115	Cullompton	Starlings Roost	3.7	4.0
2116	Cullompton	Water Meadow	2.0	2.0

Play Areas Refurbishment Summary Dec 2011 ^{Annex 1}

Site	Town Village	Site Name	Average Score	
			Equipment	Surface
2117	Cullompton	Haymans Close	3.3	4.0
2118	Cullompton	Haymans Green	4.0	4.0
2119	Cullompton	Chaffinch Drive	4.0	4.0
2120	Cullompton	Dove Close	4.0	4.0
2121	Cullompton	Crossparks	3.0	3.5
2122	Cullompton	Bullfinch Close	2.0	2.0
2123	Cullompton	Linear Park	4.0	4.0
2124	Cullompton	Saxon Way	3.5	4.0
2125	Cullompton	Windsor Close	4.0	4.0
2126	Cullompton	Hanover Gardens	3.7	4.0
2601	Hemyock	Hollingarh Way	1.5	4.0
2602	Hemyock	Logan Way	3.0	4.0
2603	Hemyock	Millhayes	4.0	4.0
2901	Holcombe Rogus	Holcombe Rogus	2.4	2.7
3301	Lapford	Church Close	1.0	2.0
3501	Morchard Bishop	Greenaway	2.0	3.0
4101	Puddington	Puddington	3.3	4.0
4201	Sampford Peverell	Cornlands	3.0	2.0
4301	New Buildings	New Buildings	2.8	4.0
4302	Sandford	Town Barton	3.0	3.0
4501	Ellerhayes	Ellerhayes	2.5	4.0
5201	Tiverton	Trickey Close	2.0	2.5
5202	Tiverton	Palmerston Park	2.3	4.0
5203	Tiverton	Amory Park	2.8	2.4
5204	Tiverton	Colesmead	2.0	1.5
5205	Tiverton	Cotteylands	1.4	1.6
5206	Tiverton	Queensway		
5207	Tiverton	Peoples Park	3.4	3.3
5208	Tiverton	Westgate Recreation	2.4	4.0
5209	Tiverton	Wilcombe	3.2	3.3
5210	Tiverton	Lowman Priory	3.0	4.0
5211	Tiverton	Marguerite	4.0	4.0
5212	Tiverton	Hawthorn Road	2.0	2.0
5213	Tiverton	Halsbury Road	1.0	4.0
5214	Tiverton	Ashley Rise	2.3	3.3
5215	Tiverton	Cudmore Park	2.5	2.0
5216	Tiverton	Starkey Close	3.7	4.0
5217	Tiverton	Morchard Leigh	2.0	2.0
5218	Tiverton	Banksia Close	3.4	3.0
5220	Tiverton	Everett Place (1)	3.8	4.0
5221	Tiverton	Everett Place (2)	4.0	4.0
5222	Tiverton	Bolham Rd In Line Skating	1.5	1.0
5224	Tiverton	Waylands	4.0	4.0
5225	Tiverton	Spencer Drive	2.0	4.0

Play Areas Refurbishment Summary Dec 2011 ^{Annex 1}

Site	Town Village	Site Name	Average Score	
			Equipment	Surface
5226	Tiverton	Popham Close	4.0	4.0
5228	Tiverton	Amory Park BM	4.0	4.0
5227	Tiverton	Marley Close	4.0	4.0
5301	Offculme	Pippins Field	2.0	3.0
5302	Offculme	Pathfields	1.8	1.8
5303	Offculme	Culm Valley Way	3.3	4.0
5801	Wembworthy	Wembworthy	3.7	4.0
5901	Willand	South View	1.0	4.0
5902	Willand	The Orchards	2.0	3.3
5904	Willand	Harpitt Close	3.7	4.0
5905	Willand	Gables Lea	3.7	4.0
5906	Willand	Chestnut Drive	2.8	3.8
5907	Willand	Victoria Close	2.7	3.8
5908	Willand	Worcester Crescent	3.0	4.0
5909	Willand	Mallow Court	4.0	4.0
5910	Willand	Buttercup Road	3.8	4.0
6201	Leoford	Leoford View	2.2	2.7

Safety Surfaces

	Rural	Full	re	Tiv	ill	Total	
1 Replace within 1 year	6	1	0	16	1	24	5.8
2 Tiles with gaps and edging repairs	26	12	12	22	0	72	17.5
3 Wet pour and edging repairs	5	2	9	1	2	19	4.6
4 Satisfactory	103	62	32	71	28	296	72.0
Total	100			110	1	11	

Equipment

1 Replace within 1 year	17	8	9	11	2	47	11.6
2 Repairs and painting within 1 year	36	8	22	28	9	103	25.4
3 Repairs and painting within 2 years	45	25	5	16	6	97	24.0
4 Satisfactory	42	36	16	50	14	158	39.0
Total	100		2	100	1	0	

[illegible]

Number of Pieces of Equipment needing replacement within 1 Year and the associated costs											
Items of equipment to paint	Tiverton	Cullompton	Crediton	Willand	Rural	Totals	Cost of painting per item	Total			
Spring Mobiles	1	1	0	0	3	5	£150	£750			
Climbing Frames and Multi Play Units	5	3	2	3	6	19	£450	£8,550			
Swings	9	2	9	1	7	28	£300	£8,400			
Roundabouts	3	0	1	0	4	8	£300	£2,400			
See Saws	3	0	0	3	1	7	£150	£1,050			
Slides	2	1	1	0	3	7	£450	£3,150			
Goal sets	1	1	2	2	3	9	£150	£1,350			
Skate ramps	1	0	6	0	0	7	£450	£3,150			
Various small items	3	0	1	0	7	11	£150	£1,650			
	28	8	22	9	34	101	Grand Total	£30,450			

	Number of Safety Surfaces needing replacement and the associated costs																
		Description of surface	Tiverton	Cullompton	Crediton	Willand	Rural	Totals	Cost to replace per area	Total							
		Safety Surface score 1, The majority of sites have safety tiles to be replaced with Wet Pour surfacing	16	1	0	1	6	24	£2,100	£50,400							
		Safety Surface score 2, These sites have Safety Tiles with gaps and damaged edging.	22	12	12	0	26	72	£650	£46,800							
		Safety Surface score 3, These sites require repairs to the Wet pour surface and the edging	1	2	9	2	5	19	£650	£12,350							
									Grand Total	£109,550							

Play area report

Cabinet Member Cllr Ray Radford
Responsible Officer Head of Environmental Services

Reason for Report: to advise members of a proposed strategy for future play area provision

RECOMMENDATION to Cabinet:

1. That the Open Space and Play Area Strategy be reviewed after the Green Infra Structure Strategy has been agreed as part of the Local Plan Development Plan Documents
2. That timely collection of outstanding Section 106 commuted sums is followed where adoption of areas has been agreed and that each sum is ring fenced for specific play areas based on 20 years including decommissioning.
3. That for those play areas where the term for maintenance has passed, no further maintenance money is spent unless a business case establishes a need for the facility and separate funds can be found.
4. That no play area offered for adoption by virtue of a new development is adopted and in future is left in the hands of the developer for maintenance.
5. That in principle, closing small play areas to concentrate on refurbishment and maintenance of larger parks become the normal route; and that in any closure, consultation on the specific site be made with the Parish/town Council and residents regarding take over or future use of the land.
6. That the Head of Environmental Services recommend those play areas to be closed in accordance with the dilapidation schedule and subsequent consultation with Parish/town councils be undertaken.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: No specific mention is made of play areas in the Corporate Plan.

Financial Implications: This report aims to reduce expenditure on play area maintenance to a level that can be afforded in the light of continued cuts to government grants.

Legal Implications: The Council is under duty to maintain its play areas so far as is reasonably practical to ensure the health, safety and welfare of users.

Risk Assessment: Included in the body of the report as a separate item .

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Members will recall from a previous report that pressure on the playground budget resulted in a request for additional funding for painting and repairs to bring several sites up to an acceptable standard.
- 1.2 This PDG set up the playground working party under the Chairmanship of John Squire with a remit to examine the play area stock, examine the issues and recommend a course of action to meet the funding shortfall.

2.0 Inspection and consultation

- 2.1 Work had been completed by the Open Spaces Manager and District Officers carrying out inspections to categorise playground equipment and safety surfaces according to condition. The playground working party were appraised of how the state of the playground estate had been assessed.
- 2.2 Playground inspections produced a risk rated schedule, attached as Appendix 1, which scored both the equipment and safety surface. The attached table shows how play areas are graded, where 1 is the worst score and 4 is the best.
- 2.3 The schedule highlights those areas most in need of action and therefore potentially the most expenditure. 12 areas would benefit from painting this year and hence would derive a better score on next inspection, However the remit to the playground working party was that such maintenance in future needs to come from the revenue budget not from reserves or capital funds as has been the case this year.
- 2.4 The playground working party met on a number of occasions and discussed the finance available from Section 106 commuted sums and problems associated with collection. It also heard of the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – yet to be declared on new dwellings. This new revenue source may possibly be made available for play area funding. The playground working party also heard that previous Section 106 money may have been exhausted by time from one site but revenue contributions from the pool of commuted sums may be being used to continue upkeep.
- 2.5 A number of individual play area sites were discussed including those with a lack of facilities, some where more than one was in the same area, some where equipment is sparse or in the case of in line skating parks, being supported through other funding.
- 2.6 The playground working party asked the officers to contact Parishes and Town Councils by letter to seek their views on the facilities in their area - how valuable it was how much use was made of it and if they would consider taking over the running of these facilities.
- 2.7 Some parishes are able to take action on sites in their areas – Willand for instance - using parish based Section 106 monies. In addition some areas have play facilities which are provided and maintained through other sources which of course are not subject to our intervention.

- 2.8 There were 19 responses to the letter sent to the parish and town councils; a consensus was that there was little appetite to take over play areas. The playground working party concluded, in light of this evidence, that transfer was not an option, the matter should be remitted back to officers to recommend which areas should be identified to decommissioned to match the reduced funding available for maintenance.
- 2.9 The playground working party in making its recommendation regarding smaller play areas is aware of this being a change to policy (i.e. creating smaller play areas by 106 agreements in areas of new development) but considers in terms of future financial sustainability in the changed economic environment, the policy should be revisited.
- 3.0 **Risk assessment**
- 3.1 There is clearly considerable conflict over the increasingly unaffordable policy to provide open space and play areas and a programme to close them. The balance has to be struck between what the Council Tax payers generally should be expected to contribute to in times of austerity and that which the locality or users should separately fund through precept arrangements. The reduction in budget over the past two years has been far reaching, unprecedented and likely to continue. Monies originally provided by Section 106 agreements has been stretched beyond the years originally agreed and some equipment installations are 20+ years old. Some equipment has been replaced during this time and any dangerous or un-repairable equipment has and will be removed without replacement.
- 3.2 There will be concerns expressed on any decision made to remove play facilities, however on economic factors alone, the Council cannot continue to support play areas to the level it has in the past. Stretching pooled Section 106 money and our revenue budget to cover 103 play areas of varying age and condition is no longer possible. Members will also need to be mindful of the pressures on the Capital programme and the reduction in formula grant expected 2013/14. These issues are covered by the Budget Report for 2013/14 elsewhere in this agenda.
- 3.3 There is an associated risk that removal would leave an area bereft of any formal play area for its youngsters and their parents. Clearly every effort has to be made to avoid this happening and makes the closure (or transfer to another provider) even more important so that money that is available is spent in areas of need.
- 3.4 In response to the request from the playground working party officers will review the attached schedule and annotate this with expected dates for decommissioning. This will also identify those larger play areas that are to be targeted to remain equipped and fully supported for the foreseeable future. This schedule will be brought forward to the next meeting of this PDG.

Contact for more Information: Paul N Williams, 01884 244606
pnwilliams@middevon.gov.uk

Circulation of the Report: Management Team, Cllry Ray Radford

1808	Crediton	Spinningpath Gardens	0.0	4.0
1812	Crediton	Fulda Crescent (<i>not equiped</i>)	0.0	3.0
1813	Crediton	Queen Elizabeth Drive (2) (not equiped)	0.0	0.0
1801	Crediton	Greenaway	1.0	2.0
2106	Cullompton	Headweir Road	1.0	4.0
3301	Lapford	Church Close	1.0	2.0
5213	Tiverton	Halsbury Road	1.0	4.0
5901	Willand	South View	1.0	4.0
1902	Copplestone	Fernworthy Park	1.3	3.0
2601	Hemyock	Hollingarh Way	1.5	4.0
5205	Tiverton	Cotteylands	1.5	2.0
5222	Tiverton	Bolham Rd In Line Skating	1.5	1.0
101	Bampton	Shillingford	1.7	3.3
1803	Crediton	Newcombes Meadow	1.7	3.5
5302	Uffculme	Pathfields	1.8	1.8
302	Bow	St. Martins Close	2.0	2.0
401	Bradninch	Townlands	2.0	1.0
402	Bradninch	Barnes Close	2.0	2.0
1802	Crediton	Beech Park	2.0	3.0
2109	Cullompton	Tufty Park	2.0	2.6
2112	Cullompton	Clover Drive	2.0	2.0
2116	Cullompton	Water Meadow	2.0	2.0
2122	Cullompton	Bullfinch Close	2.0	2.0
3501	Morchard Bishop	Greenaway	2.0	3.0
5201	Tiverton	Trickey Close	2.0	2.5
5204	Tiverton	Colesmead	2.0	1.5
5301	Uffculme	Pippins Field	2.0	3.0
5902	Willand	The Orchards	2.0	3.3
6201	Yeoford	Yeo View	2.2	2.7
5202	Tiverton	Palmerston Park	2.3	4.0
5214	Tiverton	Ashley Rise	2.3	3.3
2901	Holcombe Rogus	Holcombe Rogus	2.4	2.7
301	Bow	Godfrey Gardens	2.5	2.0

4501	Ellerhayes	Ellerhayes	2.5	4.0
5215	Tiverton	Cudmore Park	2.5	2.0
5907	Willand	Victoria Close	2.7	3.8
4301	New Buildings	New Buildings	2.8	4.0
5906	Willand	Chestnut Drive	2.8	3.8
2110	Cullompton	Bockland Close	2.8	4.0
5203	Tiverton	Amory Park	2.8	2.4
1701	Coleford	Coleford	2.9	4.0
1901	Copplestone	Sunnymead	2.9	3.0
1101	Cheriton Bishop	Glebelands	2.9	3.8
303	Bow	Village Hall	3.0	3.7
1806	Crediton	Lords Meadow	3.0	4.0
2103	Cullompton	Ash drive	3.0	4.0
2104	Cullompton	Conifer Close	3.0	4.0
2105	Cullompton	Linden Road	3.0	4.0
2108	Cullompton	Stoneyford	3.0	3.6
2121	Cullompton	Crossparks	3.0	3.5
2602	Hemyock	Logan Way	3.0	4.0
4201	Sampford Peverll	Cornlands	3.0	2.0
4302	Sandford	Town Barton	3.0	3.0
5210	Tiverton	Lowman Priory	3.0	4.0
5217	Tiverton	Orchard Leigh	3.0	2.0
5908	Willand	Worcester Crescent	3.0	4.0
304	Bow	Iter Park	3.1	4.0
602	Westleigh	Westleigh	3.1	4.0
5209	Tiverton	Wilcombe	3.2	3.3
2107	Cullompton	Ploudal Road	3.3	3.8
5303	Uffculme	Culm Valley Way	3.3	4.0
4101	Puddington	Puddington	3.3	4.0
2117	Cullompton	Haymans Close	3.3	4.0
5218	Tiverton	Banksia Close	3.4	3.0
2124	Cullompton	Saxon Way	3.5	4.0
1815	Crediton	Monks Close	3.7	4.0

2115	Cullompton	Starlings Roost	3.7	4.0
2126	Cullompton	Hanover Gardens	3.7	4.0
5216	Tiverton	Starkey Close	3.7	4.0
5904	Willand	Harpitt Close	3.7	4.0
5905	Willand	Gables Lea	3.7	4.0
5801	Wembworthy	Wembworthy	3.7	4.0
5220	Tiverton	Everett Place (1)	3.8	4.0
5910	Willand	Buttercup Road	3.8	4.0
5208	Tiverton	Westexe Recreation	3.9	4.0
5207	Tiverton	Peoples Park	3.9	3.8
601	Burlescombe	Brays Close	4.0	4.0
1804	Crediton	Barnfield	4.0	3.8
1805	Crediton	Tuckers Meadow	4.0	3.3
1807	Crediton	Walnut Drive	4.0	3.0
1809	Crediton	Queen Elizabeth Drive (1)	4.0	2.5
1810	Crediton	Beacon Park	4.0	3.8
1811	Crediton Town	Lords Meadow "In Line Skating"	4.0	2.0
1814	Crediton	Cromwells Meadow	4.0	4.0
2101	Cullompton	Knightswood	4.0	4.0
2102	Cullompton	Rivermead	4.0	2.0
2111	Cullompton	Meadow Lane " In Line Skating"	4.0	4.0
2113	Cullompton	Spindlebury	4.0	3.3
2114	Cullompton	Siskin Chase	4.0	4.0
2118	Cullompton	Haymans Green	4.0	4.0
2119	Cullompton	Chaffinch Drive	4.0	4.0
2120	Cullompton	Dove Close	4.0	4.0
2123	Cullompton	Linear Park	4.0	4.0
2125	Cullompton	Windsor Close	4.0	4.0
2603	Hemyock	Millhayes	4.0	4.0
5211	Tiverton	Marguerite	4.0	4.0
5212	Tiverton	Hawthorn Road	4.0	2.0
5221	Tiverton	Everett Place (2)	4.0	4.0
5224	Tiverton	Waylands	4.0	4.0

5225	Tiverton	Spencer Drive	4.0	4.0
5226	Tiverton	Popham Close	4.0	4.0
5228	Tiverton	Amory Park BMX	4.0	4.0
5227	Tiverton	Marley Close	4.0	4.0
5909	Willand	Mallow Court	4.0	4.0
5206	Tiverton	Queensway	void	
	site			
Reference		Where 1 is end of life within the year and 4 is satisfactory for the foreseeable future	405	158