

Heysham Village Play Area

St. Peters Cof E Primary School Consultation

8 July 2010

Facilitated by; Helen Ryan, Cultural Projects Manager, Lancaster City Council

Participants; 33 year 6 students (10 – 11 year olds)

Method;

- Discussed location and limitations such as size and money available for new play area.
- Discussed natural versus traditional play. Using Happy Mount Park Natural Adventure Play Area as an example; all had been there and thought it was good.
- In small groups they were given pictures showing different types of play and asked to place a sticker on the three things they enjoy the most.
- They were then given a shiny sticker as asked to put it on their favourite – ‘if we could do anything else this would be the one thing you would like’
- We all then discussed specific types of play equipment, possible limitations and safety surfacing.

Results

Type of play	Number of stickers received	Number of favourite stickers received	comments
Boulder/rocks	4	1	
See saw	2	0	
Maze	9	1	Would like a tall maze where can hide, but did come up with ideas when discussed the problems with on a public site.
Activity Trail	15	1	Liked certain challenging aspects of it. School are currently looking to put one on site
Sliding	9	2	Like bumpy,

			twisty slides
Hills and mounds	8	4	Two specifically would like an area for using their bikes
Climbing	12	3	Mixed between climbing logs, trees and the climbing spider nets
Swinging	28	20	One would like a traditional swing. Most would like a piece of equipment which spins you around (ie. Wicksteed Hurricane) or they liked basket swings but would prefer a pendulum style.
Spinning	12	1	Specifically likely the large angled disks which you can sit or run on – no handles
Sand play	0	0	

Note; All would like a Zip Wire, but there is not the space in this location

Safety Surfacing

Types	Comments
Rubber (wet pour)	This was the most preferred
Rubber (grass matting)	They were happy with this
Bark	Spelt funny and got in shoes – did not like
Sand	got in shoes – did not like

We discussed the cost and implications of each type of safety surface with interesting results;

When asked would you prefer rubber safety surfacing or an extra piece of play equipment on surfacing such as sand – just over 50% voted for the rubber safety surface.

When asked would you prefer rubber safety surfacing or an extra piece of play equipment on rubber grass matting – most of the students voted for the extra piece of equipment.

We went on to discuss all kinds of play equipment which they liked, some of which would not be possible in this location or a public park. They liked tall structures with lots of activities and long slides, spinning and things which involved pits amongst other things.

Half of them liked climbing walls (which are now sometimes used as an access to slides, etc.) but they would like tall ones.

We discussed a piece of equipment where you used your hands to hang on and spin or move to get somewhere i.e.; requires upper body strength. When asked most of them said this was not a problem and they like this type of equipment.

A couple also mentioned a 'stand-up seesaw' at Williamson Park which they like.

Conclusion

Most popular;

- Swinging (non traditional swings)
- Climbing
- Spinning
- Hills and mounds
- Sliding

They prefer Rubber wet pour surfacing, but understood the cost implications and would be happy with grass matting.