



**GHA/GCC Land Services
Joint Play Area Improvement Programme
Evaluation of LHO and Residents' Views**

November 2008

**Report
Executive Summary**

For further information contact:

Jim Patton

Director

Hexagon Research and Consulting

8 Roseneath Street, Edinburgh EH9 1JH

Tel: 0131 221 5212

e-mail: jim@hexagonresearch.co.uk

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

As part of the stock transfer agreement, GHA took ownership of 11 former Glasgow City Council sites designated as play areas. In addition to these a further 106 play areas are on land retained by the City Council. A significant number of the play areas were or are either in need of major refurbishment or are effectively redundant.

As a consequence, and in order to enhance local community facilities, provide safe play facilities in LHO neighborhoods and improve the local environment, since 2005 GHA's Regeneration Team has prepared annual Partnership Agreements with GCC Land Services to deliver an annual Play Area Improvement Programme. Each programme is subject to consultation with Local Housing Organisations, enabling them to nominate play areas as well as influencing the location and design of proposed play areas to suit the requirements of their tenants.

GHA and GCC refurbished nine play parks in Glasgow under the Play Area Improvement Programme for 2006/07. GHA nominated an assessment of the impact of these play areas as a GoWell Programme nested study in 2006. As part of this process, Dr. Mark Petticrew (formerly of the Medical Research Council's Social and Public Health Unit) subsequently led 'before' and 'after' audits of the 9 play areas in 2007, which assessed each area in terms of maintenance, litter, graffiti and general appearance. These were repeated by GHA's Regeneration Team using a standard audit tool in October 2008.

To complement this work, GHA also commissioned Hexagon Research and Consulting to conduct interviews with LHOs and focus groups with local residents to establish their experience of the Play Area Improvement Programme. In addition, GHA has commissioned the TASC Agency to assess the impact of the Programme on local children living in the catchment areas of the improved play areas, working through local primary and secondary schools in the locale of the play areas.

This report focuses on the views of the LHOs and local residents, supplemented by the MRC audits and information presented in Completion Reports produced by GCC for GHA's reporting purposes. The aim of this part of the evaluation is to assess:

- the extent of participation by residents in the development of the play areas,
- resident satisfaction with the play areas and perceptions of use;
- to explore the impacts and potential benefits of the play areas for young people and local communities.

The full evaluation will bring together the findings of this report, the audits and the work with young people, due to complete in December 2008.

2. Methodology

The evaluation focuses on a sample of six of the nine play areas improved in the 2006/07 programme, selected to provide a representative cross section of play area types as well as city-wide coverage:

- Knightswood Park, Knightswood - Knights HA LHO (a play area designed for 2-6 and 7-12 age groups)

- Daisy Park – Clydeside Tenant Partnership LHO (a multi purpose games court, including synthetic grass carpet surfacing and floodlights. Phase 2 will create a play for younger children)
- Cleeves Road Play Park, Nitshill – Parkview LHO (a play area with a variety of modern equipment for older children, aged 8-15)
- Hartlaw Crescent Play Park, Cardonald – Cardonald Triangle LHO (the play area includes individual areas of play, each with an item of equipment to suit a specific age group)
- Hillpark Drive Play Park, Pollokshaws – New Shaws LHO (a play facility to suit ages 5-12, with a double seat junior swing, a toddlers’ multi unit and two rotary units)
- Robroyston MPGC, Quarrywood Road – Unity Homes HA (a multi purpose games court located within a large area of parkland)

Feedback from residents was captured through focus groups held in each LHO area and the views of the LHOs were recorded through telephone interviews.

Key findings for each play area are presented in below, while our conclusions and recommendations are set out in Section 4.

3. Key findings for each play area

3.1 Robroyston Multi Purpose Games Court

The LHO indicated that there were no previous play facilities in the public park and this had been a long established issue for the local community. Consultation on the proposals was conducted primarily through the local Barmulloch Community Development Company (BCDC).

There was widespread agreement among focus group members that providing something for children in the area was a top priority. They commented on the extensive consultation with residents but it was the consultation with local children that was seen to be particularly effective:

‘By making sure they asked kids what they wanted, they managed to make the kids care about what was happening and let them see that they were being listened to. So they are proud of the park and feel responsible for it.’

‘The kids feel like they own it and are part of it, which is great. That’s certainly the feeling you get from it.’

Focus group respondents agreed with the LHO that the launch event had been very successful:

‘ It was a great occasion – pictures were taken with the kids and everyone was invited.’

All focus group respondents were very enthusiastic about the design of the park and the fact that all age groups were able to use it safely:

'It's great to see all the different age groups coming together and playing together.'

The park was also considered to be safe at night. Lighting around the games area and the well lit paths were welcomed, and the police presence, often linked to Operation Reclaim events, was also very important in ensuring there was no bullying or anti social behaviour.

Additionally, respondents agreed that the design of the park encouraged parents to meet together which also encouraged a safe and secure environment:

'Over the summer holidays there were a lot of parents up there with their kids too, and I think that helps make sure that there's no anti-social behaviour.'

'It's a very well thought out area. On a nice day they've got benches for the mums to sit out at, so that lets them socialise. There're benches all round.'

There was strong agreement among residents that the provision of the park had provided a vital play facility when nothing had existed prior to this. Its design, incorporating the views of local children, and the high level of safety had meant it is now heavily used and encouraged children to be active and healthy:

'Kids in the area didn't play much before but now the play area's here they're really making use of it and appreciating the opportunity. And that means they're getting exercise going up to the park and running around when they get there.'

'The kids are all running around, laughing and playing – it's a wonderful sound.'

By designing the park with children in mind and seeking their views on it, participants considered that local children have adopted a sense of responsibility for its use and upkeep:

'The kids have a whole new attitude now that they're responsible for something and they feel that they have to look after it.'

'The parents all keep an eye on the park as well, there's a real community interest in keeping the park nice.'

It was felt by most focus group respondents that the park was well suited for children with disabilities, both in terms of access to the park and the equipment that was provided. Some focus group members also commented on further developments that were aimed at encouraging greater integration across the community:

'They're going to make a touch garden because there's an elderly community and a disabled school round here so they're aiming to help those populations integrate more.'

'The community is very enthusiastic about the park and the new developments. I think if you give people things they want, they react well to it and enjoy being part of the community.'

Main suggestions for the future were focused on:

- parents teaching their children not to drop litter in play areas
- a preference for CCTV to be installed as a safeguard against potential anti-social behavior.

3.2 . Knightswood Park Children's Play Area

The LHO confirmed that the local Councillor was instrumental in reflecting residents' concerns about a lack of play facilities in the area. The LHO stated that in terms of the selection of the site, there were initial fears among some residents that the site was too close to residential areas and that the park may attract some youth disorder, but these have proved unfounded. The installation of CCTV in the park helped to address the latter concerns. The LHO also stated that the launch of the refurbished play area was high profile and very successful

Residents attending the focus group fully agreed with the LHO's view that the refurbishment targeted an obvious and significant problem. There was a strong view that the old play area was in very poor condition and that there was an urgent need to provide something safer and more interesting for children in the area:

“The Programme provided an opportunity to successfully target a significant problem and it has delivered a very good play area for residents.”

Knights LHO

‘More people are going to the park because there's more to do in it, and it looks so much better than it did before the refurbishment.’

Focus Group

Some respondents felt that the new park was a significant improvement and it now catered well for all ages which would ensure it would be well used by the community. However, several focus group respondents felt that an opportunity had been wasted to use more of the space that was available to the designers. There were also some concerns that the play equipment was basic and not very imaginative, and serious concerns that the park had not been designed for disabled children, both in terms of the equipment and accessibility:

‘I think that someone's just gone through a catalogue and ordered the basics and stuck them in. I don't feel much thought went into the park's design.’

‘There are lots of disabled kids in the area who would love to be able to get out and about more, and I know that they were disappointed at what they found in the park after it'd been done up.’

Despite mixed views on how the park has been refurbished, there was a consensus that the park equipment and surfaces were safe:

‘There's not really anywhere else for kids to play round here. There're lots of high flats with lots of kids in them and the park is one of the few safe places for them to play.’

Focus group respondents reported that the refurbished play park now provided a greater opportunity for parents to interact with each other. There was also a view that the park was widely used by all and that children and parents from minority ethnic backgrounds were well represented among those using the park:

'If you think the amount of families stuck up in the high flats, it's giving their kids the opportunity to get out and about. And I've seen the parents sitting about chatting too and getting to know each other.'

The interview with the LHO indicated that some residents were initially concerned that the refurbished park may attract anti social behaviour but that these views had proved unfounded. This was confirmed by several focus group respondents and the presence of the recently installed CCTV camera was seen as crucial in helping to minimise anti social behaviour:

'I've certainly not heard anything about noise problems since the park has re-opened, and there certainly used to be! I stay near the park and before you'd hear them in the evenings. Now it's a lot better since the refurbishment, and I think that's down to the camera.'

Focus group respondents raised two key areas that they felt would result in the creation of a better play park:

- a more effective opportunity to comment on the refurbishment plans to make sure the equipment reflected what children want
- utilising more of the space that was available to create a larger park:

'I think that they should have had a parents' group to pick the equipment and that would have made sure that the money was spent to the best effect.'

'It would have been good to have the opportunity to comment on the plans before they were finalised – that seems a bit of a waste of time to me.'

3.3. Cleeves Road Play Park

The LHO confirmed that the play area was selected for improvement because it was in very poor condition with substantial vandalism that made it inappropriate for safe play. It was seen as a very high priority, with the local Councillor at the forefront in nominating it for the Play Area Improvement Programme.

GCC Culture and Leisure Services carried out some outreach work with local children to see what type of facilities they wanted at the site. However, despite efforts being made, the LHO was concerned that tenants felt they were not consulted.

There was a feeling among residents that the refurbished play area was an improvement and a facility that was desperately needed in the area, but three principal concerns were raised:

- the park had been vandalised not long after it was opened
- respondents felt it was wrong to re-use the old site
- despite the efforts made by the LHO, residents felt they were not given the opportunity to comment on the plans for the park:

'The Corporation boys are always having to go in and clean it all up and spray over all the graffiti – it's treated dreadfully'

'The area definitely needed a play park – there wasn't enough to do for the kids. It's just in the wrong place, nowhere near where anyone can watch it.'

'I can't remember being asked for my opinion on where it should be built, but there are other places that it could have been built that would have been better.'

Many focus group respondents raised concerns about road safety near the play area:

'You wouldn't let your kids go down to the park on their own because the traffic's so bad – there's not even warning signs to let cars know that there're kids around there.'

While most respondents felt the play equipment and surfaces were safe, parents were concerned that the “hidden” nature of the site meant they would have to accompany them to the park as it was impossible to keep an eye on them from the estate:

'I think the play park is quite safe, but you want to be able to see your kids when they're playing.'

Concerns were also raised about the problems at the site in the evenings, with older youths drinking and vandalising the park as it appears to be “hidden” from view:

'Especially at night – I don't think that you can go near the park after about 8pm. They're about 15-18, drinking and hanging about.'

Focus group respondents said they frequently saw groups of parents and children socialising in the park. The provision of benches was welcomed, although many respondents felt the addition of tables would have helped.

No focus group respondents had noticed any disabled children using the park and concerns were raised over access problems for a child in a wheelchair as well as a lack of facilities for disabled children in the park:

'If a disabled child did get there, I don't really think there's anything for disabled kids to do in the park. I've certainly never seen any disabled kids there.'

To improve the play park, most respondents identified the need to tackle two issues:

- deal with the problems of having to cross a busy road with speeding traffic
- tackle the problems of anti social behaviour, especially at night.

'It's positive that the park's here, what's in it is good, and I think that everyone appreciates that it's there. But they should do something to sort the traffic and the antisocial kids in the evening. The placement of the park is wrong.'

3.4. Hartlaw Crescent Play Area

The LHO indicated that the play area site had been in very poor condition and a petition from local people to Councillors had called for action to be taken. GCC Land Services consulted with the LHO officer and Committee on two occasions to get feedback on the design proposals. However, the LHO believes that the finished product is not very good, citing two key problems; the equipment lacked imagination and innovation and the environment after the refurbishment was poor.

However, the views of local residents are more positive. None of the focus group respondents recalled being notified about the plans for the play park or being invited

to comment, but there was widespread agreement that there was an urgent need to deal with the old facility and that the refurbishment was a success:

'I don't remember tenants being asked about what they wanted in the new park. But I do remember that tenants were complaining about the state of the old park and the vandalism. What they have done though is good, even the way they've landscaped it. It's very good.'

Residents were unanimous about the high standards of safety of the new play equipment and surfacing, and attitudes to the impact of the refurbishment on the local community are very positive. It is seen as providing a much needed and safe play facility for children, its physical appearance has helped to enhance the quality of the local environment and there is a view that it is being well maintained:

'It's much nicer now to look over – before it was all rubble and it looked awful.'

'My view has improved a lot. The community has definitely benefited.'

They also felt that the natural “bowl” that the park was located in helped to create a sense of safety. There was agreement among residents that the refurbishment had been a success and that the park was now very well used:

'Every time I go past it there are kids playing there.'

'The park would definitely be missed if it wasn't there. They love having things to play on and things for them to do. It stops them hanging about being bored.'

However, residents' concerns centred on four issues:

- the fencing around the unimproved football pitch
- access across a busy road with speeding traffic
- littering and broken glass
- poor environmental maintenance.

Focus group respondents also felt the opportunity for parents to interact with each other was hindered by the fact that there was no seating in the park:

'One thing that I would suggest is some seats for parents and grandparents. There are no benches or anything there at the moment – adults just stand about or some of them might sit on the steps.'

'That impacts on the children too, because when the parents get bored standing around they make the kids leave. If they could sit about and chat to each other it would make it interesting for the parents too.'

Another concern raised by focus group respondents was that wheelchair access to the site was very poor and that there were no facilities that seemed to be designed with disabled children in mind:

'There's just no access to the park if you're in a wheelchair. It's a really steep stairwell that you have to use.'

No focus group respondents said they were aware of any problems of bullying or racism in the park and the only anti social behaviour was caused by some older

youths who use the park at night. However, it is felt that the refurbishment of the park allied to other activities by the police has led to a decline in anti social behaviour:

'The police drive about here in a van with a CCTV thing on top of it, and I think that makes the teenagers think twice about causing trouble.'

Focus group respondents made several suggestions to improve the park, with most focusing on extending the park to meet the demand from the children and grandchildren of local residents:

'It probably only takes about 18 comfortably, and there are loads of children in the area that would use it.... I think that they could do with making it bigger.'

'The park is in a big area and there's plenty of room for it to be extended. There're enough kids that would use it to justify it being extended.'

Finally, some respondents said that they would be interested in being consulted on any further plans including how they may be able to help with monitoring its upkeep:

'Tenants would be interested in being consulted about the play area and keeping an eye on it.'

3.5. Hillpark Play Area

The LHO confirmed that the existing play area was very run down and the residents' estate action group considered it would be better used if it was improved. The consultation process was directed through the LHO Committee which included a Councillor from Hillpark who was also on the estate action group.

Focus group respondents were critical of the development, initially sparked by the refurbishment taking a long time to complete. There was also criticism of the lack of opportunity for local residents to comment on the plans and a view that the refurbishment was not very imaginative:

'It took the best part of a year – they weren't working on it every day – but they closed it for all that time so the kids had nowhere to play.'

'They don't ask us anything – people are keen to comment on things that are going to make an impact on the life of their kids – it'd be easy to set up a meeting to get suggestions.'

'I think that I was most disappointed with the lack of imagination that went into the refurbishment.'

There was widespread agreement among residents that the play park was easily accessible and in a very safe location for children, with no significant problems caused by busy access roads or speeding traffic. Several focus group respondents felt that a major limitation of the refurbishment was that it does not cater for the under fives and there were also concerns about the limited extent of the safety mats.

Despite the criticisms, residents said the park was a vital resource for children in the area to keep active and healthy.

Focus group respondents felt the small scale of the refurbishment and the lack of facilities have limited opportunities for parents and grandparents to interact more:

'They could landscape it so that it's more social for parents and grandparents when they go and watch their kids. They could put some more tables and benches about because it's an important way for parents to meet one another and socialise. I don't think they've done enough to encourage that.'

'I think that they haven't realised how much of a benefit the park could be for young parents and kids.'

The MRC audit noted that the play park is totally accessible to people with disabilities. Several focus group respondents disagreed with this view and they were also concerned about the lack of equipment for disabled children:

'If you are disabled there's no way you can get into that park, because there're steps down to it and its all grass embankment round it.'

On a more positive note, residents felt that there were no concerns about racism and that children from all ethnic backgrounds played in the park. Several respondents also agreed that there have not been any problems of anti social behaviour from older youths, primarily because the site is open and located away from houses.

Respondents identified three key areas that they felt would lead to the development of a better play park for the local community:

- the park should be extended as it was too small
- there should be more imaginative equipment for younger and older children,
- further consultation with the community in the development process

'They should have had a meeting like this (the focus group) where you can suggest things.'

3.6. Daisy Park Play Area

The LHO confirmed that Daisy Park was selected for the improvement programme over two other possibilities as it was in the centre of one of the LHO's main concentrations of stock and therefore *'more of our tenants would benefit.'*

Consultation on the plans for the site was mainly through the LHO Committee who visited other successful developments of the type planned for Daisy Park (at Drumchapel and Ruchazie Road). In terms of lessons learnt, the LHO said that, if the opportunity arose, greater focus would have been put on getting residents' input at the planning stage.

Focus Group participants referred to the old football pitch that used to be on the site, stating it was in poor condition and inappropriate for children to play on. They were aware this had now been replaced by the MPGC which was widely thought to have been well done:

'They've put in a basketball and football pitch instead of the sandstone thing. It's much better now.'

'All they've refurbished so far is the football pitch and they've done a grand job. It looks really good now.'

Focus group respondents had mixed views on the opportunities to comment on the refurbishment programme and hoped they would have the chance to influence what went into the play park that was being developed as Phase 2:

'I'd like to have my say about what toys they're going to put in the play park!'

'It would be nice if they even put a picture of what they think the park's going to look like when it's done'

'There has been absolutely no communication with residents about what is happening in that park, and we're the ones that look right on to it!'

It was felt that there were no safety issues within the park as parents tend to accompany their children or keep an eye on the park from their homes. The only safety issue raised by several respondents related to the park being on a busy road.

It was agreed that the MPGC was a big improvement on the old pitch and it was well used by local children. Respondents also felt that it would be important to make the area for toddlers interesting if it is to motivate them into keeping active and healthy:

'The football bit is well used – there're always kids running around in it and it's well laid out. It has definitely encouraged kids to keep active.'

It was widely recognised by focus group respondents that the park should provide a great opportunity for parents and grandparents from the area to mix more but that the benches and tables currently provided did not encourage this:

'I think that they should think about seating areas. It's positive for the kids and the young mums and for people that are new to the area. It's a great thing for the community.'

Focus group respondents felt that that access to the park was straightforward and that it should not present any difficulties for wheelchair access. However, they were unsure if the park currently being developed would have facilities which disabled children could use.

The location of the park away from houses meant that there were no noise problems. However, focus group respondents were aware of the potential for teenagers in gangs to congregate in the park and steps should be taken to prevent this.

Residents' suggestions for the future focused on there being better opportunities to give their views on any proposals for the park and a concern that information on what is currently being done has been non-existent:

'It's stupid that they aren't speaking to us because we would all like to have a say – there's nothing more important to a parent or grandparent than their children, so it wouldn't be hard to attract suggestions.'

Section 4: Concluding Comments and Recommendations

The evaluation of the GHA and GCC Land Services Joint Play Area Improvement Programme has pointed to a number of very positive outcomes from a residents' perspective:

- **Improving a Vital Community Resource**
Across all six sites, focus group respondents agreed that a local play area for children was a vital community resource and its improvement was a very high priority, indicating that the Programme has successfully targeted areas of high demand and is welcomed by local residents.
- **Residents' Concerns on Anti-Social Behaviour Allayed**
In a number of cases, local residents had initially been concerned that the refurbishment may attract or increase anti social behaviour from teenagers. However, in most areas, residents and the LHOs have reported that these concerns have been allayed and there is no evidence that the programme has caused a rise in anti social behaviour. In two areas, Robroyston and Hartlaw, it was felt there was a decline in anti-social behaviour because of a combination of refurbishment of the parks, CCTV and police activities focusing on the play areas.
- **Effective Refurbishment**
Across most of the sites, residents and the LHOs agree that the design proposals and their delivery on the ground have produced new play areas that are popular and safe with residents and local children. Where there has been effective consultation (e.g. Robroyston), satisfaction is higher. While it might be more time consuming to engage with local residents and children on initial proposals, the Robroyston experience has shown it has led to the development of a highly successful project and had engendered a strong feeling of community ownership.
- **Enhancing Activity Levels and Increased Usage**
Across all six sites, residents agree that the refurbished parks have provided an opportunity for greater play than before, potentially enhancing children's health and activity levels and in some instances providing facilities for children of all ages to play. This is particularly the case where there were few pre-existing opportunities for safe play, e.g. Knights LHO MSFs.

In all of the areas, residents emphasised the importance of safe play areas for children. They pointed to the greater use of the facilities after refurbishment as an indication of the enthusiasm children have for healthy and active play.
- **Providing Opportunities for Families and the Community to Participate:**
Across all six developments, residents saw the refurbished park as an opportunity for parents and grandparents to mix more while they watched over their children/grandchildren, contributing to a greater sense of community cohesion. Additionally, there was no evidence of any racial incidents/lack of access of the BME population to the play areas.
- **Successful Community Based Launches**
Some of the play areas had an official launch, with strong representation from local residents and schools. Focus group respondents were very positive

about these, particularly the efforts made to have successful community involvement.

However, residents have also raised a number of issues that should be addressed in future developments, to maximise the impact of the improvement programme:

- **More Effective Consultation**

The Robroyston development was regarded by local residents as very successful, not least because there was an extensive programme of consultation. This included asking the views of children in the area to ensure the facilities were relevant and imaginative and which engendered a strong sense of ownership. In contrast, residents in several of the areas said they were not asked for their opinions on the proposals and in some of these cases they had serious concerns with the way the development turned out, e.g. Cleeves and Hartlaw.

Recommendation: Partners should recognise the value of consulting effectively with local residents and children on play area proposals and make this an integral part of the development process, e.g. through schools, local meetings or relevant community groups.

- **Designing for Disabled Access**

At many of the sites, residents have concerns over access difficulties for children who are wheelchair bound and have also questioned the ability of disabled children to use the equipment that has been provided.

Recommendation: Designers should address the needs of children with disabilities when development proposals are being prepared

- **Effective Site Selection**

The most successful sites were those which were large enough to offer facilities for all age groups. Conversely, there was some criticism of small sites which catered for only a very small number of children or did not include facilities suitable for all age groups.

The most successful sites were also those which were not too close to residents' homes yet were clearly visible to allow parents to watch over their children and monitor anti social behaviour. In contrast, one of the sites (Cleeves Road Play Park) was heavily criticised by local residents as it was "hidden" from view. Linked to this, problems with litter featured in some of the focus group discussions, and some of the areas re-audited also had moderate to high levels of graffiti.

Recommendation: Partners should select sites that provide the opportunity to cater for all age groups (even if this is in phases) and which have an "open" aspect. Issues with graffiti and so on should be further explored through the work with schools and assessment of the audits.

- **Learning from Successful Developments**

Some of the sites were criticised by residents and LHOs for lacking imagination, and one LHO referred to the difficulty in visualising how plans and drawings would look on the ground. In contrast, some LHO Committees took the opportunity to visit comparative developments in other parts of Glasgow to learn at first hand what had contributed to their success.

Recommendation: Partners should visit comparative developments in Glasgow and potentially beyond, as part of the development process.

- **Encouraging Parents to Participate**

As noted, residents saw the refurbished parks as an opportunity for parents and grandparents to mix more. In some cases, this had been facilitated by the provision of well placed seating and benches. However, in other developments residents felt the provision was poor.

Recommendation: Designers and partners should recognise the importance of providing facilities in the play parks that encourage greater interaction between parents and grandparents.

- **Further Resident Involvement in Upkeep**

Some focus respondents also said they would like to be more involved in the on-going upkeep and maintenance of their play park, as well as any proposals for further developments.

Recommendation: Partners should consider the opportunities to involve parents and other local residents in the on-going maintenance and development of their local play area.

- **Importance of Local Launches/events:**

As noted, some play areas had an official launch, which focus group respondents were very positive about.

Recommendation: Partners should recognise the importance of a successful community based launches and potentially additional events based around the play area, and further promote these as an integral part of the development and upkeep process.

Appendix 1 The Play Areas:

1.1 Robroyston Multi Purpose Games Court & Play Area:



1.2 Knightswood Park Children’s Play Area

The completed play area was designed for the 2-6 and 7-12 age groups to replace derelict and outdated play equipment. “Before and After” photographs from GCC’s Completion report are illustrated below:



Cleeves Road Play Park, Nitshill

The Completion Report for the Cleeves Road Play Park states that the play area contains a variety of modern equipment designed to challenge and entertain older children (8-15). A sand filled synthetic grass safety surface incorporating recycled rubber shock pads was installed beneath the equipment to reduce the possibility of injury. “Before and After” photographs are illustrated below:



After



Hartlaw Crescent Play Area

The Play Area

The existing equipment and safety surface was replaced with modern and suitable equipment to cater for all age groups, from toddler to teenagers. The surrounding area was upgraded, with the removal of unsightly steps and areas of setts and replaced with ground cover shrubs. The design has individual areas of play, each with an item of equipment to suit a specific age group. These areas are covered in synthetic grass safety surface to maximise safety. A tarmac footpath links all areas of the park with access steps from Hartlaw Crescent.



Hillpark Play Area

The Completion Report form the Hillpark play area states that it was designed to create a safe and open play facility with new play equipment and safety surface to suit the toddler and junior ages (5-12). The old play equipment was replaced with a double seat junior swing set, a toddlers' multi unit with slide, and two rotary units.

Before - July 2006



After - July 2007



Daisy Park Play Area

The Completion Report for the Daisy Park play area states that the proposal for the area included the supply and installation of a multi purpose games court fence including synthetic grass carpet surfacing and floodlights. "Before and After" photographs are presented below:

