

June 2022

# Ashburton District Council-

Playground Report  
2022



## **1.0 Summary Conclusions:**

The District has a wide range of playspaces spread throughout the District. There were some high profile playspaces that clearly received very high levels of use.

The playgrounds were in varying condition. There are a number of play items that are in very poor condition.

There are a large number of older playgrounds, that are past or nearing the end of their asset lifespan. These items have been given a condition 4 (poor) or 5 (very poor) condition rating. The number of priority 1 or 2 playgrounds is high, with a significant sum required to rectify these items.

It is often more cost effective to replace these items rather than repair. As there is a significant number and cost associated with these renewals, the condition and maintenance will need to be managed until they can be renewed or replaced. There are a number of the play items in very poor condition, these have been recommended to remove them. The safety of the users cannot be assured whilst in their current condition.

There are a number of sites that have a wide range of compliance, condition and accessibility issues. These sites are best managed as an entire playspace and redeveloped.

The maintenance was of a variable standard throughout the District. The maintenance personal are doing a good job in keeping many aging assets in a functional condition. As the asset ages it requires significant maintenance to keep in good condition. There are a number of play items and safety surfaces well past their useful lifespan.

In many cases the items are past their useful lifespan, they are not cost effective to repair. In these cases, Maintenance Personnel should monitor items until replaced.

Shade provision and accessibility have been assessed at the playspaces. Many of the solutions for accessibility will be put in place at the time of renewal or replacement. These should be taken into consideration along with compliance and condition in identifying priorities for renewal.

## 2.0 Result

The playgrounds were measured against the standard NZ 5828:2015/2004. If installed prior to this date, but prior to April 2005 the playgrounds were measured against ASNZ 4486 & 4422. Equipment and surfacing installed after April 2005 was measured against NZS 5828:2004 or NZS5828:2015.

### Compliance rating:

There are 229 assets at the playground and surfacing assets at the 29 sites.

Each individual item of equipment and safety surfacing was measured.

### Result

#### *Equipment and surfaces*

20 Items of equipment or surface complied with ASNZ 4486.

106 Item of equipment or surface complied with NZS 5828:2015 or NZS5828:2004

93 Items of equipment did not comply with any standard.

10 Items not applicable to playground standards, not inspected or not there.

**A compliance rate of 57%. The 2020 result was also 57%. The level of compliance is low compared to other similar districts/cities throughout the country.**

***Grove street was not inspected as it was being renewed. Lake Camp was not inspected due to extreme weather conditions.***

### 3.0 Condition rating:

#### ***2022 Result -Equipment and Safety Surface***

- 45 Items of equipment had a condition rating 1-excellent
- 50 Items of equipment had a condition rating 2- very good
- 87 Items of equipment had a condition rating 3- good
- 39 Items of equipment had a condition rating 4- poor
- 5 Items of equipment had a condition rating 5-very poor

#### ***2020 Result -Equipment and Safety Surface***

- 36 Items of equipment had a condition rating 1-excellent
- 48 Items of equipment had a condition rating 2- very good
- 105 Items of equipment had a condition rating 3- good
- 33 Items of equipment had a condition rating 4- poor
- 6 Items of equipment had a condition rating 5-very poor



## 4.0 Benchmarking:

The level of compliance to the playground safety standards is comparable with other Councils in New Zealand.

Whangarei District Council 2007 audit had a 97% level of compliance
Auckland Council (North) 2012 audit had an 95% level of compliance.
Hastings District Council 2020 audit had an 94% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2016 audit had a 93% level of compliance.
Tauranga City Council Lakes 2017 audit had a 92% level of compliance
Whakatane District Council 2013 audit had a 91% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council Lakes 2016 audit had a 90% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2018 audit had a 90% level of compliance
Selwyn District Council 2019 audit had an 90% level of compliance
Auckland Council (North) 2013 audit had an 90% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2020 audit had a 89% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2020 audit had a 89% level of compliance
Whakatane District Council 2014 audit had a 89% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2015 audit had a 89% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2014 audit had a 88% level of compliance.
Tauranga City Council 2016 audit had a 88% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2011 audit had a 88% level of compliance
Waipa District Council 2016 audit had a 88% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2018 audit had a 87% level of compliance.
Tauranga City Council 2020 audit (Mt Papamoa ) had a 87% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2019 audit (Tauranga) had a 87% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council Lakes 2019 audit had a 87% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2014 audit had a 87% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2010 audit (Tauranga) had a 87% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2017 audit had a 86% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2012 audit (Tauranga) had a 87% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2019 audit (Mt Papamoa ) had a 86% level of compliance
Auckland Council (North) 2015 audit had an 86% level of compliance.
North Shore City Council 2008 audit had an 86% level of compliance.
Waitomo District Council 2013 audit had an 86% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2018 Mt Papamoa audit had a 85% level of compliance
Gisbourne District Council 2018 audit had a 84% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2017 audit (Tauranga) had a 84% level of compliance
Queenstown Lakes District Council 2016 had a 86% level of compliance.
Waitomo District Council 2019 had a 86% level of compliance.
Whakatane District Council 2013 audit had a 85% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2015 audit had a 84% level of compliance.
Queenstown Lakes District Council 2018 had a 83% level of compliance.
Gisbourne District Council 2017 audit had a 83% level of compliance
Opotiki District Council 2018 audit had a 83% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2015 audit had a 82% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2012 audit had a 81% level of compliance.
Rodney District Council 2006 audit had an 81% level of compliance
Selwyn District Council 2018 audit had an 80% level of compliance
Auckland Council (Central) 2016 audit had a 81% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2016 audit had a 80% level of compliance.
New Plymouth District Council 2016 audit had a 80% level of compliance

Matamata Piako District Council 2006 audit had a 79% level of compliance.
Queenstown District Council 2015 audit had a 79% level of compliance
Whakatane District Council 2015 audit had a 79% level of compliance
Tasman District Council 2014 audit had a 78% level of compliance
Auckland Council (South) 2014 audit had an 78% level of compliance.
Waipa District Council 2014 audit had a 78% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2013 audit had a 78% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2007 audit had a 75% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2008 audit had a 77% level of compliance.
Tauranga District Council 2004 audit had a 77% level of compliance
Timaru District Council 2004 audit had a 77% level of compliance
Tasman District Council 2018 had a 76% level of compliance
Hauraki District Council 2020 audit had a 76% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2010 audit had a 76% level of compliance.
Waikato District Council 2018 audit had a 75% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2010 audit had a 76% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2007 audit had a 75% level of compliance.
Gisborne District Council 2016 audit had a 75% level of compliance
Queenstown Lakes District Council 2004 had a 75% level of compliance.
Waitomo District Council 2010 audit had a 75% level of compliance.
Western Bay of Plenty District Council 2019 audit had a 74% level of compliance.
Waitomo District Council 2011 audit had a 75% level of compliance.
Waikato District Council 2014 audit had a 74% level of compliance.
Queenstown Lakes District Council 2014 had a 74% level of compliance.
Hauraki District Council 2016 audit had a 72% level of compliance
Western Bay of Plenty 2017 result had a 72% level of compliance
Kaipara District Council 2016 audit had a 72% level of compliance
Palmerston North District Council 2016 audit had a 72% level of compliance
Tauranga City Council 2008 audit had an 72% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2009 audit had a 71% level of compliance.
Matamata Piako District Council 2010 audit had a 71% level of compliance
New Plymouth District Council 2013 audit had a 71% level of compliance
Rotorua District Council 2020 audit had a 70% level of compliance
New Plymouth District Council 2018 audit had a 70% level of compliance
Dunedin City Council 2017 audit had a 70% level of compliance
Rodney District Council 2007 audit had a 70% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2012 audit had a 70% level of compliance.
Waikato District Council 2016 audit had a 69% level of compliance
Hauraki District Council 2015 audit had a 69% level of compliance
Far North District Council 2015 audit had a 69% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2005 audit had a 69% level of compliance.
Waipa District Council 2012 audit had a 69% level of compliance

## 4.0 Benchmarking:

The level of compliance to the playground safety standards is comparable with other Councils in New Zealand.

Hauraki District Council 2015 audit had a 69% level of compliance
Kaipara District Council 2016 audit had a 68% level of compliance
Gisbourne District Council 2011 audit had a 68% level of compliance
Auckland Council (South) 2014 audit had a 68% level of compliance
Palmerston North District Council 2019 audit had a 67% level of compliance
Palmerston North District Council 2013 audit had a 67% level of compliance
Nelson City Council 2008 audit had a 67% level of compliance
Kaipara District Council 2014 audit had a 67% level of compliance
Kaipara District Council 2020 audit had a 66% level of compliance
Hauraki District Council 2014 audit had a 66% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2009 audit had a 66% level of compliance.
Hauraki District Council 2018 audit had a 65% level of compliance
Nelson City Council 2013 audit had a 66% level of compliance
Gore District Council 2020 audit had a 62% level of compliance
South Waikato District Council 2016 audit had a 62% level of compliance
Palmerston North District Council 2010 audit had a 63.8% level of compliance
Matamata Piako District Council 2004 audit had a 62% level of compliance.
Carterton District Council 2022 audit has a 61% level of compliance
Palmerston North District Council 2008 audit had a 61% level of compliance
New Plymouth District Council 2011 audit had a 60% level of compliance
Ashburton District Council 2022 audit had a 57% level of compliance
Ashburton District Council 2020 audit had a 57% level of compliance
Whangarei District Council 2004 audit had a 59% level of compliance.
Waikato District Council 2013 audit had a 55% level of compliance
Dunedin City Council 2014 audit had a 55% level of compliance
Gore District Council 2014 audit had a 54% level of compliance
Western Bay of Plenty 2011 audit had a 53% level of compliance
Masterton District Council 2017 audit had a 52% level of compliance
New Plymouth District Council 2007 audit had a 50% level of compliance
Dunedin City Council 2011 audit had a 49% level of compliance
Opotiki District Council 2016 audit had a 43% level of compliance
Hauraki District Council 2012 audit had a 47% level of compliance
Tasman District Council 2010 audit had a 42% level of compliance
Waitomo District Council 2008 audit had a 37% level of compliance.
Hawkes Bay District Council 2020 audit had a 33% level of compliance
Dunedin City Council 2007 audit had a 36% level of compliance
Western Bay of Plenty 2007 audit had a 32% level of compliance
Gore District Council 2009 audit had a 30% level of compliance
Opotiki District Council 2013 audit had a 29% level of compliance
Gisbourne District Council 2006 audit had a 25% level of compliance
Waimate District Council 2014 audit had a 16% level of compliance.



The renewals have been prioritized to reflect the age, condition, compliance and level of risk of equipment and surfacing. The Inspector recommends that priority one and two is completed within 1-2 years. That priority three is planned for in the following years. the remaining priorities are programmed as part of the normal asset renewal program and reflect the priority order recommended. Renewal cost estimates are based on equipment installed cost only, does not take into account overhead costs. Best estimated cost to replace like for like item.

As the figures for renewal are substantial, the city may decide to remove and not replace some items of equipment in the interim.

**5.0. Basis for Recommendations**

The recommendations are on the basis that the playground asset must endure a lengthy life in a difficult environment and must ensure long-term safety for its users.

On this basis it is essential that all playground decisions be taken with a long-term asset management perspective. It is more cost effective to remove some items, rather than try and upgrade them to ensure compliance. The new equipment can therefore give the City a 15-20 year life span with minimal intervention and maintenance costs.

**6.0. Playground Safety Standards**

The playground safety standards that apply are as follows:

NZ5828 1986	1996 previous to April 2005
ASNZ 4486 & 4422	1997 previous to April 2005
NZS 5828:2004	April 2005 to December 2016
NZS5828:2015	Current standard

When capital renewal repairs have been recommended, they have been estimated on the basis the installation would be to the new playground standard NZS 5828:2015.



## 7.0 Condition Ratings

**There was a number of condition 5 (very poor) and priority 1 or 2 renewals.** These items could either undergo major renewal or be replaced. It is recommended that this list be prioritized with consideration of location and use. Those items that cannot be kept safe should be closed off and or removed.

Methven Chambers Park Tractor

Wisteria Park Safety surface

Rakaia Hutts swing single, swing 3 bay junior, swing rocking seat

## 8.0 Full Renewals

A number of the parks have many issues of non- compliance, poor condition and poor accessibility. Consideration should be given to undertaking complete renewals of these sites.

Locations that full renewal would be recommended are:

Argyle Fort

Rakaia Hutts

Greenstreet/Ashburton Forks

Mayfield Park

Methvern Chambers

Methvern Domain

Rakaia Domain

Tinwald Domain

Rakaia Hutts



## 8.0 Full Renewals:

### Ashburton Domain

The Domain is the Destination playspace for the District. It has a wide range of play experiences. This site should cater to all children and be accessible to all users. Many of the play items have been added into the playspace in an adhoc manner. As such, the surfaces are scattered through the area without any cohesion. The surfaces have raised timber edges and are not accessible to all users. It is also important when items are renewed that they are done in a manner to rectify non-compliance with falling spaces.

It is recommended that the entire playspace is reviewed and an overall plan/design is put in place. The plan to address accessible surfacing and equipment, compliance and condition for the equipment and surfaces.



## **9.0 Renewal Repairs and Maintenance:**

The value of the asset is **\$4,001,800.00**. **The asset is an installed replacement value.**

There are a 139 listed maintenance issues that require attention. These have been given a priority rating under the maintenance section of the spreadsheet. The value of maintenance repairs is estimated at \$40,710. This cost is based on parts and material costs only.

### **9 Items of equipment had a maintenance priority 1, with a repair value of \$1,450**

Maintenance Cost estimates are based on material cost only, assumption that maintenance staff would be undertaking the works.

Each item of equipment and surfacing has been given a renewal priority rating. There are a number of equipment and surfacing issues that require more immediate attention. These have been given a number 1 priority rating. Some priority renewal items have been recommended to be removed if they cannot be replaced in the short term.

**9 Areas had a capital renewal priority 1, with a renewal value of \$194,000**

**47 Areas had a capital renewal priority 2, with a renewal value of \$815,700**

**89 Areas had a capital renewal priority 3, with a renewal value of \$1,466,300**

**35 Areas had a capital renewal priority 4, with a renewal value of \$584,300**

**47 Area had a capital renewal priority 5 with a renewal value of \$941,500**

## 10.0 Maintenance

The maintenance was at a variable standard. There are a number of old play items of equipment and surfaces that are past their useful lifespan and therefore difficult to maintain. It is difficult to keep these items in good safe functional condition. There are a number of items that if preventative maintenance was undertaken, then it would significantly extend the asset lifespan.

Many of the maintenance items have impacted on compliance. In particular the loosefill safety surface. Whilst there are a number that had been recently topped up, there were many playspaces where the loosefill surface was scuffed to nil depth under the swings.

The Community Playgrounds tended to have variable maintenance.

**As many of the playgrounds require some intensive maintenance there needs to be a resource allocated to bring them all up to specification. Once at a level they would then be able to be maintained.**

The maintenance issues have been prioritized from high to low. 1 being high and 3 low.

There was a number of items identified in the spreadsheet that should be addressed as part of the maintenance program. The most common maintenance issues were:

- Rusting bolts and plates. Rusted broken parts.
- Chain covers split and ripped. The chain cover is often split, open and or removed. The chain cover is only needed if it is enclosing chain with a finger entrapment. It can be removed completely if the chain is compliant.
- Timbers lifted splintered and split. The timbers require constant maintenance to remove splintering.
- Nails lifted and exposed.
- Deck tread lifted, worn and splintered.
- Timber edges broken, nails and nail plates exposed, warped.
- Split sharp metal parts.
- Rotting footings



## 10.1 Finger Entrapments

### Swing Chain Finger Entrapments:

The playground standard NZS 5828:2015 identifies the size of finger entrapments in the swing suspension chain or chain connections. There are a number of cases of swing sets with non-compliant chain or connections. The standards are not retrospective so there is no requirement for these to be upgraded until the unit is renewed.

At the time of renewal or for new swings it is essential to ensure that there are no finger entrapments in the swing suspension. There are a number of ways to address this issue:

1. Purchase compliant chain. Compliant chain is available in NZ and is the most effective way to ensure there is no finger entrapment. The chain size must have an internal diameter of less than 8.6mm in any one direction.
2. Provide a swing suspension member that is not made of chain.
3. Provide a cover over the chain. This method is problematic, if the chain cover splits or comes away then the chain exposes finger entrapments. Further to this chain cover constantly gets cut, is broken, and has sharp edges. The chain underneath the cover cannot be inspected for wear. We are starting to see swing chain failure as a result of chain wearing and rusting under the chain cover. The Inspector recommends only using compliant chain and not purchasing items with chain cover on them.
4. There is a plug that can be installed on those connections that have a finger entrapment – as shown on the images
5. When swing suspensions are renewed ensure compliant chain is used.

Finger entrapment in chains



compliant chains



chain cover



plug to fill entrapment gap in connections





## 10.2 Maintenance

Swing seats: The type of swing seat being used by the city is wrought with problems, the metal plates lift and become sharp, the seat's rubbish perishes and allows water into the inner plate. This in turn rusts and breaks. The type of swing seat currently being used by the City requires frequent renewal. There are two alternative manufacturers in New Zealand making swing seats that have had the problems designed out of them. They get a considerable longer life out of these swing seats.

The Inspector recommends using an alternative seat to reduce maintenance replacements. A Company in Wellington is producing swing seats of a different design that does not have the problem of plates lifting. The swing seat is called 'Rubber bits' and trades under the name of Industrial conveyors Ltd, 12 Victoria Street, PO Box 30598, Petone. 04 568 6983 and fax 04 568 6536. Alternatively Dunedin District Council are making their own swing seats and may produce them for others.



### 10.3 Maintenance- Swing suspension wear of connections

The District has a number of this type of swing connection. The swing connections wear and break at the lower end of connection. These swing connections need to be monitored and replaced as required.

Photo: swing connection and wear



The HUCK type rope towers have plastic connections, the bolts within the connection rust and break. The cap comes off allowing the pin to come loose. The connecting eggs move allowing rope sizes to shift.



## 10.4 Maintenance- scuff mats under high wear areas

**Those locations that are remote and do not receive regular maintenance, install scuff mats under swings to ensure the surfaces are not scuffed out between inspections.**

There was a constant problem with the high wear areas being badly scuffed out. In many cases the compliance and impact absorption qualities of the surface was compromised by the high scuff areas.

In order to rectify this issue it is recommended that scuff mats are installed under high wear areas.

The All Safe large scuff mats, come in a size of 1.2 x1m.

Installation methodology is to place a pile of cushionfall at ground level.

Mats are laid over the top of the cushionfall and pegged in 8 places

The cushionfall is returned around the mat exposing only the top approx. 500x500mm.

The aim is that only an area of scuff mat is exposed with all the edges and corners well covered by cushionfall.

This should reduce the need for constant relocation of scuffed loosefill material.





## 10.5 Recommended Maintenance:

- That the items of repairs identified in the spreadsheet are undertaken on a priority basis.
- That a significant resource is allocated to bringing all the playgrounds up to specification so that they can then be realistically maintained.
- Items that cannot be attended to in the short term, be secured off from use until they are repaired.
- That a weekly maintenance inspection is undertaken on all playgrounds, accompanied by a weekly inspection sheet detailing the inspection and recommended actions. If a weekly inspection is not possible, then additional improvements are made to the playspaces that allow a longer gap between inspections. Items such as **scuff mats** be installed to assist wear of surfaces. That the maintenance run allows the time to repair the items.
- That the Rubber Bits swing seats are used in any replacements.
- That a detailed safety inspection is undertaken on an annual basis.
- That the results of this audit are shared with maintenance staff.
- That intensively used playgrounds receive a higher level of maintenance, undertaken more frequently and receive a more frequent renewal program.
- That Capital funding is allocated on a priority basis identifying high use playgrounds as top priority.



## 11.0 Accessibility

The playspaces were assessed for accessibility. The ability to for participants to access the play space and the play items. Whilst this can be children and or caregivers in wheelchairs, it also includes those with poor mobility. Concrete level paths provide the best access to a play area. Level safety surfaces without steps/retainers/ or edges are best for all users to be able to access the play area. The safety surface itself of a form that provides a level solid surface.

The majority of playspaces have raised timber edges and no footpath – along with loosefill materials such as pea gravel. These are all major restrictions for those with mobility issues being able to access the playspace.

The individual playspaces have been assessed with recommendations on how to address the access at each site.





## 12.0 Shade

The playspaces were assessed for shade.

Many of the playspaces had mature trees in their close vicinity and would provide significant shade over all or part of the playspace and or the surrounds.

Those without and or with poor shade provision have been identified with recommendations on how to address the shade provision.

The options for providing shade could be either planting trees that will provide shade over time, and once they have grown, or provide shade sails over playspaces.





# ***Attachments***

Individual Site Reports & Spreadsheet Reports



<b>Table 1 - Condition Grading Standards</b> (Assessment or Asset Condition on a scale 0-5) PRAMS condition rating		
Grade	Condition	General Meaning
0	Non-existent	Asset absent or no longer exists
1	Excellent	Sound physical condition <i>no work required</i>
2	Good	Acceptable physical condition; minimal short term failure risk but potential for deterioration <i>only minor work required (if any)</i>
3	Average	Significant deterioration evident; failure unlikely in near future but further deterioration likely <i>Work required but asset is still serviceable</i>
4	Poor	Failure likely in short term <i>Substantial work required in short term, asset barely serviceable</i>
5	Very Poor	Failure or failure imminent/safety risk <i>Major work or replacement required urgently</i>

<b>Table 2 – Priority Rating Maintenance</b> (The relative maintenance urgency of an asset on a scale 0-3)		
Grade	Priority	General Meaning
0	Non-existent	No work required
1	High	The asset has a high likelihood or consequence of failure. Failure could cause loss of life or injury.
2	Medium	The asset has a moderate likelihood of failure and/or serious physical injury or loss could occur in event of failure, or failure of a component part.
3	Low	The asset has a low likelihood of failure and/or any resulting physical injury or loss would be minor.

<b>Table 3 – Priority Rating Capital Renewal</b> (The relative urgency of capital renewal of an asset on a scale 0-5)		
Grade	Priority	General Meaning
0	Non-existent	Not applicable/equipment does not exist.
1	High	The asset has a high likelihood or consequence of failure. Failure could cause loss of life or injury.
2	Moderate	The asset has a moderate likelihood of failure and/or serious physical injury or loss could occur in event of failure, or failure of a component part.
3	Low Moderate	The asset has a low to moderate likelihood of failure and/or serious physical injury or loss could occur in event of failure, or failure of a component part.
4	Low	The asset has a low likelihood of failure and/or any resulting physical injury or loss would be minor.
5	Not urgent	The structure of sound physical condition and is unlikely to fail in a sudden or dangerous manner. Programme replacement for end of lifespan.

# PRAMS Ratings



1	Lake Hood	Torbay Avenue
2	Harland Street	74 Harland Street North
3	George Glassy Park	38 Agnes Street
4	Tinwald Domain	62 Maronan Road
5	Jordan Ave	Nursery Drive
7	Hinds Playground	3 Isleworth Road
8	Wisteria Place	Wisteria Place
9	Clark Street	23 Clark Street
10	Argyle Park Fort	184 Middle Road
11	Argyle Playground	184 Middle Road
12	Hillier Place	2 Hillier Place
13	Breabrook	Breabrook Drive
14	Davis Crescent	56 Davis Crescent
15	Freidlander Park	Nelson St
16	Mona Square	Mona Square
17	Rakaia Hutts	
18	Rakaia Salmon	73 Elizabeth Avenue
19	Rakaia Domain	24 Rakaia Barrhill Methven Road
20	Ashburton Paddling Playground	West St
21	Ashburton Domain Playground	West St
22	Greenstreet/Ashburton Forks	749 Ashburton Staveley
23	Mayfield Playground	2016 Arundel Rakaia Gorge Road
24	Mt Somers Domain	75 Hoods Road
25	Methven Chambers Park	Spaxton St
26	Methven Rail Reserve	112 Main Street
27	Methven Domain	Methven Chertsey Road
28	Methven Camrose	Barkers Road
29	Barhill	Road Reserve Intersection Sycamore Ave & Lime Avenue
not inspected	Grove Street	187 Grove Street
not inspected	Lake Camp	Heron Lake

## Sites Inspected

**Risk Assessment Matrix**

Probability	5	Very High	VL	L	M	H	V
	4	High	VL	L	M	H	
	3	Moderate	VL	L	L	M	
	2	Low	VL	L	L	L	
	1	Very low	VL	VL	VL	VL	
			Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very
			1	2	3	4	

Severity >>

Probability score		Probability of Occurrence
1	Very low	No significant probability
2	Low	Minimal probability of occurrence.
3	Moderate	Moderate probability. An added factor is needed to cause an acc
4	High	High probability. Accident is probable without any added factor.
5	Very High	Very High probability. If situation is not addressed an accident w certainly occur

Severity Score		Severity of Injury
1	Very Low	No injury likely e.g. damaged or soiled clothing, bruising.
2	Low	Minor injury laceration or bruising only first aid required
3	Moderate	Injury requiring medical intervention e.g. laceration requiring stitc Sprain, fracture of small bones of hand or foot.
4	High	Serious injury including hospitalisation for observation, e.g. conc fracture of long bones of leg/arm, back/neck injury, fractured skul
5	Very High	Severe injury involving potential for permanent disability e.g. am of sight, spinal injury, fatality

*\*matrix kindly borrowed from The Play Inspection Company*



## Park Central Park and Playground Solutions Ltd

- Tina Dyer – Director
- [tina@parkcentral.co.nz](mailto:tina@parkcentral.co.nz)
- Mob: 021 764 250
- 54 Norfolk Street  
Ponsonby, Auckland 1021



Park Central