




Little Wakering Road



Barling Magna Parish Council

17 May 2018



Safety Inspection Report

Site name: **Little Waking Road**
Date of inspection: **17 May 2018**
Inspector: **Wayne Hock**



Report layout notes

The assets on site are categorised as **Ancillary Items** or **Play Items**, and listed under those headings.

Each **Ancillary Item** is listed in this way:

Name of item or items	(some listings may include multiple items)
Default risk = n	(This is the item's intrinsic risk if in pristine condition)
Photo	(A representative photo is included)
Findings	(Findings are listed with remedial action, risk score and photograph. If no faults are listed the item is satisfactory and assumes the Default risk.)

Each **Play Item** is listed in this way:

Name of item	
Manufacturer	(The name of the manufacturer or supplier, if known)
Applicable Standard:	(The number of any applicable standards are shown here)
Default risk = n	(This is the item's intrinsic risk if in pristine condition)
Photo	
Faults	(Findings are listed with remedial action, risk score and photograph. If no faults are listed the item is satisfactory and assumes the Default risk.)

The risk score for any items is the higher of the Default risk or the Finding risk.

Seating - Bench

Photo not possible





Shelter



MUGA

Model SMP (Playgrounds) Limited Manufactured by SMP (Playgrounds) Ltd



Standards:



EN 15312:2007+A1:2010

The item meets with the requirements of the relevant standards.

General Notes

The risk scores are calculated by plotting the likelihood of harm against the severity of the injury sustained. The likelihood is given a score of 1 to 5, and the severity is given a score of 1 to 5. In doing this a matrix is produced which gives a numerical assessment of the risk on a score of 1 to 25, and a judgement is made as to which risks are low, which are medium and which are high. Risk scores may be adjusted in the light of experience and therefore may not be exactly as per the table. For example, a score of 7 may be noted.

Risks are calculated in this way:

1. An assessment of the likelihood of harm taking place is made using the numbers 1 to 5, by following these descriptions:
 - a. 1 = Rare
 - b. 2 = Unlikely
 - c. 3 = Moderate
 - d. 4 = Likely
 - e. 5 = Certain
2. An assessment of the severity of the injury sustained is made using the numbers 1 to 5, by following these descriptions:
 - a. 1 = Insignificant
 - b. 2 = Minor
 - c. 3 = Moderate
 - d. 4 = Major
 - e. 5 = Catastrophic
3. The two numbers are multiplied to give a risk score on a scale of 1 to 25.
4. Scores of 1 to 7 inclusive are considered to be low risk and are considered to be tolerable,
5. Scores of 8 to 14 are considered to be medium risk and some control measures may be identified to reduce the risks to low, tolerable levels,
6. Score of 15 and above are considered to be high risk and urgent action is considered to be necessary to reduce the risks to tolerable levels.

General Notes

It is important to note that where an outcome is catastrophic, but for which the likelihood is rare this will present a score of $1 \times 5 = 5 =$ low risk. Similarly, a certain event for which the consequence is insignificant will present a score of $5 \times 1 = 5 =$ low risk. It is important to consider likelihood and consequence, and not just one of the factors in isolation.

The multiplication of the factors into a risk matrix is given here in Table 1, with a judgement made as to risk scoring indicated by colour.

Green = LOW risk, Amber = MEDIUM risk, Red = HIGH risk.

Table 1 – Risk Score Matrix

		Severity				
L i k e l i h o o d		1 Insignifi- cant	2 Minor	3 Moderate	4 Major	5 Catastro- phic
	1 = Rare	1 LOW	2 LOW	3 LOW	4 LOW	5 LOW
	2 = Unlikely	2 LOW	4 LOW	6 LOW	8 MEDIUM	10 MEDIUM
	3 = Moderate	3 LOW	6 LOW	9 MEDIUM	12 MEDIUM	15 HIGH
	4 = Likely	4 LOW	8 MEDIUM	12 MEDIUM	16 HIGH	20 HIGH
	5 = Certain	5 LOW	10 MEDIUM	15 HIGH	20 HIGH	25 HIGH

General Notes

Equipment has been assessed for compliance with the appropriate standards, which are listed next to each item. Compliance with these standards is not mandatory in law, but it is useful to know whether items comply or not. If we think a change is needed, then this is noted in our report. Non-compliance does not necessarily mean that a change is needed.

Compliance with standards is not always a clear-cut thing. Some interpretation can be needed, and our interpretation may differ from the interpretation of others. In some cases, we may decide not to note non-compliance in cases where we think it may mislead or be unhelpful so to do.

Exposure to acceptable levels of risk and challenge is essential to children's development and allows them to exercise their right to play. Therefore, it can be judged that levels of risk above low risk can be acceptable. The risk scores shown allow the operator to make a judgement after first considering the benefit of the activity to which the risk score relates.

There may be cases where we report issues that are not the site owner's responsibility. It is not necessarily possible for us to determine who owns what, and in any case we need to bring all risks to your attention if they can affect the safety of the site's users.

Our report shows the findings at the time of inspection. Subsequent events may affect the condition of the site. We have inspected without dismantling or destruction and so some aspects of the relevant standards may not be testable on site.

Where timbers are set into the ground it is not always possible to determine levels of decay. The owner should ensure they conduct appropriate inspections to identify decay before it becomes a problem.







Playsafety Ltd
78 Shrivenham Hundred Business Park
Watchfield
SWINDON
SN6 8TY
+44 (0)1793 317470

Playsafety Ltd is licensed by RoSPA to trade as RoSPA Play Safety
© Playsafety Ltd