

Appendix 5 - The Prioritisation process

1.0 Introduction

This appendix explains how the prioritisation process was developed and implemented in relation to the site specific recommendations provided in the four Locality Frameworks.

2.0 Workshops

Workshops were undertaken in each of the four Locality Areas (Chester, Ellesmere Port, Northwich & Winsford and Rural Areas) during February 2016, with the aim of identifying measurable criteria/priority factors to be applied to all outdoor play areas to provide a framework to guide future improvement works for the Locality Play Improvement Plans.

This will allow sites to be categorised as follows:

- High priority for improvement
- Medium priority for improvement
- Low priority – no action recommended
- Consider for alternative open space use

Locality Officers from each area invited key stakeholders to attend the workshops, and each of the workshop sessions were led and delivered by LandE/Ethos.

The workshop sessions involved brainstorming different priority factors/criteria with the group, followed by a discussion around the practicalities of measuring each priority factor. Once a list of easily measurable criteria/ priority factors had been produced, individuals were asked to vote for their favourite – participants were able to place all of their votes on one priority factor or spread them out across different options.

3. Priority Factors/Criteria

Following the Locality Area Workshops with key stakeholders, 8 criteria for prioritising play areas were agreed by the steering group based on the workshop findings. These are set out in the table below.

Priority factors and how they have been measured

Priority Factor	Statistics used/ how measured
1. Demographics (% of 0-19 year olds within each ward)	Office for National Statistics (ONS) Population of 0-19 year olds at ward level (mid-year 2014 estimates)
2. Child excess weight (overweight and obese combined)	Excess weight in reception and year six children - 2013/14 to 2014/15 pooled by ward and compared to England levels (Cheshire West and Chester JSNA)

3. Proximity to schools	Mapping
4. Proximity to other play areas	Mapping
5. Child/youth deprivation	Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) – Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) by Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) (2015)
6. Rural deprivation to services	Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) - Geographical Barriers (subset of the Barriers to Services domain) by LSOA (2015)
7. Existing Quality	Ethos quality audit rank scores (from Open Space Study/Play Strategy)
8. Potential Quality	Ethos quality audit rank scores (from Open Space Study/Play Strategy)

4 Priority scores for play spaces

For each of these criteria/priority factors listed above a scoring and weighted rank was applied as set out in the table below, in order to prioritise each play area.

Table 13 Desktop assessment criteria for prioritising sites

Priority Factor	Scoring	Weighted Ranking
1. Demographics	14-20% of ward population is between 0-19 years old: score 1 20-25% of ward population is between 0-19 years old: score 2 25-30% of ward population is between 0-19 years old: score 3	4
2. Child excess weight	Significantly higher than England: score 2 No significant difference to England: score 1 Significantly lower than England: score 0	1
3. Proximity to schools	<100 metres: score 3 100-300 metres: score 2 300-500 metres: score 1 >500 metres: score 0	3
4. Proximity to other play areas	Children's play space: <80 metres: score 0	3

	80-280 metres: score 1 280-480 metres: score 2 >480 metres: score 3 <u>Youth play space</u> <200 metres: score 0 200-400 metres: score 1 400-600 metres: score 2 >600 metres: score 3	
5. Child/youth deprivation (Rank 1 = most deprived 10% and Rank 10 = least deprived)	Ranked between 1-3: score 3 Ranked between 4-6: score 2 Ranked between 7-9: score 1 Ranked 10: score 0	2
6. Rural Deprivation to services (Rank 1= highest barriers/most deprived and Rank 10= least deprived)	Ranked between 1-3: score 3 Ranked between 4-6: score 2 Ranked between 7-9: score 1 Ranked 10: score 0	2
7. Existing Quality	Rank A (excellent quality site): score 0 Rank B: score 1 Rank C: score 2 Rank D (Poor quality site): score 3	5
8. Potential Quality	Rank A (high potential to improve): score 3 Rank B: score 2 Rank C: score 1 Rank D (no/limited potential to improve): score 0	5

Priority scores

The total score for each play area is calculated by multiplying the score by the weighted ranking and then adding the weighted rankings for each of the criteria/priority factors to give an overall score. The range of total scores (from 19 to 65) for each site has been used to group the play areas into 3 priority categories, as follows:

- **Total score between 19 and 34: Low priority for improvement**
- **Total score between 35 and 50: Medium priority for improvement**

- **Total score between 51 and 65: High priority for improvement.**

Sites were also considered for alternative open space use where their removal would not result in any gaps in access (ie. there is a cluster of sites in close proximity).