

To all members of the Facilities Committee

**Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Facilities Committee will be held on
WEDNESDAY 3rd June 2026 at 19.30 at the School Green Centre**



Bruce Winton
Chief Executive and Clerk to the Parish Council
28th May 2026

Members: Cllrs Bowler, Boyer, Clarke, Jahromi, James, Johnson (Chair), Masseron and Peer

Agenda

A. Election of Chair of the Facilities Committee

- 1.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** nominations for the election of Chair of the Committee for 2026/27
- 1.2 To **ELECT** the Chair for 2026/27
- 1.3 To **SIGN A DECLARATION** of acceptance of office as Chair of the Facilities Committee

B. Election of Vice-Chair of the Facilities Committee

- 2.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** nominations for the election of Vice-Chair of the Committee for 2026/27
- 2.2 To **ELECT** the Vice-Chair for 2026/27
- 2.3 To **SIGN A DECLARATION** of acceptance of office as Vice-Chair of the Facilities Committee

65. Public Questions

- 65.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** public questions

66. Apologies and declaration of members' interests

- 66.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** approval of apologies for absence
- 66.2 To **RECEIVE** any updates to members' declarations of pecuniary interest, and any related person interest in respect of the agenda

67. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 67.1 To **RECEIVE** and **APPROVE** the minutes of the Facilities Committee held on 6th May 2026 as a correct record of the meeting and to authorise the Chair to sign the same*
- 67.2 To **CONSIDER** matters arising from the minutes

68. Ryeish Pavilion Working Party

- 68.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a report and recommendation from the Ryeish Pavilion Working Party

69. High Copse Items

- 69.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on the for the football pitches and cricket square, and the provision of creating an overflow car park
- 69.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** quotes for the overflow car park
- 69.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** any update on cricket at High Copse
- 69.4 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on water irrigation for the sports pitches at High Copse*
- 69.5 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on the installation of the storage containers at High Copse
- 69.6 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** the installation of an instant hot water boiler in the kitchen
- 69.7 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** the creation of a free play area and the installation of picnic benches

70. Millworth Lane Items

- 70.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on a sports master planner for Millworth Lane
- 70.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update regarding the Fitness Centre at Millworth Lane
- 70.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** the possible installation of Padel courts
- 70.4 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update regarding the draft Heads of Terms between Shinfield Parish Council and the Tennis Club
- 70.5 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on the responsibility of access to the tennis club via Millworth Lane

71. School Green Centre and School Green

- 71.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** proposals for the redecoration of the Pound Green Room, Three Mile Cross Room and Grazeley corridor
- 71.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal update on the condition of the furniture held at the School Green Centre
- 71.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** options to provide shade to the Tin Roof Café patio area

72. Spencers Wood Pavilion

- 72.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on the installation of the Community Shelter

73. Allotments

- 73.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on seeking advice on flooding issues at Orchard Rise allotments
- 73.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** an update on the installation of fencing and a secure gate at Hartley Court allotments

74. Energy Matters

- 74.1 To **RECEIVE** and **NOTE** approval from Full Council to proceed with PV Panels and installation

75. Parish Wide Items

- 75.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** the location of waste bins within the Parish*
- 75.2 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a report on improvements to the Deardon Orchard
- 75.3 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a verbal report on a meeting with Andy Glencross, WBC

76. Correspondence

- 76.1 To **RECEIVE** and **CONSIDER** a request from Virtu Juniors Football Club to use the Manor Ground football pitches on a Sunday

77. Date of Next Meeting

- 77.1 To **NOTE** the next meeting of the Facilities Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, 1st July 2026 at 19:30

* Report attached ** Report to follow

**Minutes of a meeting of
The Facilities Committee
held on Wednesday 6th May 2026
at the School Green Centre commencing at 19:30**

Present: Cllrs Boyer, Clarke (Vice-Chair), Johnson (Chair) and Peer

Attending: B Winton (Clerk)
S Ali (Facilities Manager)
1 Member of the public

26/FC/51 Public Questions

51.1 There was a public question regarding the upkeep of the Deardon Orchard

A member of the public addressed the committee to revisit the question he raised in January regarding the long-term plan for Deardon Orchard. He reported that the orchard is not in good shape. They provided photographs which showed missing borders, broken support braces and one tree confirmed dead.

Freely Fruity, who originally helped establish the orchard in 2003, have grown into a national movement planting hundreds of trees a month across the country, and that operational maintenance of established orchards is no longer their focus.

The member of the public proposed that the Parish engage a specialist company to undertake spring and autumn assessments of both Parish owned orchards (Deardon Orchard and the orchard adjacent to the allotments). The recommendation included producing a multi-year maintenance plan, replacing missing trees, and helping the Parish recruit a new volunteer group. The cost would be funded from the Deardon S106 allocation rather than from Council funds.

ACTION – Volunteer Liaison Person to arrange a site visit with a specialist company to identify a long-term maintenance plan for Deardon Orchard

26/FC/52 Apologies and declarations of Members' Interest

52.1 Apologies had been received from Cllrs James and Masseron and the Deputy Clerk.

- 52.2 Declarations of Members' pecuniary interests and any related person interest

Cllr Johnson declared membership of the padel tennis company which will be referred later in proceedings.

There were no other declarations of Members interests or related person interests.

26/FC/53

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 53.1 The minutes of the Facilities Committee meeting held on 1st April 2026 were approved as a correct record and signed by Cllr Johnson.

Proposed: Cllr Boyer
Seconded: Cllr Clarke
Approved: Unanimously

- 53.2 The following matters arising from the meeting held on 1st March 2026 were discussed:

- 26/FC/28.2 Clerk to add the resurfacing of Millworth Lane to the agenda of the Finance and General Purposes Committee.

This had been done. See also minute 55.5.

- 26/FC/28.2 Clerk to discuss maintenance of the track with the University of Reading (UoR).

This was discussed at a meeting with N Frankland, L James, N Boyer on 9th April and at the joint meeting between University of Reading and SPC on 15th April 2026. There was no clear decision as there is no clear ownership of the lane. See also minute 55.5.

- 26/FC/28.2 Clerk to follow up with the University of Reading (UoR) regarding Millworth Lane.

This was done at the meeting with UoR on 15th April 2026.

- 26/FC/40.1 Clerk to inform the SRFC of the agreement of the charges for the use of the football pitches at High Copse.

This had been done.

- 26/FC/40.2 Clerk to submit the application for grant funding from the Football Foundation.

This had been done and then withdrawn. This was covered further at minute 54.1.

- 26/FC/40.3 Clerk to inform Shinfield Cricket Club of the decision of the Committee and to arrange for the Heads of Terms to be drawn up and signed accordingly.
- The Cricket Club had been informed, and the draft Heads of Terms were being progressed using those approved for Shinfield Rangers FC as a base.
- 26/FC/40.6 Deputy Clerk to add Padel to the next agenda of the Facilities Committee.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 54.2.
- 26/FC/41.1 Facilities Manager to resubmit a revised planning application for the Fitness Centre at Millworth Lane
- This is on the agenda - see minute 55.2.
- 26/FC/41.1 Clerk to investigate a competitive process or appointing a new planning consultant.
- This is on the agenda - see minute 55.1.
- 26/FC/41.2 Facilities Manager to meet with the Tennis Club to agree the Heads of Terms for the tennis courts (on a similar basis as those drawn up for SRFC).
- This was on the agenda – see minute 55.4.
- 26/FC/42.1 Cllr Johnson to arrange a meeting with the WBC sports lead.
- This would be arranged once WBC leads were confirmed for the new council year.
- ACTION – Cllr Johnson to arrange a meeting with the WBC sports lead**
- 26/FC/42.1 Cllr Johnson to follow up with UoR regarding the land for a mountain bike track.
- This was ongoing.
- ACTION – Cllr Johnson to follow up with UoR regarding the land for a mountain bike track.**
- 26/FC/43.1 Clerk and Facilities Manager to meet with the WBC officer regarding the adjustments to the siting of the recycle bins.
- This is on the agenda - see minute 57.1.
- 26/FC/43.2 Facilities Manager to arrange for the final adjustments (to the Pound Green fire doors) if deemed necessary.
- This has been done, no further works required.

- 26/FC/44.1 Facilities Manager to submit the planning application for the installation of the community shelter.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 58.1.
- 26/FC/45.1 Facilities Manager to obtain specialist drainage advice regarding flooding at the Orchard Rise allotments.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 59.1.
- 26/FC/46.1 Microgeneration - Clerk to arrange a follow up meeting to progress the recommended actions.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 60.1.
- 26/FC/47.1 Clerk to add the electric cargo bike purchase to the agenda of the Finance and General Purposes Committee.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 61.1.
- 26/FC/48.1(i) Clerk to circulate a bin report prior to the next Facilities Committee meeting.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 62.1.
- 26/FC/48.1(i) Deputy Clerk to add bin audit to the next agenda of the Facilities Committee.
- This was on the agenda – see minute 62.1.
- 26/FC/48.1(iii) Clerk to raise the matter (grassed area at Deer Leap Park) with Andy Glencross at WBC.
- The Clerk and Cllr Clarke will be meeting Andy Glencross on 27th May.
- 26/FC/48.1(iv) Clerk to follow up with Andy Glencross at WBC (open area next to the two new football pitches at Hyde End Lane).
- This is to be covered in the meeting with Andy Glencross.
- 26/FC/48.1(vi) Clerk to liaise with Taylor Wimpey regarding the soft landscaping (junction at Church Lane/Three Mile Cross).
- The Clerk had no update on this from Taylor Wimpey.
- 26/FC/48.1(vii) Clerk to arrange a meeting with Taylor Wimpey to discuss the Nullis Farm site.
- The latest information was that planning permission had still not been achieved.

High Copse Items**54.1 Update on the proposed fencing around the football pitches and cricket square**

The Facilities Manager had submitted a pre-planning application request regarding the fencing. The results were that white plastic fencing as originally proposed would not be acceptable. However, if this was changed to a timber fencing that was more in keeping with surrounding farmland this would be acceptable as permitted development and therefore not require planning permission.

The approved cost of the white plastic fencing was £45,162 (approved minute 26/FC/4.3). The cost of moving to a suitable quality timber fencing would be in the region of £22,000. A timber fence would require more maintenance, and this would be included in the LTMP.

Members approved to change the fencing proposed to a suitable timber fence

Proposed: Cllr Peer
Seconded: Cllr Boyer
Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Clerk to share the pre-app report for fencing at High Copse with committee members

It was now also proposed to move ahead with creating a suitably prepared overflow car park for the site. The area between the existing car park and the footpath is already ear marked on the planning application (223286) as use for overflow parking with reinforced grass.

The cost of providing the reinforcing and appropriate access to and from the rest of the car park is estimated to be £15,000. Total cost is expected to be up to £37,000.

Members agreed to approve the overflow car parking subject in addition to the timber fencing subject to the total cost of the timber fencing and the overflow car parking not exceeding the originally approved £45,162

Proposed: Cllr Johnson
Seconded: Cllr Peer
Approved: Unanimously

The Clerk was asked to resubmit the Football Foundation grant application for the timber fencing

ACTION – Facilities Manager to progress the installation of timber fence

ACTION – Facilities Manager to progress the installation of the overflow car park

ACTION – Clerk to resubmit the Football Foundation fence grant application

54.2 Update on the cricket at High Copse

Heads of terms are being pursued with the Cricket Club, but play cannot start at High Copse until the necessary equipment e.g. sight screens have been delivered which is expected in 3-4 weeks.

The Facilities Manager was asked to share the list of equipment being acquired for cricket at High Copse Pavilion.

ACTION - Facilities Manager to share the list of equipment being acquired for cricket at High Copse Pavilion

54.3 Water Irrigation for sports pitches at High Copse

The Facilities Manager is currently in discussions with BA Hydro Solutions. It is our understanding that an extraction licence is not required for the volume of water expected to be drawn from the borehole. The Facilities Manager is seeking formal confirmation of the situation or, failing that, how to obtain such a licence.

ACTION – Facilities Manager to confirm if an extraction licence is required for High Copse

54.4 Update on the installation of the containers at High Copse

The Facilities Manager advised that subject to weather conditions these were scheduled to be delivered on 14th May 2026.

26/FC/55

Millworth Lane

55.1 Sports master planner for Millworth Lane

The Sports Working Party had met on Tuesday 28th April. It had been agreed that the Quantity Surveyor was being asked to carry out tasks that were beyond his area of specialism and that what was required was an overall Sports Master Planner who could take on the task of identifying how the various requirements for Millworth Lane could best be accommodated within the site. This would also support the next stage in public consultation for the Sports Park.

The Sports Working Party had asked the Clerk to identify potential candidates for this work and establish if they were interested in taking on the work.

The companies identified are:

- STRI Group
- SJS LC
- Toby Wintgens Sport & Leisure Consulting
- Sports Labs (UK) - Consultancy
- Field Form
- MAC Groundworks

The Clerk had written to each with an outline of the requirement to establish initial interest in the work.

ACTION – Clerk to report back to the Working Party and Facilities Committee regarding potential consultants to support Master planning for Millworth Sports Park

55.2 Update for the Fitness Centre at Millworth Lane

The required ecology work is underway, and we expect to submit the revised planning application later in the month. We are working towards the fitness trainer starting to operate in September.

55.3 Installation of Padel courts

A proposal had been received for covered courts at High Copse, but the University of Reading had confirmed that they would not support installation of covered courts on this site. Cllr Abraham had asked the company involved to come forward with proposals for Millworth instead. This would be considered as part of the sports master planning. This would ideally be a for covered facility for up to 4 courts, but open courts could also be considered.

55.4 Draft Heads of Terms between Shinfield Parish Council (SPC) and the Tennis Club

A meeting had been arranged for the 20th May to start the discussions with the tennis club.

55.5 Access to the Tennis club via Millworth Lane

Full Council had referred discussion on the access to the tennis club back to the Facilities Committee. The Clerk suggested that it may be possible to reorientate the car park to run up to, and include, the tennis club parking. This would avoid the need for the council to have to do any work on the unclaimed lane. The Chair stressed that the consultant should be given a clean brief and not be steered toward a predetermined solution.

26/FC/56

Land Matters with the University of Reading (UoR)

56.1 Potential land matters from the University of Reading

There was nothing to report on this until next UoR Council meeting on 1st July.

57.1 Recycling bins

The Clerk had held a site visit with WBC Recycling officer who was content with the proposal but wanted their contractor to confirm there was no impact on collections before giving a final approval. This was still awaited.

The Recycling officer did advise that WBC would be introducing kerbside glass recycling in 2027 and so there would be no need to continue with the glass recycling bins at School Green.

It was agreed that instead of the original wooden fencing planned the fence panels along the north side of the School Green were continued to run along the kerb line. There was a discussion about moving the linen bank bins when glass recycling went but it was felt that they would have the least visual impact if they stayed in their current location.

Proposed: Cllr Johnson
 Seconded: Cllr Boyer
 Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Clerk to advise WBC of the planned changes to the fencing and to the linen banks staying in their current location

57.2 Any other matters relating to the School Green Centre and School Green

There were no other matters to report.

58.1 Installation of Community Shelter

The Facilities Manager had chased for the required drawings for the shelter and when these were available the planning application would be submitted.

ACTION - Facilities Manager to submit the planning application for the installation of the community shelter

59.1 Flooding at Orchard Rise Allotments

The Facilities Manager was still sourcing specialist drainage advice. Cllr Johnson agreed to fly a drone above the area to help with the assessment.

ACTION – Facilities Manager to obtain specialist drainage advice regarding flooding at the Orchard Rise allotments

ACTION – Cllr Johnson to fly a drone over Orchard Rise allotments

59.2 Hartley Court Allotments

An allotment holder at Hartley Court Allotments has requested that we consider providing a perimeter fence for this allotment site which is the only site that does not have a fence.

The materials (excluding installation) are £3,500 + VAT for standard fence panels around the site and it would be prudent to assume the same again for installation.

It was agreed that the Facilities Manager would check with allotment holders to see if there was overall support for a fence.

ACTION – Facilities Manager to check with Hartley Court Allotment holders as to whether they would support a perimeter fence to the allotment site

26/FC/60

Energy Matters

60.1 An update on microgeneration within the Shinfield Parish Council (SPC) estate

The energy consultant (Reduce Energy) had now provided site reports for the School Green Centre, Manor Ground Pavilion, High Copse Pavilion and Spencers Wood Pavilion. They have also provided a report covering capital investment options for renewable energy.

The recommendations are for

- Quick wins across all sites - £10,000 expenditure to achieve all recommendations
- Maximise the PV panels and batteries at all four sites - £220,000. School Green Centre and Manor Ground in 2026 followed by Spencers Wood Pavilion and High Copse Pavilion in 2027
- Retainer for Reduce Energy £1,000 p.a.

This was in addition to the costs incurred to produce the reports (£8,600) meaning that total expenditure (excluding the retainer) would be £240,000 approx. from a CIL allocation of £300,000.

Members asked for more information from Reduce Energy on the likely costs and operation of the maintenance contract for the PV panels that they recommended. It was agreed that the committee would recommend the capital programme to the May Full Council Meeting.

Proposed: Cllr Peer
Seconded: Cllr Clarke
Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Clerk to add the energy report to the agenda for May Full Council

ACTION – Clerk to request additional information on the PV panel maintenance contract.

26/FC/61.1

Facilities Team transport

61.1 Purchase of an electric cargo bike

It was agreed in principle at the last meeting that officers should investigate acquiring an electric bike. After discussion with staff about types of electric bike the recommendation is for a traditional tricycle configuration with front and rear cargo capacity. The expected cost was up to £3,500.

Members agreed in principle to proceed with procurement but asked to see a risk assessment and also confirmation that appropriate insurance cover would be taken out if not already covered by any existing council policy.

The request would need to go to Finance & General Purposes Committee to release the required funds.

Proposed: Cllr Johnson
Seconded: Cllr Clarke
Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Clerk to add to agenda for June Finance & General Purposes Committee

ACTION – Facilities Manager to check insurance cover for electric bicycle

ACTION – Facilities Manager to prepare Risk Assessment for use of an electric bike by council staff

26/FC/62

Parish Wide Items

62.1 Waste Bins

The papers for the meeting included a listing of all the council provided bins in the parish. The council had clusters of bins and there is no parish wide coverage. The annual cost of emptying one bin was £480 and the cost of a new bin is £385.

The Clerk advised that WBC will be doing their own bin review with the expectation that they will remove their bins from locations that have a parish or town council bin nearby.

Three bins had been identified as recurring problems

- Cutbush Lane
- Dearden Way/Scobell Close
- Grovelands Road

It was agreed that stickers warning against fly-tipping would be placed on all council bins.

A single map showing council, WBC and developer bins was requested to allow an assessment of where the council may be able to redeploy existing bins. It was also requested that an indication be provided of how full each bin was on average.

Any new bins acquired should be a version which reduced the potential for birds and animals to get at the contents.

ACTION – Facilities Manager to arrange for a single map showing all public waste bins in the parish

ACTION – Facilities Manager to source a suitable sticker on fly-tipping and obtain a quote for implementation

ACTION – Facilities Manager to source a suitable waste bin for new purchases

62.2 Notice Board at Frensham Green and High Copse Pavilion

The Clerk advised that the Deputy Clerk had been looking at options for additional noticeboard coverage in the parish.

It was proposed that noticeboards were installed:

- On Frensham Green
- At High Copse Pavilion

The cost of a new noticeboard would be £1,500 + VAT based on the same design already installed in the parish. There would also be some additional staff time each week to service the board e.g. new meeting agendas and other updates.

It was agreed to recommend both additional noticeboards to Finance and General Purposes Committee for the release of funds.

Proposed: Cllr Johnson
Seconded: Cllr Peer
Approved: Unanimously

ACTION – Clerk to add to the agenda of the Finance and General Purposes Committee

62.3 Other matters within the parish not covered above

There were no other items for consideration.

26/FC/63

Correspondence

63.1 There was no correspondence

25/FC/64

Date of the Next Meeting

64.1 To **NOTE** the next meeting of the Facilities Committee will be held on Wednesday 3rd June 2026

The meeting ended at 21.30

List of Actions

Minute number	Action	Responsibility
42.1	Arrange a meeting with the WBC sports lead	Cllr Johnson
42.1	Follow up with UoR regarding the land for a mountain bike track	Cllr Johnson
51.1	Arrange a site visit with a specialist company to identify a long-term maintenance plan for Deardon Orchard	Volunteer Liaison Person
54.1	Share the pre-app report for fencing at High Copse with committee members	Clerk
54.1	Progress the installation of timber fence	Facilities Manager
54.1	Progress the installation of the overflow car park	Facilities Manager
54.1	Resubmit the Football Foundation fence grant application	Clerk
54.2	Share the list of equipment being acquired for cricket at High Copse Pavilion	Facilities Manager
54.3	Confirm if an extraction licence is required for High Copse	Facilities Manager
55.1	Report back to the Working Party and Facilities Committee regarding potential consultants to support Master planning for Millworth Sports Park	Clerk
57.1	Advise WBC of the planned changes to the fencing and to the linen banks staying in their current location	Clerk
58.1	Submit the planning application for the installation of the community shelter	Facilities Manager
59.1	Obtain specialist drainage advice regarding flooding at the Orchard Rise allotments	Facilities Manager
59.1	Fly a drone over Orchard Rise allotments	Cllr Johnson
59.2	Check with Hartley Court Allotment holders as to whether they would support a perimeter fence to the allotment site	Facilities Manager
60.1	Add the energy report to the agenda for May Full Council	Clerk
60.1	Request additional information on the PV panel maintenance contract	Clerk
61.1	Add to agenda for June Finance & General Purposes Committee a request for funding for electric bicycle	Clerk

61.1	Check insurance cover for electric bicycle	Facilities Manager
61.1	Prepare Risk Assessment for use of an electric bike by council staff	Facilities Manager
62.1	Arrange for a single map showing all public waste bins in the parish	Facilities Manager
62.1	Source a suitable sticker on fly-tipping and obtain a quote for implementation	Facilities Manager
62.1	Source a suitable waste bin for new purchases	Facilities Manager
62.2	Clerk to add to the next agenda of Finance and General Purposes Committee the purchase of notice boards for Frensham Green and High Copse	Clerk

Ryeish Pavilion

Working Party Report

3rd June, 2026

Ryeish Pavilion - Background

- Ryeish Pavilion has been in disuse since the opening of a new Sports Hub in Ryeish Green in 2012.
- The condition of the building has deteriorated since then, with two incidents of recent vandalism.
- In May 2023 SPC instructed Kempton Carr Croft to list the building, as a sealed auction. ⁽¹⁾ ⁽³⁾
 - There were 53 expressions of interest. ⁽²⁾
 - Sealed bids received ranged from £45,000 - £275,250. ⁽²⁾
- Quotes for refurbishment of the building were received from HBDS Surveyors Ltd in Dec 2023. ⁽³⁾
 - Cost plan 1 - £442,310 ⁽⁴⁾
 - Cost plan 2 - £441,540 ⁽⁵⁾
- An agreement was not reached by SPC as to how to proceed.

Ryeish Pavilion Working Party 2025

- The Facilities Committee established a Ryeish Pavilion Working Party in July 2025 to enable the council to come to a decision as to the future of the Pavilion ⁽⁶⁾

Aims and objectives (as per Terms of Reference) ⁽⁷⁾

- To fairly assess all options as to the future of Ryeish Pavilion.
- To consult with the wider community and consider their views.
- To provide evidence based recommendations to enable the Council to come to a decision regarding the future of Ryeish Pavilion.
- Recommendations to be made to the Facilities Committee meeting December 2025, and to the Full Council meeting February 2026.

This was extended to report to Facilities Committee meeting January 2026, and again to February 2026, and again to March 2026. ⁽⁸⁾

An interim report was given at the Facilities Committee meeting March 4th 2026 ⁽³²⁾, and it was agreed that a final report would be given at the May 2026 meeting , this was deferred to the June 2026 meeting.

A budget of £4,000 was approved at Facilities Committee Meeting 22nd October, 2025, to enable the working party to source the information required to complete their aims and objectives.

Community Survey

A community survey was conducted between 2nd Sep – 31st Oct 2025, with the following questions and results. ⁽⁹⁾₍₁₀₎ The survey was available via a QR code on posters, a link on the SPC website, hard copies at reception, and face to face at the site. ⁽¹¹⁾ The survey was also shared via local FaceBook groups.

1. Name (see survey spreadsheet)
2. Postcode (see survey spreadsheet)
3. Email address (see survey spreadsheet)

4. Do you know Ryeish Green Pavilion and where it is?

Yes, well	248
A bit	31
No, not really	12
Other	2

5. What would you like to see happen to Ryeish Green Pavilion?

Love it – Community use (refurbish for clubs, events, classes, etc.)	147
Love it – Leased (refurbish and rent to a single user such as a nursery, wellbeing centre, or local business)	83
List it (sell the building and land)	13
Lose it (demolish and use the land for something new)	22
Other	31

6. Do you think Ryeish Green Pavilion is still useful for the community, even with newer facilities near by at Ryeish Green Sports Hub?

Yes	217
No	34
Not sure	25
Other	17

7. Would you support parish council money being used to refurbish Ryeish Green Pavilion?

Yes	233
No	31
Not sure	23
Other	7

8. If the building was taken down, what would you like to see on the site instead?

230 (for individual responses see spread sheet) (10)

Responses



9. Would you like to receive Shinfield Parish Council newsletters and updates about this survey?

Yes	148
No	84
Already signed up	60

Recommendations from the Working Party:

1. The views of the community, which strongly support that Ryeish Pavilion is refurbished and put back into community use, should be taken into consideration when the Council comes to making its decision.
2. The community should be informed of the full results of the survey which should be published prominently on the SPC website, and the SPC FaceBook page.
3. It was decided at the time not to include a question on the survey relating to how much the community would consider a reasonable amount to invest in a refurbishment, as up to date figures were not available at the time. The Council may wish to further engage with the community when more information regarding this is available.

Marketing Options for listing/leasing

Three estate agents were contacted to make valuations and made site visits.

HASLAMs (12)

- After careful review and consideration Haslams declined to take on the disposal of the pavilion.

AH LANSLEY LTD (13) (14)

- Recommended freehold value to be £130,000 - £135,000
- Rental option (post-refurbishment) £23,000 - £25,000 per annum (£10-£12 per sq.ft.)
- Should they be instructed the fees are as follows:-
- Initial request of a Registration Fee of £450 plus VAT which sum is fully credited against our lettings / sales commission fee on completion.
- **Lettings commission fee** (payable on completion) of £2,950 plus VAT less the Registration Fee paid out at the outset.
- **Sales commission Fee** (payable on completion) of £3,950 plus VAT less the Registration Fee paid out at the outset.

KEMPTON CARR CROFT (15) (16)

Kempton Carr Croft came back with the following response:

- The last time the building was listed it received a huge level of interest. It took a lot of time and it was a complicated process in getting responses from the council.
- The fee vs the time invested makes this instruction very marginal in terms of profitability
- The fee generated for promoting its use on a letting basis or for council use would not be enough.
- There is the potential for the firms name to be brought into negative light due to the marketing of it and the strong views of the community.
- If assurances were made that Kempton Carr Croft would be kept at arms length from local councillors and questioning they would look at marketing the building with a minimum fee of £5,000 plus VAT and an abortive fee should it be withdrawn.

HICKS BAKER (33)

After consideration Hicks baker concluded that they didn't think they would be best placed to help with this instruction and politely declined.

Recommendations from the Working Party

1. Should the council decide to sell or lease the building AH Lansley Ltd should be considered primarily as they expressed the most interest in being instructed to do so, at a competitive rate.
2. If the council decides to lease a refurbished building the recommendation is that this should be undertaken by an estate agent.

Refurbishment options

- **Modulek** , the company who refurbished Spencers Wood Pavilion, gave the following budget quotation: (17) (18) (34)
 - To refurbish building and reinstatement of gravel carpark - £575,000 plus VAT
 - To demolish and replace with new modular building of equivalent floor area, including demolition of existing building - £4,500 plus VAT per m2 (circa £1M plus VAT)
- **MJT Group** – A detailed quote was received with the following summary (19) (35).

Building Alterations & General Refurbishment	£35,230.83
Kitchen Refurbishment	£11,405.41
Window/Ext Door Replacement Inclgd. Security Shutters	£43,230.00
Floor Finishes	£26,493.51
Services	£58,550.88
External Works with mesh carpark	£133,355.00 (Includes Mesh Car Park – Cost: £75,231.50)
Contractors Preliminaries	£9,000.00
Contingency Sum	£10,000.00
Cost Plan Total Excluding VAT	£327,265.60

Alternative options for carpark (41)

Option 1 – Stabilised Gravel Grid (Mesh) system – Estimated Cost: £29,500.00 (excl. VAT) - MJT recommended option

Option 2 – Non-mesh Loose Gravel Finish – Estimated Cost: £21,500.00 (excl. VAT)

- **Karl Eastman-Bye** (Chair, Shinfield Rangers FC) was contacted and asked to provide additional quotes for refurbishment no reply was received. (20)
- **Silverline** Refurbishments were contacted to provide quotes, no reply was received, (21)

BW REED & Son Ltd attended a site visit on 1st May, 2026 with various contractors including, electrician, plumber and grounds man and will be submitting a detailed quote with the option of a gravel carpark.

Russell Gulley – local resident (39)

An interest was expressed to either buy the building or lease 'as is' and undertake the refurbishment works.

- Terms: A lease term of 10-15 years, with appropriate agreed break clauses.
- Refurbishment period: Assuming no planning consents are required there would be an estimated 12-18 month refurbishment period.
- Funding: Privately funded with a council contribution, potentially in the form of a reduced or rent free period.
- Scope of refurbishment: Broadly along the lines of the current brief.
- Cost estimate: Refurbishment of building and car park estimated at £175,000 - £225,000

Recommendations from the Working Party

1. Additional time should be given to receive quote from BW REED & Sons Ltd.
2. Recommended Gravel Grid (mesh) car park option. This would reduce the cost of car park refurbishment by approximately £45,000.
3. Governments grants should be researched.
4. Access for maintenance and emergency services to pitches must be kept in situ, as there is no other access point via the Sports Hub.
5. Consideration should be given to the timing of any refurbishment and future increase in costs.

Demolish and Site Clearance

MJT – Quote received for £51,850 + VAT ⁽³⁶⁾

John Stacey – Quote received for £49,036 + VAT ⁽³⁷⁾

J Mould – Quote received for £13,210 + VAT ⁽³⁸⁾

Recommendations from the Working Party

1. Additional cost of disconnection of services should be taken into account as not included in above quotes.
2. Cost of repurposing and ongoing maintenance of cleared site, without any generated income, should be considered.

Focus group

A focus group was held on 16th Sept, 2025. This consisted of two members of Shinfield Rangers FC, a member of the local community, a member of Shinfield Volunteers Group and two members of the Working Party.

- A proposal was put forward for a café that united the community using local produce from allotments to create a vibrant inclusive meeting place that supports local businesses, charities and initiatives. (22)
- A Summary of Ryeish Green Pavilion Community Feedback was presented with detailed observations and suggestions from the community and highlighted commercial considerations. (23)
- Comments from local FaceBook book groups were discussed. (24)

Recommendations from the Working Party

The Council considers the views and feedback of the local community when making a decision about the future of Ryeish Pavilion.

Interested Parties

- Flexx Gymnastics submitted a proposal on 17th July 2025. After initial discussions Flexx Gymnastics concluded they could not consider a joint venture as they would be unable to raise funding from British Gymnastics. They remain interested in possibly leasing a renovated building or purchasing the building outright if the price was affordable. ⁽²⁵⁾ ⁽²⁶⁾
- Berkshire Scouts were contacted on 15th January, 2026 to see if they could use the building, but neither of the relevant districts were looking to expand their property portfolio. ⁽²⁷⁾
- Dan Pitt, a local resident, expressed an interest in leasing Ryeish Pavilion 'as is' as storage and work place for a garden maintenance business and equipment. This would require an enlarged door of garage size to be fitted, and lighting, power and water, otherwise no refurbishment would be required. The proposed rental would be £300-350pm. ⁽²⁸⁾

Recommendation from the Working Party

The Council continues to follow up on all enquiries by interested parties, update active interested parties as the Council moves towards making a decision, and continues reaching out to groups that may be interested in utilising the building if it were to be refurbished.

Miscellaneous

Security

- Lantec security advised that steel doors should be fitted at a cost of £500-£600, a wireless intruder alarm with a motion activated camera be installed and monitored at a cost of £2270.47 p.a. ⁽²⁹⁾ ⁽³⁰⁾
- Cardinus Risk management advised that the reinstatement value of Ryeish Pavilion is £573,400.00 ⁽³¹⁾

Recommendations from the Working Party

Installation of steel doors to prevent further vandalism and exposure to the elements from currently damaged doors. To consider the intruder alarm system as recommended by Lantec Security Ltd. A solar panel CCTV camera is being installed.

Pros & Cons - summary

LOVE IT

Pros:

- Supports strong community view
- Council would retain community asset including land
- Provision of a community service facility
- Council would retain control of use and access rights
- Council would receive an income from lease of building
- Emergency access to pitches and for maintenance purposes would be maintained
- Possibility of allowing Spencer's Wood FC to continue using parking facility

Cons:

- Additional maintenance may be required depending on scope of any lease
- Possibility of unleased periods
- Potential need for improved security features
- No lump sum for capital investment

LIST IT

Pros:

- One off lump sum for capital investment
- No maintenance responsibility
- Could provide a community service or community focused business with potential for local employment

Cons:

- If property is sold consideration should be given to potential loss of emergency and maintenance access to pitches
- There is no alternative access to pitches from the Sports Hub, how would this affect the proposed lease arrangement with WBC?
- Loss of control of use
- Potential backlash and loss of trust from community
- Irretrievable loss of a valuable commodity/asset and land
- Potential disruption to active travel route with increased traffic
- Spencer's Wood Football Club would lose parking facility at weekends
- Loss of control as to scope of any refurbishment and protection of environment and appearance

LOSE IT

Pros:

- Retain land asset
- Could provide an open space or repurpose for community use
- Council would retain control of use and access rights
- Less traffic (cars) on active travel route
- Emergency access to pitches and for maintenance purposes would be maintained

Cons:

- Goes against community views, loss of trust with community
- Loss of building for community use
- Future planning permission unlikely due to DEPZ
- No lump sum for capital investment
- Ongoing maintenance without an lease/rental income

Summary of recommendations

Community Survey

1. The views of the community, which strongly support that Ryeish Pavilion is refurbished and put back into community use, should be taken into consideration when the Council comes to making its decision.
2. The community should be informed of the full results of the survey which should be published prominently on the SPC website, and the SPC FaceBook page.
3. It was decided at the time not to include a question on the survey relating to how much the community would consider a reasonable amount to invest in a refurbishment, as up to date figures were not available at the time. The Council may wish to further engage with the community when more information regarding this is available.

Marketing Options for Listing/Leasing

1. Should the council decide to sell or lease the building AH Lansley Ltd should be considered primarily as they expressed the most interest in being instructed to do so, at a competitive rate.
2. If the council decides to lease a refurbished building the recommendation is that this should be undertaken by an estate agent.

Refurbishment Options

1. Additional time should be given to receive quote from BW REED & Sons Ltd.
2. Recommended Gravel Grid (mesh) car park option. This would reduce the cost of car park refurbishment by approximately £45,000.
3. Governments grants should be researched.
4. Access for maintenance and emergency services to pitches must be kept in situ, as there is no other access point via the Sports Hub.
5. Consideration should be given to the timing of any refurbishment and future increase in costs.

Demolish & Repurpose

1. Additional cost of disconnection of services should be taken into account as not included in above quotes.
2. Cost of repurposing and ongoing maintenance of cleared site, without any generated income, should be considered.

Focus Group

The Council considers the views and feedback of the local community when making a decision about the future of Ryeish Pavilion.

Interested Parties

The Council continues to follow up on all enquiries by interested parties, update active interested parties as the Council moves towards making a decision, and continues reaching out to groups that may be interested in utilising the building.

Miscellaneous

1. Installation of steel doors to prevent further vandalism and exposure to the elements from currently damaged doors.
2. To consider the intruder alarm system as recommended by Lantec Security Ltd.

Working Party recommendation for the future of Ryeish Pavilion

Taking into consideration the evidenced based research complied by the Ryeish Pavilion working party, the conclusion of the working party and recommendation is that the council refurbishes Ryeish Pavilion with a view to leasing the building to a community focused business. The following conclusions are given:

- **The strong views of the community would be supported, ensuring trust that the council values and listens to community views.**
- **Access to the pitches for maintenance and emergency services would be guaranteed.**
- **The council would control of the use of the building, and would take into consideration the use of the access route which is also a local active travel route.**
- **The council would control the appearance of the building and protection of surrounding environment.**
- **A community asset (building & land) would be retained.**
- **An income would be generated from the lease of the building.**
- **A community service would be provided in the local area.**

References

1. Listing on kemptoncarrcroft.co.uk
2. SPC Full Council Minutes, 25th October 2025 (part II)
3. SPC 2023/2024 Nominal Ledger by Account – Cost Centre 202 - Ryeish Pavilion and Pitches
4. Cost Plan 1 - HBDS
5. Cost Plan 2 – HBDS
6. SPC Facilities Committee Minutes 2nd July 2025
7. Terms of Reference – Ryeish Pavilion Working Party
8. SPC Facilities Committee Minutes 7th January 2025
9. Microsoft Survey response Overview
10. Microsoft Survey Excel Spreadsheet
11. Copies of surveys collected face to face
12. Email dated 9th September, 2025
13. Email dated 19th November, 2025
14. Email dated 21st November, 2025
15. Email dated 16th January, 2025
16. Email dated 22nd January, 2025
17. Email dated 12th November, 2025
18. Email dated 27th January, 2025

19. Email dated 20th January, 2025
20. Email dated 2nd February, 2025
21. Email dated 16th January, 2025
22. Proposal for the Hideout
23. Summary of Ryeish Green Pavilion Community Feedback
24. FaceBook comments
25. Flexx Business Development Proposal
26. Email 14th September
27. Email dated 22nd January, 2026
28. Email dated 2nd February, 2026
29. Quote from Lantec Security Ltd
30. Facilities Committee Meeting minutes 26th November. 2025
31. Reinstatement Cost Assessment Cardinus Risk Management
32. Facilities Committee Meeting minutes 4th March 2026.
33. Email dated 28th April, 2026
34. Email dated 13th March, 2026
35. Refurbishment quote MJT
36. Demolition quote from MJT
37. Demolition quote from John Stacey

- 38. Demolition Quote from J Mould
- 39. Proposal from Russell Gulley
- 40. Floor plan and brief
- 41. MJT – additional quotes for gravel car park
- 42. Surveyor drawings and elevations

Irrigating High Copse

Borehole-fed watering for the football pitches and cricket square — system research and options

1. Purpose and background

Following the discussion with Bruce and Sally on Tuesday 26 May 2026, the borehole at High Copse, Shinfield can in principle be used for irrigation. The figure agreed is **20,000 litres (20 cubic metres) of water per day**. This is the threshold below which no Environment Agency abstraction licence is required — in England you may take up to 20 m³/day from a borehole licence-free; above that a licence is needed. The 20,000-litre figure should therefore be read as a cap, not a generous allowance.

The site at High Copse has **two full-size football pitches, with a cricket square of about six lanes set in the middle**. This document sets out the research needed to irrigate that turf using a manually repositioned sprinkler fed by a hose, together with the pump and storage tank required to support it. The minimum target is one football pitch plus the square; covering both pitches fully is constrained by the daily water cap (see below).

The aim is to give you **two to three workable options for each part of the system** — sprinkler, pump and tank — with enough specification detail to approach suppliers for firm quotes.

2. What the turf needs vs. what the borehole can give

A full-size FA football pitch is 105 m × 68 m, about **7,140 m²**, so the two pitches together are roughly **14,280 m²**. The six-lane cricket square in the middle is in the order of 20 m × 27 m (~550 m²). Applying 1 mm of water across one pitch takes 7.14 m³ (7,140 litres). On a hot summer day a pitch loses roughly 3 mm of moisture, so one pitch needs about **21 m³ per day** in peak conditions — around **42 m³/day for both** — and a good weekly soak of 21 mm is about 150 m³ per pitch (~300 m³/week for the two).

Parameter	Figure
Site at High Copse	Two full-size football pitches, with a ~6-lane cricket square in the middle
One full-size football pitch	105 m × 68 m = 7,140 m ² (FA standard)
Both football pitches	~14,280 m ² total
Cricket square (~6 lanes)	~20 m × 27 m ≈ 550 m ²
Water to apply 1 mm depth (one pitch)	7.14 m ³ (7,140 litres)
Peak summer loss (~3 mm/day)	~21 m ³ /day per pitch → ~42 m ³ /day for both
Good weekly soak (21 mm)	~150 m ³ per pitch → ~300 m ³ /week for both
Cricket square (21 mm application)	~11–12 m ³ per application
Borehole abstraction allowance	20,000 litres = 20 m ³ /day (the licence-free limit)

What 20 m ³ /day covers	~2.8 mm/day over one pitch, or ~1.4 mm/day spread over both
------------------------------------	---

Key point — the 20 m³/day cap is the binding constraint. Twenty cubic metres a day is roughly **2.8 mm/day across one pitch**, which is just under what a single pitch loses on a hot day (~3 mm). Spread across both pitches it is only about 1.4 mm/day — well below demand. Over a dry week the borehole can supply about 140 m³ in total, close to **one pitch's** weekly need (~150 m³) and only about half of what both pitches plus the square would want (~310 m³). In short, the licence-free borehole is broadly enough to **keep one pitch and the square in good condition**, or to hold all the turf at a deficit, but **not enough to fully irrigate both pitches** through a prolonged dry spell.

A storage tank helps with timing, not totals. A buffer tank lets you collect the day's 20 m³ and apply it efficiently overnight, but it cannot raise the weekly total above what the cap allows.

3. Options for living within (or beyond) the cap

There is a genuine decision for the Council here:

- **Stay licence-free at 20 m³/day and prioritise.** Maintain one pitch and the square to a good standard, or apply “deficit” / spot watering across both pitches — targeting the highest-wear areas (goalmouths, centre circles and the cricket square) rather than trying to soak everything.
- **Apply for an abstraction licence.** If watering both pitches fully is the goal, the Council can apply to the Environment Agency to abstract more than 20 m³/day. Note that for groundwater this also involves a “consent to investigate” step, and that installing a larger pump can itself trigger that requirement — worth raising with the EA's pre-application advice service early.
- **Supplement the borehole.** Rainwater harvested from roofs (e.g. a pavilion or clubhouse) is exempt from abstraction licensing and can be stored to stretch the supply, reducing reliance on the 20 m³ cap in dry weather.

4. Sprinkler options (manual move)

All three options below are manually repositioned — no automatic travelling carriage or reel. The trade-off is consistent: a **bigger gun covers the pitch in fewer moves but needs a bigger pump and higher pressure**; a **set of smaller sprinklers is gentler and more even but means more moves and more kit to carry**. Rainguns are part- and full-circle, so you can water a half-circle from a pitch edge and a full circle from open areas. Note that, given the 20 m³/day cap, the choice is less about raw output and more about applying a limited volume evenly where it is most needed.

	Option 1 Large raingun	Option 2 Mid-size raingun	Option 3 Impact sprinkler set
Type	Single high-output gun on wheeled sledge/trolley	Single medium gun on tripod or sledge	Line of 5–10 impact sprinklers on tripods
Throw radius	28–50 m	~25–35 m	8–15 m each
Flow rate	15–60 m ³ /h	10–25 m ³ /h	~0.5–1.5 m ³ /h each

			(3–12 m ³ /h total)
Pressure	4–7 bar	3.5–5 bar	2.5–4 bar
Manual moves per pitch	~2–4 positions	~4–6 positions	~11 strip moves
Pump demand	High (large pump)	Medium	Low–medium
Best suited to	Fast football-pitch coverage; fewest moves	Balance of speed, gentler droplets	Most even coverage; gentlest — kindest to the cricket square
Indicative kit cost (ex VAT, sprinkler element)	Gun + sledge + hose: ~£1,500–£4,000	Gun + tripod + hose: ~£900–£2,500	Set package from ~£3,000

A representative large raingun (e.g. the Yuzuak JET50 class, widely sold through UK irrigation suppliers) throws 28–50 m, uses 14.8–61.2 m³/h depending on nozzle (14–24 mm), runs at 3–7 bar and has a 2" inlet. This is the benchmark to quote against for Option 1. Mid-size guns (Option 2) sit around 25–35 m radius at 10–25 m³/h and 3.5–5 bar.

Recommendation on approach

Because the borehole is capped at 20 m³/day, the realistic plan is to **keep one pitch and the square in good condition**, and to spot-water the second pitch's high-wear areas, rather than fully soaking both. The right kit is whatever applies that daily 20 m³ most evenly and with least effort.

- **For the football pitches:** a single mid-size raingun (Option 2) is the most practical — moved between a few marked positions to put the day's water down overnight. A large gun (Option 1) empties the daily volume faster but offers little advantage when the volume itself is the limit; a smaller gun is gentler and cheaper to run.
- **For the cricket square:** a heavy raingun is aggressive for a fine six-lane square. Either run the gun on a smaller nozzle / lower pressure, or use Option 3 (impact sprinklers) for the square specifically, which gives finer, more even application. Many grounds keep a raingun for the pitches and a small sprinkler set for the square.

5. Pump

The pump must deliver the chosen sprinkler's flow at its required pressure, plus an allowance for friction losses along the hose and any rise from the tank to the pitch. As a rule of thumb add roughly 1–1.5 bar over the nozzle pressure. With only 20 m³ to apply per day, a **mid-size or modest pump is sufficient** — there is no need for the largest sets.

- **For a mid-size gun (Option 2 — likely choice):** ~15–25 m³/h at 5–6 bar — a single-phase or small three-phase electric booster, or a petrol/diesel pump.
- **For an impact sprinkler set (Option 3):** ~5–12 m³/h at 4–5 bar — a modest booster pump.
- **For a large raingun (Option 1):** ~30–60 m³/h at 6–7 bar — only worth it if a future licence raises the daily volume.

Borehole note: confirm the borehole's own yield and whether the borehole pump feeds the buffer tank, with a separate irrigation pump drawing from the tank to the sprinkler (the usual and most reliable arrangement). Installing a larger borehole pump that abstracts more groundwater can itself require Environment Agency consent — keep within the 20 m³/day basis unless a licence is being pursued. Where the system could connect to anything mains-fed, a Category 5 backflow protection (air gap / tank break) is normally required.

6. Storage tank

The tank is a **buffer** that decouples a slow, steady borehole draw from a quicker overnight application — it does not add to the daily total. Since the cap is 20 m³/day, a **single 25,000 litre (25 m³) tank** comfortably holds a full day's water and is the sensible size; there is no need for the larger 45–50 m³ buffers that fully watering both pitches would otherwise imply.

- Indicative: Enduramaxx 25,000 L vertical tank, UK-made, ~2.7 m diameter × 4.65 m high, around £3,426 + VAT.
- A second tank only becomes worthwhile if you add rainwater harvesting or later obtain a licence for more water.
- Choose a non-potable / rainwater-harvesting grade for irrigation (cheaper than WRAS potable grade).
- How quickly the tank refills depends on the borehole's yield — worth confirming so the daily 20 m³ can be captured.

7. Indicative whole-system budget

For context only — to be confirmed by quotes. UK supplier Access Irrigation lists complete manual/strip systems from around £3,000 + VAT (sprinklers only, no pump). A manual raingun system with a modest pump and a 25 m³ tank sized to the 20 m³/day cap is likely to land in the **region of £5,000–£9,000 + VAT** depending on the gun, pump and pipework — less than the larger automated travelling/reel systems (roughly £7,000–£16,000 + VAT) because the daily volume, and therefore the pump and tank, are smaller. Any move to license more water, or to add rainwater harvesting, would be additional.

8. Suppliers to approach for quotes

Local contractors (Berkshire / Reading area)

These are the closest firms and the best first calls — most cover the whole system (sprinkler, pump, tank, borehole) and can visit the site. **White Horse Contractors** stand out, having already worked at Shinfield Cricket Club.

Contractor & location	What they cover / contact	Website
White Horse Contractors — Enborne, Newbury, Berkshire	Natural sports-turf construction plus water engineering (drainage & irrigation). Have worked at Shinfield Cricket Club with the council and University of Reading. Tel 01865 736272 · whc@whitehorsecontractors.co.uk	whitehorsecontractors.co.uk

SCS Landscape Management / Big Green Gardens — Reading / Wokingham	Reading-based; sports turf and irrigation system supply and install. Tel 0118 977 2186.	scslandscapes.co.uk
Turners Irrigation Services — covers Berkshire	Installs irrigation systems, boreholes, pumps and tanks across Berkshire and neighbouring counties.	turnersirrigation.co.uk
Borehole Service Utilities Ltd — covers Berkshire	Borehole construction combined with garden and sports-grounds irrigation design and install.	boreholeservice.co.uk
AquaDrill — Newbury, Berkshire	Family-run borehole drilling and pump supply/replacement, including wells for irrigation. Useful for confirming borehole yield.	aquadrill.co.uk

Wider UK suppliers

National specialists and component suppliers worth approaching for comparison and for specific parts (rainguns, pumps, tanks).

Supplier	What they cover	Website
Access Irrigation (Rugby)	Sports pitch sprinkler & strip-watering packages, rainguns, pumps, tanks. Quote a complete one-pitch system.	access-irrigation.co.uk
MJ Abbott (Salisbury)	Major sports-turf irrigation specialist — design, install and maintain for sports and landscape. Tel 01722 716361.	mjabbott.co.uk
Fineturf	Sports-pitch construction and irrigation contractor — football/rugby pitches, cricket squares and outfields.	fine-turf.co.uk
Briggs Irrigation	Rainguns, hose-reels and turf irrigation; strong on larger sports-turf and grounds kit.	briggsirrigation.co.uk
Irrigation UK	Water storage tanks (Enduramaxx), pumps and irrigation components.	irrigationuk.com
Whisper Pumps	Irrigation and booster pumps for agriculture and groundcare.	whisperpumps.com
Enduramaxx	UK-manufactured water storage tanks (5,000–30,000 L+).	enduramaxx.co.uk

9. What to ask suppliers when you request quotes

1. **Borehole yield:** what flow (m^3/h) can the borehole sustainably deliver, and can it comfortably supply $20 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$ within the licence-free limit?
2. **Scope:** a system sized to the $20 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$ cap — enough to keep one pitch and the six-lane cricket square in good condition, with spot-watering of the second pitch's high-wear areas.
3. **Sprinkler:** part- and full-circle raingun(s) that apply the daily volume evenly across a $105 \times 68 \text{ m}$ pitch in a few sensible moves; quote nozzle options, radius, flow and pressure.
4. **Pump:** matched to the gun's flow and pressure plus friction allowance; modest sizing is fine for $20 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$; electric (state available supply — single/three-phase) or engine-driven.
5. **Tank:** a $\sim 25 \text{ m}^3$ buffer to hold a full day's water; non-potable grade; delivery and siting.
6. **Hose and fittings:** layflat or reinforced hose rated for the pressure, quick-couplers, and a hose trolley for handling.
7. **Cricket square:** a gentle, even option for the six-lane square — either low-pressure nozzle settings on the gun or a small impact-sprinkler set.
8. **Licensing & compliance:** confirm the design stays within $20 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}$ (licence-free), advise on what a licence for more water would involve, and include Category 5 backflow protection if relevant.
9. **Future-proofing:** could the system scale up later if a licence or rainwater harvesting added more water?
10. **Total installed price:** supply-only vs supply-and-install, including any underground pipe from the pump to pitch-side.

10. Sources

- [GOV.UK / Environment Agency — Check if you need a licence to abstract water \(\$20 \text{ m}^3/\text{day}\$ exemption\)](#)
- [Access Irrigation — Watering a Football Pitch \(volumes, manual/strip & travelling systems, costs\)](#)
- [Access Irrigation — Football / Rugby pitch irrigation guide \(PDF\)](#)
- [Weis Engineering — JET50 raingun specification \(radius, flow, pressure, nozzles\)](#)
- [Whisper Pumps — irrigation & booster pumps \(UK\)](#)
- [Enduramaxx — 25,000 L water storage tank \(UK, pricing\)](#)
- [Briggs Irrigation — rainguns and hose-reels \(UK\)](#)

Note: figures for sprinkler radius, flow, pressure and prices are indicative ranges drawn from manufacturer and UK supplier data to inform quote requests; exact specifications and current prices should be confirmed with each supplier.

Bin Review and Resident Consultation

Project and Engagement Plan

Prepared by: Brett Johnson, Facilities Chairman

Date: May 2026

Status: Draft for Facilities Committee discussion

1. Purpose and background

Shinfield Parish Council owns 46 waste bins across the parish. Emptying them costs approximately £500 per bin per year, an annual run cost of around £22,000, and a new bin costs approximately £400. At its meeting on 6 May 2026 (item 62.1, Waste bins within the Parish), the Facilities Committee considered a paper from Francesca setting out this operating context and agreed a clear course of action.

Wokingham Borough Council has indicated that, during this financial year, it intends to remove its own bins where a parish or town council bin is provided nearby. The committee agreed that the Parish should pre-empt that exercise by carrying out its own audit and rationalisation. Several bins, particularly around the recreation ground (bins 17 and 18 were noted), are oversupplied and could be relocated to underserved areas without increasing the overall run cost. Coverage gaps were noted north of the M4 and around the new developments at Hayes Drive, Borsche Drive and Older Grove.

The committee asked for an accurate, colour-coded map covering Parish, Wokingham Borough Council and University of Reading bins across the parish, to be produced for the next meeting on 3 June 2026. Two related actions were also agreed: investigating the retrofitting of pigeon flap covers to existing bins (used to good effect on the Deardon bin to prevent wind-blown spillage and odour), and pricing anti-fly tipping prosecution warning stickers for all bins. Persistent fly tipping around the textile bins at School Green was noted as context.

On engagement, the committee discussed whether to consult the public, and the agreed position shapes this plan. An open question asking residents where bins should go would generate an unmanageable list and could imply new spending the Parish does not intend. The framing must instead be constrained: residents are told that a set number of bins are available to relocate, and asked where those relocations would deliver the most benefit. This involves the community and shows that the Parish is listening, while preserving cost neutrality.

2. Objectives

The review and consultation are intended to achieve the following:

1. Establish an accurate, single record of every bin the Parish owns (currently 46) and where it is located.
2. Produce a colour-coded map showing Parish, Wokingham Borough Council and University of Reading bins together, to identify duplication and coverage gaps.
3. Pre-empt Wokingham Borough Council's planned removal of its bins by completing the Parish's own audit and rationalisation first.
4. Identify where oversupplied bins can be relocated to underserved areas, such as north of the M4 and the new developments, while keeping the overall run cost neutral.
5. Capture residents' and councillors' knowledge of litter and dog fouling hot spots, to target low-cost action such as flap covers, warning stickers, or more frequent emptying.
6. Demonstrate visible, transparent engagement and close the loop by reporting back what we heard and what we did.

3. Scope

In scope: all litter, dog waste, and combined bins owned by Shinfield Parish Council across the whole parish, the relationship of those bins to borough council provision, and resident and councillor views on litter and bin adequacy.

Out of scope: household waste and recycling collection (a borough council service), commercial waste, and fly tipping enforcement, except where residents raise these so that we can refer them to the right authority. The consultation gathers views and evidence; decisions on specific bins remain with the Facilities Committee and full council.

4. Approach: three strands

The work runs as three complementary strands feeding a single evidence base.

Strand A: Factual bin audit and map

A definitive inventory of the 46 council owned bins, drawing on operational records held by officers, logging each bin's location, type, condition, and emptying schedule. Wokingham Borough Council and University of Reading bin locations are obtained so all three can be shown on a single colour coded map, as requested by the committee for the 3 June 2026 meeting. The map identifies duplication (where a Parish and a borough bin sit close together) and the coverage gaps already flagged north of the M4 and around the new developments.

Strand B: Councillor and staff input

Councillors and staff are asked for structured feedback on bins in the areas they live in or pass regularly, using a short template so responses come back in a consistent and easily collated form. Their local knowledge helps confirm which bins are genuinely underused and which areas are underserved.

Strand C: Resident consultation survey

A parish wide survey open to all residents, run online with a paper option for accessibility. In line with the committee's agreed position, the survey is framed around the fixed stock of bins: it explains that bins can be relocated rather than added, and asks where relocations and low cost litter action would help most. This involves residents directly, as suggested, while keeping the exercise cost neutral.

5. The resident consultation survey

Design principles

The survey leads with the constraint the committee set: the Parish has a fixed stock of 46 bins, the aim is to put them in the right places at no extra cost, and so the question is where to relocate, not where to add. It is short enough to complete in a few minutes, written in plain language, and structured so that free text comments can still be tied back to a location. It is anonymous by default. Residents are asked which part of the parish they are commenting on rather than for a full address, and any contact details are optional and collected only from those who want to hear the outcome.

Channels

- Online form, promoted as the primary route, accessible on a phone or computer.
- Paper copies available at key locations such as the parish office, library, and community venues, with a freepost or drop box return for residents who are not online.
- Promotion through the parish website, the community Facebook group, parish noticeboards, local schools and groups, and the monthly facilities update.

Accessibility and inclusivity

Offering both online and paper routes, using plain language, and promoting through several channels helps reach residents of all ages and circumstances. Paper responses are entered into the same record as online ones so that no group is under represented in the analysis.

Data protection

The survey is designed to need little or no personal data. Where a resident chooses to leave an email address for follow up, it is stored securely, used only for that purpose, and handled in line with the council's privacy notice and data protection obligations. A short privacy statement appears at the start of the survey.

Indicative survey questions

The following draft questions are for discussion, and open with a short explanation that the Parish has 46 bins and is rationalising their placement at no extra cost. The list of localities should be confirmed before launch.

- Q1. Which part of the parish are you commenting on? (Shinfield, Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross, Ryeish Green, Grazeley, other, please specify.)
- Q2. Are there places where litter collects and a relocated bin would help? Please tell us where, as specifically as you can.
- Q3. Are there bins near you that you rarely see used, and that could be moved somewhere busier? Where?
- Q4. Are there bins that regularly overflow or are not emptied often enough? Where?
- Q5. Are there litter or dog fouling hot spots that would benefit from action such as a relocated bin, a flap cover, a warning sticker, or more frequent emptying?
- Q6. Overall, how satisfied are you with bin provision in your area? (Very satisfied to very dissatisfied.)
- Q7. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about bins or litter in the parish?
- Q8. Optional: if you would like to hear the outcome of this review, please leave an email address.

6. Governance and approvals

The plan is brought to the Facilities Committee for endorsement before launch. Content and communications are approved by the communications lead, and any use of council channels or equipment is signed off by the Clerk. All published material stays factual and politically neutral, grounded in the review's purpose rather than any party position.

7. Roles and responsibilities

Role	Responsibility
Facilities Chairman (Brett Johnson)	Overall lead: plan, survey design, analysis, and reporting to committee.
Bin placement review lead	Provides the existing placement review and helps build the factual inventory.
Finance and operations officers	Supply operational records on bins and emptying, and coordinate on cost implications.
Communications lead	Approves and publishes survey promotion across council channels.
Clerk / Chief Executive	Signs off use of council channels and equipment and broader council process.
Wokingham Borough Council contact	Provides borough bin locations and emptying arrangements for comparison.

8. Indicative timeline

Timings are indicative and anchored to the monthly Facilities Committee meeting. They are subject to committee endorsement.

Phase	Focus	Indicative timing
Phase 0	Build the bin inventory and colour coded map (Parish, WBC, University); present to committee and confirm which bins are available to relocate.	Late May to 3 June 2026
Phase 1	Councillor and staff input; confirm relocation candidates and coverage gaps; scope flap covers and warning stickers.	June 2026
Phase 2	Run the constrained resident consultation; promote across all channels; keep open about four weeks.	July 2026
Phase 3	Close survey; collate online and paper responses; finalise relocation and litter action proposals.	Early August 2026
Phase 4	Report to committee; agree relocations and actions, delivered within the existing run cost.	September 2026
Phase 5	Implement agreed actions; report back to residents on what we heard and did.	Autumn 2026

9. Handling and analysis of responses

All responses, from residents, councillors, and staff, are logged in a single working spreadsheet so that they can be sorted, counted, and tied to specific locations. Litter severity and the type of action requested are scored consistently, and a hot spot summary highlights the locations raising the most concern. This evidence, overlaid on the factual inventory and the borough bin map, is what supports the recommendations to committee.

10. Outputs and decisions

- A confirmed inventory and colour coded map of Parish, WBC and University bins.
- A consultation report summarising what residents and councillors told us, with the hot spots and relocation candidates clearly identified.
- A prioritised, cost neutral action list: bins to relocate, plus low cost litter measures such as flap covers, warning stickers, or revised emptying, with any genuinely justified new bin (about £400 each) flagged separately.
- A short feedback message to residents on the outcome, closing the loop on their input.

11. Resources and budget

The approach is deliberately low cost and built around the existing £22,000 annual run cost for the 46 bins. Relocating bins rather than adding them keeps that run cost flat. The online survey and most promotion use existing council channels at no cost, and video or graphics can be produced in house. The main modest costs are printing paper survey copies and any return arrangement, plus the two low cost measures the committee asked to scope, pigeon flap covers and anti fly tipping warning stickers. Any genuinely new bin, at approximately £400 plus its ongoing £500 per year emptying cost, is treated as a separate, individually justified decision for the committee.

12. Risks and mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
Low response rate	Promote across multiple channels, keep the survey short, allow about four weeks, and offer a paper option.
Online only excludes some residents	Provide paper copies at community venues with an easy return route.
Volume of free text is hard to analyse	Use structured questions and a consistent logging and scoring method in the working spreadsheet.
Duplication or confusion with borough services	Obtain borough bin data early and signpost residents to the right authority for non parish matters.
Raised expectations not met	Be clear that the survey gathers evidence and that decisions rest with committee; close the loop with a you said, we did update.
Data protection	Keep the survey anonymous by default, make contact details optional, and follow the council privacy notice.

13. Measures of success

- A complete and agreed bin inventory mapped against borough provision.
- A meaningful number of resident responses spread across the parish.
- A clear, evidence based action list adopted by committee.
- Visible follow up with residents that demonstrates the council listened and acted.

14. What other councils have done: ideas to draw on

A brief look at how other councils have approached bin reviews offers some useful pointers, several of which are already reflected in this plan.

Consult before removing bins

Our own borough provides the clearest lesson. Wokingham Borough Council's plans to reduce or cover some public bins as a cost saving measure met strong opposition, including a petition of around 1,800 signatures, and were reversed in favour of a public consultation and a task and finish group. The message for us is that involving residents early, exactly as proposed here, builds support and avoids a backlash, particularly wherever any bin might be removed or moved.

Right bin in the right place

Several councils, including Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, have framed their reviews around matching provision to actual use rather than simply adding bins. In practice that can mean relocating or removing little used bins while upsizing or more frequently emptying busy ones. This keeps costs down while improving the places that matter most, and fits our aim of saving money where we can while investing where coverage is genuinely lacking.

Run an open, multi channel consultation

Larger reviews, such as Edinburgh's communal bin review, combined written notice to households, an online survey, and public information sessions over a clearly defined window of around six weeks, gathering well over a thousand comments. At parish scale we can mirror the principles even if not the scale: a clear time window, more than one way to respond, and visible promotion.

Let evidence guide decisions

Some authorities, including Derby and Edinburgh, have fitted fill level sensors to bins to see which overflow and which are barely used, cutting wasted collection trips and showing where an extra or larger bin is justified. Sensors are likely beyond what we need across the whole parish, but the principle of gathering simple evidence of use and overflow is one we can apply through the survey and the audit, and a small trial on a handful of the busiest sites could be considered later if the case is there.

Coordinate with the borough and know the process

Guidance from councils such as South Norfolk and Milton Keynes shows that parish councils can site and maintain bins on public land, but need to follow the borough's process, typically specifying the bin type and the exact location. Obtaining borough bin data early and understanding how to request or register a new bin avoids duplication and keeps any changes straightforward. In many areas bagged dog waste can also be placed in ordinary litter bins, which can reduce the need for separate dog waste bins.

Sources

- Wokingham Borough Council litter bin proposals, public reaction, and review (Wokingham.Today).
- Oadby and Wigston Borough Council bin review to prioritise heavily used areas.
- City of Edinburgh communal bin review: household notice, online survey, and information sessions.
- Derby City Council and City of Edinburgh fill level bin sensor projects.
- Litter and dog bin guidance for parish councils, South Norfolk and Milton Keynes.

Appendix A: supporting materials

Two supporting items have already been prepared and can be issued once the plan is endorsed:

- Councillor and staff feedback request (email and Word versions), with a copy and paste response template.
- A working spreadsheet with a bin inventory baseline, a feedback log matching the survey and template fields, and an automatic hot spot summary.

Note: the locality list in the survey and the exact survey platform should be confirmed with the communications lead and Clerk before launch.

Appendix B: bin operating data

The figures below are taken from Francesca's paper on Parish bins, as recorded at the Facilities Committee on 6 May 2026 (item 62.1, Waste bins within the Parish). They set the operating context for this review.

Measure	Figure	Notes
Parish owned bins	46	Total bins owned and emptied by the Parish
Cost to empty, per bin	£500 per year	Recurring operating cost
Total annual run cost	£22,000	As stated in the paper
Cost of a new bin	approximately £400	One off; excludes the ongoing £500 per year to empty

Arithmetic note: 46 bins at £500 each per year totals £23,000, while the paper records the annual run cost as £22,000. The difference is minor and likely reflects rounding or a small number of bins on a different emptying arrangement, but it is worth confirming the exact figures with Francesca before they are quoted externally.

Related operating context recorded at item 62.1

The following points were recorded at the same agenda item and form the operational backdrop to the data above:

- Wokingham Borough Council intends, during this financial year, to remove its own bins where a parish or town council bin is provided nearby.
- Several bins are oversupplied, particularly around the recreation ground, where bins 17 and 18 were noted, and could be relocated to underserved areas without increasing the run cost.
- Coverage gaps were noted north of the M4 and around the new developments at Hayes Drive, Borsche Drive and Older Grove.
- An accurate, colour coded map of Parish, Wokingham Borough Council and University of Reading bins was requested for the 3 June 2026 meeting.
- Pigeon flap covers have been used to good effect on the Deardon bin to prevent wind blown spillage and odour, and retrofitting to other bins is to be investigated.
- Anti fly tipping prosecution warning stickers are to be priced for application to all bins.
- Persistent fly tipping around the textile bins at School Green was noted as context.

Source: Shinfield Parish Council Facilities Committee, draft minutes of 6 May 2026, item 62.1.

Appendix C: Wokingham Borough Council bin context

Because Wokingham Borough Council's plans directly affect the Parish, the following summarises WBC's recent and current position on litter bins, drawn from council records and local reporting. It explains why the committee's decision to pre-empt WBC by auditing first is well judged.

Recent history (2023)

In 2023 WBC proposed removing some public litter bins and emptying others less often as a cost saving measure, as part of a wider drive reported at the time as seeking savings of around £700,000. An early move to cover some bins in the summer led to others overflowing and to public anger. WBC reversed the move and ran a public consultation, which showed strong opposition, and a petition of around 1,800 signatures was handed to council leaders in September 2023. Councillors then set up a task and finish group to consider alternatives, including whether bin provision could be streamlined, whether businesses could sponsor bins, and how to tackle fly tipping around bins. It was noted that the borough council, town and parish councils, and the council's countryside department all provide bins.

Current position (2025 to 2026)

- WBC has awarded a new waste and street cleansing contract to Biffa, which comes into force on 1 June 2026 and will provide significantly more data, including litter bin fill rates.
- WBC has a proposal to save around £100,000 by reducing the number of litter bins, identified for the second year of its Medium Term Financial Plan, in 2027/2028.
- The proposal was discussed at the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 4 November and is to be finalised through Executive and Full Council in February as part of budget setting.
- WBC describes this as a data led review and states that it has significantly more bins than comparable areas.
- WBC intends to consult stakeholders, including town and parish councils.
- The final determination on removing any bins will be made by the Executive in late 2026, following an Overview and Scrutiny review.
- Separately, WBC's new collection routes under Biffa change household (not litter) collections for about 1,000 properties from 1 June 2026, including several narrow lanes in Shinfield such as Longmore Road, Babbington Road and Oakside Way.

What this means for the Parish

WBC's own timetable runs through 2026, with a data led review feeding a determination late in the year and any savings landing in 2027/2028. By completing our audit and colour coded map first, the Parish can engage WBC's stakeholder consultation from a position of evidence, protect coverage where WBC may withdraw its bins, and request the bin fill data WBC will hold from the Biffa contract. The 2023 episode also offers a clear warning: covering or removing bins without genuine consultation produced overflowing bins, public anger and a reversal. That reinforces the constrained, consultative approach this plan takes.

Sources

- Wokingham Borough Council, response to a member question on the litter bin review (committee record): late 2026 Executive determination, Overview and Scrutiny review, and consultation with town and parish councils.
- Wokingham Borough Council, Waste collection changes 2026, and the new Biffa waste and street cleansing contract from 1 June 2026.
- Wokingham.Today, reporting on the 2023 litter bin proposals, the public consultation, the petition, and the task and finish group.

Appendix D: resident survey (Facebook post and Microsoft Forms questions)

The parish wide survey is promoted on Facebook and gathered through Microsoft Forms. The post text and the full question set are reproduced here for reference and approval. The tone is positive and transparent, including the cost of the service, while making clear the aim is to put bins in the right places at no extra cost.

Facebook post

Where do Shinfield's bins belong? We would love your view.

Shinfield Parish Council is reviewing where our litter bins are across the whole parish, and your local knowledge would really help.

Being open with the numbers: the Parish owns 46 bins, and emptying them costs around £500 each per year, about £22,000 in total. This is not about cutting that service. We want to make sure every bin is in the right place, especially as Wokingham Borough Council looks at its own bins too.

You know your street and your walk to the shops better than anyone. Tell us where litter builds up, where a bin sits unused, and where one would make a real difference. It takes about three minutes, and your answers are anonymous.

Have your say here: [\[paste your Microsoft Forms link\]](#)

Open until [insert closing date]. Please share with your neighbours, the more we hear, the better the result for everyone in Shinfield.

Form introduction (top of the Microsoft Form)

Help us put Shinfield's bins in the right places

Thank you for taking part. Shinfield Parish Council owns 46 litter bins across the parish.

Emptying them costs around £500 per bin each year, about £22,000 in total. This survey is not about cutting that service. As Wokingham Borough Council reviews its own bins, we want to make sure ours are in the places that need them most, at no extra cost to local taxpayers.

This takes about three to four minutes. Your answers are anonymous unless you choose to leave an email at the end. Please be as specific as you can about locations.

Microsoft Forms questions

Notes: only the first two questions are required, so people are not put off finishing. Use branching so a “yes” reveals a follow up box asking where. Question types in brackets map to the options in Microsoft Forms.

Q1. Which part of the parish do you live in, or know best?

Choice, single answer, required

- Shinfield
- Spencers Wood
- Three Mile Cross
- Ryeish Green
- Grazeley
- North of the M4 or a new development (Hayes Drive, Borsche Drive, Older Grove)
- Other (please specify)

Q2. Overall, how would you rate bin provision in your area?

Rating, 1 to 5 stars (1 = poor, 5 = very good), required

Q3. Are there places where litter regularly collects and a bin would help?

Long text, optional. Helper text: please be specific, for example street, junction, park, path, bus stop or landmark.

Q4. Are there bins near you that you rarely see used, and that could be moved somewhere busier?

Long text, optional

Q5. Are there bins that regularly overflow, or that need emptying more often?

Long text, optional

Q6. Is dog fouling a problem in your area?

Choice (Yes / No / Not sure), optional. Branching: if Yes, show a long text box for the location.

Q7. Is fly tipping or dumping a problem near any bins?

Choice (Yes / No / Not sure), optional. Branching: if Yes, show a long text box for the location.

Q8. Which of these would make the biggest difference in your area?

Choice, select up to two, optional

- Moving a bin to a busier spot
- Emptying busy bins more often
- A dog waste bin
- Clearer signage or anti littering stickers
- Covers to stop litter blowing out of bins
- Provision is about right where I am

Q9. Thinking about our parks and recreation grounds, are the bins there adequate?

Choice (Yes / No / Not sure), optional, with an optional comment box for which site and what is needed

Q10. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about bins or litter in the parish?

Long text, optional

Q11. Would you like to hear the outcome of this review?

Choice (Yes / No), optional. Branching: if Yes, show a short text box for an email address, used only to share the result.

Microsoft Forms setup notes

- Keep it anonymous: allow anyone to respond, do not require sign in, and turn off recording names.
- Group questions into sections (Your area, Bins and litter, What would help, Staying in touch) so it feels short on a phone.
- Turn on the progress bar and a thank you message confirming that the council will report back.
- Set the theme colour to the SPC green, use branching for Q6, Q7, Q9 and Q11, and set a closing date that matches the Facebook post.
- Most responses will come from phones via Facebook, so preview on mobile before publishing, and export responses to Excel to line up with the collation tracker.