

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS BEST KEPT VILLAGE COMPETITION 2015

Little Missenden Parish Council

Holmer Green Village (Pushman Cup)

Date of Inspection: 15 June 2015

JUDGES COMMENTS

Principal features

1A - The grass in the graveyard had been cut, indicating maintenance, but the area was not very neat. There were untidy shrub beds by the church centre and the side and back areas were neglected.

1B - The grass was neatly cut at the sports ground; this is a large area with a range of activities. The large car park contained a lot of litter, as did the footpath to the next field. The green in the centre of the village is a pleasant open space, with a few seats; it is virtually litter free.

1C - The fenced play area in the corner of the green caters for under 12s. There is a good range of well-maintained equipment. A few items for older children are situated outside the fence.

1D - none

1E - The Rossetti Hall housing the parish office is well maintained and adorned by flower baskets. The bin was empty and the area litter free. The Village Centre is well used by all ages and is maintained but not smart. It was not clear to what extent the church centre was used but it looked neglected.

1F - The pond merited 4/5 marks, above the average; it is large, the surrounds well cared for and ducks inhabit it. The condition of other features in this category was variable.

Other features

2A - Mixed attention to tidiness around the shops, some well cared for and others somewhat neglected.

2B - One pub had luxuriant hanging baskets, was well maintained with an attractive garden, devoid of litter. The other had a rather untidy appearance with weeds around the building but with a pretty garden.

2C - Strongly built and generally tidy.

2D - Average although the parish council board was tidy and up to date.

2E - The small conifers in the tubs around the Memorial had dead leaves around. It was a pity that a new 2014 memorial garden (not mentioned in the submission) had been planted all around with red poppies but there were lots of weeds around the new stone in the centre.

2F - A fair spread of activities for all ages.

2G - There was little litter but the appearance of the village was generally tidy.

Possible improvements

The two War Memorials would benefit from some dedicated attention.

The map was quite difficult to follow for people who do not know the village. A list of features would have been helpful.

MARKING SCHEDULE – ALL VILLAGES

NEW MARKING FORMAT for 2015	Possible Marks	Marks Awarded			
		Hyde Heath	Little Missenden	Holmer Green	Little Kingshill
Principle features					
1A. Cemetery, graveyard (separate or attached place of worship)	10	7	8	5	6
1B. Common, green, playing field	10	10	8	7	7
1C. Children's play area	5	4	4	4	3
1D. Nature conservation areas	5	3	4	3	3
1E. Village hall, community centre, church hall	10	9	8	7	8
1F. General environmental features (hedges, verges, ditches, pond, stream, pump)	15	10	14	11	10
Other features					
2A. Areas around shops	5	5	(4)	3	4
2B. Areas around pubs	5	3	4	3	4
2C. Bus shelters	5	3	5	3	3
2D. Notice boards	5	2	4	3	3
2E. War memorial	5	3	(4)	3	2
2F. Community activity / organisations	10	8	8	6	8
2G. Overall appearance (lack of litter, litter bins etc.)	10	8	9	7	8
TOTAL 2015 (2014)	100	75 (84)	84 (84)	65 (82)	69 (75)

Notes:

- a) The whole village will be judged, not solely the specific features identified on the map.
- b) The community will be assessed as seen by the judges on the inspection day.
- c) Absent features will be awarded an average mark taking into account the other features in the category.
- d) Judges take into account that cutting of grass verges outside the settlement is usually the principal authority's responsibility.