

Appendix
Best Kept Village Competition 1961
Judges' Comments

1961

Your judges were Mr.G.W.Reeve,J.P. (Chairman of Thingoe R.D.C.), Lady Marjorie Erskine, Mrs.G.E.Shrewsbury, Mr.S.M.Casson and Mr.J.H.Whitfield and as the competition is for the "best kept" village particular attention was paid to evidence of regular maintenance as opposed to last minute efforts to tidy up a village in time for judging. Marking was stricter than last year and the following notes are in no way a criticism of the general high standard achieved.

Cavendish

The standard attained by this village is exceptional and there was ample evidence that this is maintained throughout the year. The fact that a man is permanently employed in looking after the churchyard, cemetery etc. at parish expense is evidence of the village's great civic pride in their heritage.

Cowlinge

As the markings show the effort made in this village fell below the standards attained by the others.

Lidgate

This is the first time we have visited Lidgate and the churchyard was obviously maintained in first class order as were the verges in front of individual properties. One or two Council house gardens were untidy but the parishioners are to be congratuated on a very worth while effort, as Lidgate is a long straggling village which is much more difficult to keep looking neat and well kept. They fully deserve to go forward into the next round of the county competition.

Great Bradley

The very high standard of last year has been maintained and the Council estate was particularly good. The village centre was clean and tidy but the churchyard grass had been cut some time ago and left. New grass was in fact growing through the old cuttings.

Great Thurlow

Here the churchyard was well kept with evidence of regular maintenance. The appearance of the bus shelter, war memorial etc. was much improved and there was a noticeable absence of litter. The judges have asked the R.C.C. that Gt. Thurlow should go forward into the next round with Lidgate if the competition rules allow this.

Great Wrattling

The good standard we have been led to expect of Gt.Wrattling over the past two years was maintained so far as the main road frontage was concerned, but the judges also look at the side-lanes!

Hawkedon

All the judges remarked on the vast improvement in the appearance of the green, but this was spoiled by the large patches of charred ground in the churchyard in its centre where the grass had been burned. This resulted in loss of marks which could easily have been avoided. This unsightly charring was mentioned in last year's report.

Stoke-By-Clare

There was evidence of litter in several places, a number of verges were untidy, and the lower marking this year is also an indication of the higher all round standard now required in this competition.

Stradishall

⁰⁵ In previous years we commented on litter and the relatively poor appearance of the churchyard where the grass (very long) had been cut very recently and still lay about in heaps. The appearance of the gardens and verges on the Council estate is exceptionally good.

Withersfield

Withersfield's position this year, despite the high standard of churchyard maintenance and their efforts with the greens which are unusually large, is a further reflection of the higher standard of the competition.

Clare Best Kept Village Competition 61

Judging Points	Max Points	Cavendish	Cowlinge	Gt. Bradley	Gt. Thurlow	Gt. Wrattling	Hawkedon	Lidgate	Stoke By Clare	Stradishall	Withersfield
1.The appearance & condition of the Village Centre,Village Green, Ponds,Village Playing Field, Churchyard &/or Cemetery,Bus Shelter,Surrounds of Village Hall, War Memorial, Inns & the Village School.	40	38	20	30	36	25	30	35	30	25	30
2.Condition of Hedges,Fences and walls adjacent to & surrounding buildings & gardens;the cleanliness of verges & streams.	20	18	8	14	18	12	16	18	12	12	16
3.Suitability & orderliness of advertisements & notices.	10	9	3	10	9	9	9	9	9	8	8
4.Tidiness of flower & vegetable gardens, allotments & neat appearance of out houses & sheds.	15	13	7	13	12	9	13	13	9	13	13
5.Bonus marks for the general appearance of the village (noting absence of litter and unsightly refuse dumps).	15	12	Nil	12	12	5	10	13	10	5	10
TOTAL	100	90	38	79	87	60	78	88	70	63	77

Notes:-

- The chances of a Village obtaining a good marking will not be prejudiced by the absence of one or more of the features listed in the above Schedule.
- The Schedule of Marks has been compiled so as to cover every type of Village both large and small. The merits of the architectural character of groups of buildings or individual buildings, or any modern examples of well planned development will not be taken into consideration.
- Special attention is drawn to Item 3 of the Schedule which deals with the appropriate siting and orderliness of advertisements.

1 10 4 3 9 5 2 7 8 6