

Area: Eastern, N & S

| | |
|---|------|
| Households participated | 14 |
| Households declined participation | 12 |
| (Total households approached) | (26) |
| Adults in participating households | 27 |
| Children living in participating households | 2 |
| Visiting children to participating households | 5 |
| Willing trustees | 3.5 |
| Willing managers/organisers | 4.5 |

- (1) Children are taken to be those of an age likely to use a play facility. Visiting children it should be noted vary from once or twice weekly to once or twice pr year in terms of frequency.
- (2) Trustee/manager numbers take into account some levels of declared uncertainty

26 properties contacted, 16 within the village, 10 in the outlying groups within the parish boundary with only 2 of those 10 providing any input. A statistical set of results for the subject properties is provided above. This text attempts to analyse those, and the levels of interest and nature of responses obtained at those same properties. Recommendations are made. When coupled with the other interviewers sets of findings, the report and recommendations will hopefully provide a basis for the PC to take decisions on any specific developments to pursue.

Receptiveness to survey: Generally, there was an initial uncertainty in respect of the need for such a review, even among those people who had attended the initial meeting at the Feathers late 2016. There was however a general acceptance that the community activity had indeed decreased over time, particularly the last 10 years, and that a consideration of how that might be reversed could be of value. The response was no more enthusiastic than that in most cases, significant numbers of respondents being happy with their social arrangements which they have developed both inside and outside of the village.

Most people interviewed initially assumed only the issues of a hall and/or a play facility, and then in both cases wondered where such might be established. Encouragement was given to a concentration purely on the principle of *desirability* of any initiatives. Once this was accepted, most interviews opened up and some initiatives were indeed suggested, along with reservations in respect of any downside impacts.

Hall: Of the 14 participating households, 3 were very positive for a hall with an additional 5 households being interested to attend such events which might prove of interest to them. 4.5 households would be interested to organise ongoing or one off events.

Location (noise issue), parking and increased traffic concerns were raised by 3 households, concern re sewage capacity by 1, and concern re vandalism by 1.

3 households raised high concern in respect of the essential need for a strong working relationship between the Feathers and the management of any hall. Anything other than a working together was seen as potentially damaging for both parties, and could even lead to conflict within the village. (A high proportion of households felt that the Feathers was now less of a *village* institution than it used to be, and would like to see that change.)

Outdoor play facility: 4 households positive for such a facility, with a general view to keeping it simple. The remaining 10 households were not interested in such, seeing the potential for H&S problems, litigation in the event of accidents, vandalism, and potential to attract “undesirables”.

There was some discussion centred on the linking of a play facility indoors of a hall, and of the potential to link in a library or a village walking area. (See “Other potential developments” below)

Other potential developments: The most significant other area of interest (7 of 14 households) was the potential to develop a village library facility. This could be within a hall, or in a separate shed/phone box. The facility could be on an interchange basis, and would constitute a virtually nil financial risk—but there is a question as to whether such would significantly improve community activity.

There was discussion with several households on the potential to resurrect or introduce annual village events—village fair, childrens sports day, firework display, dog show, etc. Also raised were the potential to bring back a government elections voting facility into the village (1 household) a table tennis club (2 households, and a hall would of course be required) a tennis court (1 household) an online car sharing scheme to facilitate travel in and out of the village (3 households) a village woodland walking area (1 household, and could tie in with a play area) development of a village cricket team (1 household, could tie in with walking area?), event for Children in Need (1 household), organised village walks (1 household), and a skill sharing register—online (1 household)

Overview and conclusions of writer: (This is one of five overviews, and should be read in conjunction with the other four overviews.)

Within the households visited by the writer, there is definitely a recognition that the village social activity has reduced over the last decade or so, although this was not a major worry to the majority —and presumably worries none of those who declined to participate. Many people have lived here a long time and have firmly established lifestyles, much of which is now outside of the village. Generally, people are happy to continue with that style, notwithstanding the travel involved. There is no single overriding desire for major change.

The village age profile has changed over the years, there are relatively few children in the village now and in the long term it is likely we will maintain a fairly high average age. Houses will change hands as older residents move out, and potential incomers are likely to be attracted by the generally

pleasant and peaceful ethos of the village coupled with reasonable access to the city. Those incomers are likely in the main to be middle aged/older people.

In order for the village to maintain its attraction—and hence its sustainability?—an element of community activity is presumed to be of value. The overall impression gained is that residents would welcome activities in preference to the development of new facilities to host events.

Recommendations

From the level of responses gained at the subject group of households, and recognising the difficulties of ensuring continuity of statutory manpower effort (as reported by those other village halls with whom we met at start of the process) to such elements as a hall or a play facility, it is not felt that either of those ventures can realistically be developed and maintained. What would be more feasible is to look at rejuvenating village events (as referred earlier) and indeed determining if any new activities could be brought on— to include interest for children. This would demand a working group—separate from the PC--on an ongoing basis, and the sources of that manpower could possibly—although not certainly-- be derived from those who have expressed through the survey a general willingness to become involved in community activity.

The problem with this approach is that residents may well see it as “more talk, no do”, so a positive start would be needed, with any such group being charged to quickly develop something tangible thereby gaining credibility, momentum and support for future proposals. Without ignoring other possibilities, the library concept could be one way to serve the purpose as it can cater for young and old, and should be quick to achieve. A consideration of annual event rejuvenation should also be tabled at an early stage.

The survey will itself have now raised a level of expectation throughout most of the village. There will be some anticipation of advice on the survey findings and some expectation of a level of resultant activity. It will be important to communicate this to all respondents.