

SHORNE PARISH SURVEY 2017 – SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The purpose of these notes is to highlight themes identified from the survey. Action will be taken where possible and/or the topics kept under review. Related updates will be provided at appropriate Parish Council meetings.

Distribution: The Survey forms were enclosed in the 2017 Annual Report so were distributed to every household, over 1000 copies. The geographical pattern of responses confirms that forms went to all parts of the Parish.

Responses: There were 40 responses: 3 by e-mail, 2 handed in, and 35 posted to the Parish Clerk.

Source of responses: The Street 4, Manor Field 1, Hayes Terrace 1, Crown Green 1, Mill Hill Lane 1, Shorne Ifield Road 2, A226 2, Lower Shorne 5, Shorne West 2, Hollands Close 4, Warren View 2, Court Lodge 1, Racefield Close 1, Tanyard Hill 4, Woodlands Lane 2, The Ridgeway 4, Pear Tree Lane 3,

Category of responses: 111 Good things, 110 Bad things, 77 Other. There were sometimes several topics per point.

TOPICS IDENTIFIED FROM THE SURVEY:

Quiet/noisy: 10 responses said that the Parish is peaceful and quiet. Six however mentioned particular noise annoyances: Motorbikes (2), Aircraft, rattling vehicle trailers/loads, screeching tyres from sudden vehicle braking, pub with loud music.

Friendliness/neighbours: 12 favourable comments.

Community feeling: 15 favourable comments. There was one unfavourable comment which seemed to relate to a specific disagreement.

Facilities:

- **Doctors Surgery and dispensary:** 10 favourable comments, residents appreciate having good doctors and medical facilities including a dispensary close by.
- **Village Hall and hosted activities:** 14 favourable comments, residents appreciate having the building and the wide range of regular clubs and activities that are available. One adverse comment that there is “Nothing for Young people to take part in within the village or to meet up”. Residents can start up start such a group, there are also a range of Scouting groups that cater for a variety of different age groups.
- **Other specific facilities mentioned:** One favourable comment for each of the sports field, school, preschool, and pubs. One negative comment about the maintenance/condition of the children’s play area in Shorne West – note that is a GBC responsibility.
- **Church and Vicar:** 5 favourable comments.

- **Shops:** 6 favourable comments about the shops. Additional comments from 4 people who would like Post Office Facilities, one cash withdrawal, one a greengrocer and one commented “Limited shopping”.
- **Phone/internet:** 5 comments, one favourable about the telephone boxes, 3 adverse about mobile phone signals and one adverse about poor broadband speeds. These are the responsibility of the service providers.

Environment:

- **Historic aspects:** 5 favourable mentions of the history, historic building and Conservation Areas.
- **Environment outside the Shorne Parish built-up areas:** 24 favourable comments particularly about the lovely countryside, views and open space, availability of walks, the Country Park, nature and wildlife etc. There was one adverse comment about disliked changes in Gravesend.
- **Environment within Shorne Parish built-up areas:** 18 favourable, largely general comments about our environment. Also 20 more specific comments: 6 about overgrown vegetation/verges, where public this is a KCC/GBC responsibility. Two suggestions for improving the appearance of the village and one regretting the wheelie bins (GBC decision). There were two comments about the condition of the plot of land opposite the Rose and Crown – this is privately owned, the Parish Council has contacted the owners and also GBC, and as a result some tidying up had taken place. An important point was made about the annoyance and health consequences of bonfires and wood-burning stoves, a reminder to residents will be made. A bus user raised very valid concerns about abuse of the bus shelters on the A226 which made them unusable. There was a comment wanting a place in the village to hold open air events - it was not clear if this referred to private events or public, in which case Shorne Common has possibilities, with appropriate permission.
- **Horses:** 6 comments that mentioned horses, one regretted no longer seeing them in Green Farm Lane. 5 comments were about increased numbers passing through Shorne Village, and the consequences on traffic flows. 2 mentioned unwelcome deposits on the road surface. There were also comments about rider behaviour - lack of high visibility clothing and use of mobile phones while on horseback.
- **Dog mess:** Concern was expressed about dog mess being left on public footpaths, the need for a bin at Chestnut Green (already provided) and the need to empty such bins more frequently - these last two are GBC responsibilities.
- **Planning and building issues (mostly GBC responsibility/social):** Comments about housing being tenanted, property prices locally versus affordability for residents’ children, disliking the appearance of some replacement properties on Woodlands and Pear Tree Lanes, and the Crematorium built near to houses.

- **Pedestrian safety:** 10 comments about this problem, particularly relating to The Street, and cars being parked on pavements near Shorne School, Coutts Avenue and opposite The See Ho.
- **Footpath condition:** 4 comments about overgrown/locked footpaths, two of these were about Crown Lane which had already been reported to KCC.
- **Transport:** 2 positive comments about wider transport availability and connectivity, but this needed a car/bus journey to access. 6 comments about the bus services, 5 saying it could be better, including public transport for youngsters – that would seem to relate to non-school hours transport. Non-subsidised bus provision is the responsibility of the bus providers and will be based on commercial aspects. There was also a comment about accessing transport for elderly residents such as to and from hospital appointments - there are various voluntary organisations that can help with this.
- **Traffic issues:** Traffic issues (volume, speeding, parking, prevention etc) formed the biggest response topic, with 79 comments many of which had multiple aspects. The Parish Council has been in discussions for some time with Kent County Council to see what can be done to effect improvements, but the topic is far more complicated, and the solutions costlier, than might at first appear. KCC will not provide funding unless there is significant evidence of lack of safety, otherwise funding must come from voluntary donations or the community as a whole. There also has to be full community consultation.
- **Condition of roads and pavements:** 16 comments including 4 where work has now already been done (e.g. the drains on Forge Lane and the kerb at the corner of The Street), and others (e.g. drains on Tanyard Hill) where discussions with KCC have already taken place and remedial work is awaited. These matters are the responsibility of KCC as are weeds. Parish Councillors frequently report identified issues (many potholes and requests for resurfacing) themselves and would also encourage residents to report items direct to KCC at <https://www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/report-a-problem>
- **Street Lighting:** 10 comments, 9 of these about wanting at least some street lighting, but one saying that lack of street lights is good. To have comprehensive street lighting there would need to be a full-scale public consultation, it would have to be a high level of illumination throughout the Parish, and be installed at residents' expense.
- **Flytipping and litter:** 14 comments about this very antisocial problem. Locations particularly mentioned were Shorne-Ifield Road (4 times), the end of Pear Tree Lane, Thong Lane and Claylane Wood. One was greatly in favour of more surveillance cameras. The CCTV warning signs together with the camera images since published appear to have had some deterrent effect. Unfortunately though, getting enough information for a successful prosecution can be difficult – persons involved have to be “caught in the act”, and the vehicles are often unregistered and untaxed. The Parish Council organises group litter picking twice a year and is aware of several very conscientious individuals who regularly pick up litter near their homes, for which all residents are very grateful.

- **Crime:** 10 comments that Shorne has a low level of crime and that residents feel safe. To some extent that may be due to lack of knowledge of crimes that do occur, e.g. The Parish Council has installed CCTV at the Village Hall after repeated instances of vandalism to parked vehicles. One comment asked about using generated images to check vehicle movements when burglaries occur, it is assumed that this referred to the Village Hall CCTV system. This can be checked but we do need to know an approximate date and time and a very good description of what is being looked for.
- **Lower Thames Crossing and other development threats:** 11 comments with various concerns about the proposed Lower Thames Crossing – please be assured that the Parish Council is working very hard to counter and modify the Government’s proposals. One responder asked if Shorne-Ifield road could be closed at Thong Lane – what will be best to do will depend on what the final proposals are for the A2 junction. The Parish Council had already actively opposed the A226 junction, and that has been removed from the plans, and we are strongly opposing any aspect that will cause increased traffic through villages. We will also be involved in discussions about aspects during construction. One comment was also made concerning other potential development threats. Similarly the Parish Council is very active over all development proposals that are in or will impact on Shorne Parish.

Community officials: 4 comments about lack of enforcement for parking and speeding offences, the low likelihood of seeing a police officer on patrol and asking how to contact the Community Officer although there may be misunderstanding about what that role is able to do.

Shorne Parish Council: 16 comments, 6 were grateful for what is done, one of these and one more expressed understanding of the funding constraints. 8 comments (7 from one individual) mostly covered matters that are outside the Parish Council’s remit or connected with a particular community disagreement. Another commenter was keen to strengthen the Speed Watch scheme – the team is composed of volunteers, more of whom are always welcome, see <https://www.communityspeedwatch.co.uk/WIZ-FRONT-GetInvolved-exist-4.php> . There is also a Lorry Watch scheme operating – see <http://www.shornepc.kentparishes.gov.uk/lorry-watch/> .

Susan Lindley
 Shorne Parish Council
 17th July 2018