

**GREATER MANCHESTER DRAMA FEDERATION
3 ACT PLAY FESTIVAL 2016/17**

Society	North Manchester A.O.D.S.
Title	Vicar Of Dibley – Love and Marriage
Author	Richard Curtis and Paul Mayhew-Archer Adapted for the stage by Vanessa Randall
Date & Time	Thursday 23 rd March, 2017.
Venue	Simpson Memorial Hall, Moston.
Contact/host name	David Gordon
Contact on the night	David Gordon
Young actors in cast?	No
Licence available	Yes

Production highlights:

Some excellent characterisations and good ensemble playing with sustained pace.

Enjoyable production with good verbal timing and a super range of costumes which reflected characterisation and the eccentric wedding context.

To think about for the future:

Make sure all actors maintain eye contact with the audience and other actors.

To divide different areas of the stage to represent the church hall and the homes of Geraldine and Frank to minimise long scene changes which disrupt the flow.

The Play:

An amalgam of three scripts first aired on television in 1997/8 as part of series 2, these plays are becoming a popular, if not brave, choice for amateur societies.

Using, and repeatedly returning to four different locations, requires quick changes or the stage to be split into sections where furniture constantly remains, and using lights to raise or lower as scenes change.

As much of the comedy is based on the absurdities, mannerisms, 'look' and 'sound' of the television characters, an audience could arrive with images and memories of the original creations. Thus, how well a cast emulates such, in an audience's view, could be a measure of how well a society's efforts are received and judged. Tricky for a director and casting committee. Do we provide Geraldine, for example, in the likeness and mannerisms of Dawn French or allow actors to bring their own interpretations. If the latter, and too distant from the original, will an audience's enjoyment be lessened? Either way, comedically rich characters must be provided with good comic timing.

Also, the comedy depends on the verbal interplay. Timing must be good. Movement between the comedy, and tragedy of Geraldine's desire for love, Jim's infatuation of her, and Hugo and Alice's 'childish' love must be handled well. The opportunities for farcical humour abound. Just a few challenges then!

THE PRODUCTION

Adjudicator writes and identifies themes, challenges and requirements, etc., and details the requirements and elements of the production in which he was particularly interested.

TECHNICAL

Set and props

A set which shows creativity and innovation and addresses the style of the production. Is well constructed.

Props which are in period, authentic in appearance and placed strategically e.g. furniture.

Using a wide stage and high hall requires many substantial, well supported flats. The stage structure was solid and ran the full width allowing for three differing areas to be used. Two brown bands ran horizontally across the walls.

Stage right, a large table and black, metallic fold-up chairs were originally set to depict the council meeting in the Parish Hall. Behind, black curtains in a single door frame served to allow entry of cast and chairs. However, later, this stage right area was tight for many cast entering during dark scene changes and setting chairs as they negotiated around the table to their places. I will expand in the director notes but perhaps the table and chairs should have been left permanently in place to reduce the time taken for the cast to exit and enter.

Centre stage, you in effect created a box set. We started with a long settee downstage facing the audience, with two large brown 'throws' placed over. A low wooden table was placed in front of the couch. Two tall dining chairs were set on the upstage rear wall but could not fully be seen behind the settee.

On the stage right wall of the 'box' or Geraldine's living room, was a large square box with a red cloth over to hide the structure. A simple cross was set on the red cuboid. At first I thought this was perhaps going to double later as an alter - but not so. I was unsure as to the purpose of this item of furniture. Upstage of such was a pine door.

The stage left wall had a wooden tall cabinet, upon which bottles of alcohol, a decanter and glasses were set. Downstage of such was a computer style desk with a typewriter and cradle phone. A black, modern swivel chair was placed in front of the desk.

On the far left, a narrow drop-leaf table was set against the hall wall, downstage of the box set, and brought out for the vestry jokes. Pictures adorned the walls, including one of Jesus. Perhaps such and a cross needed to be set on the wall near said table to signify the vestry.

For the living room in David's house, covers were removed from the settee which was then placed at an angle facing stage left. Again, this took time.

	<p>For the church, a tall illuminated window was set in front of gold curtains. Although this was one huge flat, it was manoeuvred quickly and skilfully into position.</p> <p>Yes, all scene changes were efficiently completed and as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, there was just too much to do which slowed the pace of the play.</p> <p>I liked the deception of the stage left door flat which masked the downstage end of the stage left sitting room wall, thus allowing a curtain to be in the stage left wall allowing the kissing Hugo and Alice to enter, and then be discovered by Owen and Geraldine as they closed the front door. However sometimes this, or another masking curtain, seemed to be in the way when cast exited through the living room front door.</p> <p>The quiz scene looked good, Alice and David sitting at either end of the Parish Hall table, a scoreboard downstage, and a mixing desk on the red cuboid.</p> <p>All hand-held props, including the radio recording desk, microphone, flowers for the bride, Dubretts lineage book, cardboard box, Alice's pink notebook with flower, record, rag doll and teddy for Hugo were practical, so helping set the context of the scenes.</p> <p>To conclude, a good (but taking a long time to set due to over 20 scene changes) staging which completely captured the feel of the living rooms, vestry and village hall: also providing a spacious playing area for the cast. Well done!!</p>
<p>Lighting and Sound <i>Lighting and sound effects which contribute towards the dramatic potential, etc.</i></p>	<p>Set within house and hall interiors, lighting changes and effects were minimal. However, with many scenes, transitions were always spot on and well timed with the cast. All the cast were well lit with no shadows.</p> <p>Certain stage sections were dimmed as light was tightly focused, for example, on the vestry. Although blackouts just after key joke lines were well timed, especially to end scene 3 of Act 2, you were occasionally a little early: for example, to end scene 7 of Act 2.</p> <p>Sound effects served their purpose and ranged from wedding bells, doorbell and many musical tracks over scene changes. Occasionally music came in a little early (page 14) or near the end of the play, too late (scene 10 of Act 2) and we needed slightly better timing with the cast – on page 20 the wrong track came on during the joke scene.</p>

	<p>There was good synchronisation with the recorded David and with the records playing for Hugo as DJ.</p>
<p>Costumes <i>Costumes which are in of the period, well fitting, colour co-ordinated and enhance characterisation.</i></p>	<p>Costumes help an actor to find their character. Or at least in the final stages of rehearsal, to allow the actor or actress find and determine how they will move and use the clothes to aid their performances.</p> <p>All the costumes gave messages about the character inhabiting them: obviously the black and white clergy shirt and collar for Geraldine. I particularly liked the black cardigan with white crosses for the second episode. To begin, a brightly coloured waistcoat and a large hanging gold cross showed her rebellious nature. Later a white surplice, and for off-duty, a red/purple top.</p> <p>Hugo initially looked plain foolish in his pyjama style trousers, thus helping us to realise his utter misunderstanding of sexy dressing. A white shirt and tank-top (pink and purple diamonds on a green background gave a golfing and upper class feel) and striped socks in two tone shoes gave a weakling type message about his character. Later, I was pleased to see changes of costume to denote different times and locations, thus for scene 7 he had changed to red tie, long brown trousers, and in scene 8, a green rain jacket. The leather jacket for his radio disc-jockey looked foolishly cool. For the second episode, new yellow tie and striped shirt again suggested time lapses.</p> <p>David, as befitting his wealth and position always looked smart and the epitome of a pompous country gentleman of means. A green shiny waistcoat, fawn trousers, tie, brown shoes - later a red golfing type jumper – and in Act 3 a dark-brown jacket.</p> <p>As scripted, Alice wore girly dresses, initially green, with flat shoes. For Act 2, a blue floral dress and bright sky-blue cardigan. The blouse with sleeves drawn up by cords was excellent and garnered much audience amusement.</p> <p>A long, grey coat for Owen accentuated his tall thin frame. I loved his walking boots tied with red string, and long black trousers, a dirty, creased shirt under a brown waistcoat and grey flat cap; all of which suggested a mix of country farmer and bumpkin. Later the red chequered suit for Owen again using his thin frame well.</p> <p>For Jim, you conveyed untidiness: the shirt constantly hanging out of his trousers, and a grey, overlarge jacket. Later in Act 3 a dark blue jacket.</p>

	<p>I loved the jumpers and very large red bow tie for Frank.</p> <p>All of the hen party and wedding costumes added to the eccentricity of the play and characters; thus bringing out even more visual comedy. Excellent teletubby costumes, yellow wedding dress with a pink heart emblazoned with “I love Hugo”, grey long tail suits - making Hugo and David look very smart, correctly so based on their wealth and traditional values – and a hand-written sign pinned to the back of Frank’s suit.</p> <p>For the hen party the pink tutu and pink wavy headband looked funny, as well as the white Biker girl T-shirt.</p> <p>You completely captured the strangeness of the Trotter family: a blue bowler with flower sticking up for Mrs Trotter, accompanied by big round green pearls. Also a long coat for Mary.</p> <p>The costumes for this play were integral to the ‘look’ of the piece, so necessary for this television programme type of play. You pulled out all the stops and created a symphony of colour, contrast and comedic messages which supported the efforts of the cast. Throughout the play, clothing suited each character and fitted the atmosphere and setting of the piece. Costumes were inventive and fun to look at. An excellent contribution to the overall success of the play.</p>
<p>Makeup and hair <i>Make hair and wigs which are in period and appropriate to the production (including size of venue) and assist in developing the character.</i></p>	<p>All the hairstyles were natural and appropriate to the production and characterisation. Make-up was natural and befitted each character. I especially enjoyed seeing Geraldine’s black wig change to blonde. Alice’s hair/wig was shaped to suit the original television creation and this helped the ‘look’ of this character. Male hair was suitably short. With costumes, you created an excellent imagery for this play, so helping to convey key character traits. Super!</p>

DIRECTION

Detailed study/knowledge and interpretation of the text; progressing the author's intent with creativity and sensitivity.

Using theatrical dynamics to communicate with the audience.

Appropriate delivery of the text using timing and rhythm.

Settings with regard to focus, pace and groupings.

Movement which is appropriate to the period and style of production.

Creating atmosphere and mood to develop the full dramatic impact.

Director: Vanessa Randall

You were blessed with a large stage, which incorporated a range of acting areas, used to good effect. However, these areas needed changing and such slowed down the pace of the production. Your backstage teams worked hard and always made sure everything was in the right place before lights up. But this takes time, especially the cast shuffling on with chairs in dim light to arrange themselves around the village hall table. Plus, the script demanded many, many scene changes. Personally, I would have left all the furniture out, far stage right and far stage left. These areas would then be dimmed as light focused on the living rooms centre stage. The settee was slightly too long and took up a great deal of room. Perhaps a shorter one would have allowed two, one for each living room, set in a V side by side. Or perhaps, set one living room far stage left where the vestry was placed, with a small upstage area for the jokes. There was a piece of furniture covered with a red cloth and a simple cross on top, which could have been used as the vestry. Also, Geraldine could have walked into the hall scenes from her living room, if you had kept the Parish hall furniture intact stage right.

Sometimes though, you had to work in a small acting area in each set, and placed around tables, minimised movement opportunities. Whilst within each area there is always going to be a finite and restricted number of different moves and poses a director can utilise, in the main, a range of acting positions were displayed, making full use of the living rooms. The movement of Geraldine around Hugo and Alice waiting to kiss was good, weaving her in and out. Then keeping her stage right so they were not blocked.

You created small nice pictures and images. In scene 3 we had Hugo and Alice staring at each other with Geraldine between them trying to urge them to kiss. As they approached each other, Geraldine stepped out of the way – a nice little well timed routine to stand stage right, shouting “*just do it!*” This little sequence, like many others, just one example of the pauses you gave, and the good timing you instilled in your cast to make the comedy effective. Such was ably demonstrated in the two kisses between Owen and Geraldine. You created a super image as he leant her almost horizontally over, plus the slow put down by Geraldine of the filling on the table. Also, Geraldine sitting, then approaching the bottles for a drink, and sitting, constantly changing her mind.

The cast arrangement at different levels for the page 26 radio programme was good: Alice kneeling stage left, Geraldine, Jim and Frank on the settee and Owen back to us, and swivelling round with sun glasses and cap back to front. Here Jim was blocked by Alice a little from the stage left audience view.

Another good picture was formed for the quiz: Hugo on knees for scoreboard duties, slightly left of centre, Alice and David stage right, Owen with his controls and Frank and Jim in the audience.

Dialogue always had pace and energy. In fact, you ensured all the cast constantly attacked this script with plenty of drive. Quick, snappy dialogue fizzed along, and skilfully you ensured no verbal jokes were lost or rushed.

Perhaps Owen could have been slightly more forward for his 'sun is out' rendition Page 10.

The singing of 'Bare Necessities' worked well and was greatly enjoyed by the audience - all nicely in character. However, in this scene one or two actors purposefully looked at the audience as if 'milking' the applause and wanting a response.

You also created some tender moments, such as the hug from Geraldine when Alice was upset that the whole village heard she was a moron. Also, Owen's filming along the church line, or backwards on the trolley as the bride walked up the central audience aisle, was imaginatively staged.

You moved well between the sad reflections of Alice, the anger and bitterness of David, the farce of Owen's lust crazed kisses, the childishness and ineffectuality of Hugo, the desperation for a man from Geraldine, and the poignant admission of homosexuality from Frank. Thus, you made sure all the essential ingredients and themes were richly and clearly conveyed by good varied intonation with the correct levels of voice and excellent vocal timing to effect the jokes and the thoughts upon love, boyfriends, sex and friendship.

I thought the characterisation for Simon was played a little too sleazy and he perhaps needed to be a kinder, more considerate man in opposition to his brother.

The play is made up of many conversations which you handled effectively, bringing out the thoughts and feelings of the different characters. You crafted and enabled scenes of comedy with good ensemble work as the actors almost bounced off each other, successfully using appropriate facial expressions and reactions to the revelations unfolding, even when not speaking. As a director, your understanding of the themes and relationships is evident. The text and humour were sensibly highlighted when necessary by the actors with good facial expressions.

You were blessed with a confident cast, who worked well together to produce, with your skill, and attention to detail, a humorous, entertaining comedy.

ACTORS

Characterisation which is believable shows flair, originality and understanding.

Vocal technique which is appropriate to the play and is delivered with understanding and a good technique.

Movement which is in character and in period and incorporating movement to deliver pace.

Supporting ones fellow actor unselfishly and enhancing his performance.

Using all available theatrical skills to make a noticeable contribution to the play.

(Include individual adjudications for each actor.)

Before I comment on the performances, (all good) I am aware that characters from well known and loved television series are so well defined in the public consciousness, that they can stand or fall in a play such as this as the audience judge their likeness and emulation of the original 'thing'.

Am I reviewing the cast acting or impersonating? Are both the same thing? One could argue that recreating a character in the exact image of the original is mere copying without room for the re-creator to add their own interpretation and ideas. The audience comes with images in mind of the original characters and compares. Indeed, it could be argued that the nearer a performance and direction is to the original, then an audience will be more pleased. Any deviation will bother those that love the television series. A fine line to tread between emulation/copying and interpretation.

As amateurs and actors we all do it; steal ideas from the originators. But especially with a character so famous as Dibley. Yet twenty years is a long time since the original aired. So is comparison only a subject for anyone over 40?

I do not know the intentions of the director or cast. Yet with something so defined as this, my reference point has to be the characters as first portrayed. It is unfair to review against the original actors in the series as this takes away from your actors' efforts and decisions for their roles. But in the main, unless I see a purposeful recreation, I will not comment or compare against the original actors, only against the character your cast portrayed or as given in the script. I will base the review on characters I think leap from the page, and the caricatures actors were supposed to be representing or denigrating.

David Horton – Tony Cenci

There was a pompous air about your mannerisms which occasionally needed a little more in the voice. Oddly we heard it during the radio broadcast but just needed a little more inflection and snooty attack to suit your good facial expressions; for example, as witnessed in your shortness and frustration with Hugo regarding Alice in scene 7, but also in general with the vicar and other members of the village.

You 'covered' well when the Dubretts book was not on the stage, walking round with extra lines, "*I wonder where it can be?*" Well done for not drying up.

I liked your strident tone when trying to cut Hugo out of the will and sour face when talking about the inadequacy of Alice as a future daughter-in-law. Also, your serious, disgruntled look at the others was funny when they sang to finish scene 5 of Act 2. Your expressions continued to register contempt and the low opinion of others. For

example, the frustrated look as Hugo and Alice first entered, holding hands on page 40, and David's utter dismay at mention of burger king. There was a lovely fed-up face when losing the quiz, reluctantly presenting the prize and having to kiss Alice.

You had little 'business' routines but we saw good comic timing trying to stop Hugo showing the chocolates and port David had bought to Geraldine. I enjoyed the "*good God, no*" on page 33 - not listening to Frank. I also liked the dry delivery of "*I came, I saw....limb from limb*" on page 34.

Overall, you presented a snooty, opinionated and upper-crust individual who showed little regard for others. Well done!

Reverend Geraldine Granger - Kelly Parker

Started the play as you meant to go on - with good clear, audible diction. From the very opening, you showed and maintained good eye contact with the audience. Although, you constantly and nicely showed (through good facial expression) her frustration with the other characters and their foolishness, we perhaps needed to hear such in your tone of voice a little more. Geraldine needs a tone that sums up her feeling sorry for Alice, as well as resignation of the peccadilloes of the odd assortment of parishioners. The ends of sentences needed that crispness and tartness, that abject acceptance which also depicted disagreement.

So, for example, we nicely had hands on hips for the line, "*we were playing monopoly at the time,*" to Alice's memory of winning a beauty contest, but we also needed to hear the 'dig', the sarcasm, the realisation of Alice's futility a little more in the voice to match the good gestures and facial expression. The latter were always good, for example the excited, raised hand when the lovebirds kissed; the blowing out of lips to show them how to kiss; the slow placing down of the filling, passed from Owen, onto the table; the long laughter when Owen asked, "*how about it?*" on page 14; the thinking about the drink- approaching the bottles, changing her mind.

There was a little wickedness and cheekiness about Geraldine that was effectively conveyed. For example, on page 6, standing stage left, pointedly delivering the line, "*plan of action,*" with a wry smile on your face.

Some highlights for me were the reactions to others: bewilderment that Alice does not understand the jokes; the confused reaction at Frank's admission and at his pink jacket; the pleased look on the excellent rap, and the line, "*I am rather,*" to end scene 5; urging David to kiss Alice and present the quiz prize; the amazed look at Owen's "*acreage of womanhood*" on page 38 and the lustful look at Simon, followed by panic that lipstick had not been applied.

Dialogue was clean, audible and fast paced. You were the glue that held the comedy together and we forget that your character's job is often to provide the straight feed to Alice, or in many cases, to Owen. This was nicely achieved. Movement was fluid and your energy levels were excellent. A very good, confident and driving performance.

Owen Newitt – Martin Taylor

Similarly, to Amy with Alice, you chose to emulate Owen, especially with your voice which completely captured the drawled tones of the original actor. You had a tremendous way of accentuating certain vowels by lengthening them. Or you capably

clipped certain words for meaning. Sometimes little spaces were put in-between words or phrases. All of which, really captured Owen's decisive nature. He is an awful character really: dirty in clothing and in mind, selfish and desperate, confusing in the way he relates stories and experiences. But the audience has to warm to him. And you captured all of these nuances in your portrayal – especially the vocal delivery and rich intonation which held and conveyed so much meaning

I liked your unexpected gaze at seeing Hugo and Alice kissing, and your disbelief and excitement that Geraldine had offered to let Owen kiss her - hands clenched in excitement. You had good body control as you held Kelly backwards to kiss her.

The speech or declaration of love to the vicar on page 14 was excellent, making every word and phrase count- this is a wonderful piece of comic writing which shows up so much of his nature and sexism, but one which you accomplished well constantly bringing out the comedy. Gestures too were effective; on "*you've got smaller brains*" (page 14) and hands on table, happy that Jim had someone to give both sides of the poodle debate.

You could read an audience well, pausing to deliver a line to await audience laughter to subside. For example on "*marriage to an old lush*" on page 17. Although you maintained excellent eye contact with audience and cast, sometimes you looked out to the audience (page 45) which looked a little artificial.

Comic timing and pace and delivery were excellent, creating a hilariously crude character. Excellent.

Frank Pickle – David Long

A briefer role, mainly confined to the Parish Hall scenes but one in which you fully brought out his jovial demeanour. There was a simplicity about the character in the sense of his views on life and happy acceptance of people and the world. Frank always seemed to be smiling; for example, happily helping with his information about Owen's brother drowning himself.

You had one of the most poignant and tender moments in the whole play as Frank reported his homosexuality. Wisely you played this straight- a sincerity was apparent which was very important. It somehow conveyed a sadness behind Frank of lost opportunities and stress at having to hide his sexuality – especially in a rural close-knit community. I liked the beaming smile in the pink jacket – yet sadly none of his friends had heard him.

There was always a nice, warm concern for the 'vicar'. In addition, you conveyed a man who worried about what others might think, especially reticent about the message that you were not Alice's father. A confident performance.

Hugo Horton – Andrew Borg-French

You captured his early worry, looking quite perturbed sitting on the settee alongside Geraldine in scene 3. The unease about the prospective kiss was conveyed well, followed by a wonderful look of happiness having kissed. Later, you again showed unease with keeping the secret of his love for Alice from his father – scene 7 page 12 - with a lovely vacant look as David called her a stick insect, followed by a nervous look as David moaned at him in scene 7.

Good timing with Alice was evident all the way through.

The dialogue always had pace and I liked the straight face at the 'duck' speech which was delivered as a 'matter of fact' report of his meeting with David. The clarity of speech here was excellent.

Hugo has to go through most of the play as a wimp, afraid of his father. Facial expressions and a dejected air at David's comments about Alice (page 23 for example) were sustained. To match the weak demeanour, you needed a slight whine or ineffectual tone to the voice. Although such weakness later came over very well in facial expression and gestures, we needed to hear that wimpy, wet, mard voice. Then the disc jockey scene would have worked better as you tried too hard to emulate the American slang to look cool.

Throughout the wedding ceremony you made sure Hugo looked tense, followed by happiness at the union. This was an assured performance with light and shade in the intonation. A good contribution to the team.

Jim Trott – Nick Lowe

Similar to Frank, Jim's main comedy derives from the Parish Hall meetings.

The comedy was capably delivered by adopting the television's original character voice and utilising a super pose. Your body stance to keep Jim hunched all the way through the play was excellent; keeping the chin down. You made sure he moved in a shuffling manner to reinforce his untidy and shambolic state. This was helped by having your shirt constantly out of your trousers.

Add in the almost nasal inflection for the "no no no" oft repeated line and you captured the audience's humour.

I liked the way you made him become too excited, such as the sequence about oriental ladies (page 38), vocabulary speeding up and rocking back and forth. Then the realisation in the voice he had gone too far and needed to calm down: blinking of eyes and hand to brow to recover. A super magical moment.

The verbal Abba 'Knowing me, knowing you,' routine over pages 43/44 was excellent with super verbal timing. You waited for laughter to die down before continuing. The shuffled walk into Geraldine's room was excellent.

Alice Tinker – Amy Gilmore

You chose to go with an impersonation of the original Alice and you did this so well. Impersonation is a maligned skill – still acting but riskier - as you must completely capture the character. Few professional actors can do this – they get the voice, or the mannerisms or a little of both. Or they accentuate the well-known caricatures of the personality, making bigger a gesture or saying, to deflect from their inability to 'copy' the full person. With Alice, you had to provide the accent; the giggle; the full, wide silly grin; the stance; the small gestures such as rubbing Geraldine's arms; and the snigger as if someone else was being silly (balance out Tarka page 40)

With costume and make-up's help you achieved the look. But the rest was up to you and you nailed this spot on. I thought this was a marvellous portrayal, well-acted with

super comic timing comprised of verbal and facial reactions as part of excellent body language. For example, this was captured on page 14 as Alice asked about Owen; hands out excited on "*this is brilliant,*" and then upset moments later, "*Oh poor you, you're going to marry someone you don't love.*" Both contrasts innocently believed. Then panicked upset, "*that's him at the door.*"

Facial reactions, as alluded to already, were excellent. For example, the look of complete misunderstanding at the vicar's jokes, or the nice smile on 'first prize' when telling Geraldine of the chocolate prize. With wide cheesy grins, or giggles you also suggested a poignancy about Alice: beneath the comedy is a girl perhaps lacking in self-esteem, and foolish in the ways of the world; an innocent, a 'child' in adult clothing. Thus, if not careful the comedy can be cruel – are we laughing at weakness and inability? Skilfully, you steered us down the right path where we laughed at the character and her warmth, her misunderstandings, her naivety and silly observations.

Verbal intonation was excellent. You held onto the ends of words in a happy, whiny, complaining or confused voice. Sometimes your expression suggested she realised some insight; 'organ donar', held on page 22, or she was pleased on "*very very nice....with sausages.*"

This was a commanding, fully rounded portrayal which showed many facets of Alice. You created excellent comedic moments: in the quiz, with Hugo kissing, at the wedding and brought out her warmth and love for Geraldine and Hugo. You capably formed an excellent partnership with Kelly. Very impressive!

Simon Horton – Dominic Pastore

I'm afraid I did not understand the way you chose or was directed to play this character. He came over as a spiv, a sleazy brother of David, especially on page 46, "*well hello blondie*" the 'blondie' held for too long so sounding dirty and desperate. Surely, he should be the romantic lead, the gentleman, the kind considerate man that David is not.

You toned down such for their later encounters, and for me Simon's greater warmth was displayed.

However, your characterisation was constant and supported the production and dialogue well.

You had a confidence in your playing and provided a hint of the mysterious, slightly naughty man that might interest Geraldine's desire for sex – oddly a mirror of Owens to her. With the dialogue as written, I can see why you chose this characterisation and type of expression. Well done – a brief role but amidst so much visual absurdity, you stamped Simon's presence.

Woman at Wedding Service – Wendy Young

Very serious delivery and utterly convincing, you strode purposefully down the aisle. But using a good strident tone of voice, you convinced us that you were perhaps a relative. Only a few lines but ones delivered strongly, including the embarrassed apology on "*wrong church.*" Well done!

Teletubbies – Scarlett Taylor and Molly Taylor

You looked brilliant in your costumes, happily walking in with the wedding party. Your bright smiles helped the audience to enjoy the spectacle of the marriage ceremony.

Slowly though, you nicely showed they were fed-up, yawning and with good stretched arms showing us their boredom and tiredness, eventually falling asleep.

You both served the drinks well at the party.

Mrs Tinker – Judie Krebs and Mary Tinker – Jenny Taylor

There is not a mention in the script of your characters and thus I cannot check or comment on your dialogue against my notes. However, aided by imaginative costumes, you both completely captured the proverbial 'Dingle' side of the Trotter family. Mrs Tinker strutted about importantly at the party, and perhaps to show where Alice got her foolishness from, Mary kept striking a very effective dim pose, staring out.

You both could be clearly heard and I liked the fed-up faces, not wanting to be there but needing to have a nosy. Two comical little cameos to show the other, less salubrious side of Alice's clan.

OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT (or CONCLUSION)

An excellent understanding of the author's intent. Direction which shows skill, originality, sensitivity and creativity using all the theatrical tools of pace, focus, delivery, timing and rhythm.

Talented actors creating highly effective dramatic impact.

Evidence of teamwork and unselfish ensemble playing.

Actors who interact and react and a production team who use all resources to create atmosphere and mood.

I feel that Vanessa successfully helped the cast to not only recreate a well-known programme and bunch of characters, but also to present three plays seamlessly into a whole. The adaptation provided a flow to the dialogue, and although there are just too many scenes, the cast kept the pace flowing.

I have questioned the staging choices which unfortunately slowed down the overall experience-possibly adding twenty minutes.

There were times of excellent comic timing, good partnership acting, especially between Amy and Kelly, and between Kelly and Martin. Jokes and situations all hit the funny bone.

You also uncovered the more poignant tone of the piece. Characters were well defined. Three tales were capably told with pace and varying positioning. All of this good direction was enhanced by a super wardrobe which helped to provide the right 'look'.

Thank you for your pleasant welcome.

Adjudicator (print)	D. B. Carlile
Date	11.04.17