assistant clerk gov

From: Sent:

23 August 2023 14:44

To:

Cc:

Subject: Re: DRAFT Minutes Maintenance Committee Meeting 17 August 2023

Flag Status: Flagged



I will try to answer at least some of your questions.

MA030/23 (i) Cycling in the Cemetery

The issue here is to do with cyclists using the cemetery as a through route. The access to the track from Water Lane is not intended for cyclists. A change in design would be needed to make this possible. We are looking at the best ways to address the matter. Changing the track-gate design is an option should it be felt appropriate to permit this to be used as a through route. I think you will agree bike racks are a good idea for people visiting the cemetery by bike. It's a work in progress.

MA031/23 (c) Worcester Way Fence

We have an obligation to maintain this boundary. County Farms, who own the adjacent land, have previously asked us to prevent random access to their land. Effective fencing has been erected at the end of the nearby woodland area to address this request. Some effort has been made in the past to secure the long boundary with the farmland. The latest fence and vandalism problems are part of this latter project.

You are right about talking again to County Farms in coming to some kind of managed solution. That is what the maintenance meeting agreed to do next. Clearly we cannot keep spending money in a fruitless attempt to comply with the landowners demands without a discussion.

MA031/23 (j) Dog Fouling

Managing this problem requires signage, together with bins into which to put dog faeces. We have mixture of both across the village. Installing more bins additively increases the collection costs so I guess there's a balance that needs to be struck. In the end we have to rely on the sensible compliance of dog owners. Most are very responsible but it only takes one - and more bins might not make a difference to someone who does not care.

The Committee is also reviewing the waste collection bins in the village as a global matter in an attempt to optimise this from both general waste and recycling standpoints.

Hope this helps!



On 23 Aug 2023, at 13:02,

wrote:

Thanks for this.

Reading through I'm struck by the number of mitigations that we are considering against human behaviour. Signs, fences, etc. I am increasingly aware of the concept that people (as a group) are rarely wrong, but the engineering/architecture/landscaping is. An example being the "desire lines" of worn grass across open spaces when there are apparent nearby paths. The answer in many of these cases is not to put signs up encouraging people to use the paths, but the review where the paths are.

I would therefore like to urge the maintenance (and wider full council) committee to consider changing environments to suit existing human behaviour rather than attempting to enforce changes in behaviour. Now obviously this isn't always the right answer, but please do consider it.

A couple of examples from this meeting:

MA030/23 i)To consider the installation of "no cycling" signs in New Road Cemetery ACTION:Office to provide quotes for bike rack installation and arrange for signage.

Could we consider (at some cost sadly) any way of provisioning a cycle route through/pass the cemetery? There's clearly a desire to use it as a link route to water lane, so could we look at meeting desire rather than enforcing against it?

MA031/23 c) Repeated vandalism to Worcester way fence.

Now this is clearly a right-of-way issue with the adjacent land-owner, but might there be alternatives to replacing and repairing the fence over and over, when there is clearly a desire for access?

MA031/23 j) Dog fouling. Would more dog waste bins be more effective than signage?

This approach is not always appropriate of course, and there are many other examples where enforcing desired behaviour is the correct process (parking outside Orchard Road Cem, anti-graffiti paint etc), but I do think that as a society we try to enforce rules rather than trying to understand why they're being broken.

just my two pennyworth!