

## **Poll Results: Lambourn's vote on West Berkshire Budget Proposals 2024/5**

Poll Date: December 2023

Responses: 136 unique votes cast

### **Comments received from respondents:**

#### **Remove 18 litter bins in the Lambourn Parish**

1. Absolutely crazy
2. Bins are not emptied on a regular basis as it is so if there were less, rubbish would end all over the place
3. Even with the current number of litter bins the village already has a litter problem, reducing the number would simply increase the problem.
4. Guess where litter will go? Would it not be better to find a way to more efficiently empty bins rather than a set schedule?
5. I cannot see how more litter on ty3 streets will improve things
6. I suggest that bins in rural areas are unnecessary (e.g. Seven Barrows, but near shops/high streets are useful to prevent littering (e.g. Lambourn High St.).
7. I think people should be encouraged to throw away rubbish responsibly this will make the problem worse.
8. If there is no litter bin people will just drop litter on floor
9. If you remove bins more people will litter and you will spend more money on clearing up dropped litter than emptying bins.
10. It will encourage littering.
11. It will generate more litter in the roads
12. It's hard enough to get folks to put litter in bins. If you remove more bins, there will be more litter strewn over the streets.
13. Just want to make the place look untidy
14. Lambourn is a large village and the bins are a necessity
15. Litter bad enough with bins removal will make worse
16. Litter everywhere
17. Litter is already bad, removing bins is only going to make it worse!
18. Litter on the street then?
19. Maybe reduce the number around the village area and keep village centre & outside the church
20. More rubbish being littered, at least when I walk past the majority of these bins they are being used
21. pathetic
22. People don't seem to be capable of taking their litter home with them.
23. Removing the odd one or two here and there can probably do no harm, but removal of 18 is not going to work. I'm particularly horrified at seeing anything close to the village centre being removed, as is being proposed here, since these are the bins which are well used and frequently overflowing. What are you thinking of? I wish we

- could rely on people to take their litter and dog poo home, but we can't, sadly. I really don't want Lambourn to resemble an open-cast litter bin.
24. Residents of the village already have to do a littler pick a few times a year to deal with discarded rubbish, this will only increase the amount that residents (who pay their taxes!) have to pick up
  25. So long as the ones that remain have been properly identified as the most useful locations
  26. Surely there will be an increase in dog mess or discarded bags filled with dog mess?
  27. Then there will be rubbish on the streets!
  28. There are almost not enough bins. Removing them will be detrimental to the village scene.
  29. There are not enough bins/dog waste bins so the piles of litter/poo will be left were the bins are removed.
  30. There aren't enough before you reduce! It was just make the village full of rubbish everywhere!
  31. there is far to much litter as it is which reflects badly on the village
  32. there is not enough.
  33. There is too much litter in the village. So does not make sense.
  34. There is too much rubbish thrown in the village this would make it worse.
  35. This will encourage more people not to put litter in bins
  36. This will increase the amount of litter on the ground
  37. This will increase the propensity for irresponsible dog owners to leave their dog poos in the Cricket Field and on other public areas. Each litter bin needs to be reviewed for how how much they used and the cost of collection.
  38. This will lead to litter all around Lambourn. Common sense?
  39. This will only worsen the litter problem
  40. This would only exacerbate the current litter problem
  41. Too much litter around already
  42. We already have litter problem in Lambourn, this proposal will make it worse.
  43. What is the cost saving? Presumably the biggest cost is mobilising the collection crew to Lambourn. Is the incremental cost of each bin significant?
  44. Where are visitors expected to put their trash? Will end up with more litter on the streets which will lead to other problems and be harmful to the environment.
  45. Will increase litter on the streets. Reduces the chance for people to dispose of waste properly. Potentially a threat to wildlife.
  46. Will only increase amount of litter which is already an issue
  47. With significantly fewer bins I can foresee that litter in the village will increase dramatically
  48. Worry more litter just thrown on ground
  49. Would cost more to employ road sweepers to pick up thrown litter than empty bins

## Introduce car parking charges at the Lambourn High Street Car park

1. agree, but first 60 minutes should be free to keep drop in trade for local business
2. By putting this in place more people would park on the high street causing more problems
3. Cars park all over the high street don't give them another excuse. If you do make the first 30 mins free. For people just popping into the shops and police the rest of the illegal parking.
4. Charging to park will the already over congested High Street, reduce customers shopping, and probably INCREASE the costs to the council (payment machine infrastructure, more traffic wardens etc)
5. Charging would probably result in people going elsewhere other than the High Street to shop and would also increase parking on street despite double yellow lines
6. Cost to set up will never be recovered....no saving. Better to have 2 hours free parking, no return within 2 hours and no commercial parking. Presents a more friendly message without expensive ticket machine that someone has to empty every few days i
7. Good idea
8. How much will it cost to install and maintain machines for a small car park?
9. I can't believe the proposed charges would cover the salary of a parking warden and the cost of a parking meter.. it would simply be an irritation. It might be more workable if you brought in 'free' for first 2 hours and free overnight
10. I don't use it but would put people off using it more parking on high st
11. I suspect many people park for excessive lengths of time. should really be for short term parking so introduce a free period of say 1 hour for people visiting the shops.
12. If paying by mobile phone, I wouldn't be able to park there
13. If people have to pay they will not use the car park and park on roadside causing more traffic congestion
14. If this was done in conjunction with making the high street a no parking zone it might work. Maybe a free parking for 20 minutes could be a good option too?
15. Imposing a charge will only add to the already nightmare parking on the High Street
16. Instead of making charges for parking, get a parking attendant to come to the High Street
17. Introducing parking charges will encourage more people to park illegally and also people use the car park to visit the Junction food bank and support the village shops
18. It will cause more drivers to park in the main street Including on double yellowswot we do need is a regular traffic wardens to stop all these double yellow line parkers
19. It will force people to park on already congested and dangerous High Street. If anything Residents Permits should be issued for High St properties
20. It will have a negative effect on the businesses in the high street and encourage illegal parking. Most people do not want to park for 4 hours, maybe 10 minutes, occasionally an hour for lunch. It will cause congestion in the village. We want to encourage the use of local shops and facilities this will not help in any way. You will also need to pay someone to manage and police the car park so additional cost. Or Farm it out to a third party who will make most of the profit. I am totally against this.
21. It will have an adverse affect on local businesses and result in less choice for older residents

22. It will just clog up the high street even more so no I don't agree with adding charges here
23. It's a village not a town what a stupid idea !
24. Most only park their cars for 20mins max, you will just encourage more illegal parking on the high street thus creating more congestion!
25. No one will want to pay, the high Street is bad enough already. Cars are always parked on the double yellow lines, this would make it worse
26. No this will be sold to a private company
27. No-one will pay to park there.
28. Parking is bad enough on the high street and especially by the George and opposite Universal and that is with the car park being used at weekends. Most people are parking for less than 30 minutes. They won't pay for 4. You'll have to introduce residential parking permits or those living on the high street wont be avle to park. You'll have to pay more in traffic wardens than you'll get back in parking fees and setup cost/monitoring.
29. Parking is bad enough, this will push more cars onto the highway
30. Parking on the high st in Lambourn is an accident waiting to happen with people completely ignoring the double yellows and parking all the way up to the junction. Introducing paid parking will only serve to make this problem worse.
31. pathetic
32. People do not use the car park for long periods instead for running errands. A charge will just redirect people to park in the street causing more congestion.
33. People will just park on high street double yellows making it even worse for pedestrians and traffic!
34. People will just park on the street causing even more congestion
35. People won't use it and will park anti-socially elsewhere. The cost of controlling and checking will probably be more than the revenue.
36. Please use SMS charging system and not a machine which costs lots of money
37. Seriously stupid, it's not a busy car park and will cause more to park stupidly around the high street
38. that will only encourage people to park on the roads (more than they do now!). It they insist on charging then free for first hour would be reasonable. At least it would give people chance to get some shopping in the village. So that shops don't suffer either.
39. That's just asking for trouble and strife, given that people can't even be bothered to walk the extra few yards from the car park to the shops when it's free.
40. The amount of illegal parking on double yellow lines on the High Street is already hazardous. This will only increase the problem.
41. The cost to enforce this will exceed revenue wate of time!
42. The High Strett car park is the ONLY off road parking available (besides the half a dozen at the Market Place. Lambourn is designated as a RURAL service centre and so people are expected to travel to the village for the shops etc. Charging for the parking will put off the use of the village shops. UNLESS thee could be an arrangement for 2 hours of free parking.
43. The thinking here needs to be joined up rather than the Council just looking at raising money. Traffic flow on the High Street needs to be improved. Charging for car parking will only result in more parking on the High St and constrict traffic flows. The

proposed charges are reasonable and should not affect businesses. My concern is that the Council would be able to change the tariff without consultation and so this could be the thin edge of the wedge.

44. There are already parking problems around our shops,, this will increase illegal parking without any way to stop this.
45. There should be a short period, max 1 hour?, to allow residents to visit shops without penalty. There is sufficient congestion on the High Street as it is.
46. This will discourage people to use local businesses. Who will police and won't that remove any expected revenue benefits?
47. This will encourage more people to park on the high st. It would be more useful to stop HGVs driving through the town centre.
48. This will make people park on the already busy high street and surrounding roads, making it dangerous for all.
49. This will need enforcement, the cost of which will exceed the maximum revenues (e.g. 43x2x-£1=-£86/day).
50. This will not encourage people to shop in the village.. Please let\'s not forget the cost of living crisis.
51. This would deter people from extending their stay in the village and therefore have an adverse effect on the local economy
52. Totally unnecessary for a village. Why change something that doesn't need too
53. Unfair to local businesses
54. Well this idea stinks of a money making scheme. I live in Upper Lambourn and quite frequently pop to the local shops in the village. The free parking spaces along the high street and in other areas give me the opportunity to easily and quickly achieve this. On a second note with parking spaces already in high demand along the high street I can only imagine how difficult it will become once they are being charged for. Complete waste of taxpayers money in my opinion and will cause nothing but trouble and upset throughout the entire community. Many will either get their shopping at larger supermarkets in towns further afield than have to deal with the inconvenience of parking charges. This can only have a negative impact on the businesses along the High Street
55. What a stupid idea. Support local shops by providing people with somewhere to park their vehicle for free whilst spending their cash in the shops.
56. What are the costs associated with the implementation and policing of this? Far more than the revenue generated. Any machine must accept coinage to be inclusive to all sectors of society.
57. Why punish the local businesses?
58. Will adversely affect local businesses. Will force more people to park on busy High Street. Madness!
59. Will affect local businesses. Will create further mayhem on the High St , vehicles are already parked illegally while people pop into the shops, this will just increase, the yellow lines are not respected. This will then lead to danger to pedestrians.
60. Will cause more people to squeeze onto the already packed high street and other locations
61. Will just add to the congestion in the High Street - any income will be negated by the cost of sending a traffic warden out to check people are paying.
62. Will just force parking onto local roads.

63. Will result in more illegal parking and parking in local streets

## **Reduce grass cutting on specific pieces of land from 7 cuts to 2 cuts a year**

1. A bit more carbon storage. Good idea.
2. A reduction in grass cutting throughout the village will only give the image of an unkept and untidy village. Couple this with less bin emptying and it's a recipe for making the village look like literal rubbish.
3. A smaller reduction to, say, 4 cuts per year would be more acceptable We already have some areas only cut twice per year
4. Although it could cause a danger to emerging traffic
5. Carefully managed this would benefit the insect and small animal population.
6. could save money
7. Except at junctions where the grass cutting should be increased. Especially the junction of Ermine Street and Baydon Road. This is a particularly difficult junction to turn right onto Ermine Street and, in the summer, the long grass makes this turn even more hazardous.
8. Grass cutting is essential especially at road junctions for the safety of pedestrians and drivers
9. Hasn't been cut 7 times this year anyway!
10. I agree provided grass is cut where it makes driving unsafe.
11. I agree, except where grass cutting aids safety/visibility.
12. I don't believe this was being done 7 times a year anyway!
13. I think that some grass cutting is unnecessary and may discourage wildlife.
14. If I can't see my dogs poo, i won't be able to pick it up.
15. If they cut it when the grass was growing instead of in November when it has stopped and then again in March before it has started growing would make more sense.
16. It will be good for biodiversity but LBC should infer incentives and assist local groups who would like to adopt road verges for example by loaning of petrol strimmers.
17. It's keeps the village looking smart !
18. It's difficult to see out of most junctions already in the area, this will give rise to more road traffic accidents
19. Maybe plant with meadow flowers, as long as they are not obstructing the view for road users.
20. More detail required to make a decision - cost saving?
21. Never cut 7 times a year now
22. No chance of winning the tidiest village
23. Not really happy with this, but it's one I could live with providing the cuts are done when they are needed, not in the spring before anything has grown, when it is a lazy option to do a cut because it will take less time. At the very least, the places to be prioritised should be corners of road junctions where visibility is compromised.
24. pathetic
25. Perhaps reduce by one cut but not from 7 to 5 minimum
26. Reduce by 1 or 2 cuts but not 5
27. Reductions to grass verge cutting could prove a major safety concern. Driving around here there are thousands of deer etc and cut verges are the only blessing to help see

them. Minor cut backs to other areas I wouldn't suppose but not from 7-2, that's ludicrous.

28. Something has to go
29. The Cricket Field is one of the best amenities in Lambourn and we are very lucky (despite it being ultimately owned by a property developer). The grass cutting and upkeep is paramount - even though there are challenges. Last weekend, youngsters on scramblers (without number plates) drove all over the Field in circles resulting in huge track marks and a muddy mess. I'm not sure how this is being monitored but there needs to be a way for locals to report as it must be a criminal offence? Twice a year will not be enough with summer growth! Perhaps a group could be formed to look after it.
30. The parish council needs to respond to this as they should know the safety implications of each site.
31. The village will start looking very scruffy
32. This could be good for wild flowers and nature. So cut at the
33. This saves money and is good for the environment
34. This will reduce lines of sight for drivers, cyclist's & horse riders on already poorly maintained grass verges on small country roads and lead to accidents.
35. This would make visibility at junctions positively dangerous
36. Uncut verges can be a hazard blocking views to roads together with making Lambourn look an unkempt scruffy village. It encourages people to dump rubbish
37. Verges get overgrown presently
38. Village will look a total mess and you wouldn't be able to see clearly at road junctions
39. What happened to making places look tidy
40. Yes reduce cuttings over the 6 months October to April



## Reduce frequency of road gully emptying

1. Absolutely not, they aren't emptied enough already, hence the flooding across the village.
2. Another safety hazard
3. Any excess water will drain poorly in unkept gullies leading to flooding, which means road damage and again higher repair costs.
4. As long as the areas selected do not create additional flood concerns.
5. As we notice very little in the way of gully emptying going on now, maybe we could live with this proposal.
6. Blockages will cause flooding of roads and cause more water damage to tarmac.
7. Cause more flooding and extra costs to deal with this and accidents.
8. Concerns over the risk of flooding
9. Depends by how much. What is Thames Water's opinion?
10. Depends how the sewage would be affected.
11. Emptying gullies regularly is essential.
12. Even more pathetic
13. FGS we have enough trouble with drainage as it is, don't make it worse please.
14. Flooding happens due to blocked drains already
15. Flooding is already an issue
16. Flooding is dangerous.
17. Given the poor sewage system it would be a ridiculous decision
18. High risk of flooding if this is discontinued
19. I already remove leaves from drains or there is flooding anyway.
20. I think this would lead to an increase in flooding in the area with incidents like the recent heavy downpours being unable to drain away freely if gullies are cleared less frequently.
21. I would be intrigued to know how often it is done currently. As there is a perennial flooding problem in the area as it is.
22. Lambourn floods at the best of times, this would just be silly!
23. More detail required to make a decision - cost saving? Would have to be done on a risk assessed basis. For example if the gully is not emptied (or as frequently) is there significantly higher risk of flooding of property, buildings or roads?
24. More focused emptying in liaison with Environmental Agency and at times in the Autumn when leaves fall. Living in an area with so much open land surely a more long term proposal can be found. IE Soak away area to take excess water when springs rise. Gullies should be cleared regularly
25. Not going to be a cost effective solution if it leads to flooding
26. Not sure this really has an impact now as there are always floods on roads
27. Only seen this done for the first time this year because of the flooding so surely should be done more often not stopped!
28. Proposing this in a village already struggling with water/drainage issues
29. Putting people's homes and businesses at risk here with the already poor drainage system.
30. Reduce that, and make the place flood even more
31. Road drainage around Lambourn is already poor due to large puddling after rain. Gully emptying should be improved not reduced.

32. Road sweeping is very important for horse and vehicle safety. If roads continue to be swept then gully emptying can be reduced.
33. Short term saving, long term negative consequences.
34. Should be OK unless it gets very very wet
35. The roads flood with a small amount of rain as it is never mind if they reduced this.
36. There already problems with gulleys and drains overflowing and increasing the dangers of flooding further reducing the emptying would increase the danger of flooding and increasing dangers on the roads.
37. These need emptying to stop flooding
38. They don't seem to be cleared very often at present
39. This is already not done enough, causing flooding .
40. This will increase flooding, which is already a problem.
41. water will floor the roads
42. We are already a flood risk being a valley. This will make the situation worse.
43. We had to request sand bags from you as the gully next to our houses was not cleared
44. will result in flooded roads
45. You Don't manage this now

## Reduce weed spraying to once a year from twice a year

Again it,Äôs keeping are village tidy !!

Again overgrown verges are a major hazzard particularly in our area. I understand you,Äöre looking for making money but these ideas are ludicrous. Back to the drawing board please. All of the options are short sighted in that they save or generate money in the short term but will lead to increased repair costs or will impact the community negatively in the medium to long term.

As a village we have very little resources applied stop Taking away all we have paid towards . Cannot say after over 40 years in the village that I have really noticed spraying of weedkiller I agree to less weed killer.

I am all for improving biodiversity

I am sure that there is a spray that can be used at the right time of year that can be used once.t

I don\'t think we should be spraying anyway so this is great for the insects etc

It there are accidents on pavements, it will be a personal injury claim as is thease now. Might just be more of them

Leaving weed growth worsens damage to pavements

Make the village look untidy

maybe necessary occasionally

More detail required to make a decision - cost saving?

Not clearing of weeds will cause problems on views at junctions and could cause problems for on coming traffic

Not sure we need to do this anyway as they are good for the wildlife

Plant with meadow flowers on the verges, this will keep the weeds under control. Should still spray pavements.

Ridiculous. Twice a year should stay as it is

Similar to the comments on the grass cutting

This would exacerbate the visibility problems that already occur at junctions and leaving weeds to grow on pavements etc would make Lambourn look more deprived than it already does .

Unless weeds are sprayed at the right time of year, they will seed and create more problems Verges only need spraying so that drivers can see to pull out. Otherwise spraying is bad for the environment, bees and other pollinators. However, the verges, the ditches and the grips need to be looked after and maintained to reduce flooding.

Why do we want weeds everywhere....can\'t bulbs and perennials be planted instead to choke the weeds

Why not spray once in the spring with a residual weedkiller instead of doing it in September when most weeds have germinated and the roots are already causing damage to tarmac.

Wilding has become a watchword for neglect. The kind of places that need spraying the most - pavements and cracks in urban areas do not have bees in them anyway, so it is not going to affect the bees, especially as targeted spraying is highly effective anyway. Weeds very quickly cause damage to pavements and concrete, which is storing up huge and expensive problems for the future, not to mention health and safety issues. I should add that if I feel any area could withstand cuts it is the regular roadsweeping which goes on. Most people are more than capable and willing to sweep the road and fallen leaves outside their own homes.

Will reduce village to an uncared for community

Will WBC then pay for whatever weeds that spread onto neighbouring farmland because of the reduced weeding?

You shouldn't be using glyphosate full stop. With all of the evidence on how harmful it is I can't believe it is still being used.

Your comments regarding weed spraying reduction proposal