

## **7)Email from Sue Feather regarding Pinch Point.**

**Agenda item 1. Question: is the committee reply from the whole committee or just one person probably David Moro as at least one point is inaccurate.**

The verges are communal land like the road and maintained by the owners who's property fronts on to them.

Not true - I was told by Dorrington's Peter Yates (not sure of the spelling) that as I don't own the land outside my boundary I cannot be held responsible for it – which is logical really. Quite apart from anything else how can I be responsible when the committee as taken on the responsibility by installing the pinch point and possibly a footpath or am I expected to maintain something I didn't want or ask for?

How can you legally make adjustments to land you don't own.

I am also not happy with the wording of what I thought was going to be an apology in item 2 of the agenda.

I didn't feel I was shown in a bad light – I was, and still am with that sentence. David Moro seems to have persuaded the committee that his smoke and mirrors is fact when it is not. It seems I need to re-iterate – I AM NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR LAND I DO NOT OWN.

**From the Chairman's report I garnered these figures:**

41% of households responded and 60% voted in its favour.

So total households are 237 therefore 41% is 97 of which 60% voted in favour which is 58. 58 people from a total of 237 is 24.5% - not exactly the resounding majority that has been quoted.

It would seem that the high percentages you quote in various minutes are all from a low percentage return and you have assumed that people who did not vote were in favour of the pinchpoint which is not necessarily the case. So yet again it seems to be skewing figures to get the result David Moro wants rather than what everybody wants.

Unsurprisingly no-one seems to want the pinchpoint on the verge outside their house so why should I have to have it outside mine. Perhaps 1 of the 58 people who are in favour could have it outside their house.

**Minutes 19 Jul 2019 – paragraph relating to pinch point questionnaire**

There had been 3 replies via email/telephone but these would not be included.

Why not? I can't think of any logical reason that the 3 replies could not be taken into account – presumably they were not in accord with David Moro.

I could go on but I've had enough for today.

Regards Sue

**Committee to Reply**