



**Decision Ref. No.**

(Please enter)

D/002/16

B0017 Part

## DECISION RECORD <sup>1</sup>

**Subject: ROAD HUMPS NOTICE (LOVE LANE, KINGS LANGLEY) 2017**

Staff Contact: Ian Thompson

Executive Member: Ralph Sangster

Tel: 01992 658 175

Portfolio: Highways

### 1. Decision

To proceed with the removal of 5 sets of existing speed cushions and to install 2 new sets of speed cushions in Love Lane, Kings Langley (2 sets of speed cushions are to remain in their original location; 4 sets of cushions remaining overall).

### 2. Reasons for the decision

This follows the receipt of a petition by a Parish Councillor concerning the removal of the rubber humps on Love Lane. The major reasons are understood to be that local residents vehemently support their removal and there are overwhelming numbers in favour of their removal.

In the light of an engineering assessment undertaken of the existing environment to review it against the criteria set out in the Hertfordshire County Council Speed Management Strategy (SMS) County Councillor Richard Roberts supported a scheme to reduce the number of speed cushions (but not remove) and recommended it as a priority.

#### Informal Consultation

In November 2015, 79 residents and organisations possibly affected by the proposals were consulted as part of the informal public consultation. This returned a healthy 32 (40%) responses. Of those responding 23 (72% of replies) offered support for the proposals, 3 (9% of replies) partially supported the proposals and 6 (19% of replies) were opposed to the proposals.

#### Formal Consultation

The local member considered the balance of the comments received at the informal stage was about right and the formal road hump noticing subsequently took place between 1st and 22nd February 2017.

Nine responses were received of which six were interpreted as objections and three as comments. After careful consideration the local member could see no genuine objection that overrides the expectation to replace, repair and reduce in height the Love Lane humps; the objections do not outright reject the idea of traffic calming.

### 3. Alternative options considered and rejected <sup>2</sup>

As part of the investigation stage of this scheme, all speed reducing features were assessed and subjected to a safety review, with the preferred solution subject to a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit; the location of two pairs of speed cushions were slightly revised to promote more equal spacing between features.

Alternative options were considered during the Feasibility Study and at the end of the Consultation period, however, were rejected due to the targeted nature of the proposal and the existing environment.

Decision Record 120910

## DECISION RECORD

### 4. Consultation

#### (a) Comments of Executive Member<sup>3 4</sup>

Consulted and 11<sup>th</sup> May 2017 confirmed agreement for proposed decision and for scheme to proceed.

#### (b) Comments of other consultees<sup>5</sup>

The local member was consulted at informal and formal stages and supports the scheme.

The Police accept the proposal is resident driven and as such did not have any objections, however, stress that the measures were an integral part of the scheme that allowed the introduction of the 20 mph restriction at that time.

The decision to proceed was supported by the local member (County Councillor Richard Roberts) on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2017.

### 5. Following consultation with, and the concurrence of the Executive Member, I am proceeding with the proposed decision.

Signed:  Thompson)

Title: Highway Locality Manager

Date: 28/5/17

### 6. Copies of agreed document to:

- All consultees
- Chairman, and Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Hard & electronic copy (for public inspection both at County Hall and on Hertsdirect) Assistant Head of Member Services - Room 214 County Hall.

<sup>1</sup>for guidance see Chief Legal Officer's note "Taking Decisions"

<sup>2</sup> details of any alternative options considered and rejected by the officer at the time the decision was made record any conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member consulted. If an Executive Member declares a conflict of interest DO NOT PROCEED without seeking advice from the Chief Legal Officer

If the matter has general significance for the Council and/or is, or is likely to be, controversial, then the officer shall consult the appropriate Executive Member before proceeding. In some cases it will be necessary to consult more than one Executive Member, and in some cases the Leader of the Council will need to be consulted

<sup>5</sup> If the matter has local significance, but no general significance for the Council and no controversial aspects, the officer shall consult or inform the local member in writing (or by e mail) and proceed. It is essential that all officers responsible for delivering services ensure that local members are kept well briefed on issues affecting their areas.