



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Council held on Tuesday 11th January 2022.

Present: Cllrs Anderson, Angiolini (Vice Chair), Button (Chair), Collins, De Silva, Johnson, McLean, Morrish and Sinclair.

Also Present: Mr Paul Dunham, Clerk to the Council; County Cllr Richard Roberts; representatives of Kings Langley Football Club.

1. Apologies for Absence.

1.1 Members received and accepted apologies for absence from Cllr Rogers.

2. Declarations of Interest.

2.1 None.

3. Public Participation / Question Time / Urgent Planning & Licencing Matters

3.1 Public Participation / Question Time.

3.1.1 Parking at Kings Langley Football Club, damage to grass verges, safety issues etc. There was a positive discussion between Members, Cllr Roberts and representatives of the football club. All agreed that there was not a simple solution and that this discussion as a start to an engagement process was an important one. It was clear that a solution would not be found at this meeting and Cllr Roberts suggested that a separate sub-group meeting should be set-up, which was agreed. Cllr Roberts was asked if he could get Highways / traffic experts, eg Andrew Freeman, to attend. Cllrs Button, Anderson, Johnson and Sinclair would represent the Council. The Club agreed to host it and the Clerk would coordinate its organisation.

3.2 Urgent Planning & Licencing Matters

3.2.1 Consideration of Planning Applications as listed here:

Reference	Address	Details of Application	Submission	Reason (if any)
21/04668/LDP	62 Alexandra Road	Construction of outbuilding	No objection	
21/04707/FHA	107 Hempstead Road	Excavation of front for car parking and to form a drop kerb and crossover	No objection	

3.2.2 Other Planning & Licencing Matters.

3.2.2.1 None.

3.2.3 Any Other Planning & Licencing Business (Not Requiring Formal Decision).

3.2.3.1 Cllr Anderson advised that 21/04693/CON - Fixed Line Broadband Apparatus – replacement telegraph poles (x2) and a new telegraph pole (all 9m in height) adjacent to Nos 25/27, 57 and 75 Rucklers Lane – had been submitted. The Parish Council would not normally be consulted in these cases unless there was something exceptional. The Borough had already responded that it had no objections.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

4. Police Matters and Other Services.

4.1 Crime reports.

4.1.1 The reports for December 2021 had been received from PCSO Bardi Agallili and distributed to Members. There were 13 recorded crimes.

4.2 Any Other Police and Neighbourhood Watch Matters.

4.2.1 None.

5. Hertfordshire County Council Matters.

5.1 General Matters.

5.1.1 Cllr Roberts reported on the County's budget which is about to be set, advising that there would be increases in the funds available for footpaths and domestic abuse. The budget would be increasing by over £50m, which would include £40m for adult social care and £20m into children's services. An additional £13m had already been put into recruitment and retention of care workers.

5.2 Highways Matters.

5.2.2 The Clerk asked Cllr Roberts if he was aware of the condition of the roundabout at the top of Home Park Mill Link. It was noted that it had suffered a succession of knocks dislodging brickwork which could cause an accident if it went into the road. The Clerk had reported this, but no action had been taken, but he suggested that a straightforward repair might not be the best solution. Cllr Roberts agreed to add it to "the list".

Cllr Sinclair arrived at this point

5.2.3 Cllr Morrish asked whether Cllr Roberts had managed to obtain an update for the resurfacing of the M25/J20 roundabout. He responded that he hadn't but that he understood it was scheduled for the current financial year and that he would shortly be meeting with Highways and would seek clarification then.

Cllr Roberts gave his apologies and left the meeting at this point. He was thanked for his attendance and contribution.

6. Minutes of Previous Meeting(s).

6.1 It was proposed, seconded and RESOLVED that:

The minutes of the meeting(s) held on 7th December 2021 be adopted as a true record.

6.1.1 The Chair then signed the Minutes.

7. Matters Arising.

7.1 Minute 9.4.2. Further to this Minute relating to bank balances, the Clerk advised that the bank had written to say that it intended imposing charges now that the Council's "turnover" had exceeded the threshold contained in the terms and conditions, despite the existing arrangements with the Council, and that he had replied that he would like the bank to reconsider.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

8. Reports.

8.1 Standing Committees.

8.1.1 Planning & Licensing Committee.

8.1.1.1 The minutes of the meeting(s) held on 16th November and 7th December 2021 were adopted as a true record.

8.2 Chair's Reports.

8.2.1 No report.

8.3 Reports from Chairs of other Committees / Groups.

8.3.1 No reports.

8.4 Clerk's Report / Action List.

8.4.1 No report.

8.5 Village Warden's Activities, Priorities and Planning.

8.5.1 The Clerk advised that the Warden litter-picked the High Street and surrounds daily.

8.5.2 Cllr Anderson sought clarification regarding the use of the Council's supply of salt / grit in the event of bad winter weather. The Clerk responded that most of the supply would be used to keep the Council's salt bins topped up. The warden would also provide bags for shopkeepers who requested them for use outside their shops, rather than spreading it himself.

9. Finance Matters

9.1 Schedule of Payments for December 2021.

9.1.1 It was proposed, seconded and RESOLVED:

That the payment schedule for December 2021 in the sum of £21,989.03 be approved, and that the Clerk be authorised to issue the appropriate payments.

9.1.2 The Chair then signed the schedule of payments.

9.2 Examination and signing of the Council's Bank Account Statements (as at 30th November 2021).

9.2.1 The Chair examined the Council's bank account statements and signed a statement to that effect on behalf of the Members that the balances as at the above date were:

Current Account:	£5,000.00
Reserve Account:	£114,331.63
NS&I Investment Account:	£45,865.32

10. Dacorum Borough Council and Other Public Bodies.

10.1 Dacorum Borough Council.

10.1.1 Cllrs Anderson and Johnson – Reports and Members' questions

There had been no Dacorum Borough Council meetings since the last Council meeting. Cllr Anderson advised that the Borough's budget was "uncontroversial".



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

11. Members Items / Reports and Questions (not included elsewhere).

11.1 Parish / Neighbourhood Plan Reports.

11.1.1 Neighbourhood Plan (Cllr Morrish).

The plan was still in its final consultation phase which expires on 27th January. He encouraged Members to submit their comments.

11.1.2 Parish Plan – Environment Group (Cllr Button).

Nothing to report. There had not been a meeting.

11.1.3 Parish Plan – Leisure Group (Cllr Johnson),

Nothing to report. There had not been a meeting. The planning application for the “trim trail” in Green Park had been submitted.

11.1.4 Parish Plan – Transport Group (Cllr McLean).

Cllr McClean had provided a report, see appendix 1, to which he spoke. With the help of Cllr Roberts and HCC’s Andrew Freeman the Group had determined its priorities at its meeting on 13th December, as follows:

High Priority:

Item 2): ARUP Fall Back position. Safety requirements as Included in Neighbourhood Plan.

Item 4): Resolution of Pinch Point. Immediate Consultation.

Item 6): One Way System: Immediate Feasibility Study.

Item 7): Primary School Crossing Rectory Lane (Manual):
Primary School Crossing Rectory Lane (Electronic):

Item 8): Traffic Lights @ Nap/High Street.

Priority Medium:

Item 9): Tow Path Completion.

Item 10): Red Lion Congestion.

Item 11): Double Yellow Lines Rucklers Lane:

Priority Low:

Item 1): Implementation of full ARUP recommendations.

Item 3): Focus on Improving Cycle Ways/Footpaths.
Focus on enhancing/promoting existing routes.

Item 5): Review of Parking expansion options.

Cllr McClean was encouraged that there were very positive signals from HCC that the projects in the high priority list could be achieved in the next financial year. The Chair added that he was pleasantly surprised at the cost estimated for Item 8, but also that he would not like to see any money diverted from above the priorities towards the verge parking issues discussed earlier.

Cllr Morrish advised that that the latest proposal for Red Lion Lane was to put double yellow lines at the danger points, ie the traffic island near the care home and at where the canal footpath crosses, and also at the bottom of Rucklers Lane.

11.2 Geographical Areas Reports

11.2.1 Abbots Rise area (Cllr Angiolini).

Nothing to report.

11.2.2 The Common, Vicarage Lane / Langley Hill / Great Park (Cllr Button)

Nothing to report.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

- 11.2.3 Hempstead Road areas (Cllr Collins).
The houses so far being built in Rectory Farm have reached roof level.
- 11.2.4 Blackwell Road area (Cllr De Silva).
Nothing to report.
- 11.2.5 London Road area (Cllr De Silva).
Nothing to report.
- 11.2.6 Watford Road area (Cllr Johnson).
Nothing to report, except that, Cllr Johnson had noticed that the area used for parking at Station Footpath (south side) had been resurfaced. It was not known whether parking restrictions had been removed.
- 11.2.7 Rucklers area (Cllr Morrish).
Cllr Anderson asked if the Clerk could thank Dacorum Borough Council (Craig Thorpe) for clearing the debris from Rucklers Lane after the recent down-pours. This was agreed.
- 11.2.8 High Street area (Cllr Rogers).
No report.
- 11.2.9 Coniston Road area (Cllr Sinclair).
Cllr Sinclair reiterated that the verges in the area were churned up.
- 11.3 Village Garden (Cllr Johnson).
- 11.3.1 Cllr Johnson reported that there had been little activity in the garden because of the bad weather. The Clerk advised that the Church had asked for permission to place a “cave” to commemorate Easter and Christ’s resurrection on the grass just outside the garden, to which he had responded that there was no objection; it is Highway’s land.
- 11.4 Litter Picks
- 11.4.1 These would re-start in February.
- 11.5 Sunderland’s Yard Allotments
- 11.5.1 Nothing to report, although it was noted that river levels were generally high.
12. Kings Langley Parish Council Representatives on Outside Bodies.
- 12.1 The Kings Langley Community Benefit Society (KLCBS) (Cllr Morrish).
- 12.1.1 Nothing to report.
- 12.2 Kings Langley Community Association.
- 12.2.1 Nothing to report,
13. Council Surgeries.
- 13.1 The next surgery would be the forthcoming Saturday. The Clerk had received a note from the Warden that there was further damage to the grass in the village garden.
14. Other Matters.
- 14.1 None.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

15. Any Other Business ((Not Requiring Formal Decision)).

15.1 Cllr Collins had provided a mock-up of the proposed addition the village entrance signs to denote “Historic Village”. The upright font was preferred. Members were happy with the proposal but would now require a quote for the cost of the work, which Cllr Collins undertook to obtain. The Clerk added that the replacement of the uprights to the northern sign would need to be completed before this addition. He would be arranging this shortly.

16 Exclusion of the Public – the following resolution was passed:

That, in accordance with Kings Langley Parish Council Standing Order 17(q), under schedule 12 of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended to schedule 12(A) by the Freedom of Information Act 2000, in the view of the special and/or confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be temporarily excluded, and they are instructed to withdraw.

PART 2

17. Budget 2022-23

17.1 Consideration of the 3rd Draft.

17.1.1 Members had received a copy of the third draft of the budget prepared by Cllr Anderson and he explained some minor changes. The proposed increase to the Precept is 5.7%.

17.1.2 It was then:

Proposed (Cllr Button), seconded (Cllr Angiolini) and RESOLVED that this budget be formally and publicly presented for approval at a special meeting of the Council to be held on 25th January 2022.

18. Rectory Farm “Community Land”.

18.1 In the event that development on the rest of Rectory Farm is permitted, Members were asked to consider their preference for the future ownership and management of the area which the developer has designated as community land.

18.1.1 This item had been deferred from the meeting of 7th December 2021 to allow Members an opportunity to have a meeting to discuss how arrangements might work involving a third party. As a result of this it was then:

Proposed by Cllr Button, seconded by Cllr Anderson and RESOLVED that should the further development of Rectory Farm take place, it would be in the best interests of the village that the Parish Council assumes ownership of the proposed area of community land and leases it with full responsibility to a third party.

Clearly this would be subject to a considerable amount of contract discussions and work.

19. Cllr Collins asked if any consideration had been given to celebrating HM The Queen’s Jubilee. It was agreed that this would be placed on the agenda for the February meeting.

Meeting closed 21:40.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.

Transport Group Priorities: As determined at the meeting of 13/12/2021.

Details of the discussion resulting in the focus of the Group are available as an attached set of minutes.

High Priority:

Item 2): ARUP Fall Back position. Safety requirements as Included in Neighbourhood Plan.

Item 4): Resolution of Pinch Point. Immediate Consultation.

Item 6): One Way System: Immediate Feasibility Study.

Item 7): Primary School Crossing Rectory Lane (Manual):

Primary School Crossing Rectory Lane (Electronic):

Item 8): Traffic Lights @ Nap/High Street.

Priority Medium:

Item 9): Tow Path Completion.

Item 10): Red Lion Congestion.

Item 11): Double Yellow Lines Rucklers Lane:

Priority Low:

Item 1): Implementation of full ARUP recommendations.

Item 3): Focus on Improving Cycle Ways/Footpaths.

Focus on enhancing/promoting existing routes.

Item 5): Review of Parking expansion options.

Transport Group Update: Prepared by Bob Mclean 29/12/2021.

The notes are based upon the discussion from the Transport Group meeting held on 13/12/2021.

Attendees: Richard Roberts, Andrew Freeman, John Morrish, Bob Mclean.

Apologies: Howard Button, Andrew Tempany, James Markham.

The key items 1 to 7 on the notes of the meeting 14/10/2021 were used as the agenda for this meeting. Additional items of ongoing activity have now been included, see priority list.

Item 1: Implement Full Arup.

A lengthy debate ensued with regard to the dropping of this objective in the particular climate of austerity as a consequence of the pandemic impact on finances, unrealistic to expect funding to be available in the near future.

Conclusion was to maintain this as an overall objective recognising the financial situation and therefore it would certainly be deemed a desirable objective but be given a low priority.

Andrew was able to report that he had undertaken, albeit a non-scientific and cursory review of the technical and financial aspects, and his conclusion was that the scheme was viable on both counts with an outline price tag of £800k to £1million.

Full Arup implementation: Low Priority.

Item 2: ARUP Fall-back position.

After some debate it was agreed that the safety aspects as defined in the ARUP report were key, they have been re-iterated in the appropriate section of the Neighbourhood plan and should be focussed upon and implemented as part of that overall objective.

Safety Aspects of Arup: High Priority.

Item 3: Focus on improving Cycleways.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

It was reported that the possible upgrade to the Green Park link between the Nap and Church Road had been investigated and sadly the width restriction did not allow for the route to be widened and therefore provide a duopoly of function. It was concluded that this almost certainly would be the situation across other footpaths in the village and that therefore there seemed to be little value in pursuing this strategy.

It was concluded that a policy of all new/future footpath developments should actually be constructed on the basis of a duopoly of function taking into consideration the safety implications of both walkers and cyclists.

In order to encourage use of the existing infrastructure, improved and enhanced signage should be pursued alongside a promotional campaign to provide additional literature for visitors to the village.

Future pathways and cycle routes: Low Priority. Promotion of existing routes: Medium Priority.

Item 4: Resolution of Pinch Point.

After some debate it was agreed that the Pinch Point could not be resolved without the loss of significant parking spaces on either the West or East side of the High Street. In order to achieve this a total of 8 spaces would need to be removed. Andrew had visited the site with both John and Bob and it was clear this was the only option with a possible mitigation of 4 spaces being added on the East side pavement if no obstacles were found to prevent this, notably BT cable runs, this would require a detailed investigation.

This Pinch Point was recognised as a long running issue consistently raised by the villagers and the conclusion therefore was that an immediate Consultation process should be entered into involving and collecting views from across the village. Undoubtedly there would be objections from the shopkeepers on both sides of the High Street therefore the consultation would need to focus upon the aspects of Road Safety, De-polluting the air in the High Street and encouraging the 'green' environment in order to gain the necessary villager support

Resolution of Pinch Point: High priority. Immediate Consultation.

Item 5: Review Car Parking options.

Langley Hill:

This issue was able to be visited during Andrew's visit to the High Street. The timing of the visit coincided with the key use of Langley Hill during School depart time around 1530. Langley Hill was, to say the least chaotic at that time with traffic coming down Langley Hill and wishing to enter the High Street opposite the Saracen's Head public House. The length of the traffic queue and the delay in crossing into the High Street was horrendous. The traffic queuing in Langley Hill was head to tail and took up the full half width of the road. Two cars were parked 'legally' on the South side of the hill requiring alternate passing at those points.

There is clearly insufficient road width to create a section of parking at the lower end of Langley Hill and thus this should be discarded as any future addition to parking.

Expansion of the Nap:

Opportunity taken to review this during Andrew's visit. At that time the sensible option, should this happen, would be to expand opposite the Doctor's surgery rather than outside the Community Centre. The lay of the land is such that it is flatter and more easily developed and in size offers much the same capacity.

Notwithstanding the Group felt that the immediacy of this requirement may have been significantly affected by the 'Covid' pandemic. Regular visits to the car park over the past few months at various times of the day had shown that significant spare spaces were available to visitors and shoppers.

In order to progress this a further analysis would need to be undertaken to convince Dacorum of the need for this expansion. It was concluded therefore that this item be given a low priority until such time as the status quo had been achieved in terms of business post the pandemic and the use of the car park reverts back to a pre-pandemic situation.

Car Parking review: Abandon Langley Hill, Expansion of the Nap: Low Priority.



Item 6: One Way System.

Discussion took place regarding the meeting organised by the residents of Vicarage Lane which was attended by various Council representatives and it was agreed the residents made a good case. Notwithstanding this did make a case on behalf of small group of affected individuals directly resident between Marwood Close and Five Acres close. The question posed was 'is this still a major issue' particularly since the pandemic when traffic flows have been significantly reduced and could anyone remember being particularly delayed when using this route over the past 6 months.

Parish representatives, whilst accepting this point, did however feel very strongly that this still represented a major area of concern for the villagers and would raise its head once more post pandemic and that the issue, constantly on the agenda of villagers should be addressed.

It was agreed that an immediate feasibility study be undertaken to review the possibility of a trial of a 'one way' system for a period of three months.

Andrew indicated that this may not be quick but it was agreed that this would be undertaken and given high priority on the Transport Group list.

One Way System: High Priority, Initiate an immediate feasibility study.

Item 7: Road Safety – Primary School Crossing @ Rectory Lane.

Andrew reported significant progress on this issue with regard to a 'Lollypop person' being agreed as the short-term way forward. The recruitment of such an individual may pose a significant problem, however it was hoped this could be in place by the Spring.

Parish representatives felt there may be an opportunity to utilise 'Volunteer' support to take on this role in the short term using a combination of links to the 'volunteer centre' in Hemel and local 'social media' to promote this need. There was collective agreement that this was an absolute high priority.

Equally it was agreed that although this was a significant step forward there was, in the longer term, an absolute need for a more permanent electronic set of pedestrian lights at this junction once Rectory Farm additional housing came on stream.

Funding existed for the 'manual' short term solution, Andrew indicated that a more permanent solution may require the order of approx. £100k and that this would need to be funded partly from the Rectory Farm CIL monies and also from other sources which may take some achieving.

Primary School Crossing (People Based): High Priority.

Primary School Crossing (Electronic): High Priority.

Item 8: Traffic Lights at the Nap Crossing.

Much to the relief of the Group the opening of the Pre-School at this junction had, thus far, not seemed to have caused additional traffic issues or more importantly serious traffic/accident issues. Again, this could be as a consequence of reduced traffic through the working at home directive from Government, thus giving a short-term false picture which may well change once 'Covid' overcome and the situation reverts to the new norm.

There was certainly a view from Parish representatives that this would become, once again, a major issue which would need addressing and that the solution was a revamp of this junction layout involving the removal of the SPAR pedestrian crossing and integrating this into a consolidated traffic and pedestrian crossing at the point of the Nap and Vicarage Lane.

Andrew indicated that this may be of the order of £200k to achieve but the general consensus was that this was an absolute priority, would represent a significant step towards a first phase of the ARUP report, was supported by the inclusion of this road safety aspect in the Neighbourhood Pan and therefore was considered to be a high priority task.

Traffic Lights at the Nap Junction: High Priority.

Item 9: Tow Path completion:

This was an additional item discussed at the meeting and was now assumed to fall into the realms of the Transport Group.



KINGS LANGLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Andrew indicated that two sources of funding had been identified which would contribute to the completion of this section of the Tow Path and that progress was likely to take place in the 2022 year.

This was welcomed by the Group although would not feature in its priority list and would remain with for monitoring purposes with the Transport Group.

Item 10: Red Lion Lane congestion:

Again, not specifically on the agenda for Transport Group but a continuing problem and source of complaint from residents. Transport Group would now include this in its remit.

Andrew was able to report some progress in resolving the parking issue and the 'Double Yellow Lining' of some parts, particularly the narrow areas close to the traffic islands which would assist the traffic flow through these narrow sections.

We await further updates on this situation.

Item 11: Double Yellow Lines, corner of Rucklers Lane and London Road.

Highlighted as a continuing issue as a danger point for traffic both entering and existing Rucklers Lane from London Road. The major issue is the parking of resident's vehicles so close to the junction and this requires, albeit a short stretch, of the road to be 'yellow lined' from London Road to some 7 metres back into Rucklers Lane to the second dwellings on each side of the road, this will offer a clear sight when both entering and exiting the junction. Parish representatives had believed that this was always part of the original re-development of the junction which did not get completed and feel this does represent a High Priority for the Transport Group.

There being no further items for discussion the Chairman wished everyone a Merry Christmas, a Happy New Year and thanked participants for a most constructive and productive meeting.