

Classification Level

Official.

Freedom of Information Exemption(s)

Decision Summary:	None.
Written Report:	None.
Supporting Document(s):	N/A - There are no supporting documents.

Reason for the application of a Freedom of Information Exemption(s)

Decision Summary:	N/A - There are no exemptions being applied.
Written Report:	N/A - There are no exemptions being applied.
Supporting Document(s):	N/A - There are no supporting documents.

Data Protection

[Data Protection principles](#) have been applied to this Written Report and the Supporting Document(s), if any. The following can be shared with Scrutiny and/or published:

Decision Summary:	Yes - redaction(s)/pseudonymization is not required.
Written Report:	Yes - redaction(s)/pseudonymization is not required.
Supporting Document(s):	N/A - There are no supporting documents.

Legal Advice

In accordance with the [Ministerial Code](#), its supplementary guidance on [Ministerial Decisions](#), and legal privilege principles: no verbatim legal advice, nor any text alluding to legal advice having been sought, is found in any of the documentation supporting the Ministerial Decision.

Preparatory Information

Ministerial Decision Type:	Miscellaneous
Ministerial Office:	Infrastructure
Signatory:	Minister
Lead Department:	Infrastructure and Environment (I&E)
Lead Directorate:	Operations and Transport (I&E)
Lead Officer:	Associate Director – Highways, Transport & Infrastructure

Required for the States Assembly:	No - the document(s) supporting this Ministerial Decision DO NOT require presenting/lodging with the States Assembly.
Children's Rights Impact Assessment:	No, a Children's Rights Impact Assessment is not required for this type of decision.
Human Rights Impact Assessment:	A Human Rights Impact Assessment is not required as part of this decision.

La Haule – Pathway Alterations

Introduction

This is a written report to support a Ministerial Decision and is to be read alongside the supporting documents, if any. This report has been prepared by officers and is viewed to be in accordance with the [Ministerial Code](#), supplementary guidance on [Ministerial Decisions](#), appropriate [Freedom of Information exemptions](#), and with consideration of [Data Protection Principles](#).

Supporting Documents

There are no other documents supporting this Ministerial Decision.

Reason for the Decision

It is recognised that there is a fall hazard and associated risk along this area of the sea front. There have been two recorded incidents where it is known that members of the public have fallen off the edge of the existing shared pedestrian / cycle path. A formal risk assessment has been carried out which recommended that edge protection be provided.

Having visited the site, the Minister believes that alternative mitigations should be used. These measures are not a substitute for physical edge protection but would raise user awareness and improve delineation along the path. The Minister was not aware of the last planning application to instal edge protection (railings) and recognises that there is not sufficient community or political support at present for this particular mitigation. The proposed measures therefore seek to balance safety concerns and the technical advice with these views and are proposed as a practical and pragmatic compromise.

To avoid increased urban clutter, it is proposed that the measures could be introduced progressively, with their effectiveness and user acceptability assessed overtime, in terms of balancing the need to improve safety and minimise visual impact. This would also help inform whether further future intervention would be required to ensure public safety.

Recommendation

The Minister decided to implement, on a progressive basis, the following measures along the sea front between La Haule slipway and Le Mielle, St Aubin:

- Painting a solid white line along the edge of the asphalt path adjacent to the sea wall.
- Extending the physical segregation between the cycle and pedestrian paths at the north-eastern end.
- Installing additional warning signage.

Action Required if the Recommendation is Adopted

The department and/or Ministerial Office to update relevant parties of the decision.

Resource Implications

These measures can be introduced through the utilisation of existing resources within the department, and do not require additional monies.

Conflict of Interest

The decision-maker does not have an actual or perceived conflict of interest as relates to this decision.