

ISLAND PLAN (P.69/2002): SECOND AMENDMENTS (P.69/2002 Amd.(2))- COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 25th June 2002
by the Planning and Environment Committee**



STATES OF JERSEY

STATES GREFFE

150

2002

P.69 Amd.(2) Com.

Price code: A

Comments of the Planning and Environment Committee on paragraph (a) of the amendment of the Public Services Committee

1. The Planning and Environment Committee supports the encouragement of walking and the use of public transport as important components of a sustainable transport system for the Island. It is, however, of the view that the proposal of the Public Services Committee to require the provision of roadside footpaths along site frontages, where none exists, as part of any proposal for significant developments on main routes, is not an appropriate means to achieve these objectives.
2. It is considered that the adoption of a crude 'blanket' policy requiring footpaths to be provided along the frontage of any development adjacent a main road in the Island would be ruinous for the character and appearance of the countryside. The potential for the unqualified loss of roadside walls, banques, hedges and trees which do so much to define the uniqueness of Jersey through the adoption of such a policy is immense and should not be countenanced when so much of the emphasis of the Island Plan, and other States policy, seeks to protect and enhance that which is special to the Island.
3. Pedestrian safety is, however, a matter of great concern. The provision of safe and convenient pedestrian routes should, however, be related to need and should be based on a planned and co-ordinated approach to the provision of such routes where they are specifically required. Roadside pavements in the built-up area, urban and key rural settlements should be a priority. Footpath links from these centres to peripheral bus stops would also appear to warrant attention.
4. The Planning and Environment Committee is of the view that it is incumbent upon the Public Services Committee, as the Island's strategic highway authority, to specifically define such a network and to embark upon a specific programme secure it, rather than seeking to impose a loose and ill-defined blanket requirement that any development next to any main road in the Island should have a footpath. The Committee has made this point in the States Chamber before when the President answered questions from Deputy Gerard Baudains regarding a site in St. Clement. The Public Services Committee's approach not only has the potential to result in many small, unconnected sections of footpath, possibly on different sides of the road, throughout the Island, as development occurs in a haphazard and incremental fashion, but is also likely to lead to a footpath network which remains piecemeal and incomplete indefinitely as it is entirely dependent upon development opportunities, rather than a proactive approach to the planned implementation of the required safe pedestrian network. A defined and targeted approach to the improvement of the pedestrian route network, agreed by both the Public Services and Planning and Environment Committees, is adopted for the Town of St. Helier through the identification of road widening lines: this specific approach should be adopted and applied outwith the town to those parts of the primary route network where footpath provision is specifically justified, taking into account those factors mentioned above.
5. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed Policy G10 of the Jersey Island Plan Final Draft 2002 (pages 411) has the potential to require the provision of any associated infrastructure deemed necessary as a direct consequence of a development proposal through the establishment of a planning obligation. This may include the provision of infrastructure both within the boundaries of a site and off-site. Consequently, the proposed Plan has the necessary provisions to ensure that where major developments occur next to or in close proximity to a main road that has no footpath, that such a facility could be provided by the developer, where the development necessitated it, under the terms of this policy.
6. On the basis of the above, the Planning and Environment Committee is of the view that this proposition should be rejected.