

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN 2015 – 2018 (P.27/2015): TENTH AMENDMENT (P.27/2015 Amd.(10)) – COMMENTS**

---

**Presented to the States on 27th April 2015  
by the Council of Ministers**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## COMMENTS

- (1) The Minister for Planning and Environment is already intending to bring forward and consult upon new planning guidance on the design of homes, which will include standards for density; the size of homes; and the provision of amenity and parking space, which will all seek to promote and enable good quality urban living and contribute to the objectives of this Strategic Priority.

The Council of Ministers therefore accepts the Amendment

- (2) The Council shares the broad ambitions for the future development of Havre des Pas.

The purpose of the Strategic Plan, however, is to set a high-level direction which informs the development of detailed delivery plans. The Plan already commits to the development of a Masterplan for the town of St. Helier, including the associated urban areas of St. Saviour and St. Clement. This entails the development of –

- a Public Realm Strategy to increase the quality and quantity of public space – streets, squares, parks, other green space – and the links between them;
- a clear and comprehensive plan for travel and transport in and around the town; ring-road parking; more pedestrian areas; adequate parking for the town.

The St. Helier Masterplan needs to be developed in a comprehensive manner in relation to the whole of the town. It will, as a matter of course, need to consider the concerns and aspirations of everyone who lives, works and trades in the town, as well as the specific interests of individual communities within the town, including the residents of Havre des Pas, amongst others.

The Council is therefore concerned that the Amendment proposes the commissioning of a separate, parallel Masterplan for transport and public realm improvements for Havre des Pas and the dedicated allocation of ring-fenced funding for this purpose.

The Council believes that the comprehensive reviews set out in its own proposals will provide the opportunities for residents and users of Havre des Pas to voice their aspirations for the future and result in properly costed, sequenced and prioritised plans for the area. It cannot support a piecemeal, more costly approach to achieve the same ends.

The Council therefore rejects the Amendment.

- (3) The Council shares the broad ambition for the development of a contiguous promenade for St. Helier and the ‘Desired Outcome’ outlined in the Amendment is consistent with existing States policy.

The States' Sustainable Transport Policy already states –

*'Long term redevelopment plans for the harbours areas may provide an opportunity to connect existing or proposed cycle routes to and from the west and east with the ultimate aspiration to provide a cycle route from Corbière and the Airport through to Gorey Pier.'*

The purpose of the Strategic Plan, however is to set a high-level direction to inform the development of detailed delivery plans.

The development of a clear and comprehensive plan for travel and transport in and around the entire town is already defined as a key area of focus in the Strategic Plan. This will include an assessment of facilities and initiatives required to support and encourage walking and cycling.

The Council notes that the Amendment –

- is linked to Amendment 10(2), which proposes the development of a specific, separately funded Masterplan for Havre des Pas in parallel to the proposed St. Helier Masterplan;
- proposes a separate, ring-fenced funding allocation to examine the potential for harbour head links for cyclists and pedestrians.

The Council believes that development of a specific facility is a matter to be explored within the context of any detailed proposals to promote cycling and walking. The comprehensive reviews set out in the Plan will result in a properly costed, sequenced and prioritised plan for travel and transport in and around the town. The suggestion of a harbour heads link can be included in the review, but the Council cannot support a piecemeal, more costly approach to achieve the same ends.

The Council therefore rejects the Amendment.