

**STATES RESOURCE PLAN 1998 (P.112/98):
SIXTH AMENDMENT**

**Lodged au Greffe on 16th June 1998
by the Planning and Environment Committee**



STATES OF JERSEY

STATES GREFFE

**STATES RESOURCE PLAN 1998 (P.112/98):
FIFTH AMENDMENT**

In sub-paragraph (b) of the proposition, after the words Appendix 5.4 insert the words with the addition for the years 2000, 2001 and 2002 respectively of the projects 47, 48, and 49 (Urban Renewal Programme).

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REPORT

Urban renewal vote

The Planning and Environment Committee wishes to amend the outcome of the recent Capital Programme Review and Prioritisation Workshop. The recommendation made in the States Resource Plan 1998, specifically in relation to capital funds for the Urban Renewal Programme being withdrawn in 2000 - 2002 is not acceptable to the Committee. The arguments for restoring the budget provision are summarised below -

Public commitment

The States will be aware that the Urban Renewal Programme was established as a direct response to the Strategic Policy Review. The initiative was subsequently developed and a programme was prepared to operate over an initial five-year period. The five-year programme, commencing in 1997, and the associated capital funding to support it, represents a commitment which has been stated publicly in the press and through the publication of documents associated with the programme. Cutting the programme part-way through will do nothing but harm to the credibility of the States and those responsible for determining spending priorities.

Continuity

In a capital programme of this nature, involving a multitude of agencies all working on different aspects of urban renewal, the issue of continuity is extremely important. Much time and effort has been invested in building up good working relations to ensure that any potential barriers to implementation, which can beset capital projects where various interests are involved, are removed. The Committee has fostered these relations with the community but is now faced with the withdrawal of the capital funds that are required to implement the programme of works that has been prepared.

Community support

In essence, the work of urban renewal is focused on making urban environments more pleasant places to live and to enhance their utility - to make them more user-friendly. Urban Renewal supports many of the States strategic policies and enjoys much community support. Commitments have been made and good working relations established with residents, community groups and sectors of industry and commerce in parts of St. Helier and St. Brelade. This work, however small in scale and cost, where the Island's taxpayers can influence and directly benefit from changes to their daily environment that will enhance the quality of their lives, is subsequently unnecessarily threatened by the withdrawal of this funding.

The business community are also supportive of the work of the programme: the Urban Renewal Vote significantly finances the Centre Ville initiative. Enhancing the environment of the town and making it easier and safer for people is good for business and creates a favourable image and experience for tourists. Through these environmental changes, direct economic benefits are secured.

Contribution to strategic objectives

Perhaps most importantly, the Committee is concerned that a capital programme which requires a relatively modest amount of funding but which contributes to so many of the strategic objectives of the States and States committees should suddenly, after being regarded as one of the highest priorities for capital support in the last three years, have its funding withdrawn even though there has been no corresponding change in States policies. Against the context of the current housing shortage, the Housing Forum, improving tourism infrastructure, the work of Centre Ville (which is funded only for as long as urban renewal funding exists) and the need to make the urban areas of the Island more attractive places to live in, visit and work in, the proposed withdrawal of funding from this important programme does not represent good governance.

Not only does the programme offer environmental benefits, but by so doing it serves to enhance the image of our urban areas as attractive places to live, to work, to shop and to enjoy, as well as make them safer

and easier to use, whatever the mode of transport. Consequently, the benefits to be derived from the programme contribute to the economic, social, stewardship and environmental objectives that fall within the remit of a number of States committees.

In the light of the above, the Planning and Environment Committee wishes to propose to the States that the capital funding for the Urban Renewal Programme be restored to the States Capital Programme for 2000 to 2002 and would include projects 47, 48, and 49 (Urban Renewal Programme) in its capital programme for 2000, 2001 and 2002 as set out in Appendix 5.4. Details set out in the attached chart.

CHART ONE

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMME 1998 - 2002

Programme elements and projects	Current	Future			
		Projected budget 1999 (£s)	Projected budget 2000 (£s)	Projected budget 2001 (£s)	Capital bid 2002 (provisional) (£s)
Open spaces					
Children's play space	25,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
EPIAs					
EPIAs	84,900	100,000	100,000	100,000	120,000
Havre des Pas	122,400	100,000	0	0	0
Town centre					
Snow Hill	227,900	0	0	0	0
Ordnance Yard	5,000	0	9,500	9,500	0
Town murals	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
West Centre	100,000	0	0	0	0
Pedestrian accessibility	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	310,000
Centre Ville	30,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Design services	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Corridors and gateways					
Victoria Avenue	45,000	35,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Tourist areas					
St. Aubin	0		25,000	25,000	0
Town trees					
Town tree programme	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Other urban areas					
Les Quennevais	26,500	10,000	10,000	0	0
Other groups	0	10,000	10,000	25,000	27,000
Others					
Exhibitions/ conferences/ printing & publications	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Total	814,700	548,000	497,500	502,500	600,000
Cumulative projected spend (incl. 1996/97 carry over)	951,200	1,499,200	1,996,700	2,499,200	3,099,200
Projected cumulative Urban Renewal vote	1,000,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000	3,100,000