## **STATES OF JERSEY**

1

## ST. HELIER WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT: DIRECTIONS TO W.E.B. LTD. (P.159/2005) – COMMENTS

Presented to the States on 6th September 2005 by the Policy and Resources Committee

**STATES GREFFE** 

## **COMMENTS**

The Policy and Resources Committee does not believe that it would be in the public interest to instruct the Waterfront Enterprise Board 'to refrain from taking any further steps to progress the development of the St. Heliel Waterfront until the manner in which the area should be developed has been considered and agreed by the Assembly in 2006'. This could mean a delay of at least 6 months, and possibly longer, until such time that the new Assembly has had the opportunity to consider the issues and agree on a way forward. The proposition would not only impact on these elements of the Waterfront that are still being designed, but would mean that W.E.B. were unable to fulfil outstanding commitments to existing projects and developers including the Island Site, Harbour Reach, and the Waterfront Hotel. If these developments were to be halted or significantly delayed as a result of the moratorium, the legal and cost implications could be very significant.

Senator Shenton is of course correct when he states that the public of Jersey need time to reflect on decisions being made on the Waterfront. These are major decisions, and the public does need to be involved. It should be pointed out, however, that the public is already being given the opportunity to comment on the proposals, and Dandara Limited have recently decided to withdraw their plans in the light of comments received from the public about the height of the proposed buildings. Mr. David Crossland has indicated that he intends to revise his plans in the light of comments from the public and CABE. Consultation will continue on the development proposals for Castle Quay, Les Jardins de la Mer and other sites on the Waterfront, and the developers have made it clear that they will listen to the comments from States members and the public before finalising any plans for submission to the planning authorities. It should be noted that the work and investment undertaken by the developers is entirely at their own risk and that no Planning applications have yet been submitted.

Once schemes have been finalised by the developers working in conjunction with W.E.B. they will be submitted for planning approval and will be subject to the full planning process just like any other scheme. Senator Shenton's proposition is therefore not only damaging in respect of existing commitments but is unnecessary, and, contrary to his Report, could have substantial financial implications.

Finally, the report accompanying P.159/2005 contains 2 significant errors which should be drawn to the attention of members –

- Firstly, it is stated that the Waterfront Enterprise Board is the planning authority for the St. Heliel Waterfront. This is clearly not the case, as this authority rests with the Environment and Public Services Committee.
- Secondly, it is stated that 'the States appointed as Chairman of W.E.B. an ex-politician who happened to be a consultant for Dandara', and it is implied that this involvement resulted in a change in plans for the Waterfront 'in favour of the developer'. It is regrettable that the Senator should resort to this kind of innuendo, and the Committee would strongly refute any allegation or insinuation that the Chairman of W.E.B. has acted in an improper manner. It is widely known that Mr. Horsfall acted as a consultant to Dandara for a period of approximately 12 months followin his retirement from the States, but it should be pointed out that this involvement was made clear at the time of his application for the post of Chairman of W.E.B. The consultancy arrangements with Dandara were terminated as soon as Mr. Horsfall was advised that he had been selected for the post of Chairman of W.E.B.

In conclusion, therefore, the Policy and Resources Committee strongly opposes the proposition, and recommends that it be rejected.