

**JERSEY MINERAL STRATEGY 2000-2020 (P.51/2001): REPORT**

---

**Presented to the States on 17th April 2001  
by the Public Services Committee**

---

**STATES OF JERSEY**

**STATES GREFFE**

180

2001

P.51 Rpt.

Price code: B

## REPORT

### 1. Introduction

The Public Services Committee welcomes the opportunity to comment formally on Proposition 51/2001, the “Jersey Mineral Strategy 2000-2020” and would state at the outset that it supports recommendations (i) - (v) of the Proposition.

However, the Committee is obliged to bring to the attention of the States certain ramifications of the Strategy which do not appear to have been addressed to date, but which are of relevance to other strategies and policies of the States.

### 2. Chronology

The Public Services Committee and the Department have been consulted on relevant matters during the development of the Strategy; however, the proposal to create a new berth and handling area at St. Helier Harbour was only put forward as the preferred strategy in August 2000. The following chronology is relevant.

August 2000	Revised Mineral Strategy Report circulated for consultation.
August 2000	Public Services Department commented that traffic implications of the proposal need to be considered and that road improvements and traffic management measures will be necessary.
February 2001	Act B7 of Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 23rd November 2000 received by Public Services Committee, intimating that the Mineral Strategy document was to be lodged “au Greffe”.
February 2001	Public Services Committee sent an Act to Planning and Environment Committee stating that either an Environmental Impact Study of the Strategy should be carried out or the completion of the Island Plan should be awaited before lodging the Mineral Strategy.

March 2001	Vice-President of Planning and Environment Committee attended Public Services Committee to discuss the Report and Proposition which was being lodged. A copy of the draft Proposition was distributed to Public Services Committee. This was the first occasion that the Committee was aware that clause (iv) of the Proposition would include the phrase “subject to transport infrastructure being adequate”.
March 2001	Planning and Environment Committee lodge Report and Proposition 51/2001.

### 3. Concerns

The Public Services Committee recognises that a number of the concerns, which both the Committee and the Public Services Department had raised in the consultation stages, have been acknowledged in the Planning and Environment Committee’s Report, even if only in note form.

The main concerns are in respect of -

- traffic generation;
- the impact of this traffic on the existing road network both in terms of traffic levels and the need for highway improvements; and
- potentially compromising other planned developments, particularly on the Waterfront and at La Collette.

### 4. Traffic generation

The traffic movements resulting from operating an aggregate facility at La Collette have not been included in any traffic modelling exercises carried out to date. Similarly, the current traffic to the tipping site at La Collette has never been included in any traffic modelling as it was considered to be of a temporary nature and would be replaced by the planned developments on the completed site.

The area in question at La Collette was modelled as a light industrial area, (warehousing). An aggregate facility will generate more traffic movements than that of some light industrial units. If, as is likely to be the case, aggregate processing operations also relocate to the site, the overall traffic generation will be considerably greater than that of the planned warehousing it replaces.

The Jersey Harbours Port Masterplan is still developing. The indications are that this too will lead to greater traffic generation than has been included in the planning to date.

It is essential that a proper assessment of the traffic generated by developments throughout the Waterfront and La Collette areas is carried out and plans modified to ensure that the impact of developments does not become unacceptable.

### 5. Impact of traffic

The traffic implications of the strategy have not been identified. Traffic generated by the Waterfront and La Collette developments will necessitate improvements to major junctions in the Weighbridge area and at Mount Bingham. It will also increase traffic levels in areas such as Havre des Pas and Green Street.

In addition to the volume of traffic, the type of traffic generated by the aggregates facility and any associated processing facility will have a deleterious effect on the road network, particularly in the Waterfront and La Collette areas but also throughout the Island, including St. Peter’s Valley and routes to Ronez at St. John, potentially requiring improvements to junctions at Bel Royal and Mont Felard, for example.

Lorries and other heavy vehicles cause damage to the road structure. Depending on the size of the lorry and its payload, a single lorry can cause more damage to a road than 100,000 car movements. While lorries currently access the tip at La Collette and travel to and from Granite Products, Simon Sands and Ronez, it is inevitable that greater damage to the existing road network will occur; for example, there will be a substantial increase in the volume of loaded traffic going into St. Peter’s

Valley. As a result, it will be necessary to carry out major reconstruction of the road structure and its supporting walls and embankments and in some cases, even some road widening.

As well as the cost of these works, there is the potential environmental impact of road widening in areas such as St. Peter's Valley.

While the Committee supports the Strategy, it must alert the States to these significant costs to the Island which are not discussed in the Report.

A feasibility vote has been approved for a comprehensive assessment of the condition of highways and highway structures. However, there is no capital allocation, as yet, for the reconstruction of roads nor any allocation for necessary road improvements.

## **6. Effect on other plans**

The Mineral Strategy requires a co-ordinated approach to development. It is evident that this has been addressed in linking it to the Solid Waste Management Strategy, which the Committee applauds.

However, the Committee's concerns in respect of traffic issues appear to have been left to the Island Plan Review to resolve. Initial sight of the draft Island Plan Review appears to indicate that such strategic planning matters have not been addressed or recognised.

## **7. Summary**

The Public Services Committee supports the Jersey Mineral Strategy, including the assurances contained therein that the traffic implications of all developments in the Harbour, Waterfront and La Collette areas will be addressed (to the satisfaction of the Public Services Committee), in the Island Plan Review.

The Committee wishes to alert the States to the fact that adopting the Mineral Strategy will involve considerable additional investment in the highway network and result in significant levels of heavy goods vehicle traffic circulating in the Waterfront and surrounding areas of St. Helier for the foreseeable future.