

# STATES OF JERSEY



## ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 26th April 2011  
by the Deputy of St. Mary

---

STATES GREFFE

**1 PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

“except that in paragraph 8.31 (page 299), after the words ‘the Institution of Highways and Transportation guidelines’ insert the words ‘, interpreted and modified as necessary to Jersey conditions, with such adaptations to be consulted on with users.’ ”.

**2. PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

“except that in Policy TT1 – Protection of the Island’s footpaths and cycle network (page 299), after the words ‘other rights of way’ insert the words ‘or future development of these networks’ ”.

**3. PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words “except that –

- (a) in paragraph 8.60 (page 307) after the words ‘off-road cycle facilities’, insert the words ‘and on-road treatments’;
- (b) in Policy TT3 – Cycle routes (page 307), in the first paragraph, after the words ‘off-road cycle facilities’ in both places where they occur, insert, on each occasion, the words: ‘and on-road treatments’ ”.

**4. PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

“except that in Policy TT5 – Road safety (page 309) delete the words ‘where possible’ ”.

**5. PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words –

“except that in Policy TT6 – Park and ride (page 312) –

- (a) in the first paragraph for the word ‘will’ substitute the word ‘may’;
- (b) after criterion 2 insert a new criterion as follows –  
‘3 is better than other existing or possible sites for hubs’ ”.

DEPUTY OF ST. MARY

---

## REPORT

### **Amendment (1) – Paragraph 8.31 (page 299)**

As it stands the text says –

**“8.31** If the opportunity arises to improve facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists this should be secured and routes provided in accordance with the Institution of Highways and Transportation<sup>(7)</sup> guidelines. Care should be taken to ensure that development adjacent to existing pedestrian or cycle facilities does not hinder the safety (and perception of safety) of users of the networks by providing adequate sight lines, safe crossing points and avoiding potential conflict points where possible.”.

I think this is unwise and should be qualified. As it stands, this text applies the IHT guidelines, without exception or qualification, to Jersey. I had some experience with UK highways guidance in the past, and it is evident that it simply would not fit into Jersey.

My amendment simply modifies this absolutist position to take account of our local situation where space is at an absolute premium.

However, as this is a derogation from a national standard, which may indeed have much to commend it, I add a safeguard, which is that there must be consultation with users. We do not want low standards we want standards which are safe and which offer convenience, so far as this is possible, to all users of the roadway or footway.

### **Amendment (2) – Policy TT1 (page 299)**

As it stands the Policy reads –

“In order to protect the integrity of the Island’s footpath and cycle network, both off road and along the road side, development proposals that would result in the loss, or prevent the use, of any part of the existing pedestrian or cycle network or other rights of way, or compromise the safety of users thereon, will not be approved, unless alternative routes are provided that are similar or better in quality, safety, convenience and length.”.

The Policy as it stands treats the Island’s footpath and cycle network as if it is set in aspic, and will never evolve. The amendment simply allows for the likelihood of future enhancements and additions to the walking and cycling networks, which in turn, will need to be protected in the same way as existing provision.

Additions already being implemented or which will be implemented soon are the walking route from the St. Mary’s over-55s development to the nearest bus-stop and the new cycle route connecting Liberation Square to Havre des Pas via La Collette.

This amendment will ensure that these welcome additions to provision for walkers and cyclists will be able to be protected in the same way as existing provision.

### **Amendment (3) – Policy TT3 (Page 307)**

As it stands, the Policy clearly implies that the provision of off-road facilities is the only way to secure improvements for cyclists, “anywhere in the island”. Such measures “will be supported”.

This ignores the fact that in practice most improvements which have been made in the Island have been using existing roads, e.g. the Tourism Jersey Cycling Network, and that it is likely that such improvements will mostly continue to be on-road in future.

I would urge members to vote for the principle of developing better routes for cyclists – commuters, shoppers, as well as tourists and leisure riders – without pre-judging how this should be done.

The notion that off-road is the only way, which underlies the phrasing of the Policy as it stands, is a misconception, and an expensive one at that.

### **Amendment (4) – Policy TT5 (Page 309)**

The policy as amended would read –

“Where appropriate, traffic and pedestrian safety measures will be implemented on the highway network, particularly in residential areas, and near schools, to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists, reduce vehicle speeds and enhance the street environment. In new residential developments, all new road layouts should be designed to reinforce low vehicle speeds, cycle safety and pedestrian priority.”

Unamended, the last sentence would read –

“In new residential developments, all new road layouts should, where possible, be designed to reinforce low vehicle speeds, cycle safety and pedestrian priority.”

The change is self-explanatory. The notion that designing in road safety is a “where possible” matter is astonishing.

This amendment would impose a duty on those designing new residential developments to design out road danger in just the same way as Policy GD1, for example, refers to “the need to design out crime.”

I am assured by the Planning Department that to substitute the word “will” for the word “should” is not necessary

### **Amendment (5) – Policy TT6 (page 312)**

(a) The first part of this amendment simply corrects what appears to be a drafting error. As it stands, the Policy reads –

“Proposals for the provision of park and ride facilities will be approved on sites within the Built-up Area, provided that the site:” . . . and then follow 2 conditions which must be met:

- “1. is well related to the primary route network and is, or could be, well served by a bus route; and
2. does not adversely affect the environment of local communities such that the proposals minimise the visual impact of the facilities through appropriate design, location and the provision or enhancement of landscaping in accord with Policy GD1 ‘General development considerations’.”

This means that provided the 2 conditions are met, any site must be approved. I trust this is not the intention of the Minister.

In fact there are other issues not covered by the 2 conditions as stated, and also better alternatives to park and ride itself may be available. The “may” gives the necessary flexibility.

- (b) The second part of this amendment is self-explanatory. It adds the notion that a proposal should be assessed against other possibilities, a requirement which is not present in the Policy as drafted.

#### **Financial and manpower implications**

There are no additional financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this amendment.