

STATES OF JERSEY

Committee of Inquiry Public Meeting

FRIDAY, 25th APRIL 2008

Panel:

Mrs. C.E. Canavan (Chairman)

Mr. D.J. Watkins

Mr. P. Kemble

Witnesses:

Mr. D. St. George (Highways and Traffic Engineer, Transport and Technical Services)

Clerk to the Committee:

Mrs J Bell-Cook

Mrs. C.E. Canavan (Chairman):

Mrs. Bell-Cook you have been corresponding with, she is the clerk for our committee, Mr. Kemble and Mr. Watkins. To briefly explain, we have had volumes of documents, obviously, from Planning Department which have included comments that you have made and correspondence that you have sent in. From that correspondence we have drafted this list of questions. It does not cover the whole area; we know that, because we did not want to waste everybody's time going over areas that we are happy we have the information for. You have had the questions. We may digress, if that is okay with you, if something crops up as a result of what you have said.

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

The traffic implications of Bel Royal before the rezoning debate: how involved were you or the department before the rezoning?

Mr. D. St. George:

Roger Corfield at the Planning and Building Services Department wrote to me (you do not mind me referring to my notes, I take it) on 11th June 2001 and I wrote back on 10th July 2001. I assume that you will have seen that letter. That letter was in reply to my comments on 15 sites which were then being proposed for rezoning for housing. The first part of that letter was talking generally about the impact throughout the Island. Presumably you have that letter on file. I have it here, so I could read it all out to you.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

No, we have it.

Mr. D. St. George:

What I did in that letter was I talked generally about the fact that all these sites were going to generate quite a bit more traffic. I made particular reference to the fact that a number of sites would increase traffic on St. Aubins Inner Road. I predicted at that time that St. Aubins Inner Road traffic might

increase by about 14 per cent if all these sites came to fruition. The point of that was that careful consideration needs to be given to encouraging alternative means of travel if this number of housing units is to be provided outside of the town area, particularly those in the west of the Island. That particular site was not seen as one of the worst sites [such as the one in] in St. Ouen, for example. We saw it as worse because of the opportunity for people to go about their lives with less car use would be much reduced, whereas the Bel Royal site, although it was in a pretty congested area, did give people opportunities to walk to the primary school, to cycle or get the bus into work. In that letter it made particular comments for each individual site. With regards to the Bel Royal site, my particular comments were: "Footpath to inner roads, bus route needed, road binding for footpaths and pedestrian crossing islands is recommended, visibility required 50 by 2.5. Positive points: close to a primary school, some shopping facilities within walking distance, excellent cycle facility via the Perquage path and coastal cycle track. Negative point: poor direct bus service to route 8, although a frequent bus, service routes, is 0.7 kilometres away on the inner road. Potentially significant increase to traffic flow on the inner road to and from St. Helier." That was the gist of my comments. As I say, the important [point] was we were commenting on 15 sites at the time as opposed to going into any great detail on one particular site.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

A simple question: how do you gauge the effect? How do you get to that figure?

Mr. P. Kemble:

I must say 14 per cent alarms me for 120 houses, or the 97 we are now getting.

Mr. D. St. George:

The 14 per cent related to all the 15 sites.

Mr. P. Kemble:

But you did say the increase along the St. Aubins Inner Road was 14 per cent.

Mr. D. St. George:

That was my prediction at that time that was correct. That was for if all 15 sites ...

Mr. P. Kemble:

Yes, but the 15 sites, with respect, are in different parts of the Island. They are not going to have an impact on St. Aubins Inner Road.

Mr. D. St. George:

Some would. We have a computer traffic model which enables us to do it much more scientifically, but we have only recently updated it. At that time we did not do a modelling exercise, partly because we were not asked to and partly because it was starting to get too out of date. I did a manual assessment. In answer to your question, we have survey data from housing estates, so [that] we know what a typical traffic generation for a [particular] housing estate [is]. If you are building a housing estate in St. Ouen, for example, it will generate more car trips per house than a housing estate will at, say, First Tower, where people are less likely to use their cars for every single trip. We have standard rates. It works out roughly about one car trip per household in the country areas, so that will be about 0.8 of a trip coming out in the morning rush hour and 0.2 going back in. We have quite a lot of data, so we have a very good feel for the amount of traffic that we would expect to come out of a particular housing estate. For that particular exercise, I looked at the 15 sites that the Planning Department were considering and said: "Right, up at St. Peter's Village they were proposing 80 or so houses up there, so that is about 80 car trips in the morning rush hour, 20 coming in -- 80 car trips, about 60 coming out and 20 or so going in. Of those 60, the majority would head toward St. Helier but not all, so you then say for St. Peter's

Village some will go down Beaumont Hill and some will cut across into St. Peter's Valley, so I split some between the 2 routes. Obviously, the Bel Royal site, everybody is going to come on to St. Peter's Valley Road. There are some other trips from St. Ouen. There is a site that was rezoned for housing for about 40 houses up there. I worked out the amount of traffic that would come out of each housing estate and put it on to the nearest road, or somewhere like St. Peter's Village, partly on Beaumont Hill and partly on to St. Peter's Valley and then accumulated for the 15 sites what I expected the increases to be on all the various roads. There are a lot of assumptions and generalisations made in these things. As traffic congestion increases, so people start to look at their mode of travel and their time of travel. When your percentage increase is going to tip the balance and cause major amounts of traffic congestion, the likelihood is that will not materialise because people will spread on to other routes if they can, or think about using a different mode of travel. There is quite a science and a lot of computer modelling goes into predicting things, but at that time I just did a very crude manual assessment. The message I was trying to get over to planning at the time was that whenever you build houses outside the immediate St. Helier area, it is invariably going to add to the traffic problem. As a traffic engineer I would like to see all the houses built within walking distance of St. Helier.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Number 2 you have answered. The next one we were asking was what constitutes unacceptable levels of traffic. A hard one, I am sure.

Mr. D. St. George:

That is the hardest question to answer. I think it is pretty subjective. Traffic engineers have ways of assessing capacities of roads, but it is usually the junctions that roads go in to more than the road itself, although roads do have limited capacity. The road between Bel Royal and Beaumont is the main road in Jersey which has quite limited capacity, never mind the junctions either side of it. Ideally, you would be able to say that the roads or junctions in the immediate area of the development you are looking at do have spare capacity and you could predict the amount of extra traffic and show that it would stay within capacity. That would definitely be an acceptable level of increase, I would suggest. Quite what then becomes an unacceptable level really is hard to say. The Planning Department have to weigh up lots of other considerations and we just input into the process. I did not say in this exercise that something is acceptable or unacceptable. I was really just giving them a steer that if they made the decision not to build 100 houses at Bel Royal, if you then ended up with vehicle sites that are further out from Bel Royal in the west of the Island, that would be worse. So, it would be difficult to say that that development is going to create an unacceptable level of traffic. You have to put it into the context of what you are being asked to consider, and the fact that the Planning Department have to weigh everything up. I do not know if I have explained that very well. There are scientific ways of trying to put numbers to these things, but what is unacceptable is subjective, I think. If a site is seen as reasonably good in that it is close to schools, shops, cycle routes, bus routes, then you might be more flexible in the amount of potential extra traffic you would get because you would know that the alternative modes are there. Whereas if you are looking a site in the middle of St. Ouen which is not on a bus route and is not by a school or a shop or whatever, then I would find it easier to draw the conclusion that there was an unacceptable level of traffic. When you looked at the numbers you would then be relating it to the whole significance of the site.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Can you tell us of a site, in your experience, which was unacceptable, or is that an impossible question?

Mr. D. St. George:

There will be occasions where the access is not safe, and certainly there have been sites -- I have been advising the Planning Department against any significant level of houses at the Plemont site. I could mention other sites of that nature.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

That is on access not on volume of traffic?

Mr. D. St. George:

No, it is on the issue of sustainability, so it would be difficult to say that the particular proposal up there would cause the road network to fail as such, but I would consider that it is a very poor site from the point of view of sustainable traffic. It is looking at how the Island has developed in the wider picture rather than individually. There may have been occasions where we would say a site is undoubtedly going to be so close to a junction that everybody is definitely going to be using that junction and the change in numbers would be so severe that it could lead to the conclusion that it is unacceptable. Or perhaps they simply cannot provide safe access or they are unable to provide good pedestrian access. There is the whole geometry of the site that you bear in mind. On the Bel Royal site they were able to provide a good access with proposed improvements to pedestrian footways and what have you. It did not quite get there with the full package that we wanted because of the issue of the tree getting listed.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

On balance you say this was a good site as far as traffic, because of the other possibilities of access and buses.

Mr. D. St. George:

We were sitting on the fence, I suppose, to be honest, but there were certainly a number of good factors. It was really a question of what the alternative is, bearing in mind at the time the Planning Department were faced with having to rezone a certain number of sites to provide for housing need. What I was trying to do was weigh up one site against the other. That site was reasonably good in terms of the fact that the trip generation rate could be expected to be relatively ... well, not low, because it is not. You could walk to town from there, but in this day and age people think it is too far to walk. As I say, if you can site places within definite walking distance of St. Helier then your trip rate comes down significantly.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

You wrote your comments only on the 15 sites when you were asked to comment. Would you then say: "But there are 2 large private sites which impact on this"? Would that be part of your response? You penalise these sites because of other sites out in St. Peter which may have already had an impact on traffic?

Mr. D. St. George:

In 2001 when I replied to the Planning Department, the information I had been given were these rezoned sites, so I commented then on the accumulation of traffic on those particular sites. I had not been given information on other private developments at that time, and had not been instructed by my seniors or from the Planning Department to do a study of it. In answer to questions that Deputy Le Fondre was asking a year or so ago, I did an exercise of accumulating all the known private and public, for want of a better word -- the rezoned sites plus all the private sites and did an annual estimate of the number of the trips I expected could potentially arise from that. More recently we are now doing a lot of work for the new Island Plan on this very issue: the accumulation of traffic and when best to provide potential new housing, given the potential population growth that the Island may have to accept.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

But statutorily you are only asked to reply to the question that is asked regarding the sites in rezoning?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes, but I think in answer to your question we do not just look completely in isolation. If you know that there is another development just up the road which is undoubtedly going to increase traffic levels on that road, then that would be a consideration. I remember discussing at the time with Dandara who appointed a consultant to do the traffic impact. I said there were these other known sites, and they said: "You cannot really blame us for the traffic that is going to be generated from those other sites." My answer to that was: "I cannot blame you for it, but I can certainly bear it in mind when I take on your information and pass on my comments to the Planning Department" which we did do.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

I do not know why question number 4 got in, because you did make recommendations, did you not?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

That is what you have just explained to us: the alternative means of travel and footpaths.

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes, and they were put in the feasibility study.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Yes, so I do not know how that one slipped through. Strategic plans for traffic. Can you explain basically what they are and how they are done and what use they are, before you tell us what the 2001 one was?

Mr. D. St. George:

The strategic plans that we have developed in my time have been to set a policy so the department can be consistent and know what general direction it should be going in. Going back many years we had a report by a Professor Gwilliam, and the States at the time had a car accommodation policy, which was basically just to try and build their way out of trouble: improve junctions, improve the ring road, provide car parking and accommodate car use. We have moved away from the policy now. The policy that was in place in 2001 was the 1999 Sustainable Transport Policy which the Public Services Committee at the time took to the States. It was all policy stuff. There was nothing specific in there that said: "Build a car park on site X" or: "Widen that road" or whatever. It talked about how to encourage more cycle use and better public transport and making sure that the Island was not completely spoilt by excessive car use. That was the policy in 1999 and it suffered from lack of funding. Now we have a draft policy which is called the Integrated Travel and Transport Policy, which is a bit overdue for going to the States. Because we work closely with our Minister on it, although it does not formally have States backing as yet, the sentiments of it are much the same as the 1999 policy and we are using parts of it, in effect, to advise officers as to how to apply the department's policy. That will get submitted to the States this year fairly shortly. Again, it is a firming up, really, of the 1999 policy, where we are looking to get some shift of mode of travel so there will be a relatively better proportion of people choosing public transport, cycling, walking, car sharing, so the impact of private-car traffic will be reduced.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

So at present the traffic plan is as it was, but with modifications which will become ...

Mr. D. St. George:

The formal answer is the 1999 policy is still the one that is in place, because we have not gone back to the States with the new policy as yet.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Number 7, the implication for traffic; that is what you were referring to earlier on, is it not?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Do you have to be asked specifically about accumulated impacts? If a plan was put in for you today, for example, for the Bel Royal site, forget what has gone on in the past, but if it went in today, would you just look at the impact on that road again?

Mr. D. St. George:

Well, as I was saying, we would be aware of other developments, and it is only part of the package. When traffic impact assessments are done in the U.K. it is quite common to apply a national growth rate to traffic. If they look at the volume traffic on the surrounding road network, they will say: "Year of opening will be 5 years' time and there may be 2 per cent growth per annum, so we will assume that the base traffic level will have gone up 10 per cent." We do not do that, because we have been monitoring traffic levels, and we are trying to do it perhaps more empirically. That is perhaps not the right word. We are monitoring traffic levels; we can show there has not been any significant traffic growth in the last 5 years and there has been quite a lot of new housing coming on line, which gives me hope that the modes of transport are slowly starting to change. We are doing some more survey work this year to try and assess that. What I am coming to is we do not say to a developer when we ask him to a traffic impact assessment: "Assume 2 per cent growth or 3 per cent growth." We will just take into account what are the known factors that are likely to influence the amount of background traffic which they then need to put their development traffic on top of to do an assessment of what the impact would be.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

For example, with the waterfront model that I saw, you have your computer in that. Presumably the cars coming in to where the road is supposed to go underground is traffic that you have calculated coming from everywhere east of, say, the Grand Hotel.

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes. The traffic in that model has come from surveying all the base traffic and then adding on to it all the predicted traffic for the known developments. In that particular case, we did not just add on the traffic the Esplanade Quarter would generate, we added all the other waterfront developments and also all the major office developments going up along the Esplanade and also on the corner of Kensington Place and what have you, so we had some predictions for the amount of traffic those sites would generate. It is a complicated thing because a lot of the people occupying those sites are relocated office workers that were already working in town and are just moving into different buildings, so the majority of it is not going to be a new trip. But for that particular exercise, we made an assumption that there would be some new traffic, so the model made an allowance for that. Certainly the Esplanade Quarter, if we are saying it is not acceptable to us then the Esplanade Quarter developer could quite rightly say: "Hold on, you are showing this road network failing because of traffic being generated by other sites and not just by mine."

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

That is what I was trying to get to in my head. It is not just the piece of road outside the development; it is the knock-on effect further down the road as well?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes. We do have some figures for the wider area on the Esplanade Quarter, although because in that

particular job they are making very substantial changes to the road network, they have concentrated on showing that their changes to the road network will deliver an acceptable network in that immediate area. They would argue that increases -- if you look further afield on the wider model that shows increases at Beaumont and what have you, then they would certainly be keen to argue that that is hardly any of their doing, because they are almost totally relocated trips.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

As far as this site is concerned, for example, when you looked at the figures, or if you looked at them today, would you then look at the effect as far away as, say, the traffic lights at the Grand [Hotel], or do you just stay within the area?

Mr. D. St. George:

The effect does dissipate, so the answer to that is it depends on how big a site you are talking about. On that Bel Royal site, we were talking about 100 houses producing something like about 0.7 trips out in the morning in rush hour, so about 70 trips. The majority of those will head towards St. Helier, but not all of them, so I think we estimated that there would be about 60 trips that go along St. Aubins Inner Road and then some will peel off down Rue du Galet, some will stay on the inner road. Some are, ultimately, going all the way to St. Helier, so every time you go another junction along the route, the effect reduces. In the U.K. it is common, if it is a congested network, to consider effects which cause a 5 per cent change to the junction, or uncongested networks will commonly use 10 per cent. That percentage will reduce as you go down each junction. I asked them on the Bel Royal site to analyse the effect on the 2 junctions at both ends of Rue du Galet on the basis that we did not really feel that it -- once you started then looking at First Tower and West Park and what have you, the numbers would reduce and it would be difficult to really pin a significant change on somewhere like the West Park Junction on the Bel Royal development.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Sorry they are simplistic questions, but I am just trying to work it out in my head.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

Would you have an idea of what unacceptable journey times would be, or pollution of sitting in jams and polluting the air? Is there a degree when you say this is unacceptable, or have we not reached that yet?

Mr. D. St. George:

What happens with congestion is people have their own idea of how much they will put up with, so they tend to spread their journey, which is what I was saying before. What we really want to get people to do is consider using their cars less. Congestion is the best means of getting a bit of modal shift, but the other thing that happens is people shift their time of travel. We tend to concentrate on what we call the peak hour. Generally if we you look at how traffic flows, it is probably about a peak hour but if you were doing a study in London, they will have a peak 3 hours. What I would say is when you look at our peaks and troughs on some of our roads, the peaks and troughs are relatively flat, so if you look at the traffic that goes through the tunnel, for example, it has almost the same flow throughout the whole day, so it is very worrying when you talk about increases of traffic on areas like that. In St. Peter's Valley you can see the little peaks for the morning rush hour and the evening peak hour and the gap in between drops very substantially. So it does give me comfort that as long as you are not predicting -- if you predict the amount of traffic that would cause the off peak to reach the level that the peaks are at, then that to me would be a very worrying scenario that I would suggest is unacceptable.

Mr. P. Kemble:

But built into that is the period of time that people are prepared to queue, is there not? That is the

frustrating thing, and one imagines that something unacceptable would be to have a queue down the Avenue, for example, that is being contributed to by development in the west of the Island, which to a degree almost happens now in the morning. You have [the] Grand Hotel back to First Tower is almost [a] solid 2 lanes. That is unacceptable to some people having to queue, but maybe not to others.

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes, it is subjective, is it not, really? It is also the time period that that queue occurs.

Mr. P. Kemble:

Yes, it is a relatively short time, I would imagine.

Mr. D. St. George:

What I am saying is we can take heart in the fact that roads like St. Peter's Valley do have quite big peaks and troughs, so there is scope to have more traffic in the off peak without getting to peak hour levels of congestion throughout the day, which I hope we never see in Jersey. There are some areas where there really is very little spare capacity.

Mr. P. Kemble:

The occupiers will twig that very quickly, will they not, one imagines? To move into town between 7.45 a.m. and 8.45 a.m. will be difficult, so they will just move their visiting time or their need to travel to a slightly different time.

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes, and that already happens from the west of the Island. There is a lot more traffic coming in at 7.00 a.m. from the west of the Island than there is from the east. The east does have traffic congestion, but its peak hour is quite definitely 8.00 a.m. and by about 8.55 a.m. it is gone, whereas in from the west it is spreading a bit.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

When you commented on the first rezoning, you will probably have seen the proposal for 97 houses, and at some stage shortly after that 15 per cent would be sheltered housing. The achievement now is only 5 per cent sheltered housing. Would that have affected you in terms of your response on traffic flows?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes. We have rates for sheltered housing and, as you might expect, they are much less than [those for] family housing, and family housing is much more likely to produce a commuter trip and a school trip. Sheltered housing is of less concern. As I was saying before, as a traffic engineer I would like to see all new housing now within walking distance of St. Helier, and we have certainly been inclined to get planning to take that aspect of things very, very seriously when they look at their rezoning. But sheltered housing is, from our point of view, much more acceptable. The amount of traffic and the type of trip that is made is less damaging. It is going to be less peak hour, less school, less commuter. But you are talking about small numbers, so if the 15 per cent dropped to 5 per cent, then to scientifically say your number of trips has dropped from 70 to 64 ...

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

The difference is not significant?

Mr. D. St. George:

It would be hard to show it as being particularly significant, yes. If you were talking about 100 sheltered housing units on the Bel Royal site as opposed to 100 family homes, then I would be able to make the case that there is a significant difference in the type of traffic, but a percentage variation in the split

would be much less so.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

I have just noted from the officer's report, which I think was 2006, that at that time it says: "T.T.S. has previously advised that a development of 140 homes should not be accepted on traffic impact grounds." Was that you that responded there?

Mr. D. St. George:

It must have been, yes.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

That would have obviously caused you concern enough to say do not accept 140.

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes. I have to confess I cannot remember particularly the occasion when I said that, but obviously at the time we were taking the view that less is better, because it is a congested area.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

I can look it up, but can you remember offhand what your view was when it went down to 129? Was that better?

Mr. D. St. George:

[Went down] from 140? In fact, I think it was 150 that was the original.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

It was 150, then it went to 140 and then it went down to 129.

Mr. D. St. George:

It is a question of scale, really, because to only lose 10 units of housing is an insignificant number in terms of traffic modelling. We were obviously hoping that we could get it down to a more manageable number so that the impact would reduce. Ten houses is not a huge deal of difference.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

The other conditions that you were concerned with, or recommendations I should say, were footpaths and the widening of the road. Was that your area, the widening of the road?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Can you give us a brief explanation as to what the plan was for the entrance and the wall and the trees in the first place and why it reached the stage where the developer could not carry out the plan?

Mr. D. St. George:

What we asked for was that the road should be widened so that, firstly, a pedestrian refuge could be provided to enable people to cross over from the northeast side of the road to the side. The current footpath that comes up from Bel Royal is only on one side of the road; it is on the northeast side and it runs out to nothing just before you get to the site, so my proposals were that that footpath needed to continue on to turn into Rue de la Blanche Pierre. We had favoured roadside footpaths, but we were comfortable that the footpath to connect through to Sandybrook could go behind the trees, but to continue the footpath up from Bel Royal up to Rue de la Blanche Pierre had to go roadside, which was

impossible to do without widening the road, and it was impossible to put in a pedestrian refuge, which was our favoured means of crossing facility. The road needs to be widened for that as well. So, what I had proposed was sections of footpath with a crossing facility which enabled to the people on the new development to get across to Blanche Pierre to go down to Sandybrook and to get across and go down to Bel Royal and for all those 4 basic sectors to all be safely linked up. It then turned out that the trees were listed, which made it impossible to do any road widening, which made it impossible to put in a crossing refuge or extend the footpath up from Bel Royal. We disputed that and a compromise was met whereby only one tree has been retained. That enables us to get the pedestrian crossing refuge which connects people from Bel Royal up, extends the existing footpath by about 40 or 50 yards as far as the site and as far as that crossing refuge. It does not, unfortunately, enable it to continue all the way up to Rue de la Blanche Pierre. We have a footpath which enables people to safely connect through to Bel Royal via the crossing, and a footpath that goes behind the trees down to Sandybrook. It does mean that people from Sandybrook in fact have to cross -- there is a section of footpath that we cannot deliver now because of keeping the one tree which is from the refuge up to Rue de la Blanche Pierre, so it does cause an extra road crossing. People who need to get to Rue de la Blanche Pierre will use the footpath along the site and then have to cross again opposite Rue de la Blanche Pierre. So, what we have ended up getting is about three-quarters of what we saw was the best provision for pedestrians.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

What is the timescale on that? When you made your initial recommendations that you should get your footpaths that you wanted in your plan, did you know that the trees were listed?

Mr. D. St. George:

The trees were not listed when we put in our requirements.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

And the requirements were on the planning permit before the trees were listed, is that right?

Mr. D. St. George:

They were, yes. The trees only became listed because when the developer started to remove them, people became very interested in the fact. That is when more attention was paid to the fact that trees had to go to deliver the road improvements.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

Did your plan have the effect of moving the entrance slightly south, or down towards Bel Royal? This road is outside the developed area slightly; it is just outside the red line, so it has come slightly down the road towards Bel Royal from the original.

Mr. D. St. George:

I am not quite sure what your question was. It does affect where the pedestrian refuge goes, but as long as we can get the refuge in a sensible position with safe visibility to play with, there was a bit of flexibility on where the access might go.

Mr. D.J. Watkins:

Who designs the road, you or planning?

Mr. D. St. George:

We put in our requirements and tell the developer that he has to design it into his scheme and then submit a plan to us which we approve.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Just so that I get the situation in my head correct, the recommendations were made and the trees were not listed. The developer then started to carry out the recommendations but was stopped because of the trees being knocked down. Then the trees were listed and that is when you had problems trying to get your recommendations?

Mr. D. St. George:

Yes, the developer could not deliver the recommendations that were all part of the original plans, because of the listing of the trees. We had a number of meetings with the Planning Department and the Minister for Planning and a compromise was agreed upon which only one tree was kept, which, as I say, was able to deliver the majority of our pedestrian improvements but not all of them. What I have asked the developer to do is to sell us the land which the one remaining tree sits upon and then, when other trees have matured, that tree may have become a less worthwhile specimen and we will finally deliver the final part of the connection of all the footpaths.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

That has clarified it in my head. Is there anything that you think is important that we have not touched upon today?

Mr. D. St. George:

I do not think so, no.

Mrs. C.E. Canavan:

Thank you very much. Thanks for coming.