

**Jersey Draft Island Plan Examination in Public**

**Day 7 - 29 September 2010 (up to 3.00pm)**

**Travel and Transport**

*General notes for participants in all topic sessions*

*The Inspectors have been appointed to provide an independent review of the (Draft) Jersey Island Plan. After the EiP they will write a report to the Minister for Planning and Environment recommending, with reasons, which aspects of the Draft Plan should be retained and whether, and if so what, changes should be made. They will take into account all written submissions including the Minister's own proposed changes in response to consultations, published in a schedule dated 20 June (EiP library core document IP8). Participants should also look at the Minister's response to the Strategic Environmental Assessment dated 13 August which recommends changes to a number of policies throughout the Plan.*

*They have also selected key topics for debate. Participants for the debates have been selected to represent a range of views. The Inspectors are looking to them not simply to re-state their views (which they will have read) but to challenge or support the views of others. It will be helpful if there is a lively and constructive debate. The sessions will be held in an informal atmosphere, with no cross-examination. The Inspectors are conscious that some participants from organisations, or members of the public, may not have experience of these events; they are a relatively new phenomenon in Jersey. Those participants can be assured that they will not be put under pressure, but that the Inspectors are very keen to hear their views in order to get a rounded picture of the issues*

*However the Inspectors are also looking where possible for specific proposals as to recommendations they should make; in particular they would welcome debate on specific suggested changes to the policies in the draft plan. Some participants have already couched their representations in this way but others have not.*

*Generally the timetable for the EiP is tight. Participants should therefore seek to keep their comments succinct and not to repeat views already expressed (though they may wish to express support for the views of another participant).*

*Participants should if possible have read the representations from other participants in the session, and also the relevant written representations from other parties.*

*The Minister will be represented at all sessions by officers from his department who will normally be invited by the Inspectors to respond to the points raised. Other Ministers and officials will be participating in topics of particular interest to them (housing for example); however the Inspectors want to hear a wide range of views also from organisations and individual members of the public.*

## Specific comments for Day 7 participants

The Inspectors issued a list of questions on 29 July. On this occasion they will not be issuing a further list of detailed questions but will work through the five published questions in turn. The following commentary may help to focus the debate.

**Question 1** Concerns the relationship between the Draft Island Plan and the now published Jersey's Sustainable Transport Policy (2 July 2010) (JSTP). The Inspectors, of course, fully recognise that there are separate Ministerial authorities, and they stress that JSTP is not of itself open to debate before this EiP. It has evidently been subject to separate processes of consultation leading to the current published version. But travel and transport and land use planning are inevitably interwoven and the relationship between the two documents is important.

At the outset it would be helpful if the status of JSTP could be clarified. Is the document as a whole the 'Policy'? (It does not include formally expressed individual policies). It has the form of a now established document but several of its key sections conclude with 'Recommendations'. Is there a further approval process? If so, is it appropriate for aspects of the Island Plan to influence decisions on the recommendations?

Island Plan paragraph 8.15 states that "The Island Plan has to respond to and seek to support the transport objectives set out by the Island's strategic highway authority. The Transport and Technical Services Department has set out the general principles, objectives and proposals in the *Draft Integrated Travel and Transport Plan: action plan 2007-2011 (2007)*". That Draft document has since been superseded by JSTP.

JSTP understandably includes a great deal of what might broadly be called 'operational' matters (public education, financial arrangements for bus services etc) as well as issues falling within the realm of land use and development; the Island Plan while anchored on land use and development topics, understandably also addresses behavioural or operational topics. Where the two overlap (or duplicate) are they consistent? Where they address different matters are they complementary? Has progression from the 2007 Draft document to the current JSTP rendered any aspect of the Island Plan out of date?

**Question 2** Both documents include aims to reduce the need to travel by car with specific aims to reduce road traffic by 15% by 2015 (and there will have been a brief debate on this principle on Day 1 of the EiP). Is the distribution of development envisaged by the Island Plan consistent with this aim? In particular it has been suggested that provision for residential development in the western parishes is not matched by provision for employment or services, risking increased road traffic to and from St Helier. Is this a valid criticism, should the Draft Plan be amended and if so how? How should the 'pinch point' at St Aubins/Beaumont and Bel Royal be viewed in this regard? As also flagged up for discussion within the Built Environment discussion last week, what implications arise from the proposed Airport Regeneration Zone (Draft Island Plan Proposal 12)?

**Question 3** Concerns parking. As one eagle eyed participant pointed out, question 3 was intended to refer to “economic and other needs (not others needs) of the Island and St Helier in particular”. In this context “other needs” simply encompass parking demand not directly contributing towards economic activities: social, leisure, educational etc.

The question raises the controversial issue of public parking provision and also private parking standards required at new developments. At risk of over-simplification several participants argue that if St Helier is to thrive, it must have a sufficient supply of car parking in quantity, quality and location to match the demand by commuters and shoppers in particular. Others argue that limiting the provision of parking is one mechanism towards reducing traffic flow, easing congestion and making the streets more congenial. Surface car parks are not to be protected from redevelopment. Is that supported? Is it sensible not to allow temporarily vacant land to be put to use for parking?

It seems unlikely that a consensus will be reached on this topic and the Inspectors certainly do not want to stifle debate, but participants are urged to explore constructively in what specific ways the Draft Plan, in particular Policy TT10, might be supported or amended.

For many years it was axiomatic for planning authorities to require developers to provide sufficient parking spaces to meet the assessed new demand arising from a development. Generally the provision would be on site but in some circumstances, particularly in town centres, commuted payments towards additional public provision might be made. In either case, however, the requirement aimed at a minimum provision and applied across the range of developments types. The Draft Plan and JSTP now look towards maximum parking requirements, with standards to be set by future Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). (Proposal 19) Some see this approach as counter intuitive, others as a desirable mechanism for curbing road traffic and congestion. Should the approach be supported; if not in what ways should the Draft Plan be amended? Is it right to leave the standards themselves to SPG ?

**Question 4** Is much more specific. Draft Plan paragraph 8.41 states that complete pedestrianisation of the [St Helier centre] town streets is not envisaged during the Plan period. JCC in particular suggest that just such a long term aim may be inferred. Is that so and what would be the implications? The Draft Plan, Policy TT2, identifies locations within St Helier for improved pedestrian provision. Do participants agree that the identified locations are the optimum ones? If not, where else? The JSTP, paragraph 5.4 et seq, also draws on the EDAW work but concludes that only on one length of road would the benefits of full pedestrianisation outweigh the ‘cost’, assessed broadly to include such things as the impact of displaced traffic. That length is Halkett Place south of Waterloo Street. Do participants agree? The JSTP goes on to consider the possibility of ‘shared spaces’; streets that do not demark separate areas for, in particular, pedestrians and vehicles. Should this concept be supported by the Island Plan?

**Question 5** When drawing up topics for the EiP it was not clear to the Inspectors whether the Draft Plan references to electric vehicles meant hybrid (petrol/electric) or purely battery powered. This question was raised also at that time by an EiP participant. It seems clear now on subsequent receipt of the JSTP that is battery powered vehicles rather than hybrids that are being aimed for, but it would be helpful if this could be confirmed or not at the outset. It is not immediately obvious what land use policies are required to support the use of hybrid vehicles.

What are participants' views regarding electric (non hybrid) vehicles? Does Jersey's compact size and relatively modest traffic speeds make the island well suited to such vehicles? Have electric vehicles reached, or will they soon reach, the stage of technical development, and price, to make them a practical proposition for everyday use? On a local level, could they help reduce traffic noise and air pollution? On a wider consideration, how material is it whether the electricity used to recharge the vehicles has itself been generated from low emission or renewable sources? If the aim of having more electric vehicles is supported, does the Draft Plan do enough to support that aim? Recharging points are an obvious issue.