



Future St. Helier Workshop **Travel and transport: what you said...** May 2015

# Future St. Helier: travel and transport

People who engaged with the workshop were asked to address the following issue:

• Future St Helier is a place where people find it easy to get to; move around and navigate; whether by foot, bike, bus, car or van.

This is a just summary of what people said: it provides the context for what people identified as priorities for change.

## What you said ...

## Policy and practice

A need was identified for a clear integrated strategy for travel and transport that was realistic, with clear objectives and proposals, as well as resources identified to deliver it.

People told us that there was a greater need for joined up working: this was both between government and the community, to make sure that people's concerns were listened to and taken into account when decisions about travel and transport were mad. Decision-making also needed to be more transparent and accessible. It was important to people that there was a clear evidence base for change and that the data underpinning proposals and decisions was available.

The need for the two highway authorities with jurisdiction over roads in St. Helier – the Parish and the Transport and Technical Services Department - to work better together was mooted.

It was also felt that modes of transport should be better integrated and that there was potential for other parts of the town – other than Liberation Station – to act as transport hubs. St. Helier's transport network needed to be better connected if it was to be more sustainable: the separation of the town from the waterfront was identified as a challenge in this respect.

People felt the need for a change of culture: work should not be 'over-engineered'; there was a need to 'de-clutter the streets; be willing to try things out; and to change them if they didn't work or needed adjusting.

There was a sense of some frustration; that St. Helier was difficult to get into, particularly at certain times of the day when there was congestion; at disruption to the road network; or changes to traffic management. Staggering workplace or school hours emerged as a proposal.

Vehicle speed within the Ring Road was identified as an issue, and the reduction of this was proposed.

Travel planning, for workplaces, schools and at a personal level was discussed: it was suggested that people should be encouraged to think about how they travelled depending on the type and purpose of their journey. For shorter journeys people, including children travelling to school, should be encouraged to take more sustainable modes rather than relying on the private car.

To encourage modal shift and less reliance on the private car, the use of 'carrots and sticks' was proposed, with disincentives, such as increased pedestrianisation; congestion charging; and higher parking charges (especially for commuters) mooted.

A counter view was offered to question whether we really had any problem with travel and transport in St. Helier.

### Use of technology

The use of technology, such as an integrated payment card (similar to an Oyster card in London), to pay for transport services such as buses and parking was suggested (an Ormer card?). It was also suggested that number plate recognition could be extended to all public car parks.

Technology was also seen as a tool to provide information and data about travel and transport ranging from the availability of public car parking; bus services; car-sharing and for use in traffic management systems.

### Use of road space

It was recognised that there were competing claims for the use of road space but there was widely held view that this needed to be rebalanced in St. Helier with less priority afforded to the private car through the use of phrases such as 'places for people'; 'reclaim the streets'; and 'sharing the streets'. More pedestrianisation; greater pedestrian priority and wider pavements were the proposals to emerge from discussion.

The need for road space to be available for deliveries was acknowledged and the introduction of drop-off/pick-up points was suggested.

### Walking and cycling

There was a widely held view that pedestrians in St. Helier needed a better deal: they should be exposed to less hostility and a better pedestrian environment should be created that was safer; easier to use; convenient and pleasant – 'happy trails' were proposed to meet these objectives.

Wider pavements; more pedestrian crossings; and longer crossing times were needed, and covered pedestrian routes and better links to the bus station were also proposed, with the widening of pavements in Conway Street emerging from a number of discussions.

The point was made that catering for the needs of people with disabilities generally delivered a positive outcome for all pedestrians: it was noted, however, that some pedestrian enhancements (such as removing kerbs) can pose challenges for some (such as people with visual impairments).

As with pedestrians, there was also a general view that better infrastructure for cyclists was, in particular, to enhance safety: more dedicated bike lanes and the need for a cycle network was identified, along with more cycle parking. The segregation of cyclists and pedestrians on the Railway Track to St. Aubin was mooted. The potential for buses to carry bikes was also suggested.

#### **Public transport**

There was a more widely held view that the bus service could be improved by a greater frequency of buses, with routes that were more convenient (particularly to commuters and shoppers); and a service which offered longer hours of operation. Some considered bus travel to be expensive too. A need for a hopper service, which served the outer districts of St. Helier, was identified by some.

Others stated that the existing bus service was good.

The role of taxis in public transport provision needed acknowledgement and more ranks provided.

### Parking

Parking was a big issue with the availability of different parking provision and the charging regime for it being key topics. The most widely held view was that there was a need for more public parking to meet the particular needs of residents and shoppers. There was a general view that public parking provision for commuters should be a lesser priority.

There were differing views about the cost of public parking. Some said it was too low; it should be free (for shoppers); and more expensive (for commuters). It was also suggested that the hours of paid parking should be extended.

There was a general view that the provision of public parking should be reviewed. More could be provided underground to free up space on streets and that the provision of parking space on each street should be evaluated. Park and ride was mooted as a potential option.

There was a general view that the payment system for parking should be reviewed and modernised. The enforcement of parking regulations was of concern to some and, in particular, the need to deal with the abuse of pavements.

### Other ways to have your say

This is a summary of the output and feedback about travel and transport from the public workshop. If you want to add to or join the debate about travel and transport in Future St. Helier and the changes you would like to see happen, you can do:

- Send us an email: drop us a line at <a href="mailto:futuresthelier@gov.je">futuresthelier@gov.je</a>
- Twitter: follow the conversation at @FutureStHelier

## **Priorities for change**

Participants at the workshop were asked if they could only make two changes to travel and transport in Future St Helier what would they be: this is what they said was most important to change:

Shared vision and thinking     (i.e. more opportunities for all stakeholders to be involved in decision making)
<ul> <li>Joined up thinking and action in government (<i>i.e. between parish and centre</i>)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Make small incremental changes (i.e. be prepared to try things out and change them if they don't work; use data to inform decisions)</li> </ul>
• Reduce 'traffic engineering' (i.e. de-clutter the streets of road furniture: look to London for examples)
Redress balance between vehicles and pedestrians
Good balance between modes of transport
• Put the car in its place ( <i>i.e. places for people; prioritise the type of wheels that we use</i> )
• Provide better alternatives to the car ( <i>i.e.</i> a better bus service (e.g. more frequent service to all parts of the island); cheaper fares; hopper bus for St. Helier)
<ul> <li>Disincentivise road (car) use (i.e. use 'carrot and stick' approach to encourage modal shift e.g. pedestrianisation, congestion charge etc)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>More sustainable transport network (i.e. more convenient bus routes for commuters and shoppers; proper cycle network)</li> </ul>
Address poor air quality
• Happy trails ( <i>i.e. pleasant routes for walking and cycling that avoid the hostile road environment</i> )
Better facilities for pedestrians and cyclists     (i.e. more cycle routes, better crossings, wider pavements)
<ul> <li>Radical re-think of parking in St Helier (<i>i.e. review street by street provision; consider underground; review charging (it's free in Gsy) and methods of payment</i>)</li> </ul>
Park and ride
Parking for St. Helier residents is a priority
Free parking for shopping
<ul> <li>Introduce a digital smart card (e.g. an 'Oyster' card for Jersey as a way of paying for all sorts of travel and transport)</li> </ul>
• Use digital technology (e.g. to advise about parking availability; manage traffic flow; promote car-sharing etc)
• A proper business plan to deliver change ( <i>i.e. develop a realistic set of proposals and identify resource to deliver</i> )

## Your top priority for change

Tell us what you think is the most important change for travel and transport in Future St. Helier. Go to our online survey and vote: <u>http://consult.gov.je/portal/fsh/transport</u>