

Public consultation on the masterplan for St Helier Waterfront's Esplanade Quarter

A report on the result of the consultation

Minister for Planning and Environment

Senator Freddie Cohen

16 April 2008

Contents

Page

- 3. Changes made to the masterplan as a result of the public consultation
- 4. How the key issues which emerged in the consultation have been addressed in the new masterplan
- 7. Summary of the public consultation on the Hopkins Masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter, St Helier
- 8. The written responses
- 19. Response of the Waterfront Design Group
- 24. Verbal responses made at the exhibition
- 27. Verbal responses made at the Town Hall presentation
- 29. External review of the consultation process

Changes made to the masterplan as a result of the public consultation

The Masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter has been altered since a draft was first published in October 2007 (the Hopkins Masterplan). The consultation process included several different elements and all the information gathered has been analysed and evaluated and the document amended in response.

Clearly the plan has not been changed in response to each and every point made by those who replied but where there has been consistent concern expressed and shortcomings evident, changes and restructuring have taken place. Perhaps this has been most evident in the transportation section. As a result of the consultation, this section has been substantially rewritten. This part of the plan has changed greatly from the original design in the form and detail it now contains. The transportation section is a key part of the masterplan.

All of the responses made as a result of the consultation have been recorded and scheduled. While not attached to this report, they were an essential part of the careful collection of views expressed in writing or as part of the public exhibition.

The working party set up to work on the development of the masterplan discussed and analysed the responses so that the different parts of the team were aware of the key issues relating to their own sphere of interest. These were then amalgamated into the new masterplan.

The analysis of the consultation and the work which was generated as a result of that review has taken six months to complete. Whilst the core of the masterplan retains its consistent and original intention to bury the road, many other elements of the masterplan were changed in response to the issues raised. All these changes are detailed in the table below.

How the key issues which emerged in the consultation have been addressed in the new masterplan

The nature of the issues raised ranged from the fundamental to the detailed. That is entirely normal and the challenge is to be able to prioritise those which have clearly occupied people who either made the effort to write or who visited the exhibition. The points addressed in the section which follows has clearly focused on those more fundamental criteria. That is not to diminish the significant number of detailed points made by many which can and will be addressed at a later date, but the masterplan is set deliberately at a high level. It is, in effect, a mechanism which will form and guide development proposals for this area. If the masterplan is endorsed by the States then it is likely to trigger a planning application which will clearly carry far more detail, and which will in turn be the subject of a public enquiry. Many of the detailed points can be addressed at that stage.

However, for the purpose of refining and improving the new masterplan, focus is given to the fundamental concerns. The points below reflect that and are not intended or able to address every point made within the consultation but to identify the larger more important changes made to the masterplan following the publication of the original draft in October 2007.

Issues	Action
Traffic	
This is possibly the section which generated most public concern, in a number of general and specific areas	The new traffic section has been redrafted to include details of:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the strategy and consultants involved in the development of the traffic management proposals • the proposed above ground road network • vehicular access to the proposed development • Port traffic implications • the effect on the Esplanade • the southern link road • junction details within and adjacent to the site • emergency services routing • pedestrian provision • provision for cyclists • public transport proposals • car park design and operation • temporary traffic management and phasing • tunnel design • risk of underground flooding • air quality

Uses	
This generated some diverse views on what may be appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the table of uses has been amended to reduce the retail and restaurants by 50%, (total now 53,755sq ft) the retail space removed has been reallocated to residential use the importance of work presently being carried out in housing and retail areas is recognised as having the ability to further shape the balance of uses within the site

Impact on St Helier	
Comments have focused on the competitive and possible negative impact of the scheme on the life of St Helier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> retail floorspace within the Esplanade Quarter has been reduced by 50% the plan recognises the key link between investing the capital return to the States back into the town. This will require a new Masterplan for the town which will focus on its regeneration. A special task force will be established to deliver this important objective

Design	
There were numerous and varied views expressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the grid approach has been retained but changes have been made to the layout with particular emphasis given to length/width of streets and height of buildings buildings have been set back from the former sea wall a new Winter Garden has been introduced a new Landscape Architect has been commissioned to address the internal squares and Les Jardins de la Mer building heights have been examined and readdressed with more work to follow sun path studies have been carried out

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wind environment and pedestrian comfort studies have been carried out • a new sunken central square has been added
--	---

Sustainability and Environmental Concerns	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section has been given new emphasis within the Masterplan as a result of the comments made. It has been extended and recognises the widespread desire expressed within the consultation to achieve the highest quality in terms of sustainability for the scheme

The Financial Arrangements

This part provoked significant comment. Normally this element would not have been included in what was intended to be technically a planning document. However, this information was included as it was the view of the Minister for Planning and Environment that it formed the context for much of the work on the Masterplan and it was information that the public needed to be aware of. The separate section on the financial deal has been removed from the new Masterplan although the headline information remains within the summary. Nevertheless the discussion that this section and the adjoining section within the draft Masterplan on the economics of the Waterfront development provoked should not be ignored. Some key questions which emerged focused on why Harcourt came to be the developer; how is Jersey to be protected from financial risk and to what extent might this scale of new office floorspace be inflationary. These were not the only matters raised.

The work of providing a response to these issues is ongoing and it is appreciated that for some these are important questions. Although this work will not be led by the Minister for Planning and Environment he will ensure that a response is prepared, prior to any debate of the Masterplan in the States.

Summary of the public consultation on the Hopkins Masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter, St Helier

Introduction

The public consultation on the new masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter on St Helier's Waterfront began on 14 November 2007. On that day the full masterplan document was published on the States website; it was made available in paper copies at Parish halls and from States offices; an abbreviated paper version was published and widely distributed (including through 24,000 copies of the Jersey Evening Post) and a CD was also made widely available, giving a version of the entire masterplan for download on a PC.

The consultation ended on 11 January although late submissions were accepted.

The Minister for Planning and Environment, Senator Freddie Cohen, personally led the launch and the principal architect, Jim Greaves of Hopkins Architects, was available in Jersey for interview by media organisations.

Senator Cohen made it clear that he welcomed public interest and comment and outlined opportunities for the public to express a view in the eight and a half weeks of public consultation. This was the first stage in another period of consultation, and a Public Inquiry, which will precede his consideration of a planning application later in 2008.

Between 14 November and 11 January the public were invited to learn about the masterplan and to comment to the Minister by either:

- Emailing or writing directly to him at the Planning Department at any time during the consultation period;
- Visiting a public exhibition at the old Jersey Tourism offices during a three week period from 19 November – 7 December;
- Attending a public presentation from the principal architect at St Helier Town Hall on 6 December
- Attending a surgery offered at the Planning Department.

The Minister also established a small group of individuals with specialist knowledge to advise him, bringing a range of local knowledge and with a brief to bring passion and local relevance to the project. This was the Waterfront Design group. The consultation period was extended until 25 January to allow two late submissions from the Association of Jersey Architects and the Jersey Hospitality Association.

This summary will address:

- the written responses;
- the written response from the Waterfront Design Group;
- the verbal responses made by individuals attending the public exhibition and recorded by the planning officer in attendance;
- verbal comments and responses made at the Town Hall presentation.

I. The written responses

In all, 44 written responses were received, of which the majority were sent by email to the Minister for Planning and Environment. Others were sent by post to the Minister at the Planning Department. Responses received an acknowledgement from him with the promise of the publication of a summary of the responses once the consultation period had ended.

The length and detail included in the written responses varied widely. The longest submission included over 80 pages of typescript and photographs. The shortest was just two lines long. Some were written on behalf of large organisations, professional groups and lobby groups. The majority came from individual members of the public.

The comments and submissions mainly covered a number of recurring themes. These are not listed in any order of priority, except that traffic concerns, comments on the financial arrangements, and on design, were the most numerous and detailed:

- Traffic
- Financial arrangements
- Sinking the road
- Further extending the tunnel
- Uses
- Effect on the old town
- Design
- Impact on the size of Jersey's resident population
- Sustainability and environmental concerns.

Traffic

One respondent summed up many people's views when he said: '*traffic is an emotive issue in the Island and the reality is that the plan's impact on traffic will be critical to its acceptance by many Islanders.*'

It was perhaps unfortunate that information about traffic arrangements in the published masterplan was very much work in progress and this was not fully understood by everyone reading the document. It is hard to judge how many of the respondents voicing strongly-held views about the unworkability of the published traffic arrangements might have been more supportive, had they understood that the traffic designers were still hard at work.

One writer articulated what several others hinted at: '*...there is totally inadequate information in the plan regarding traffic....I am not expressing total opposition to the Master Plan, only that there are too many missing links to decide either way.*'

Many submissions expressed concern about the ability of traffic to flow westwards from the Esplanade Quarter and the ability of traffic to flow eastwards through the development, from Gloucester Street, Castle Street and Mulcaster Street. Several

people asked how the emergency services would be able to cope, and some were particularly concerned about the emergency services' ability to gain access to the area during construction work. One respondent suggested a solution to the westward traffic flow would be to create a small new road (with speed restrictions) from Castle Quays to Gloucester Street, creating an additional route to the west.

Several people expressed concern that the development would have an undesirable impact on congestion in the rest of the town area and that it would not be able to cope with current and future traffic flows – particularly once the offices had been populated with workers.

Several people expressed reservations about the wisdom of an underground roundabout, mostly on the grounds of safety, but also because it could be undesirable on health grounds to have possible congestion (resulting from people waiting to gain access to the roundabout) underground.

It is fair to say that there was a general feeling that the plans for traffic were inadequately explained (one writer said they were '*pathetic*') and there were calls, albeit a small number, for an extension to the consultation period so that a revised traffic plan could be at least published and consulted upon, before the masterplan was debated by the States.

Financial arrangements

This was the topic which, along with traffic, absorbed more column inches than any other.

Much of the comment concerned the development being carried out by a single development company, coupled with fears about the future situation when this one company would own all of the buildings in Jersey's new financial district. There were calls from a small number of correspondents for some sort of official inquiry into how this situation had occurred.

One writer, who feared the situation would result in high rents in the new development, said: *..an off-island development company would effectively be granted a monopolistic market position and control of the viability of the finance industry... this threatens the very survival of the industry.'*

Several people expressed concern and others, frank incredulity, about the sheer scale of the investment required and how it could be financed in a way which was 'safe' for Jersey. Some people asked what would happen if this single developer went bankrupt before completing the scheme, or for some other reason, failed to complete. Concern was also expressed about the length of the 150-year lease and the possible undesirable consequences for Jersey, because the Island would be tying itself into an deal for what seemed a very long period.

One substantial response (from the Chamber of Commerce) posed many questions about the financial arrangements, both initial and for the future, and how the single developer had been appointed. There was a clear wish for more information, most of which was of a very detailed financial nature.

The Jersey Hospitality Association also wrote and, while agreeing its members had initially shared the types of mentioned above, had taken the trouble to meet representatives of WEB and Economic Development. They wrote: *'we...focused primarily on the competitiveness issues with a single developer having such a dominant position and we are now more reassured. The chosen developer has huge international experience and there is no doubt that Harcourt has the obvious quality, management experience and expertise to deliver this project.'*

A submission from a rival development company asked many questions about the details of the financial agreement, including about the appointment process leading to Harcourt's appointment as the developer. It is interesting that while this development company was not alone in asking these questions, another respondent organisation (which had taken the trouble to meet WEB and discuss their concerns before writing) had found some reassurance. This suggests that, in order to similarly reassure others, WEB – or Harcourt themselves – should take steps to explain how the development will be managed.

One substantial response cast doubt on the figures published in the masterplan. Overage payments in the future from the developer are expected to be not less than £25m, but, said this response: *'there has been no supporting calculations, figures or timetable with these returns and as such, they cannot be scrutinised by the public.'* This was not the only call for the full figures to be published *'so they can be verified by the general public'*. In fact, it is doubtful whether all but the most informed and interested members of the public would understand the final transactions proposed and so would not be able to make an informed judgement. Those who *would* understand would likely be people with a direct interest, such as competing development firms, and whether or not they should be supplied with the figures is a matter for conjecture.

This same substantial response questioned all the other significant figures published in the masterplan: the £45m value placed on the sunken road; the £50m being paid by the developer. This submission posed many questions of a detailed financial nature and it must be a matter for WEB and the developer to decide how much of it could or should be placed in the public domain and whether there would be a public benefit from so doing. It should be remembered that the States Scrutiny Panel with an interest in the Waterfront has had full access to all the details of the financial arrangements and has concluded that the agreement is well-founded. It might be judged that this Panel is capable of acting on behalf of the public.

The Association of Jersey Architects, possibly understandably, argued forcibly for the inclusion of local architectural expertise. Not only would it allow the inclusion of passion and a sense of place, variety and local relevance, but would also have the benefit of reducing the development's carbon footprint.

Two respondents clearly had not accepted, or understood assurances that the development would result in no cost to Jersey, one of them saying; *'the States should stop all major projects such as this because they will cost the residents too much.....if Jersey is so hard up, how can we be considering it?'*

What is clear is that the sheer scale of the proposals in an Island more used to a piece-meal approach to development is, for some members of the public, disconcerting. Many

of those expressing fear about the scale of the initiative also expressed doubts about the future of the global financial services industry: if its future is not secure, why are we embarking on such major investment? Other people, often who also expressed a sense of pride in Jersey, or in the finance industry (which, after all, is Jersey's key industry and in which it is a world 'name'), said they felt that a development of this scale and ambition was just what Jersey needed, to secure and support the industry.

Again, it appears that what is needed now is some greater explanation of the matters outlined above: how Harcourt came to be the developer; how Jersey is to be protected from financial risk and what demand actually exists for this type of office development so that the public could be reassured that the masterplan offers a viable financial solution.

Sinking the road

The masterplan proposal to sink the road from Gloucester Street as far as the existing underpass attracted the attention of many respondents. The majority of people who commented on it saw it as the removal as an unwanted eyesore and a barrier between the waterfront and the town. A typical comment being *'the existing roadway, effectively cutting the whole area into two separate parts, is clearly not practical and left as it iswill continue to be an embarrassment to the Island'*. Many of them simply expressed frustration that sinking the road didn't go far enough (see below).

The Association of Jersey Architects said it was *'very supportive, in principle, of the Hopkins Masterplan and the concepts of sinking the road to create a more pedestrian-friendly area...'*

But a few respondents did not like the idea and put their objections forcibly. They said the disruption caused by several years construction work outweighed any potential benefit; they felt the underground road network would be unhealthy; the environmental consequences of managing the disposal of waste (which had been deposited there only 20 years before) would be too great. One letter said the underground road would have 'no material benefits' and that the associated underground parking would be better provided in an *'attractive multi-storey car park'* in the area of the underpass roundabout.

The Jersey Hospitality Association, while in support, did express concern about the effect that a prolonged period of construction would have on the hospitality industry and urged all speed: *'...we have been assured that traffic disruption will not be continuous....The development must avoid, at all costs, unacceptable traffic jams.'* They said they were extremely concerned about disruption in an area which had been a building site for far too long, but concluded: *'..we believe in working towards the future success of our Island and we recognise that some pain must be experienced for the ultimate gain.'*

Two respondents suggested that more financial benefit could be obtained for Jersey if the developers did not have to pay for sinking the road – the Island would get £45m instead. One respondent proposed that instead of sinking the road, the whole development should be built on five metre high stilts, allowing traffic to pass underneath.

Another detailed response suggested that *'partly lowering a very small section of road, making the bridge a deck.....easy to navigate and large enough in size for vast flow of daily pedestrians would be created at little extra cost.'* This writer suggested that if the

£45m cost of lowering the road as proposed in the masterplan could be saved, then the public could be involved in deciding how the £45m could be spent on other community projects.

The masterplan explains that the proposal to lower the road would create a new development site above it, and it is for this that the developer is prepared to fund the cost of creating it. One might assume that, if the proposal to create this new development site was abandoned, then the £45m might have to be renegotiated.

Further extending the tunnel

As explained above, most respondents referring to the sunken road welcomed the proposal. But some said the new tunnel should go further. How much further was a matter which people differed upon; one respondent said it should go as far as the Green Street car park saying that an exit already exists there and it *'would open up a world of opportunities: allowing relocation of ferry terminal to La Collette, town marina would be enhanced and the single busiest road in Jersey could be extinguished'*.

Most people who proposed extending the sunken road suggested that it should go as far as the existing tunnel – because, unless it did so, the existing barrier would not fully be removed. One respondent suggested that, while sunken, it should be open to the sky and allowed to merge with other underground development at base level.

Uses

There was a wide range of views on the proposed uses of the buildings. Many of these views reflected the backgrounds and interests of the individuals themselves but some did consider the wider interests of the Island as a whole.

Most people commenting on this aspect of the new development were in favour of a mix of uses, so that it would be visited by a wide range of people in Jersey. The Association of Jersey Architects called for a *'better mix of uses'* which would help to give islanders a sense of ownership. This organisation suggested a finance learning centre should be pursued tenaciously.

But not everyone was reconciled to the mix of uses. One respondent said the new quarter should be used solely as a financial centre with no other mix (any new retail space restricted to a smaller area around the waterfront itself). However, some people countered this view by expressing concern about whether the new area would be fully used outside office working hours, and the potential for it to be 'dead' in the evenings and at weekends.

One submission said: *'..density of office blocks will create a dull area which might make people feel unsafe at night...'*

Some expressed disappointment that it was to be used as a financial quarter; an example being *'It is very disappointing to me that a much more imaginative purpose could not have been established for this unique site.'* Citing examples of a substantial indoor tourist attraction, a business school and a technology park, the writer said he appreciated that the proposed uses of offices and residential would be the *'most profitable and lowest risk'*. It is interesting that this view directly contrasts with those who

feared the amount of office space would present a very great risk to the developers and ultimately, to the States of Jersey.

One writer said the use should not be for offices, but for flats for local people.

One writer, himself involved in the Castle Quay development and other schemes in the immediate vicinity, expressed concern about the proposed mix of uses and the effect they could have on Castle Quay... *'This will materially effect Castle Quay development with a small amount of occupiers and users on the Island. You are planning a scenario which will dilute both developments and the risk that both will fail as places where people want to be.'*

Some people making comments on the uses were in favour of more open public space and fewer office buildings *'.... the paltry amount of public open space.... Marks a clear abandonment of previous assurances that much of the waterfront would be available to the public'*. One respondent said *'we would suggest a development of leisure facilities eg ice skating rink, skateboard area, children's recreational and play areas as well as imaginative eating areas and parkland.'*

A respondent called for the new buildings to be open to the public not just at first floor level, but on the upper levels as well, so that the widest possible range of people would be able to enjoy the new spaces.

Effect on the old town

Concern was expressed about the effect that the retail space and office space described in the masterplan would have on the existing town: both on existing local businesses and on property values in the town centre. One correspondent judged that the quantum of retail space was excessive and would have a detrimental effect not just on the town centre, but on fledgling retail areas such as the Weighbridge and the Castle Quays district.

The Chamber of Commerce, which would be expected to express an expert view on such matters, said it would make further comment, if necessary, when the retail impact study is published.

One writer warned that *'issues with vacant properties in town need to be resolved as this 700k ft² will drain life out of St Helier.'* A small number of writers expressed doubts that financial organisations would want to move to the new financial quarter from existing offices in the town.

Another writer said: *'Some will be offices but if large areas are not to be dead or 'net curtain land' there will have to be substantial retail shopping incorporated. This could have a serious threat to the main shopping areas of St Helier.'*

The Association of Jersey Architects asked how the vacant and out-dated office premises in St Helier would be dealt with and, if it was to become housing, what the financial effect would be. This group proposed that a St Helier Town Study Group should be established, combining local professionals with off-Island consultants, to ensure that adequate thought is given to integrating the Hopkins Masterplan into the regeneration of

'Old St Helier', Fort regent, East of Albert and so on, offering to lend their expertise to this process.

It would be helpful if the Minister for Planning and Environment could release more information which would explain how the Hopkins Masterplan supports the recent EDAW study on the town and how it fits with other significant planning policy, such as the Island Plan.

Design

Many different aspects of design were commented upon – some regarding detailed design issues and other more general concerns. One aspect of the proposals received widespread praise – the colonnaded buildings.

But the grid design received mixed responses. One respondent said it was *'unappealing...the justifications for the grid patterns...weak, valueless and/or irrelevant'*. Another said it lacked the *'wow factor'*. Another said it didn't extend the grain of St Helier and seemed *'abstract and nondescript'*, while another writer said it would block out any views of the sea. One respondent had gone to the trouble of proposing an alternative layout, with two new diagonal roads crossing the right-angled boulevards described in the masterplan, which provided oval-shaped public squares instead of the masterplan's rectangles. Other people welcomed the grid design.

Several respondents expressed concern about the square buildings suggested by the masterplan drawings and promoted rounded buildings instead, or buildings with rounded corners, which, one respondent believed, would *'soften the overall impact of the development.'* Another said that square buildings would look *'unimaginative, boring and soul-less'*.

Several people commented on their belief that the tall buildings would cause draughty spaces and shadows. This was a recurring theme. One respondent suggested that buildings on the southern side of the public squares should be restricted in height, to allow the sun to shine in and the same writer said the plans should be given wind tunnel testing. One asked for more space between the buildings, to reduce the impact of the scale of the development.

Some respondents offered advice on matters such as public lavatories (don't forget them); the importance of cycle lanes going through the whole area to connect east and west; the need for good disabled access; a wish for mature, spreading trees (but not rooted in planters) and wide pavements.

Several people asked that granite should not be the all-pervading material for facades (which could be *'dull'*), wanting *'interest and style to reflect the new Jersey'*. Several also called for modern, bold design and imaginative use of materials; not pastiche.

A few writers discussed the proposal for Les Jardins. Some were against the idea of raising up this public space on the grounds that it would lose its protection from the wind and others liked the idea of being able to sit and enjoy the splendid views of the bay. Pragmatists also suggested that it would be a good way to dispose of some of the waste material. A couple of writers suggested that a landscape architect of international renown should help with the development of this area.

There were comments about the advisability of siting a large building on the Weighbridge, as had been suggested. This, it was said, would add to a potential cut-off between this area and the historic harbour.

There were questions about the permeability of the northern edge of the site and particularly, the ease of access from Castle Street. One partially-sighted respondent expressed concern about crossing the Castle Street junction to reach the waterfront, because of the amount of traffic on the junction. There were a small number of, forcibly expressed, comments and questions about the assumption that people would go to the waterfront area from Castle Street, when the most popular route to the existing waterfront area appeared to be Conway Street.

The Association of Jersey Architects said that a three dimensional model was urgently needed in Jersey. They have to do it for smaller schemes, they pointed out, so why not Hopkins?

During consultation on the Waterfront Planning Guidance, it became clear that an important aspect of the design of this scheme would be a sense of passion, coupled with local relevance. This was repeated by the Association of Jersey Architects in their submission. They also made the point – as did others – that water should be a central theme.

Impact on the size of the resident population

A relatively small number of writers expressed a concern that creating a new financial district would lead to growth in Jersey's resident population and, because of that, on the number of new homes which would have to be built. *'...that amount of office space could accommodate up to 4,000 people, which is equivalent to about 40% of all those currently employed in the financial and legal employment sector; the 300 homes to be created on the site would be a mere drop in the ocean of the number of new homes required.'*

Again, another writer said: *'are we keeping our population under control or are many more people coming in to fill the extra offices and straining our physical resources of water supply and waste disposal?'*

A small number of respondents suggested that the waterfront plans should be drawn up either in parallel with, or after, the conclusion of the debate on managing the ageing population – Imagine Jersey 2035.

The Association of Jersey Architects called for a statement on whether or not the Esplanade Quarter would in fact act as a catalyst for population growth. Population size is a thorny issue in Jersey and so this statements would indeed seem to be advisable, so that residents can make informed judgements on the issue.

Sustainability and environmental concerns

A sustainable approach to building is recognised as a priority by many multi national firms. Jersey's planning policy is not in the vanguard of this movement but this does not

prevent an public expectancy that the waterfront development will match the best possible environmental standards.

But, building aside, a number of people voiced concerns about the effect that excavating material for the underground section of the development would have on the rate of landfill. One writer said: *'in promoting EcoActive last year, the buzz words were reduce, reuse, recycle. This plan is in complete contrast to the three Rs.'*

Several respondents asked that high environmental standards should be imposed on the buildings (solar panels; high thermal efficiency, water recycling, zero carbon rating) and asked for more information to be published on the more detailed plans in this respect.

A couple of writers expressed the view that BREEAM standards were not good enough and specified steps which could be taken to ensure that tangible sustainable features should be incorporated from the outset.

One writer – one of the relatively small number who opposed sinking the road - asked for an independent assessment of the carbon footprint to put in the road and the remainder of the scheme, compared with an alternative scheme which did not include the sunken road.

Another detailed submission on the sustainability issues called for a sustainability strategy to be developed, involving the community and stakeholders, at an early stage in the development. This, said the writer, should aim to address the quality of life in an integrated way, attempting to intertwine together economic, social, environmental and physical dimensions of the development.

Such a strategy would appear sensible. The Minister has already declared his intention to ensure this development does match the best environmental standards and so must plan to produce a detailed sustainability strategy. Clearly it would be helpful if he could explain his plans for its development.

Conclusion

Inviting public comment on any published document will inevitably mean that most responses will contain criticism, or express concerns. One must not overlook that this is the purpose of consultation – it allows those with reservations or ideas to express them so that the end result will be stronger and informed by the wisdom of the general public. This is true of the responses to this public consultation.

It is very difficult to judge whether some responses, while filled with ideas and comments, were in fact in principle supporting the concept. It must be said that even though the consultation invited criticism and concerns, a significant number of comments received were extremely positive. In some cases, writers took the trouble to list what they liked about the proposals before going on to identify their concerns, or dislikes.

It must also be noted that – even though the consultation invited criticism – the majority of responses supported the masterplan in broad terms.

Many of these positive comments welcomed the boldness of the approach outlined by Hopkins Architects, seeming to express the view that a scheme of this level of ambition

was just what the island of Jersey – with a global reputation in the financial services industry and an enormous innate sense of pride – needed. Perhaps surprisingly, even one detailed submission which called for the masterplan proposals to be rejected admitted: *‘The masterplan does have many good proposals in terms of the standard of buildings, the linking of open spaces, the desire for a world class built environment....it is a shame that (Hopkins Architects) were not employed 15-20 years ago. If they had been St Helier and its waterfront would have been built by now and we would all be enjoying a rich vibrant business and visitor environment.’*

APPENDIX ONE

1.1 Response of the Waterfront Design Group

THE RESPONSE OF THIS GROUP IS PROVIDED IN FULL. MEMBERS WORKED WITH HOPKINS ARCHITECTS FOR FOUR MONTHS TO PRODUCE THEIR REPORT. THE WORK OF THE GROUP WILL CONTINUE, REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE MINISTER, ADVISING HIM ON ALL MATTERS RELATING TO EMERGING ISSUES OF DESIGN, APPEARANCE, SCALE AND FORM.

The Hopkins Masterplan 25 January 2007

Introduction

The Waterfront Design Group was convened at the request of the Minister for Planning & Environment to specifically advise him on the Hopkins Masterplan and, in particular, to inject passion and local relevance to the project.

The Waterfront Design Group

The membership of the Group has been selected to ensure that wherever possible and appropriate local relevance forms part of the design concept both in relation to the design and appearance of the buildings and also the provision of open space.

The Group has been selected on the basis of their experience in matters of design, heritage and their commitment to protecting and enhancing Jersey's built environment.

List of Members

Chick Anthony

Marcus Binney

Jon Carter

Francis Corbet

Simon Crowcroft- Resigned January 2008

Andre Ferrari

Philip Hewat-Jaboor

Stephen Izatt

Paul Nichols

Sara Marsh

Sarah Le Claire

Mike Waddington

Executive Officer, Richard Williamson

The Role of the Group

The Waterfront Design Group will operate in an advisory capacity to the Minister for Planning and Environment. It has no statutory function but the Minister will take into account the views of the Group "specifically in relation to design", ie.

The Waterfront Design Group is an independent, non-political group predominantly concerned with the design aspects of the Esplanade Quarter project.

The brief for the scheme, including volumes of retail and office space and the identity and purpose of the scheme as a central business district, etc were given

to Hopkins before the Group was convened, and we have taken those as read for the purposes of our discussions. Indeed the Group has been instructed, and wishes to underline, that these matters are outside their remit.

What will the Group Do?

- The Group will in the first instance advise the Minister on the Esplanade Quarter Masterplan, commissioned by P&E.
- The Group will assist Hopkins Architects in the preparation of design codes for the Esplanade Quarter. These Design Codes have been commissioned by WEB.
- It will review and offer advice to the Minister upon the submission of drawings for Outline Planning Application for the new Quarter, either in drawing representing preliminary design work in following that upon the submission of the formal planning application. The Group will also consider and offer advice to the Minister in relation to the provision of all hard and soft landscaping within the site. The Outline Planning Application is being commissioned by Harcourt, the preferred developers for Esplanade Quarter.

The members of the Group have attended several meetings, some with Jim Greaves of Hopkins architects, and vigorously debated the Masterplan. Whilst not all Members agree on every aspect of all points, we are pleased to outline our comments below, the principles of which all Members are in agreement with:

WDG Comments on the The Hopkins Masterplan

1. Needs to be revised to include/reflect all WDG comments to date, eg:

- (a) Needs to evoke a “sense of place”, a true feeling of being in Jersey. In this respect, the section on Design Coding needs to either be removed or re-written with input from the WDG. Useful clues can be taken from the Draft Jersey Design Guide, being finalized by the Planning & Environment Department.
- (b) Needs to evoke a sense of being on the Waterfront with a discernible relationship to the sea.
- (c) Needs to have water as a central feature of the Masterplan.
- (d) Needs to create a sense of expectation, discovery or surprise, attracting people other than those who work there. It needs to create “delight”.
- (e) While we acknowledge the practical reasons for the structural grid, it is essential to avoid uniformity. The individual buildings should be different in shapes. It is possible to have both, and the Masterplan should make it very clear that this will be encouraged. The almost simultaneous creation of 16 units – under the influence of a single architectural practice – is likely to lead to a degree of universality of design concepts rather than encouraging a fresh mind being applied to each block.
- (f) Building heights and roofs must be varied, although tall buildings are not favoured. Imaginative and sensitively designed roofscapes are essential.
- (g) To encourage variety and visual richness/interest local and international architects must be involved in the design of individual buildings.
- (h) There must be variety in the street patterns, street widths and alignments.
- (i) A crescent form should be explored in relation to the buildings facing the Jardins de la Mer.
- (j) There needs to be a real focus to one or more of the Public Squares. For example in

the form of a major sculpture, pavilion, distinctive planting or hard landscape?

(k) Bold, imaginative, honest, modern and locally relevant architecture is preferred to historical pastiche.

(l) There is a need for imaginative night-time lighting to enrich and enliven the Waterfront in the evening and create a sense of security.

(m) Very careful consideration needs to be given to the effects of prevailing winds and wind patterns.

(n) Very careful consideration needs to be given to views along the Esplanade and also to buildings or features above and beside the entrance to the tunnel into the proposed new submerged road system.

(o) The approach to the Jardins is a key issue.

(p) The “naming” of squares, streets and the Quarter as a whole needs special consideration.

The names have to be relevant and contribute to evoking a “sense of place” and capture the imagination.

(q) Careful consideration should be given to including maritime artefacts in the open spaces of the development.

2. Urgently needs a 3-d physical model, here in Jersey- we live in a three dimensional world!

3. Needs to acknowledge that a collaborative/local approach is a sustainable approach. This also applies to contractors, suppliers etc.

4. BREEAM is not good enough alone. If the Esplanade Quarter is to be an environmental exemplar then the whole masterplan needs to be environmentally conceived, not just the individual buildings. Also there need to be some highly visible, tangible or recognizable sustainable features, eg:

i. Geothermal heating & cooling via the significant basement

ii. Natural ventilation, or mixed-mode, for the offices

iii. Wind turbines and solar panels on the roofs

iv. Photovoltaic street and public lighting

v. Photovoltaic lighting for the car parks (all Jersey’s car parks are artificially lit 24/7- this is unacceptable for Esp. Qtr)

vi. Bins which collect from public places into the basement.

vii. An electric bike-hire scheme to link Esp. Qtr, St Helier, St Aubin etc.

5. A better mix of uses is needed which, again, would give Islanders a more intimate feeling of ownership of the project. A business school, roof top restaurant etc. NB this was not a view held by all Members.

6. The Masterplan needs to hint at the wider issues, and suggested better linkages with the regeneration of the rest of St Helier.

7. An international landscape architect is needed, working in collaboration with a local one.

8. Other inputs from: Space-Syntax, a coordinated approach to the signage etc. (eg. Bruce Mau), a name for the area, lighting artists/designer, a Public Art Adviser and a Sustainability Consultant for the overall project, beyond BREEAM. The role of the Jersey Public Sculpture Trust should be central in determining a Public Art Strategy for Esplanade Quarter and beyond.

9. The traffic study needs to be concluded. There are concerns about congestion, safety and pollution/ventilation which need to be resolved.

Specifically, there is a concern at the issue of simply shifting traffic problems from the central site to the periphery? For example, what happens with the new traffic intersection at the West Park end? There is a real danger that far from being solved, the problems of the road will be relocated and to another existing area, effectively cutting West Park off from the Waterfront. These issues should be addressed as part of the Masterplan and not left to other consultants or TTS to resolve, after the event, with potentially low-grade traffic engineering 'solutions'.

10. The opportunities for public art are an extremely important aspect of the Masterplan and ultimate development for Esplanade Quarter. But consideration of the public art element of this project should take place within the context of the St Helier public art strategy currently being commissioned by Education Sport and Culture and the Jersey Public Sculpture Trust. The Masterplan aims to link the new and old Towns and appropriate public art at nodes, on routes, at night etc as well as on/in buildings can strongly support and develop these linkages. Good public art can develop themes of local relevance and provide another means to engage the community in the meaning of new development and the growth of Town. The strategy must be to engage planning of public art at the earliest possible stages of design development. It must also be recognized that public art can deliver on a small scale of detail and need not be all grand, monumental, international gestures.

Conclusion

The Hopkins Masterplan offers an opportunity for Jersey to better accommodate and celebrate its most important industry, create sustainable development on a large-scale for the first time and for this to act as a catalyst for urban regeneration in Old St Helier and new connectivity initiatives (Old Town/Old Port) beyond. It has the potential to put Jersey at the forefront of best environmental practice, be thoroughly modern yet capture the essence and sense of place we all know is unique to the Island and makes Jersey special. The Waterfront Design Group are fully in favour of lowering the road and using the space to create a pedestrian-friendly, Jersey-relevant new quarter in St Helier.

In principle the Group is also in favour of the Hopkins Masterplan, subject to its comments outlined above being included.

We recommend that the Planning Minister instructs Hopkins to revise and re-issue the Esplanade Quarter Masterplan with the Waterfront Design Group's comments incorporated.

APPENDIX TWO

Verbal responses made at exhibition

Exhibition Opened: 19 November 2007

Exhibition Closed: 7 December 2007

Times of Opening: Monday / Friday 12:00 – 14:30hrs

Times of Opening: Saturday 10:00 – 12:00hrs

The Exhibition consisted of approximately 20 AO Boards displayed within and around the former offices of Jersey Tourism at Liberation Square. Three separate documents were also produced as part of the consultation:-

1. The Draft Masterplan
2. An introductory pamphlet
3. A CD that could be played on a laptop or desktop computer

Prior to the opening of the Exhibition 2 adverts were run in the JEP giving location and hours of opening. In addition prior to the opening of the exhibition a copy of the introductory pamphlet was circulated in conjunction with the JEP. Approximately 27,000 copies of the introductory pamphlets were distributed in this way. Copies of the main consultation document, the pamphlets and the CD's were also deposited at all Parish Halls. Copies of the same documents were also made available at:-

1. The Public Library
2. Morier House
3. Cyril Le Marquand House

During the exhibition two further adverts were put in the JEP advertising the exhibition and a Public Meeting which was held at the Town Hall on the 6th December 2007. These adverts appeared on the 30th November and the 3rd December.

The Exhibition was manned continually and in total over 600 visitors took the opportunity to view the display boards. Copies of the three documents were available to take away and approximately 250 copies of the main consultation document were dispersed in this way.

Firstly it needs to be said that accurately reflecting all the comments made at the exhibition was neither an easy or particularly scientific task. When 60 to 70 people

visited over a 2½hr period it simply was not possible to speak to all who visited. Some parties deliberately stayed to ask questions whilst others visited and left without taking on having the opportunity to have their views recorded. In every case assistance was offered to those looking at the display boards if the opportunity presented itself. The comments made were noted but in some instances it was not possible to “write up” the day until the exhibition closed. There were also occasions in discussions when questions were asked concerns raised and explanations in more detail were provided. In some cases it was clear that the explanation given had satisfied the original misgivings in other cases it was considerably more difficult to say that this was the case, irrespective of whether I considered that the explanation had satisfied the questioner. The points raised in this report reflect the concerns originally expressed.

Finally many of the larger issues raised had a series of sub issues within them. In the recording of the comments made I have tried to reflect as many of these sub issues as possible for many of them were important to the people who made them.

Many of those who visited wished to know the time scale of the consultation exercise and more importantly what the programme was thereafter. There was a good deal of support for the masterplan both conditional and unconditional. However there were some recurring themes in the comments made which have been recorded and which reflect concerns and reservations. It is probably best to seek to review these by topic subject. More general issues and comments received are also included.

TRAFFIC

Issues:-

The burying of the road will carry some implications for traffic management both during and after construction.

There was concern that although the road was being buried there was not sufficient clarity in the drawings on display to show how traffic would travel:-

- From the Port going West
 - From the West going into St Helier
 - Moving through the site
-
- ◆ The Esplanade and the other new boulevard are not shown as trafficked routes but they will need to be able to accommodate new surface traffic movements.
 - ◆ Excessive traffic moving through the Esplanade Quarter would intrinsically impact on pedestrian use and will adversely impact on character.
 - ◆ The temporary provision for traffic routing whilst construction is in progress needs to be very carefully considered to avoid substantial congestion.
 - ◆ Why not extend the underground road through to the entrance of the existing tunnel in front of the abattoir.
 - ◆ All matters and implications in relation to the traffic and road management need to be resolved prior to any decision in the adoption of the Masterplan.

- ◆ The Emergency Services need to be part of any consultation process, which entails a new traffic strategy.
- ◆ The underground roundabout may be dangerous, will cause congestion and needs careful consideration.
- ◆ Traffic at the Weighbridge should be removed or the road there fully or partially sunk to allow liberation Square and the Weighbridge to be linked.
- ◆ A new roundabout at the existing tunnel entrance (west) would help traffic distribution.
- ◆ It's not clear from the drawings if scheme will be completely/partially car free above ground.

LAND USE

- ◆ The area could suffer a loss of vitality if it were to be solely a financial centre limited to office use.
- ◆ If the area competes commercially with the town it could damage King Street and Queen Street.
- ◆ The open space needs to be interesting, with active uses around it.
- ◆ The open space needs to be lively and animated, with high quality features and perhaps sculptures.
- ◆ More offices are not needed. There are clearly empty offices in town. What will happen to all the buildings which might be vacated.
- ◆ More than just extra apartments are needed. There needs to be wider spread, in the kind of residential accommodation provided.

MATERIALS

- ◆ Local materials should be used.
- ◆ Exposing the sea wall is an excellent idea.
- ◆ There should be no ugly plant on roof.
- ◆ Design should not be prejudiced by the developer taking shortcuts, and trying to reduce costs.

SCALE

- ◆ The new CPA office building is far too tall and massive.
- ◆ New streets should not be built too high or constrain space and light.
- ◆ 6 storey buildings will be too tall on the site.
- ◆ There may be a grid below but the buildings need some sweeps and curves above.
- ◆ If the buildings are too tall it will impede views for the Esplanade.

- ◆ There should be some variation in building heights
- ◆ The twin boulevards concept is good provided they are not clogged up with traffic.
- ◆ The setbacks on what are essentially 6 storey buildings are key to reducing perceived height.

VARIOUS

- ◆ Potential flooding of the tunnel must be addressed
- ◆ Contaminated land is likely to come out of site and will have to be accommodated at La Collette.
- ◆ Life of La Collette will be shortened. Other options will need to be considered sooner than anticipated.
- ◆ How will the tunnel be ventilated?
- ◆ A long build out time will impact on potential users for the new offices and may result in the scheme not being completed (this one needs a little clarification).
- ◆ Extending commercial opportunities here might lead to reducing high rental rates in town.
- ◆ The Island will lose control of site by signing a 150yr lease. Might we not be better doing the scheme ourselves?
- ◆ Do we need this quantity of new development to serve the financial services sector?
- ◆ Can we get rid of the cinema?
- ◆ Adequate and convenient parking for Marine traders and users needs to be provided adjacent to the marina.
- ◆ The scheme must represent best practice in sustainable development terms.

CONCLUSION

The views and questions expressed above are those which recurred on a regular basis at the exhibition. There were many other questions and views expressed which perhaps have slipped through without note but I am confident that the issues which either troubled or interested those who attended have been recorded. Those who wrote in response to what they saw or took away will have their comments addressed in a separate report.

APPENDIX THREE

Verbal responses made at Town Hall presentation

This meeting was held on 6 December 2007, giving Jim Greaves, of Hopkins Architects and the principal architect behind the masterplan, the opportunity to explain his ideas in some detail. It was promoted widely: in the consultation documents; at the exhibition; in media news coverage and in paid-for advertising.

Attendees: 39 people in total, of which 11 were associated with P&E; WEB or Hopkins Architects and 28 were members of the public.

The main area for discussion was traffic, but there were also questions about the overall design in the masterplan; the financial arrangements with the developer; the process; and the impact on the population.

Traffic

Many of the themes raised at this meeting echoed concerns voiced in both written submissions and at the exhibition. There were questions about how traffic would flow from Gloucester Street to the east of the Island (one speaker suggested the solution of a 'shallow underpass' linking Conway Street to the Tunnel); about the safety of an underground roundabout; the effect on traffic elsewhere in the town area, and also one 'new' concern – the noise of traffic coming from the western underpass entrance becoming a nuisance to residents of the proposed flats.

Financial arrangements

Questions were asked about the precise nature of the financial arrangement with the developer. Another speaker asked why local firms had not been given the chance to profit from the developer and another voiced the concern (expressed elsewhere in the consultation) that the esplanade development would cause property values in the existing town to fall, which would be to the detriment of local people.

Design

One speaker asked whether the streets would be wide enough in proportion to the scale of the buildings and whether they would benefit from extra width. Another speaker, saying 'this scheme is offering something very special' proposed that it could be enhanced by adding a pedestrian subway linking Liberty Wharf to the new development. Another comment on design expressed concern about how the new development would 'fit in' with Jersey, asking 'couldn't the Esplanade square be made to look more like Jersey?'

Process

Three speakers expressed exasperation at the length of time which had passed in reaching this proposed solution. "Shouldn't we have thought about many of these things 20 years ago?" asked one, while another said: 'Can you put a lid on discussion so we can just go forward?'

Impact on the resident population

One speaker expressed concern about the development causing an increase in the population, because more workers would be brought in to fill the offices. But another view countered this, suggesting the buildings should 'go up to ten storeys' to help solve the problems of the ageing society.

**MASTERPLAN FOR THE ESPLANADE QUARTER, ST HELIER WATERFRONT
REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS
MARCH 2008**

1. The brief

My brief, which was formalised in a meeting with the Principal Planner - Waterfront (PPW) on 27th February, is to review the efficacy of the public consultation initiative, which was conducted on behalf of the Minister of Planning and Environment during the period between 14 November 2007 and 11 January 2008. The stated aim of the consultation process, as expressed on page 2 of the Masterplan Summary document, is as follows:

'This consultation provides a channel for people to express their views and enables the Minister to listen to the public, so that the proposals can be refined and improved.'

I have kept this underlying aim in mind in preparing this report and I have therefore brought within the scope of this review the process by which representations arising from the consultation have been used to inform the revision and improvement of the Masterplan proposals.

The consultation timetable is explained more fully on page 47 of the full version of the Masterplan. It is intended that the amended Masterplan, accompanied by a Report and Proposition, will be presented to the Council of Ministers at the end of March 2008, and subsequently to the States.

The Masterplan is a composite effort. It is driven and directed by Hopkins Architects working to the Minister's brief, with important specialist contributions by Transport and Technical Services and their consultants, and input from WEB, the Economic Development Department, and the Planning and Environment Department. A pivotal role is provided by the Principal Planner – Waterfront, whose job it is to coordinate input from various sources and ensure that matters arising from the public consultation are given effective attention by the appropriate agencies in the reworking of the Masterplan.

2. Documentation provided

I have been provided with copies of the following documents:

- The Consultation Draft of the Masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter, St Helier, published by Hopkins Architects on 14 November 2007, in hard copy and CD format.
- The printed summary of the Masterplan published in November 2007
- A report entitled 'Requirements and timetable for the completion of the Esplanade Quarter Masterplan as of January 2008', prepared by the Principal Planner – Waterfront.

- A hard copy of all the written responses made by interested parties, whether by letter or email, together with a schedule of all such representations received up to 6 February 2008, over 3 weeks after the formal conclusion of the consultation period ended on 11 January.
- A report entitled 'Summary of the public consultation on the Hopkins Masterplan for the Esplanade Quarter, St Helier', which was prepared by Katie Le Quesne on behalf of the Minister (K Le Quesne Report). This includes 3 appendixes, viz:
 - Response of the waterfront design group
 - Verbal responses made at the exhibition (at the St Helier Town Hall)
 - Verbal responses made at the Town Hall Presentation (on 6 December 2007),

3. The structure of this report

It seems to me that my assessment can be broken naturally into 2 parts, which reflect the successive stages of the consultation initiative.

Part One deals with the form of the public consultation initiative, including the nature of the Masterplan, the way in which the relevant information was communicated to interested parties, and the means for facilitating and receiving responses from members of the public

Part Two deals with the means by which the issues raised in the consultation responses has been assimilated, their relative significance assessed, and a mechanism provided to ensure that these matters are used to drive the refinement and improvement of the Masterplan.

THE REVIEW

PART ONE, deals with

The nature of the public consultation initiative, including the way in which the relevant information was communicated to interested parties, and the means for facilitating and receiving responses from members of the public

The consultation exercise was facilitated by the following means, which are detailed more fully in the K Le Quesne Report referred to above:

- Wide distribution of the printed Masterplan in its full version, in its summary form, and in CD format, as well as public access to the full version of the Masterplan on the States website;
- Wide coverage in the media;
- A public exhibition held at the former Jersey Tourism office between 19 November and 7 December 2007, which was widely advertised in the local media;
- A public presentation by the principal architect of Hopkins at the St Helier Town Hall on 6 December, which was widely advertised in the local media;
- The creation in early 2007 of the Waterfront Design Group, a focus group comprising local experts representing various fields of interest, with a brief to advise the Minister and engage with Hopkins Architects during the formulation of the Masterplan.

A Masterplan such as this is essentially a planning tool which aims to provide a framework to guide the form and quality of development in a specific area. The obvious benefit of the consultation

exercise is that all aspects of the draft Masterplan can be scrutinised, tested and challenged by the local community. This process should enable the Minister and his advisors to refine and improve both the content and presentation of the Masterplan, resulting in a document which is fit for purpose, robust and locally relevant.

A wide range of issues are raised in the draft Masterplan and these seem to me to be expressed in a manner which can be readily understood by the non-expert reader. The vision and aspirations for the Esplanade Quarter are clearly stated, and all relevant technical issues are explored and the intentions explained. The coverage of the various issues is variable, with the section on highways being the least well developed. This may be inevitable in a complex document such as this, and the consultation process clearly provides a correcting mechanism in the sense that matters which are not convincingly portrayed or not covered in sufficient detail are likely to attract the heaviest comment, ensuring that they will become a key focus of attention and improvement during the redrafting process.

Given the intense and long-standing public interest in the development of the St Helier Waterfront, the Masterplan also sets out the terms of the financial deal with the preferred developer, and describes the economic benefits that should result from the development, particularly in relation to future investment in St Helier. Whilst these matters are of fundamental importance to the town and the Island, it is fair to say that they are peripheral to the main purpose of the Masterplan, which is to **guide the form of development in the Esplanade Quarter and secure its integration with the established town centre**. The Minister may wish to review whether these important issues should remain embedded in this document, or be dealt with by some other means, perhaps as free-standing reports which are linked to the implementation of the Masterplan.

It is clear to me, however, that the consultation draft of the Masterplan was fit for purpose in explaining the broad aspirations and the detailed proposals for the Esplanade Quarter, and is consistent in its form and content with masterplan documents that have been prepared for major developments elsewhere in Europe. With one minor reservation, I am therefore satisfied that this has provided an effective mechanism for stimulating community involvement and encouraging feedback on the proposals. My reservation relates to the matter of highway infrastructure. This was one aspect of the Masterplan that attracted significant public comment, and the view was widely expressed that the proposed arrangements were not thought out sufficiently carefully and could be unworkable. The suggestion has been made that this aspect of the Masterplan be revised, and further consultation be undertaken. It is my view that as the intentions in respect of highway matters were clearly expressed in the Masterplan, and bearing in mind that the planning application in respect of the Esplanade Quarter will be subject to a public enquiry in due course, then further public consultation on the revised Masterplan matter is unnecessary.

Given the wide ranging publicity in the press and media about the proposed Masterplan, there could have been very few people in the Island who were unaware of the issues being raised, their significance to the Island, and the fact that the views of Islanders were being actively sought. The Waterfront Development Group had been actively involved in the formulation of the Masterplan throughout 2007, and the membership of this group is made up of several independently minded individuals, representing a wide range of interests. This would have guaranteed challenging and critical discussion on all matters of principle, as well as on issues of design and detail.

Copies of the Masterplan were readily available in various formats, and an opportunity was provided for interested parties to view the exhibition at the former Tourism office, and/or attend a presentation by the principal architect of Hopkins at the St Helier Town hall. At both of these events, representatives of Planning and Environment were available to answer questions and record any representations that interested parties wished to make. Comments were also invited by email or in writing. Although the consultation period ended on 11 January 2008, late representations were received and assimilated. It is difficult to imagine how much more could reasonably have been done to encourage and facilitate public involvement in the draft Masterplan.

My conclusions for Part One are that:

- a) the nature and content of the set of Masterplan documents that were issued were fit for the intended purpose and provided a good basis for public consultation;
- b) the mechanism for promoting and disseminating the Masterplan, explaining its content and facilitating public comment, was well-considered and effective

PART TWO deals with

the means by which the issues raised in the consultation responses has been assimilated, their relative significance assessed, and a mechanism provided to ensure that these matters are used to drive the refinement and improvement of the Masterplan.

It seems to me that there are 3 distinct steps involved here.

A Scheduling of issues

The first essential step is to ensure that all of the consultation responses have been logged and a schedule created of all the significant and relevant issues that were raised. Such a schedule was prepared and is attached to the report prepared by K Le Quesne referred to above. The Principal Planner – Waterfront also logged the responses made by members of the public during the exhibition at the Tourism Office and at the public presentation at the Town hall. I am satisfied that all matters raised during the public consultation were properly captured so as to provide a sound basis for action.

B Attaching weight and relative significance to the issues raised in the consultation process, and directing these to the attention of the authors of and contributors to the Masterplan, so that these issues properly inform the refinement and improvement of the Masterplan

The nature of the issues raised range from fundamental concerns, such as doubts about the practicability of the proposed road network, to more detailed matters such as the naming of the proposed streets and squares. As in any consultation process, these matters clearly need to be sifted, weighted and prioritised. Fundamental and significant matters can thereby be given a high degree of priority and attention, whilst other matters can be attended to by the most appropriate means, according to their significance.

As in the initial drafting of the Masterplan, the process of refinement and improvement following the period of public consultation was a joint effort. As letters and representations were received, and comments were made during the public events, these were assessed by the Principal Planner – Waterfront, and reviewed in conjunction with the Minister for Planning and Environment and the Chief Executive Officer. As soon as individual issues were crystallised, these were referred by the Principal Planner – Waterfront to appropriate members of the Masterplan team for attention, with more complex issues, such as highway infrastructure, being the subject of regular meetings and discussion as the Masterplan proposals were refined. Copies of the relevant representations were also provided to the appropriate team members for their information. It is my conclusion that the issues raised in consultation were assessed and prioritised in an effective appropriate manner, with input at the highest officer and political level. I am satisfied that the referral of the various matters to the appropriate members of the Masterplan team was undertaken in a professional and efficient manner, and careful monitoring was imposed on the process of amendment and refinement of the Masterplan

C Ensuring that the revised Masterplan has properly addressed the issues raised in the public consultation

The final stage of the consultation process involves the signing off of each of the issues raised, indicating what action had been taken in the amendment and refinement of the Masterplan. At the time of writing this report, this work was still under way, reflecting the continuing progress in the completion of the final version of the Masterplan. I have pointed out earlier that some of the issues raised go beyond the normal scope of a planning document such as this, and it would, in my opinion, be legitimate to deal with these in separate documents which are associated with but not integral to the Masterplan. Nevertheless, the final stage of monitoring stage should include a mechanism which indicates how all the key issues raised during consultation have been addressed. This process is being achieved by means of a tabulation which explains the nature of the action that has been taken in response to each of the issues raised during the consultation process.

Following my appraisal of the consultation responses, and my discussion with the Principal Planner - Waterfront, it is clear to me that the issues raised in the consultation process have been diligently followed up and commendable effort has been made by the authors of the Masterplan and their advisors to respond to the wide range of community views that have been expressed. I recommend that the monitoring tabulation be completed, together with a brief overview, and included in the documentation which is provided in support of the Report and Proposition to the States.

Conclusions

My conclusions on Part Two are that the matters raised in public consultation have been diligently and effectively utilised so as to form the basis for the improvement and refinement of the Masterplan, and that the objective of the public consultation initiative has therefore been achieved.

Stuart Fell Dip Arch RIBA IHBC
MSPlanning
March 2008

11/13 New Street,
St Helier, Jersey JE2 3RA
Telephone: 01534 869425
Fax 01534 869825
E-mail info@msplanning.co.uk