



| Minutes | |
|--|---|
| <u>MINUTES OF THE ROADS COMMITTEE MEETING – A- AGENDA</u> <u>HELD IN THE ASSEMBLY ROOM ON</u> <u>WEDNESDAY, 12 JANUARY 2022 AT 9.30AM</u> | |
| PRESENT | Constable S Crowcroft (SC) The Very Rev'd M Keirle (MK) Mr B Le Feuvre (BLF) Mr J Baker (JB) Mr T Vibert (TV) Mr K Proctor (KP) |
| IN ATTENDANCE | Mr G Jennings (Procureur du Bien Public) (GJ) Mr P Pearce (Procureur du Bien Public) (PP) Mr S Alves (Head of Infrastructure) (SA) Mr A Sty (Infrastructure Manager) (AS) Mrs A Roberts (Parish Secretary) (AR) Miss E Sheehan (Minutes) (ES) |
| APOLOGIES | Mr B Manning (BM) Mr J Turner (Chief Executive Officer) (JT) |
| DECLARATION OF INTEREST | JB Member of West of Town Association and Friends of New Hospital KP Member of West of Town Association BLF Member of West of Town Association TV Chairman of First Tower Group SC President of Bowling Club |
| OPEN MEETING | None |
| MATTERS ARISING | |
| 01/2022 TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED PLANNING RESPONSE FOR THE HOSPITAL PLANNING REFERENCE P/2021/1670 | <p>SC read the contents of a letter he had received from Senator Lyndon Farnham which included the following:</p> <p>"I can confirm that there will be scope for people to use the cycleway in both directions. It will be a standard width path and, as with other facilities of this kind, cyclists will be able to choose how they travel on it. While cyclists will be advised to travel downhill on the road if possible, slower cyclists, children or other users would not be prevented from using the path.</p> <p>With respect to the northern access to Westmount Road, I can confirm that the proposal allows a left turn in from Tower Road, so islanders travelling from the north can turn in from Queen's Road and from Old St John's Road.</p> <p>The Political Oversight Group is also supportive of access to the Hospital site from the right hand turn from Tower Road, as well as the left-hand turn out into Tower Road to the west. The Roads Committee can formally request this change as part of the planning application response if they wish and their views would be welcomed by the POG"</p> <p>SA asked the Roads Committee to consider his response to the planning proposal for the new Hospital at the Overdale site at Westmount Road and asked for their comments.</p> |

(Comments added to planning response)

We are basing our comments on the existing Island Plan as of today.

The absence of a green and workplace travel plan is a severe deficiency in any discussion about parking.

There is no understanding from the engineers how this will affect, for example, Cheapside or any other traffic coming into that area.

The Committee welcomes the offer of two-way cycling but is concerned without a cycling strategy from the Government will lead to irresponsible cycling and accidents. Suggest it should have adequate signs and be policed.

BLF referred to Lyndon Farnham's letter, and he suggested we seek clarification. The Political Oversight Group supports access to the Hospital from Tower Road's right turn. However, are they suggesting we will only be allowed access as far as the Hospital, preventing traffic continuing down Westmount to Cheapside area? The Committee agreed to this change as long as traffic is allowed to continue into town.

States commitment around the unnecessariness of some proposals in the absence of a walking and cycling strategy.

The Roads Committee supports the new Hospital, but they object strongly to the planning application, and the comments are intended to improve the plans should they go through.

The Roads Committee object against all loss of heritage sites in the area.

(Amendments added to planning response)

Further details on how the crematorium will operate with the ongoing works to Westmount to include noise as well as parking and access. (10)

To add the use of tarpaulin as well as wheel washing to prevent dust and debris and any water generated to be disposed of inside the site and not on a public road (5)

All car spaces to have the ability for electric charging. (11)

Amend overall transport plan to go in order, Walking, Cycling and public transport to include a separate section on disabled access (14-17)

Cycle parking to be provided for larger cycles such as delivery bikes and child trailer bikes as well as tricycles and cycles with trailers (14 c)

To add covered shelter for cycle parking with solar panel roof (14)

Ask for more than 50 motorcycle parking spaces and all parking spaces to have the ability for electric charging. (15 a)

No provision given to taxi pick up and drop up (11-17)

Copy comment no (45) to public transport (16)

Too late to request the study of the area to be extended now we are on the planning application. I would like it noted the Committee, despite repeated requests for the study area to be expanded, are disappointed to note that IHE has restricted their attention to these junctions. The Roads Committee can not say without any degree of confidence there will not be traffic chaos

from the proposal (18)

Reword Cycle routes paragraph now that two-way cycling will be allowed on the proposed cycle route (19 & 20)

Suggest item 22 (I) and (II) measurements be amended to Pedestrian access from 2m to 1.5m and Cycle provision from 1.5m to 2 m (22)

Remove the second paragraph as it relates to no right-hand turn from Tower Road (25)

The Committee does not support the bus change over at Inn on The Park, and the way it affects the junction (d)(Public transport)

Add that Lewis Street/Kensington Place area is part of a proposed neighbourhood improvement program at the end of January (27)

Although trees do not come within the Roads Committees ambit, we have had a great deal of interest over the past two decades with trees within St Helier. Remind the planners of the States debate the states have agreed to replace any lost trees. Also needs to be a tree planting regime. They should introduce a maintenance strategy for at least the first five years. The Committee notes that the benefits of the proposed trees will take many years to be received.(28-30)

Trees have a value of at least 50k per tree, which is a case of 800 million loss on the 600 trees; we have already enjoyed the trees for half their life so instead of 800 million loss we have 400 million loss, the equivalent of the Government taking 400 million worth of our assets. We will lose the benefit of these new 160 trees for at least 20 years. We will also lose the Pergola and all the cherry trees adjacent. SC suggested the Committee should specifically resist the loss of the Pergola and cherry trees, as they are an asset of St Helier. We will also lose the biodiversity in this area, which will not return for 20 years. There are also over 50 mature trees at the Overdale site, which will be lost that are not included in the figures that will not be replaced. The tree loss, bowling club and Peirson bluff could all be avoided if the superhighway was not built. (28 - 30)

The whole proposal for the area at Victoria Park is unnecessary. If you take away the proposal for the bus terminus, it takes away the need for a larger roundabout and loss of green space (36 - 37)

The Committee notes the loss of trees should be replaced but objects to the loss of trees(39)

Imagine if you could not explain how you got the patients from the wards to the operating theatre, trying to fob us off with barely explained infrastructure. Suggest if we have a world-class Hospital, we also need world-class access for walking and cycling. The access is not going to work if there is not a network (40-41)

If they are to move the roundabout, can we suggest that IHE consult the Roads Committee as to the design (43)

The Roads Committee object to the loss of the Bowling Club its part of our infrastructure, and putting it at Warwick farm will not be as good as leaving it where it is (47)

Suggest comment should start with an objection and then the reason why all comments should start with an objection at the loss of a facility only if it is to go do we impose these conditions (48)

Request a green/buffer zone around the children's playground (47e)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>Parish events on People’s Park extend to Victoria Park and Lower Park (55)</p> <p>(Committees Comments)</p> <p>GJ informed the Committee that the new wording of the highway code coming in to force 29th January 2022 clarifies that pedestrians are permitted to walk along cycle routes that are legally dedicated. Pedestrians have priority; cycles have to give way to pedestrians, motorcycles, etc.</p> <p>TV wanted to make a formal proposal to reject the offer of two-way cycling on the new cycle path. SC put this to a vote. It was denied.</p> <p>TV read out the following statement from Mr Staddon.</p> <p>"The second alternative that I addressed was the Overdale hospital site. Whilst this is an existing hospital location and within the built-up area, it is physically separated from the main town and the topography makes it inaccessible, particularly by walking and cycling modes of transport. The intensification of development required to accommodate the hospital combined with the ridge location within the Green Backdrop Zone would result in very significant adverse visual impacts. There could also be adverse residential amenity and biodiversity impacts. This option would create significant challengers with the Island plan"</p> <p>TV said that this judgement by the same person now appointed to be the planning inspector to adjudicate on the current plans, plans to put the hospital at Overdale confirmed many of his fears about the whole unsuitability of the complete project and left him wondering how the States, in the light of this opinion, of which they would have been aware, could have decided on Overdale at the very outset.</p> <p>JB said Mr Staddons comments were on the then existing Island Plan and quoted the following extract from the C13 Policy.</p> <p>'Our Hospital and associated sites, Proposals for the development of the new Hospital within the designated 'Our Hospital development Site' will be afforded the highest level of priority and will be supported where:</p> <p>(a)The proposals is not considered to cause serious, unacceptable harm to the character and amenity of the wider area of neighbouring uses'.</p> <p>SC agreed the Committee need to clarify what happens if all this work is thrown out because there is a new Island Plan. Why is the planning department putting us through this process making comments under an Island Plan that could be considered out of date?</p> |
| AGREED DECISIONS | To amend Planning response as highlighted above item 01/2022 |
| NEXT MEETING | The next meeting will take place on Wednesday 26 January 2022 at 9.30am Assembly Room Town Hall. |