



14 March 2019

Request:

Please supply the following information to me (listed below) by e-mail in respect of the Masterplan for Havre des Pas and its associated Project Steering Group that was formed in the spring of 2018 following the decision by the Parish Assembly of St Helier to allocate £155,000 for a feasibility study to be conducted by UK-based consultants, WSP Group.

- 1) The minutes of all meetings of the Project Steering Group that took place during 2018;
- 2) The final report of WSP Group on the Masterplan for Havre des Pas.

Response:

1) The minutes are provided below –

Date	Title & details	File ref
14.03.18	Meeting No 1 Notes	Meeting No 1 Notes 140318.pdf
06.06.18	Meeting No 2 Notes	Meeting No 2 Notes 060618.pdf
08.11.18	HdP Improvement Group meeting: Stakeholder Update Presentation minutes Held on 08.11.18)	20181214_HdP-VIS_BriefingNote-Dec18.pdf
25.09.18	Meeting No 3 notes	60844_MIN_SteeringGroup_P1_S3.pdf
08.11.18	Meeting No 4 notes	20181108_HdP-Steering Group Meeting 4.pdf



Meeting No 1 Notes
140318.pdf



Meeting No 2 Notes
060618_PM Comms.p



60844_MIN_Steering
Group_P1_S3.pdf



20181108_HdP-Stee
ring Group Meeting 4.



20181214_HdP-VIS_
BriefingNote-Dec18.p

2) The final report has not yet been produced.



PARISH OF ST HELIER



Notes of the Havre des Pas Village Steering Group Meeting No 1

Wednesday 14 March 2018

OMC, Town Hall 12.00 – 14.00

Present:

SC	Constable Simon Crowcroft - Chairman
RL	Deputy Russell Labey
JM	Deputy Judy Martin
SW	Deputy Scott Wickenden
SA	Silvio Alves - Director of T&E
AS	André Sty - Manager of T & E
AR	Adam Routier
AM	Andrea Mallet
GW	George Walker - WSP
DH	Daniel Hyde – WSP
PM	Peter McComisky - TACP
TD	Tristen Dodd – Department for Infrastructure
MF	Margaret Fraser - Secretary

Action

1 Welcome & apologies

2 Introduction

GW introduced WSP and advised that the draft scope comprised of the following stages beyond today’s meeting:-

1. Data collection/mapping the setting
2. Initial stakeholder consultation
3. Scheme options assessment
4. Stakeholder consultation on options
5. Master planning

GW indicated that the programme for the above stages would hopefully be complete by the end of December 2018.

SC said that as the States set their budgets for the following year during November/early December it would be helpful to have a budget figure before that. SC agreed to advise GW of the date the budget would be set and GW said he would incorporate this key date into the programme.

SC confirmed that Fiona Kerley, Manager of the Ommaroo Hotel and Marcus Calvani, operating his business from Havre des Pas Bathing Pool, had agreed to be members of the Steering Group and would represent the traders in Havre des Pas.

It was agreed that SC would act as Chairman for the Steering Group until the elections have taken place in May.

AM ensured that everybody had received a copy of the Feasibility Study and Regeneration Project that she had produced.

AM said she would give MF some more contacts to be included in the HDPIG email database.

SC

AM

3	Study Objectives	
	<p>After some discussion the group set the following study objectives:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in through traffic along Havre des Pas • Redefine Havre des Pas as a residential village area as well as a destination for people to visit 	
4	Discussion	
	<p>TD said the group needs to be aware that solving a traffic problem in one area could just move the problem elsewhere. He said that the types of vehicles and fuel in use is already changing. TD said that the area was adjacent to a Ramsar site, had heritage and archaeological links which all needed to be taken into account during the feasibility study.</p> <p>AM said the volume and speed of P30 vehicles and buses mounting the pavement in Green Street was of particular concern.</p> <p>AR/AM said that Havre des Pas was a highly saturated residential area and campaigning for change had been taking place for many years but been ignored.</p> <p>SC said the traffic modelling process was not in line with States policy of reducing traffic and that drivers will adapt to any restrictions imposed.</p> <p>JM said the traffic heading for the metal recycling facility would cause even more issues as the roads being used were not built for heavy traffic.</p> <p>AR said the traffic using the La Collette facilities was a major problem.</p> <p>RL said Havre des Pas and Green Street were the main areas of concern and these streets should be a key focus of the study.</p> <p>RL said the HDPIG met regularly on the first Thursday of each month and members could be easily contacted by email or a flyer drop to attend any meetings.</p> <p>SW said that he felt that people living in town were being treated as second class citizens as opposed to those living in more rural areas.</p> <p>AM asked what had happened to the introduction of the 20mph speed limit which had been agreed some time ago, TD said he would chase the matter up but said he was aware that the Law Draftsman was under extreme pressure at the moment.</p> <p>RL said it would be a shame if the scope of the study was restricted by DfI policy. He said the politicians had the opportunity to change States policy and would like at this stage all options be considered. TD said this was the opportunity for "blue skies" thinking which could be moderated at a later date if necessary. GW said it was the role of WSP to explore all options and TD said that options could be trialled.</p> <p>SC said that if a one way traffic scheme was considered commuters would still use the roads either at the beginning or end of the day and he felt commuters should be lowest in the hierarchy of priorities. He felt that the current environment stopped people coming to the area to enjoy it. SC said that the introduction of a no through road would stop commuters but visitors could access the area from either end of the restriction, this would also enable to roads to maintain two way traffic.</p> <p>AM said the traffic reduction would have a knock on effect on cyclists, pedestrians and parking.</p> <p>SC felt that some of the local businesses had failed because of the limited parking and there could be an opportunity to provide additional parking by adding more storeys to the car park on La Route du Fort or on an area near the incinerator. Neither of these locations were too far a walk away from Havre des Pas.</p> <p>JM was concerned that vehicles driving round looking for a parking space added to the volume of traffic. She said the Lido was a fantastic facility that was underutilised. JM said the reduction in the number of spaces at Green Street Car Park had not helped.</p> <p>TD said the sea at Havre des Pas was clean and sheltered.</p> <p>JM said that Jason Maindonald was the organiser of the annual Seaside Festival and could provide valuable feedback, this years' festival will take place on 21 & 22 July. SC suggested this would be a good time to carry out a consultation exercise.</p> <p>RL said he was happy to walk around the area with anybody from WSP to point out the issues/attractions.</p> <p>SC said that previously the Parish had been asked to consider the introduction of a Residents' Parking Zone in the area so this could also be part of the consultation and could re-claim on-street parking for residents.</p> <p>TD said that more parking was available in the evening in South Hill and Green Street Car Park. He said that the</p>	TD

	<p>bus service and walkability were important factors. TD said that he hoped visitors would start feeling that they had entered the “village” by the use of street furniture etc and that there were lovely gardens in the area that were maybe not fully appreciated. He said that a vast amount of money could be spent extending the car park at La Route du Fort but this may not be convenient enough for visitors.</p> <p>AM thought it was quite acceptable to park on the periphery of the area and walk.</p> <p>AM advised that Havre des Pas was the island’s original boat building area and this could be the theme of any artwork. She said that her research had indicated that local artists could start on the artwork later this year and that would indicate to the States how passionate the residents were.</p> <p>TD said that this was a historic waterfront and consideration should be given to the provision of a trail and improvements to the promenade.</p> <p>AM said that any modernisation or rejuvenation needed to be in keeping with the area. She said there was an open green area adjacent to the barracks which was currently under-utilised and could be a possible location for a children’s playground.</p> <p>SC suggested that the study area included Mount Bingham, La Collette and South Hill. TD was concerned that study area be allowed to spread but AM said they were all linked together.</p> <p>RL said that a number of surveys, including one for a linear park, had been commissioned for the area but not been followed up by any action. He said that the Lido featured as one of the top ten in Britain and was a jewel in the crown that was ignored and lacked maintenance. He said the proprietor, Marcus Calvani, was keen to improve the facility but was in need of some support. The Lido is currently covered in netting for Health & Safety reasons which does not look attractive. RL said the new bridge must have been expensive and the marine mast/diving platform could be restored to its former glory.</p> <p>SC said the primary area to be considered was Green Street and Havre des Pas with Mount Bingham, La Collette, Snow Hill and St Clement’s Road being considered as the secondary area.</p> <p>PM said that WSP would identify the character of the area and draw that into the art and consideration would be given to the vibrancy of the area, telling a story and history.</p> <p>RL said that the area had links to the occupation.</p> <p>SC said that the Société Jersiaise should be one of the stakeholders.</p> <p>AM suggested projection of art/images onto the incinerator, RL said this had been proposed to residents in 2014 but maybe needed revisiting with a further explanation of the proposal to residents.</p> <p>PM said the residents needed to be consulted and AM said they would be happy if the area was regenerated as it had become a slum.</p> <p>AR said the industrial area was an issue and RL said there was in effect a bypass already there via La Route du Fort and the Tunnel and agreed to pass on the details to WSP.</p> <p>SC said the Roads Committee and Deputies were stakeholders.</p> <p>GW said the Study Output would comprise of a masterplan to sell the proposals to stakeholders</p> <p>AM said that there had been attempts to open dialogue with the owners/developers of the restaurant sites and maybe WSP could make contact with them.</p> <p>JM said that Andium were the other developers with whom contact should be made and AR said they were maybe carrying out work already that could be affected by the proposed village scheme ie substation relocation/utilities. GW said WSP would make contact with them along with the utility companies.</p> <p>AM said that residents had been asked for ideas for the open space that will be created at the La Collette development, suggestions included an amphitheatre, but others felt this could attract nuisance.</p> <p>AM said that Marcus Calvani has suggested that if Havre des Pas was made one way diagonal/chicane parking could be introduced. SC pointed out that this would encourage vehicles into the area to find a parking space. AR said that delivery space was definitely needed. Concerns were expressed that providing parking along the seafront may spoil the character of Havre des Pas. TD gave the example of cars parked around Gorey Castle which hide the historic buildings from view.</p> <p>GW said all the information discussed at the meeting would be captured into a brief document which would then be circulated as a draft, amended as necessary and become the scoping document. He said this document would be prepared within the week.</p>	RL
5	Date of next meeting – to be agreed	



PARISH OF ST HELIER



Notes of the Havre des Pas Village Steering Group Meeting No 2

Wednesday 6 June 2018

OMC, Town Hall 15.30 – 17.00

Present:

SC	Constable Simon Crowcroft - Chairman
RL	Deputy Russell Labey
JM	Deputy Judy Martin
SA	Silvio Alves - Director of T&E
AS	André Sty - Manager of T & E
AR	Adam Routier
AM	Andrea Mallet
MC	Marcus Calvani
GW	George Walker - WSP
DH	Daniel Hyde – WSP
PM	Peter McComisky - TACP
TD	Tristen Dodd – Department for Infrastructure
MF	Margaret Fraser - Secretary

Action

1 Welcome & apologies – apologies received from Fiona Kerley

2 Introduction

GW/PM/DH made a presentation to the Group of their work to date including – definition of the study area, history & development, character study, highway network, bus routes/stops, pavement widths, parking, traffic surveys and accident data.

The team then gave a number of options for consideration and highlighted some of the pros and cons of each:-

1. Closure of Havre des Pas
2. Havre des Pas one-way (fixed)
3. Havre des Pas one-way (tidal)
4. Havre des Pas weight restriction
5. Havre des Pas weekend/evening closure
6. Havre des Pas/Green Street speed restriction
7. Green Street closure
8. Green Street one-way (fixed)
9. Havre des Pas/Green Street closure
10. Havre des Pas/Green Street one-way
11. Public Realm Improvements Only
12. Public Car Parking Options

3 Discussion

SC said that weekend/evening closure was playing into the hands of commuters and that people will change their driving habits.

TD suggested that the group should not restrict its options at this stage. He said that in order to encourage people to use public transport the differential costs between the use of private cars and public transport needed to be greater. He suggested that as people still needed to access the area a staged implementation in conjunction with other measures could be the solution.

DH said that the traffic modelling could also be staged to reflect a series of measures.

MC said that parking was key.

SC expressed concern that traffic reduction has not been addressed by various DfI Ministers and the congestion and grid lock would be resolved if people stopped using their cars.

AM suggested an island-wide public bike system using part-motorised bikes. TD said a similar system existed in St Helier already.

GW said that there may be opportunity for additional on-street parking if some of the traffic was removed.

MC asked about the possibility of diagonal parking, TD said this was achievable but the geometry would constrain this in some locations. GW said that drivers would need to reverse in to any such spaces and drive out to ensure maximum visibility.

MC asked if economic stimulation of the area had been considered by WSP. GW said not directly but should be an outcome of making the area a "destination". TD said that redevelopment usually followed after work to improve the public realm.

RL thought that option 10 would have a huge impact on the area but not cause issues for HGVs.

AM said that all the discussions over a long period of time had canvassed for option 10. She felt it would not have such a negative impact as a road closure but a lot could be achieved eg higher footfall to the area, economic growth and wider pavements.

AM said a weight restriction could be implemented along with the other options, this would give a better platform for buses and cyclists.

MC said the introduction of an accompanying speed restriction could improve the area for pedestrians, as seen in St Aubin.

TD said that option 10 would enable the 2 cycle routes to be linked.

SC suggested that the other options were not given further consideration as option 10 had been favoured for many years.

AR said that option 2 would not solve the morning commute issue whereas option 3 would.

TD said that option 3 would be difficult to implement because driver awareness was key.

SC said that in his opinion increasing tourism and reclaiming the area in the evenings was more important than tackling the morning rush hour.

AM said that weekend closure as indicated in option 5 would be well received.

MC said that if a 15/20 MPH speed limit was imposed along with speed humps this would rid the area of some of the commuter traffic.

SA pointed out that there are no speed humps in the successful traffic management system in St Aubin.

TD said that if speed humps were considered they would need to be gentle as this was a bus route used by a number of elderly residents who may have back issues which would be aggravated by some designs of speed humps.

JM said that a loop bus would be ideal and this had been mentioned many times in the past. This would be of special importance if option 8 or 10 was considered to enable bus users to reach their desired destination.

JM said that if option 1 was chosen it would be similar to King Street and Queen Street pedestrian area.

RL and MC said that evening closures were commonly seen in France.

SA said parking provision was important.

AM said she had heard that the La Collette building project had issues as the builders had hit bedrock that they were not initially aware of, therefore the cost of the development will increase and may be taken back to the States as it is not financially viable. She said the proposed amphitheatre area which was meant to be handed over to the residents could be used for parking.

SC said that a large majority of the private parking in the area was owned by a single hotel and it may be that the regeneration fund could be used to purchase the car park from Seymour Hotels.

AM asked if there was any update on the availability of a car park area at La Collette, SC said this was not as at first thought and related to an unsuitable area by the incinerator.

MC asked if it was possible to tank an area under the sea and build a car park there. PM said this could in theory be done but there is strict environmental legislation and there would be a significant cost implication. TD said that car parking space is lost in car park design when there are ramps included.

4	Conclusion
	<p>The Group agreed that option 10 was the preferred option combined with full evening/weekend closure, 20 MPH speed limit and removal of HGVs.</p> <p>Option 1 should also be given due consideration, possibly for evenings/weekends only.</p> <p>PM said that following this meeting more detailed options would be drawn up, including pros and cons, which would bring more reality to the proposals for wider feedback.</p>
5	Stakeholder Group Consultation Workshop
	<p>GW suggested that this should take place week commencing 2nd July and the proposals then put forward to the community late summer. He said the Stakeholder Group needed to comprise of a manageable number.</p> <p>TD said that as people have different interests a “story board” could be a good way of portraying the proposals.</p> <p>MC said that the Jersey Hospitality Association should form part of the Stakeholder Group.</p> <p>SC suggested that it could be held to coincide with the HDPIG meeting on 5th July. AM suggested that the large developers working in the area could be included.</p> <p>GW said that the format of the meeting needed to be given some thought, ie workshop with people breaking into groups.</p> <p>SC said more information about parking needed to be included to supplement the 2 options under consideration.</p> <p>GW said that the Stakeholder Group Meeting would develop the options under consideration to take forward to the community.</p>
6	Chairman
	SC agreed to remain as Chairman of the Steering Group
7	Date of next meeting – to be agreed

MINUTES OF MEETING



Project number: 60844	Page 1 of 4
Project title: Havre des Pas, Jersey	Location: Town Hall, St Helier
Date of meeting: 25/9/18	
Purpose of meeting: Steering Group Meeting	
Prepared by: PMc	Date of Circulation:
Approved by:	Date of Approval:
Present: Constable Simon Crowcroft (SC) Deputy Russell Labey (RB) Marcus Calvani (MC) Andrea Mallet (AM) Partner of AM (AM+1) Tristan Dodd Growth, Housing & Environment (TD) Russell Labey – Deputy Connetable (RB) Scott Wickenden (SW) Silvio Alves – PoSH (SA) George Walker – WSP (GW) Dan Hyde – WSP (DH) Peter McComiskey – TACP (PM)	Circulation: All present

Item	Action
1	<p>GW explained the findings of the traffic assessment and report and noted that it is available to any who want it. The report had been passed to the Infrastructure Minister. GW was of the view that we should not go to consultation without a deliverable scheme, and therefore was keen to enter into dialog with Dfl. This discussion culminated in the response from the Minister the previous Friday.</p>
2	<p>GW set out the purpose of the meeting to be to review where we are, and to ensure that the study is taken forward as the Steering Group require. What are the options and actions to take forward? GW stressed that WSP are focussed on delivering something for the Havre des Pas. He also noted the importance of having an open discussion.</p>
3	<p>SC raised the potential of Mount Bingham woods, suggested it was currently a lost opportunity as a public resource and could be a potential community project. He suggested the study red line boundary should include Mount Bingham.</p>
4	<p>MC queried the extent of traffic modelling in relation to the current red line boundary. DH explained that the modelling extends beyond the red line.</p>
5	<p>DH explained the summary traffic baseline and the AM and PM peaks.</p>
6	<p>AM queried if Havre des Pas (HdP) was made one-way westbound whether there would be</p>

WSP

- significance for PM movements.
- 7 SW referred to the States' Sustainable Transport Policy and suggested GHE's position was not supporting it.
- 8 DH explained the journey time slide and variation in travel time.
He explained that the morning peak is affected by funnelling while the PM peak is more extended.
He then summarised the proposed options considered in the assessment and the resulting conclusions.
- 9 MC suggested that there appears to be only a relatively minor effect on evening journey. TD explained that there are further knock-on effects on junctions and queuing.
GW also explained that the Island model is not at a fine enough grain to identify detailed impacts. It would require micro-simulations to identify detailed effects.
DH explained that the impacts currently assessed are expressed as average times across the region.
TD explained there was already very little capacity in the highway network, despite a 5% traffic decrease through sustainable transport initiatives during a period of 9% population increase.
- 10 GW set out a series of options to take the project forward.
- 11 SC suggested that it is not correct to assume that people do not react to congestion. He suggested that people will alter their behaviour to avoid congestion.
- 12 SW suggested that the DFI approach means that people in town are disadvantaged and that it does not comply with the sustainable transport policy.
- 13 TD explained that the STP included a second preference survey. This showed that buses are the favoured option. However, buses get caught in congestion so would be disadvantaged by the potential scheme.
- 14 TD suggested that other measures can be taken forward which would make the route less favourable to traffic and would encourage modal shift. He noted that congestion does not necessarily cause a change in behaviour.
He also stressed that the impact on economy needed to be considered, as well as on local people and their journeys.
- 15 SC suggested that TD's argument supports cars, not government policy. There is a need to reduce the numbers of cars passing through the area.
- 17 AM welcomed the proposed intermediate measures but stressed the need to come to an agreement on a one-way system.
- 18 AM suggested that a one-way scheme should be at least trialled, to identify potential impacts.
SC advised that a trial can be a bad idea as it can only demonstrate the pain and not the benefits.
He suggested that it would be better to agree a scheme and implement it.
The proposal should paint a picture of regeneration, including Mount Bingham, and that it does not affect the morning commute and enables an increase in tourism etc.
- 19 TD noted that there had been a very recent experience of the impact following the Mount Bingham rock fall. Variable control of the traffic flow had to be managed to avoid major congestion. Therefore, the Minister does not support a trial.
- 20 TD recommended developing a proposal for short term gains and with a long term vision – but noted that he was not able to comment on political decisions.
- 21 TD notes that the STP was not sufficiently supported by 'stick' measures, but despite this there has been an increase in bus and cycle use.

- Additional measures could include work place parking levies and a public parking cost increase.
- 22 MC suggested the introduction of electric buses and referred to California driverless buses. TD explained that the current technology was not yet suitable for 'real' road applications.
- 23 AM refers to city bikes/electric bikes, and suggested they could be introduced island-wide. TD explained that a grant had been made available for the purchase of electric bikes. GHE are also currently considering dockless bikes and potential electric scooters.
- 24 SW explained that he does not agree that traffic flow cannot be restricted, as this disadvantages the people of HdP for the benefit of people outside the area.
- 25 SC commented that it seemed the Steering Group were adamant to pursue the one-way option.
It therefore needs to be agreed what is included in the public consultation.
He also noted that it needs to be explained the the favoured scheme is not supported by the GHE and the Minister.
- 26 AM noted that HdP had been disadvantaged repeatedly but that it is St Helier's only seaside village, and should be a 'goldmine'.
- 27 TD agreed that HdP deserves investment, but he cannot recommend the favoured scheme to the Minister. He emphasised that there are easily achieved elements for which funding can now be sought, for 2020 implementation.
He noted potential public realm benefits – improving surfacing, making it more attractive, creating space, extending al fresco, etc.
- 28 RB noted that the 20mph speed limit has been sought by the residents of HdP for a long time so suggesting a speed limit now is insulting. He noted that he is constantly asked about reduced speed limits.
TD explained that GHE currently have a programme of liaison with respect to speed limits island-wide, and that the HdP area got caught up in that.
- 29 RB emphasised that Green St must be made one-way.
DH explained that making it southbound one-way would not be significant for traffic but there would be an impact on bus routes.
TD agreed that to maintain bus passage a narrowed road cannot be created. If the buses adopted a loop route they would travel down Cleveland Rd.
SW suggested that the public may prefer better street environment than maintaining the current bus service
RB suggested that the bus route could go up Mount Bingham which would pick up elderly residents from Bingham Court.
TD noted that the bus company needs to be consulted.
- 30 RB again stressed that making Green St one-way must be the priority.
He also suggested introducing a tidal traffic flow system on HdP.
GW explained that a tidal flow system would not be feasible due to side roads and private accesses
SC noted that he would be reluctant to prioritise Green St one-way over HdP, but rather both are needed.
AM+1 explained that his walking route up Green St has included buses mounting the pavement and being knocked by passing vehicles.
TD explained that he would be happy to work with DH to consider options for Green Street.
AM noted that the current traffic calming measures on Green St are not working and are dangerous.
- 31 MC suggested that the current bus stock is not suitable for Jersey roads.
He proposed that bus movements could be managed to avoid them meeting on Green St.

- SC agreed that buses cannot offer full advantage because bus priority is not achievable on Jersey roads.
It was agreed by all that the bus company needs to be involved going forward.
TD noted that high numbers of daily bus passengers (700) on Green St.
- 32 AM queried who would have the final say on what scheme goes ahead.
SA explained that the decision is with the Minister but could be pushed forward by elected members.
- 33 TD apologised that the one-way option was not clearly included in the Ministerial letter, although it was intended to be.
- 34 AM stated that it was not acceptable for the Minister to refuse the scheme and only provide minor elements.
- 35 TD confirmed that the HGV restriction and 20mph signs could go up immediately.
- 36 GW again emphasised the consultants' desire to deliver something.
- 37 SC stressed the need to illustrate benefits.
- 38 MC explained that he had recently hosted a digital tourism conference, and that many attendees remarked that the Lido was the best conference facility they had been to.
- 39 It was agreed by the Steering Group that the next step was to work up a scheme for a one-way system along with the package of measures. **WSP**
GW stressed that consultation will need to explain that the Minister does not support the one-way proposal. Both the benefits and disbenefits will need to be explained.
SC emphasised the need to create 'sexy' images of the proposal.
- 40 SC also noted that the road outside the Omaroo Hotel should also be one-way.
The scheme should include the Mount Bingham green space and car parking provision near the EFW.
- 41 MC suggested the inclusion of a boardwalk on the beach edge to extend the sea-front public realm.
He also noted that the car hire site on HdP should be considered as a potential car park, as it may become available.
- 42 GW reminded the group of the objective to redefine HdP as a destination.
He suggested the Lido was the existing 'jewel in the crown' but that there could be another project to identify potential new attractions.
- 43 RB suggested a meeting with the HdP Improvement Group on 1st November.
Due to the half-term it was agreed to move this to 8th November. **ALL**



AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70044230	MEETING DATE	08 November 2018
PROJECT NAME	Havre des Pas Village Improvement Study	VENUE	Ommaroo Hotel, Havre des Pas, Saint Helier, Jersey
CLIENT	Parish of St Helier	RECORDED BY	DH
MEETING SUBJECT	HdPIG meeting: Stakeholder Update Presentation		
PRESENT	<p>Steering Group – Simon Crowcroft (SC), Russel Labey (RL), Judith Martin (JM), Scott Wickenden (SW), Silvio Alves, Andre Sty, Andrea Mallet (AM)</p> <p>WSP - George Walker (GW), Peter McComiskey (PMC), Dan Hyde (DH)</p> <p>Stakeholders – HdPIG Residents and Stakeholders</p>		
APOLOGIES	June Summers, Tristen Dodd		
DISTRIBUTION	Steering Group and WSP team members		
CONFIDENTIALITY	Confidential		

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	Introduction - Russel Labey		
1.1	<p>Meeting brought to order by Russel Labey, chair of the study.</p> <p>RL confirmed that the meeting was a special convening of the Havre des Pas Improvement group, which is usually held on the first Thursday of each month. Next meeting likely to changes, potential first Thursday in Jan 2019.</p> <p>Headcount - approx. 43 attendees, in addition to WSP & Steering group (10).</p> <p>RL stated that he has been seeking to develop improvements to Havre des Pas, Green St, St Clements, La Route du Fort area for many years. He stated that the meeting was a consultation exercise on potential improvement options and was a chance for residents to feed into the scheme development.</p> <p>RL confirmed format of the evening with WSP to explain options via presentation, followed by Q&A and then SC outlining the political position and next steps for the study.</p>		

MEETING NOTES

2	WSP Presentation		
2.1	<p>GW outlined the position of the study with background and outline thoughts on potential improvement options. GW stated that the meeting was being undertaken prior to formal public consultation to be held in Jan 2019.</p> <p>GW and PMC delivered the study presentation – from impacts and issues through to potential improvement options.</p> <p>PMC outlined the proposed one-way scheme and the potential public space improvements through increased footway widths.</p> <p>GW outlined the next steps with the design refinement during Nov 18 - Jan 19, with public consultation events to be held in Jan 19. If successful schemes would be started in 2020, provided funding and GHE approvals could be secured.</p>		
3	Stakeholder Feedback on proposals		
3.1	<p>General:</p> <p>Q – Resident - Are slides going to be available – RL not yet. Will be available early next year at the public consultation events following refinement of the proposals.</p> <p>Q - RL – What are people feeling about the proposals?</p> <p>A - Resident - Excellent bus service currently, however, loss of eastbound bus service due to one-way would have a large impact, especially with less mobile users in the La Collette area. Cannot afford to lose the service. Would like to have an improved bus service not reduced.</p> <p>A - RL – Confirmed desire to improve and that solutions would be developed.</p> <p>Green St:</p> <p>Q – Resident - Safety a concern currently due to narrowness. Needs significant improvement.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Bus didn't use to travel along the street – could it change back to the previous route.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Would like to limit traffic volumes and sizes, maybe even access only, however, would like to have two-way for residents.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Liberty bus could run hopper service round Pier Rd and Green St.</p> <p>A - JM - indicated she has been in discussions with Liberty bus, and a service would be coming soon.</p> <p>A - JM – outlined the scheme needs a strong response from residents to be able to confirm what schemes are taken forward.</p>		

	<p>Q – AM - Stated east to west was prominent traffic movement in AM, which was why the one-way was in that direction to enable people to get to work without impact, but that the evening was less important. However, for the scheme to progress they must have SoJ GHE approval. Therefore, she considered it more likely to get approval with one-way east to west than west to east closure.</p> <p>Q - Resident - How will the scheme impact business?</p> <p>A - PMC regeneration is key to improving</p> <p>Q – Resident - Is there a sustainable approach and material usage?</p> <p>A – PMC – Sustainable approach would be key and is considered in all scheme development.</p> <p>Q – Resident – Stated she lived at tunnel end of Green St and one way would increase her journey time to arrive/leave home, however she would absolutely support the one-way scheme.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Access to/from Havre des Pas hinterlands is a particular concern. Suggested a study needs to consider and develop improvements for the hinterlands.</p> <p>A – SC – confirmed that would look at it.</p> <p>Q – Resident -Has any consideration been given to Roseville St / Cleveland St.</p> <p>A – GW/DH – Confirmed areas partially assessed in terms of traffic re-assignment and further work would be needed as schemes developed.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Boardwalk a great idea especially creating more space for cyclists, although did not consider it was safe in high winds and with sea spray. Also, would not want the impact of roadworks while construction was undertaken.</p> <p>Other residents indicated they would accept the short term distrubtion given the benefits the schemes would have.</p> <p>Q – Resident – Concerned that Fort d’Auvergne development/option could overlook properties and create privacy issues.</p> <p>Q – Resident – Why is Green St a critical need for this study?</p> <p>A – GW/SL - Safety impact of narrow footways and two-way traffic.</p> <p>SL asked for a quote on the options presented to gauge opinion: Vote outcome – most generally in favour (95%), a few undecided (5%).</p>		
4	Closing address - Simon Crowcroft		
4.1	SC closing items:		

MEETING NOTES

Residents parking – Noted it was not discussed however confirmed it would be investigated and that he was seeking to undertake a study in due course, subject to funding.

Art House – Noted that the Art House would be undertaking a project next year in Havre des Pas.

Britain in Bloom – confirmed that next year (2019) St Helier would be competing in the finalist's round and that he was very keen to win. Therefore, as part of an early scheme, he would be seeking to control of Mount Bingham woods and gardens and overhaul to bring back to its former glory, which together with La Collette gardens could help win the competition. Support and assistance from residents would be needed.

SC noted that traffic engineers would be difficult in the schemes development and approval, but with public support, the scheme could go forward.

A resident stated that the Havre des Pas Facebook page could be used to gather information and ask for support.

A further resident also stated that the 20-mph speed limit scheme must be fast-tracked.

NEXT MEETING

An invitation will be issued if an additional meeting is required.

Havre des Pas Village Scheme Study: Steering Group Meeting No 4 – Community Consultation Strategy

12:00 10th January 2018

1.0 Introduction

This note follows the public meeting held with the Havre des Pas Improvement Group on November 8th, 2018. It is intended to brief the Steering Group on the key issues raised at the meeting and set the agenda for the next Steering Group Meeting, to be held on 10th January 2019.

2.0 HdPIG Meeting 8th November 2018

The meeting was held to update the Havre des Pas Improvement Group on progress of the study, prior to a formal community consultation, due to be held in January 2019. WSP gave a presentation on the work undertaken to date, which was followed by an informal question and answer session. The meeting was attended by approximately 43 members of the public/stakeholders. Notes from the HdPIG public meeting are attached as Annex 1. The proposals were generally received by attendees. Key issues raised by attendees can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed highway changes will impact on local bus service routing and access to for some would be significantly affected. How will this be overcome?
- Road safety is currently a key concern.
- How will the highway changes impact on local businesses?
- The proposed highways changes will impact on residents' journeys, which will have to be considered carefully.
- Access to and from the Havre des Pas 'hinterland' a concern – study should consider improvements in this area too.
- Boardwalk is a 'great idea' to create more space for cyclists, but may be safety issues with high tides, wave overtopping and sea spray.
- Concern over disruption during construction, although long term disruption would be offset by long term benefits.
- The Fort d'Auvergne development option could overlook properties with consequent privacy issues.
- Are the proposed highway changes required to allow the other development proposals to go ahead?

- Are changes to Green Street critical for the study.

A 'show of hands' confirmed approximately 95% of attendees were generally in favour of the proposals presented.

3.0 Agenda for the Steering Group Meeting

The next stage of the study is to hold a formal community consultation (due to be held in January) on the proposals and it is important that the Steering Group agree the timing and form of the consultation, what should be presented, how the information should be presented (particularly with respect to the traffic and bus impacts) and how views from the community should be gathered and recorded. The key objectives of this Steering Group meeting are therefore:

- To review and discuss the key issues raised by the HdPIG meeting
- To discuss agree how information on traffic and bus impacts will be presented and to agree with GHE how the current difference of view between the Minister for Infrastructure and the Parish will be reported.
- To agree the strategy, timing, location(s), duration and form of consultation including the publicity required to ensure it is sufficiently advertised, including the role of the Parish website and social media.
- To agree the feedback sought from the consultees and how this will be achieved i.e. what questions do we want the public to answer and how
- To agree the consultation material presented (WSP will present the draft exhibition panels for review and discussion)

Since the meeting with HdPIG was held, and the GHE Transport team has considered further the likely impacts of the proposed changes to the highway network and Tristen Dodd will update the Steering Group and give a presentation on the Minister for Infrastructure's current position

The draft Agenda for the meeting is attached at **Annex 2**. We look forward to seeing you all again in January.

Silvio Alves

Parish of St Helier

George Walker

WSP UK Ltd

Annex 1 Meeting Notes HdPIG 8th November 2018

Annex 2 Draft Agenda for Steering Group Meeting 10th January 2019

Annex 1 Notes from the HdPIG Public Meeting Held on 8th November 2018



AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	70044230	MEETING DATE	08 November 2018
PROJECT NAME	Havre des Pas Village Improvement Study	VENUE	Ommaroo Hotel, Havre des Pas, Saint Helier, Jersey
CLIENT	Parish of St Helier	RECORDED BY	DH
MEETING SUBJECT	HdPIG meeting: Stakeholder Update Presentation		
PRESENT	<p>Steering Group – Simon Crowcroft (SC), Russel Labey (RL), Judith Martin (JM), Scott Wickenden (SW), Silvio Alves, Andre Sty, Andrea Mallet (AM)</p> <p>WSP - George Walker (GW), Peter McComiskey (PMC), Dan Hyde (DH)</p> <p>Stakeholders – HdPIG Residents and Stakeholders</p>		
APOLOGIES	June Summers, Tristen Dodd		
DISTRIBUTION	Steering Group and WSP team members		
CONFIDENTIALITY	Confidential		

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION	DUE
1	Introduction - Russel Labey		
1.1	<p>Meeting brought to order by Russel Labey, chair of the study.</p> <p>RL confirmed that the meeting was a special convening of the Havre des Pas Improvement group, which is usually held on the first Thursday of each month. Next meeting likely to changes, potential first Thursday in Jan 2019.</p> <p>Headcount - approx. 43 attendees, in addition to WSP & Steering group (10).</p> <p>RL stated that he has been seeking to develop improvements to Havre des Pas, Green St, St Clements, La Route du Fort area for many years. He stated that the meeting was a consultation exercise on potential improvement options and was a chance for residents to feed into the scheme development.</p> <p>RL confirmed format of the evening with WSP to explain options via presentation, followed by Q&A and then SC outlining the political position and next steps for the study.</p>		

2	WSP Presentation		
2.1	<p>GW outlined the position of the study with background and outline thoughts on potential improvement options. GW stated that the meeting was being undertaken prior to formal public consultation to be held in Jan 2019.</p> <p>GW and PMC delivered the study presentation – from impacts and issues through to potential improvement options.</p> <p>PMC outlined the proposed one-way scheme and the potential public space improvements through increased footway widths.</p> <p>GW outlined the next steps with the design refinement during Nov 18 - Jan 19, with public consultation events to be held in Jan 19. If successful schemes would be started in 2020, provided funding and GHE approvals could be secured.</p>		
3	Stakeholder Feedback on proposals		
3.1	<p>General:</p> <p>Q – Resident - Are slides going to be available – RL not yet. Will be available early next year at the public consultation events following refinement of the proposals.</p> <p>Q - RL – What are people feeling about the proposals?</p> <p>A - Resident - Excellent bus service currently, however, loss of eastbound bus service due to one-way would have a large impact, especially with less mobile users in the La Collette area. Cannot afford to lose the service. Would like to have an improved bus service not reduced.</p> <p>A - RL – Confirmed desire to improve and that solutions would be developed.</p> <p>Green St:</p> <p>Q – Resident - Safety a concern currently due to narrowness. Needs significant improvement.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Bus didn't use to travel along the street – could it change back to the previous route.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Would like to limit traffic volumes and sizes, maybe even access only, however, would like to have two-way for residents.</p> <p>Q – Resident - Liberty bus could run hopper service round Pier Rd and Green St.</p> <p>A - JM - indicated she has been in discussions with Liberty bus, and a service would be coming soon.</p> <p>A - JM – outlined the scheme needs a strong response from residents to be able to confirm what schemes are taken forward.</p>		

Q – AM - Stated east to west was prominent traffic movement in AM, which was why the one-way was in that direction to enable people to get to work without impact, but that the evening was less important. However, for the scheme to progress they must have SoJ GHE approval. Therefore, she considered it more likely to get approval with one-way east to west than west to east closure.

Q - Resident - How will the scheme impact business?

A - PMC regeneration is key to improving

Q – Resident - Is there a sustainable approach and material usage?

A – PMC – Sustainable approach would be key and is considered in all scheme development.

Q – Resident – Stated she lived at tunnel end of Green St and one way would increase her journey time to arrive/leave home, however she would absolutely support the one-way scheme.

Q – Resident - Access to/from Havre des Pas hinterlands is a particular concern. Suggested a study needs to consider and develop improvements for the hinterlands.

A – SC – confirmed that would look at it.

Q – Resident -Has any consideration been given to Roseville St / Cleveland St.

A – GW/DH – Confirmed areas partially assessed in terms of traffic re-assignment and further work would be needed as schemes developed.

Q – Resident - Boardwalk a great idea especially creating more space for cyclists, although did not consider it was safe in high winds and with sea spray. Also, would not want the impact of roadworks while construction was undertaken.

Other residents indicated they would accept the short term distrubtion given the benefits the schemes would have.

Q – Resident – Concerned that Fort d’Auvergne development/option could overlook properties and create privacy issues.

Q – Resident – Why is Green St a critical need for this study?

A – GW/SL - Safety impact of narrow footways and two-way traffic.

SL asked for a quote on the options presented to gauge opinion:

Vote outcome – most generally in favour (95%), a few undecided (5%).

4

Closing address - Simon Crowcroft

4.1

SC closing items:

MEETING NOTES

Residents parking – Noted it was not discussed however confirmed it would be investigated and that he was seeking to undertake a study in due course, subject to funding.

Art House – Noted that the Art House would be undertaking a project next year in Havre des Pas.

Britain in Bloom – confirmed that next year (2019) St Helier would be competing in the finalist's round and that he was very keen to win. Therefore, as part of an early scheme, he would be seeking to control of Mount Bingham woods and gardens and overhaul to bring back to its former glory, which together with La Collette gardens could help win the competition. Support and assistance from residents would be needed.

SC noted that traffic engineers would be difficult in the schemes development and approval, but with public support, the scheme could go forward.

A resident stated that the Havre des Pas Facebook page could be used to gather information and ask for support.

A further resident also stated that the 20-mph speed limit scheme must be fast-tracked.

NEXT MEETING

An invitation will be issued if an additional meeting is required.

Annex 2 Steering Group Meeting 4 10th January 2019 – Draft Agenda

Havre des Pas Village Scheme Study: Steering Group Meeting No.4 – Community Consultation Strategy

12:00 to 14:30 10th January 2019, St Helier Town Hall

Agenda

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 12:00 - 12:05 | Welcome and Introductions |
| 12:05 – 12:35 | Update on Presentation to HdePIG on 8 November 2018 and review comments raised. |
| 12:35- 13:15 | GHE presentation on impact of the one way and review options and discussion |
| 13:15 – 13:45 | Community Consultation Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Consultation Objectives – What do we want to achieve?○ Consultation Venue(s) – Where should we hold the consultation?○ Consultation Publicity – how should we advertise it?○ Consultation Form - How should we present the consultation material? How do we make sure everyone has the opportunity to participate?○ Consultation Dates and times – when should we hold it?○ Consultation Responses – How should we capture the community's views?○ Website/Social media – How should we best use the Parish website/social media?○ Presentation of Transportation information – how do we best set out the key transportation issues? |
| 13:45 – 14:15 | Review of draft exhibition panels |
| 14:15 – 14:30 | Agree programme of actions required to achieve the consultation date. |
| 14:30 | Close |