



## WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP

### MEETING

WEDNESDAY 12<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2014 @ 10AM – PWD MEETING ROOM

### MEETING NOTES

#### ATTENDEES

MLA Mike Poole (Chair)	(MP)
Michael Betts (Project Coordinator)	(MB)
Steve Butler	(SB)
Darren Christie	(DC)
Dave Eynon	(DE)
Simon Fletcher	(SF)
Manfred Keenleyside	(MK)
Lydia Morrison	(LM)
Joshua Peck	(JP)
Leona Roberts	(LR)
Roger Spink	(RS)

#### MEETING

MP requested the following items be added to the agenda; Development Plan Update and DE Planning Application.

#### 1 Review of previous meeting's minutes

- 1.1 There were no issues with the previous minutes. MB suggested that the minutes of these meetings could be made available to the general public and asked if there were any objections to this. No objections were heard, but the group agreed to circulate the minutes prior to public release to ensure no sensitive or confidential information was present.

**ACTION** – MB to circulate previous minutes to the group to ensure no sensitive or confidential information is released to the public.

#### 2 Waterfront Walk

- 2.1 DC described the 'waterfront walk' that was conducted by him, MB, SB and MK in response to the action laid out in the previous meeting. DC continued that the group had identified 8 key areas that needed addressing and put forward some simple solutions to overcome these issues.

*i. Area 1/2*

- 2.2 DC stated these two areas were perhaps the most problematic along the waterfront, with restricted space for both pedestrians and vehicles. MK suggested that an additional path could be put in adjacent to the sea wall (above the wall and below the road), with a barrier to ensure safety along the sea wall.
- 2.3 SF asked if the front road could be closed during busy tourist days, but MK stated that this option had been previously investigated and ruled out as a possibility. MK added that it had been concluded that other roads would not be able to cope with the increased flow of traffic and would cause more problems than solve. The problem of parking on John Street was also raised and that alternative parking would need to be sought if traffic was diverted as parking would have to be then restricted along John Street to allow for the increased flow of traffic.
- 2.4 DE asked for clarification on the 'Waterfront Walk' document, under *Area 1*, which stated Jubilee Villa gardens could be redeveloped to allow for more space as this would involve private land. It was clarified that the corner of the road was the issue and that the corner radius could be increased whilst only affecting the first garden.
- 2.5 DC stated that there was not enough signage currently to direct tourists along the waterfront and that clear signage would need to be installed regardless of what changes were agreed along the front.
- 2.6 DE put forward a 'reduced-flow plan' for the front road on busy tourist day, which involved reducing the amount of traffic.
- 2.7 The group agreed that the current pathway needs improving, with an emphasis being placed on increasing safety. It was stated that it was inevitable that some people would not walk where designated, but improving the pathway and improving the signage would result in improving the waterfront and safety.

*ii. Area 3*

- 2.8 DE stated that alterations to the boathouse building and slipway, including the construction of a pathway through the land, would not be possible. DC suggested there could be a pedestrian crossing placed just prior to the boathouse building (on the east side) to allow for pedestrians to cross safely to the church and whalebone arch.
- 2.9 Mk suggested that the whalebone arch front green could be pushed back to allow for the widening of the road and footpath to create a more easily accessible space for pedestrians, which could also including seating, etc.

*iii. Area 4*

- 2.10 The suggestion of a footpath being constructed along the upper part of victory green was positively received by the group. Via clear signage, the new path would direct pedestrians away from the sea wall, therefore reducing the risk of accidents occurring. It was noted that the need for barriers along the sea wall would still need to be discussed and SB added that liability would need to be included in these discussions.

**ACTION** – SB stated that liability issues regarding safety along the sea wall need to be investigated, so the group could be adequately informed as to what the consequences would be if a legal action was filed.

*iv. Area 6*

- 2.11 LR stated that a clear pathway needed to be developed to the Museum, as significant investment has already been put into redeveloping the Museum. LR also stated that admission to the Museum would not be affected by which people entered the site, but that it would be positive to develop the already attractive sea wall path behind the bank and town hall.

**ACTION** – MP asked that the ‘Waterfront Walk’ group continue the process of developing a scheme, with rough costs, of improving the walkways between the public jetty and the new Museum site.

### **3 Stanley House**

- 3.1 MP stated that since the initial meeting discussions had been held over the future of Stanley House with MK and other members. Stanley House has been identified as a future development site (i.e. for tourism) and is open for offers, but consideration of its current use must be taken.

### **4 Areas of Responsibility**

- 4.1 The group agreed that specific areas of responsibility couldn’t be set until specific plans/projects have been developed, but that landowners would have the final say on developments on their land.
- 4.2 LR asked if there were any plans in place for the rest of the historic dockyard, excluding Museum developments. LM further asked if plans for the areas surrounding the museum could be discussed during these meetings. The group agreed that complimentary development should be encouraged in the historic dockyard.

**ACTION** – discuss at the next meeting plans for the rest of historic dockyard, not currently designated to the Museum. MP suggested that some public consultation on the future of the surrounding land could be a possibility.

### **5 Development Plan Update**

- 5.1 SB provided the group with an update on current status of the town development plan. SB stated that the plan was taking a broad approach, so the document won’t be full of unnecessary details and simpler spatial planning can identify areas for future developments.
- 5.2 SB stated that due to the waterfront strategy already in existence it did not need to be redone in the new plan, but the info from the existing strategy would be fed into the document.

### **6 DE Planning Application**

- 6.1 DE informed the group that he was in process of submitting a planning application for three extra berths for permanent layups. DE also notified the group that containers had been recently removed from the boathouse land, improving the aesthetics of the boathouse, and that the remaining container would hopefully be removed later this year.

6.2 DE ruled out the possibility of any changes being made to his land or buildings, in relation to the waterfront development, under the current circumstances.

## **7 AOB**

7.1 MP updated the group on the latest edition of the Island's Plan, which is due for release in April. The Island's Plan illustrates the Government's commitment to the waterfront development and MP stated that it is mentioned at least twice in the new edition.

7.2 LM reminded the group that the long-term development of the waterfront should not be forgotten alongside short-term plans.

## **8 Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held in mid/late April 2014. MK stated that the PWD meeting room could again be used, depending on availability.