STATES OF JERSEY



POLICE STATION RELOCATION: REVIEW OF DECISION (P.92/2012) – COMMENTS

Presented to the States on 19th November 2012 by the Council of Ministers

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

Introduction

P.92/2012 is seeking to request the Minister for Planning and Environment not to approve development of a new Police Headquarters on Green Street Car Park, to protect the open end of Green Street Car Park for parking, and to find an alternative site for the development. The proposed amendment to the Proposition seeks to change part (a) and request the Ministers for Treasury and Resources and Home Affairs not to proceed with proposals for the development.

The Council wishes to make clear that this comment specifically excludes the views of the Minister for Planning and Environment, who has responsibility for determining the application and may decide to comment separately.

Summary of the Council's position

In summary, the Council strongly opposes the Proposition for the following reasons –

- The proposed scheme is the subject of a Planning Application and this statutory process, designed to consider developments against policy whilst consulting with the public, is the most appropriate way to determine the suitability of the scheme.
- It has already taken far too long to provide appropriate facilities for the States of Jersey Police. This work began in 1999, and 13 years later the need is now critical. Further delay is unthinkable, in terms of the continued impact on delivering modern policing, increased capital expenditure and the continued costs of maintaining the existing buildings.
- This Proposition offers no viable alternative. Members should not assume that an alternative site could be found quickly or that another site would be any better for the States of Jersey Police. An alternative site in private ownership would also be likely to incur considerable acquisition costs, as well as the additional difficulty, delay and risk which are inevitably involved in such an acquisition. Attempting to find an alternative site will therefore incur considerable delay and could add millions of pounds to the cost of the scheme.
- The proposed site meets the original brief set by the States of Jersey Police. The building has been designed collaboratively and to modern standards, and has the flexibility to accommodate future changes in staffing, operations and technology. Even if a larger site were to be found, the internal space would not be any bigger than currently specified.
- The displacement of commuter parking spaces can be accommodated within the
 existing car parks. Reduction in car journeys and commuter parking within the
 timescales of this scheme are in line with the States' Sustainable Transport Policy.
 Mitigation measures do exist, in particular the possibility of extending Snow Hill
 for shopper parking, which would assist town traders and help to alleviate
 concerns about visitor parking to the Police HQ.
- Evidence from the Transport Assessment undertaken as part of the project did not show that the scheme would have a significant impact on traffic in the area.
- Broader benefits of the scheme, in particular the delivery of affordable housing for local Islanders and the provision of a much-needed boost to the local construction industry, would be lost.
- The financial implications of not proceeding with this scheme are significant and could easily run to many millions of pounds in additional capital and maintenance expenditure.

Members have a choice between accepting a scheme and location which meets the current and future needs of the States of Jersey Police, or accepting the uncertainty, extensive delays, additional costs and impact on the delivery of modern policing which would result from the Deputy's Proposition.

The Council of Ministers urges Members to reject this Proposition.

Detailed Comments

Index

1.	The planning process	Page 5
2.	The implications of finding an alternative solution	Page 5
3.	Size of the building and 'future-proofing'	Page 10
4.	Parking	Page 13
5.	Accessibility	Page 16
6.	Traffic	Page 17
7.	The operation of the States of Jersey Police	Page 18
8.	Financial implications	Page 19
9.	Summary	Page 20
	Appendix A: Overview of sites considered	Page 22
	Appendix B: Statement by the Chief of Police	Page 31

Detailed Comments

1. The planning process

The Council of Ministers believes that part (a) of the Proposition, if not amended, is fundamentally flawed as it seeks to constrain the Minister for Planning and Environment from undertaking his statutory obligation under the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 to determine a Planning Application. The Minister for Planning and Environment has received a Planning Application for a development on this site and he has a legal duty to determine it.

The planning process is designed to assess applications against Island Plan policies and test public opinion through a statutory consultation process. The 2002 Law gives no role to the States Assembly in determining Planning Applications, and the Minister is not required to consult with the Assembly before making a decision. In addition, the adoption of a Proposition opposing the granting of planning permission should not influence the Minister's decision under the Law.

It is recognised that there will always be differences of opinion over development proposals of this nature, but Council believes the only way such issues can be successfully balanced is through the robust planning application process that exists in Jersey.

Part (b) of the proposition also seeks to ask the Minister for Planning and Environment to bring forward an amendment to the 2011 Island Plan in order to safeguard the open end of Green Street Car Park for car parking. Whilst revising the Island Plan is entirely a matter for the Minister for Planning and Environment and there is no legal requirement for him to respond to an adopted Proposition, restricting a site that is already in the built-up area to its existing purpose would seem to place unnecessary constraints on the future land use of the site.

2. The implications of finding an alternative solution

In part (c) of the Proposition, the Deputy asks the Minister for Planning and Environment to '...identify a <u>larger</u> and more suitable site for the development of a new Police Headquarters'. The Council would wish members to consider the implications of this suggestion.

Included within the Planning Application documentation is the history of the sites examined since 1999. This report (attached at **Appendix A**) shows the extensive range of sites considered over this period.

Through the work undertaken to date, it has been clearly demonstrated that the current site fully meets the current and future requirements of the States of Jersey Police as the first ever purpose-built Police Headquarters in Jersey. This not only represents good use of valuable States land, but Members will also be aware that the proposed scheme will support States policy through enabling the development of much-needed affordable housing on the Summerland and Ambulance Station sites in addition to freeing up further land at Rouge Bouillon.

Members are reminded that the current proposal will release $4,600 \text{ m}^2$ of land on the Summerland site, which it is planned will be used for affordable housing. Subject to detailed feasibility and business case, the relocation of the Ambulance Station would free up an additional $3,000 \text{ m}^2$ and create a larger site.

A Planning Application has recently been submitted for an affordable housing scheme at the Summerland and Ambulance sites. This Planning Application has been made by Jersey Property Holdings, who are charged with supporting Policy H1 of the Island Plan 2011, namely the provision of 150 units of affordable accommodation, above and beyond any normal requirement of a planning consent, on States-owned land. This scheme would provide a total of 170 units (95 on the Summerland site and 75 on the Ambulance site). The current scheme therefore directly supports a States decision to provide more affordable housing.

The need for new affordable homes is better understood now that the Minister for Housing's new Affordable Housing Gateway is providing valuable data on the need for affordable housing, and social housing in particular. Output from the Gateway is published monthly on the States website (www.gov.je).

At the end of September 2012, the net requirement for new social rented homes (allowing for optimal use of the existing stock) was as set out below.

Bed Size	Number
one bed	386
two bed	239
three bed	151
four bed	29
five+	2
TOTAL	807

Some demand is masked because the very strict eligibility criteria for access to social housing excludes groups like Key Workers, single people and couples under 50 years of age without children from gaining access to the Gateway.

States-owned sites such as Summerland and the Ambulance Station site are important in the overall supply of affordable homes. Particularly so at the present time, when it seems unlikely that the planning system will deliver significant numbers of affordable homes from the private development market, despite there being some 373 affordable homes approved in the 2002 Island Plan still outstanding.

Delays to the project

The Council would urge members not to presume that the identification of a 'larger and more suitable' site in Jersey will be achieved simply and quickly or at less cost. It will not. As history would suggest, the process will be lengthy, fraught with difficulty and with no guarantee of finding a site any better in terms of location and meeting the requirements of the States of Jersey Police.

Members should be aware that <u>any</u> alternate site would need to be subject to full feasibility and design processes which, along with design issues, would need to

consider a range of factors including availability, impact on the local area, ground conditions, site topology, compliance with planning policy, traffic, parking, access and infrastructure.

Even if we were to assume that an alternative site could be found quickly, bringing a new scheme to the current stage of design will take at least 18 months, and longer if a site needed to be acquired from the private sector, in relation to which there would also be substantial financial risks due to the amount of work required before a binding agreement to purchase could be signed.

Members will recall that as far back as 1999, it was recognised that the States of Jersey Police occupied inadequate accommodation (a former school, a former factory and a 19th century arsenal), which was not only unfit for the delivery of modern policing, it was beyond its economic life. In summary –

- The accommodation is totally inadequate for Police use.
- The buildings are beyond their economic life.
- There is no opportunity to adapt the accommodation to reflect modern policing methods.
- The custody area falls well below Home Office design guidance for detaining and managing detained persons. The configuration of the custody suite also makes compliance with established guidance for the safety of detainees more difficult to comply with. As a result there is a greater risk to the welfare of detainees, visitors and staff.
- The custody facilities provide challenges that could, *in extremis*, hinder the legal process.

Maintenance implications

Members are asked to consider the implications of maintaining the current buildings. In 2011, an independent overview of the condition of the buildings at Police Headquarters, Summerland and Broadcasting House was undertaken. This work sought to -

- identify the essential repairs needed to combat progressive deterioration, ensuring the building services provide the required levels of resilience over the next 3–5 year period, after which the new Police HQ was expected to be completed;
- schedule the works and provide estimated costs for the necessary remedial works needed to maintain the buildings for the stated timeframe.

This work estimated the aggregated costs for the 4 buildings as being in the region of £930,000, with the costs of works deemed 'essential' identified as c. £600,000. These figures exclude professional fees, works scheduling (i.e. out-of-hours working) and any removal of asbestos.

To date, the maintenance expenditure on the properties has been kept to a minimum due to the proposed new Police Station project, and it has been possible to reduce the priority of maintaining the properties' fabric and mechanical and electrical systems due to the proposed move. Further delays to the vacation of the site will mean that it will be essential to address such items in order to maintain the service over this period.

Impact of delay

As identified above, the work to find appropriate accommodation for the States of Jersey Police began in 1999. The inadequate nature of the existing accommodation and the need to find a better alternative was identified 13 years ago.

With this in mind, members should be clear that meeting the needs of the States of Jersey Police has become critical, and should note the implications of further delay -

- The timescales for completion of the project would move by at least 18 months (i.e. from September 2015 to March 2017), and longer if the site had to be purchased.
- Throughout this time, the States of Jersey Police would have to continue to operate from totally inadequate accommodation.
- The maintenance issues identified above would be compounded, and will increase the likelihood of further failures in the property, in particular its fabric and the mechanical and electrical elements. It is clear that at some point in the near future an element of the infrastructure within one of the properties is going to cease working. Delay would therefore increase the risk of a major impact on the operational functioning on the Department, and therefore to the service provided by the Police to the Island's community. It would also incur the kind of expenditure identified above as a minimum.
- Whilst in the absence of an alternative site a detailed assessment is difficult, experience of previous options analysis suggests there would be significant implications on the building project, including –
 - The design and planning fees already paid would be incurred on a new site, which would add £573,000 to the project costs.
 - There would be additional inflation costs which, based on an 18 month delay, could easily add in the order of £1 million to the project costs, more if the delay was to be longer.
 - Depending on the site, there could be demolitions and additional external works which, based on previous schemes considered, could potentially cost anything between £1.5 2.5 million. This could be higher if the new site required infrastructure changes, such as new road access and drainage.

- o If underground basement parking was required (which is not needed on the current site), this could add a further £1 −£1.5 million, and could be higher depending on the number of spaces and nature of the site.
- o If the scheme required the temporary relocation of staff, previous work in this area (see below) has identified that this could also introduce additional costs in the order of £3 million.
- o If the scheme was to revert to the former Summerland site, previous work has identified that this would require demolitions, land acquisition, phased development and the possibility of temporary relocation. Such a scheme would also mean that the opportunity to provide a large number of affordable houses on the site would be lost.
- o If a private sector site was identified, significant acquisition costs are likely to be incurred, which would be an additional cost to the project.
- In response to the recommendations in the Fiscal Policy Panel's 2012 Report, the Minister for Treasury and Resources has recently asked States Departments to make rapid progress on tendering the capital schemes that have been funded in 2012 and 2013, so as to inject this spending into the local economy at a time when the construction industry is struggling. With the majority of the capital budget for the Police HQ already funded, further delay will mean that an opportunity to address one of the Panel's key recommendations to support the local economy would be lost.

Suggested alternative

Whilst in contradiction to part (c), the Deputy goes on to suggest that a new Police HQ is not needed on one site, and that staff should be temporarily relocated to enable the operational facilities only to be redeveloped in order to save money. On the basis of the history of this project and the condition of all the current States of Jersey Police facilities, this suggestion has no merit whatsoever.

Decanting Police staff was first examined in 2003, when consideration was given to temporarily relocating Police operations to an existing office building of c. 14,500 ft². Due to the nature of the Police operation, in particular its security, communications and IT requirements, the rental and fit-out costs of occupying a building for 4 years was identified as £2.3 million. At today's prices, the costs of the same scheme would be closer to £3 million. In suggesting a disruptive and expensive temporary relocation of staff in order to redevelop operational facilities only, the Deputy is clearly not aware of the inadequate conditions at Police HQ, or of the need to provide our Police Force with fit-for-purpose facilities which are demanded by modern policing.

The Deputy questions the need for one site against the previous split-site option. The decision to embark on a 2 site option was driven by the opportunity to acquire and redevelop Lime Grove House in a timely way. This did not change the requirement for a redevelopment of all facilities. Having reviewed the options again in 2011, it was recognised that the most timely and effective way to address the requirement was to provide a single, self-contained Police HQ which is fit for purpose for modern policing. It should be noted that a single-site solution avoids the generation of traffic as a result of the need to move staff, equipment and vehicles between different sites.

The Council of Ministers is determined to support our Police service through providing the first ever purpose-built Police Headquarters in Jersey, which will provide the kind of working environment that modern policing demands.

Let members be clear on the significant implications of finding an alternative site, in particular the disruption to the Police service and the additional costs likely to be incurred in the running of the service and as part of the building project.

Let members also be clear that the project, as currently structured, represents an efficient use of valuable States' land and directly supports the States Assembly's desire to provide a considerable amount of additional affordable housing in the Island.

These issues must be foremost in members' minds when considering the other elements of the Deputy's Proposition.

3. Size of the building and 'future-proofing'

The Deputy states that the new building is an attempt to put a 'quart into a pint pot' and questions whether the building is 'future-proofed'. It is important for States Members to understand the process that has been followed in the design of the building.

The brief for the current building was set in October/November 2009, when a comprehensive and detailed review of all proposed areas of the building was undertaken. Two one-day workshops were held, with stakeholders present to examine and test the area schedules on a room by room basis. This involved aligning spaces with modern space standards and seeking to deliver the brief with appropriately sized spaces. This exercise resulted in a reduction in area requirement of c. 30%, and this was signed off by the States of Jersey Police as fit for purpose and meeting its requirements.

Members should note that this work was undertaken before the current proposal had been identified; the same brief was used for both the Lime Grove project and the subsequent work to develop proposals at Green Street.

The proposed scheme has been subject to a comprehensive and detailed feasibility study, which demonstrated that the scheme could be delivered on the site. As part of this work, architects with specialised Police and custody experience undertook a two-stage consultation process with States of Jersey Police staff to review a range of issues, such as departmental adjacencies, requirements and proposed layouts. This process involved a series of workshops and individual meetings to take views and update the plans accordingly. The outcome of this work was both an accommodation schedule and layouts that were signed off as acceptable by the States of Jersey Police. On this basis, on 11th January 2012, the project's Political Steering Group agreed the feasibility scheme should be used as the basis for a Planning Application.

As members may recall, having undertaken public consultation on the scheme in February 2012, it was decided to revise the scheme to address many of the comments made. As part of this process, a further comprehensive consultation process was undertaken with States of Jersey Police staff to review floor plans and detailed room layouts. Again, these were subsequently signed off by the States of Jersey Police and

the Political Steering Group approved the submission of a Planning Application based on this scheme on 19th July 2012.

On 7th November 2012, the Chief of Police issued a statement setting out the position of the States of Jersey Police with regard to the new development. This statement (attached at **Appendix B**) confirms that the scheme is regarded by the Police as fit for purpose both now and into the future.

Contrary to the Deputy's assertion, the scheme has <u>not</u> received 'special dispensation' from the Home Office. The States of Jersey Police has worked with the Home Office and reached a solution which satisfies the natural daylight requirement through the application of new technology. As the Deputy points out, this has been achieved through delivering natural light to the cells through light guides. This technology is far from complicated and is becoming more common throughout Europe, with examples of its use in Jersey.

Members may wish to note that, as a result of the 2009 review exercise identified above, the internal occupied area brief for Police HQ was set at 5,303 m². The current design has an internal occupied area of 5,457 m², a small increase in overall area. Whilst the area schedules will always be the subject of review and development as part of the design process, the current scheme has not resulted in a reduction in overall floor area. Members may also wish to note that the original area brief set out the requirements for the new building regardless of the site. *It is therefore important to understand that, if the building were to be located on an alternative 'larger' site, its internal area would not be constructed any bigger than currently proposed.*

The design proposals for the new Police Headquarters have been carefully developed with States of Jersey Police to provide a flexible and future-proof solution. Space standards within the headquarters building proposal reflect best practice guidelines for UK police buildings and British Council of Offices recommendations. An important element of the design process has been the need to support the adoption of modern working practices to meet the changing demands of modern policing. This, coupled with the provision of flexible spaces, allows the Police to make the best possible use of space.

The new headquarters will facilitate the adoption of the kind of working practices endorsed by Home Office guidance and Association of Chief Police Officer recommendations, which encourage improvements in the way space is used. Crucial to achieving this is a workplace design which provides for flexible working. The new building will provide a range of options to support this, including –

- Open-plan working
- Hot-desking
- Cellular meeting/break-out areas
- Flexible multi-purpose communal spaces
- Discreet report-writing areas
- Efficient dedicated welfare facilities
- Dedicated resource and support areas.

Some specific examples of where the building provides flexibility for the future include –

- The new custody suite has been expanded from the current 12 cells to 20. The States of Jersey Police has identified that this will accommodate likely demand for at least 30+ years, whilst observing all the necessary guidance and regulations.
- 10% spatial tolerance has been incorporated into all office areas. This means desk configurations can be reorganised and compressed to allow for an additional increase in workstations.
- One example of future flexibility is a team space with 16 workstations in an open plan area of 82m², which allows 14.9m³ per workstation. British Council of Offices guidance suggests that a typical office workstation that is fully used throughout the working day requires 11m³. Adopting this guidance would allow an extra 5 workstations to be added if required a 20% increase in utilisation.
- The control room has been deliberately increased in size to cater for the possibility of future expansion as a joint control room. This could be increased in size by 4 desks (from the current 8) to accommodate this requirement.
- Internally, the building makes extensive use of lightweight partitions to allow for changes in layouts and activities with minimum disruption.
- The building contains multi-purpose spaces on all floor levels, such as eating areas that can serve as meeting spaces, meeting rooms which are equipped to function as interview rooms/briefing areas, and conference/training spaces that will function as major incident facilities when required. Such a configuration provides spaces that are both flexible in meeting operational requirements and provide future-proof spaces.
- The service risers, raised floors and ceiling voids enable a high degree of flexibility to meet future service layout changes and have been specified to cater for future expansion in electricity, IT cabling and other services.
- The design proposal includes comprehensive provision for technology. In addition, the building design includes more CCTV and access control points than specified to cater for future expansion in security provision.

It should also be noted that, operationally, States of Jersey Police staffing has seen little growth since 1988. Staff numbers have reduced in recent years and are unlikely to change dramatically in the long term. In setting the requirements for the new building, the States of Jersey Police have carefully considered the implications of 'future-proofing' in their user requirement.

Through a comprehensive consultative process, the States of Jersey Police has developed a scheme which meets its requirements. Through designing to modern standards and ways of working, the new building will have the flexibility to accommodate future changes in staffing, operations and technology into the foreseeable future.

The internal area brief was set independently of this scheme, and putting the building on a new site 'larger' site would not lead to its internal area being constructed any larger than that currently proposed.

4. Parking

Impact on car parking in the area

Green Street Car Park currently has 608 spaces. It has always been made clear that the proposed scheme will mean the displacement of 91 of those spaces. From Monday to Friday the Car Park is more or less full from 9.00 a.m. until early afternoon, but overnight and at weekends there are typically more than 350 free spaces. The loss of spaces will therefore predominantly affect commuters. Shoppers and nearby residents who wish to park in the afternoons, at weekends and overnight will not be affected.

The Transport Assessment identifies that a low number of States of Jersey Police staff (c. 39% against a norm in St. Helier of 78%) travel to work by car. This assessment also makes it clear that it is anticipated that the increase in demand for public car parking, having taken into consideration those who make their own parking arrangements, will be a predicted maximum of 65 cars, plus 46 motorbikes and 46 cycles. Not all 65 people will park in Green Street Car Park, and provision has been made in the scheme to accommodate all the additional motorbikes and cycles in the area

The States of Jersey Police operate a shift system, which means that a peak of 220 staff will be in the building between 7.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. on weekdays. With Green Street Car Park having considerable capacity in the evenings (more than 350 spaces) and weekends (approximately 400 spaces), the Police HQ will have no impact on residents' and shoppers' parking at these times, even if the predicted maximum of 65 police staff cars were parked.

Whilst it is inevitable that there will be some impact from States of Jersey Police staff using the nearby Green Street Car Park, preliminary transport assessment work by the States of Jersey Police indicates that many will change their transport plans when relocated, by using public transport, cycle or motorcycle, car-share, by continuing with existing private parking arrangements or by using other private parking nearby. A number of private parking options exist in the area, and the States of Jersey Police have already been made aware of the possibility up to 40 new private spaces being available near the development.

These measures will be formally addressed through the development and maintenance of a Workplace Travel Plan, which will be a requirement under any Planning Permit for the scheme and secured through a planning condition. Developing a Workplace Travel Plan is a serious undertaking, and is designed to encourage staff and others visiting an organisation to use environmentally-friendly alternatives to driving alone, at least for some of their journeys. It will contain a mix of incentives and disincentives, e.g. car-sharing, promoting more use of public transport, encouraging walking and cycling, restricting on-site parking and supporting alternative work practices which reduce the need for travel. The loss of the limited staff parking at Rouge Bouillon will be an incentive to travel by other means, and the estimate of 65 cars can therefore be considered a worst case. The recent announcement by the new bus operator that it will extend the Route 15 bus service from the west through the tunnel to the east will help reduce private car use.

As clearly identified as part of the planning submission, the broader impact on the displacement of the 91 long-stay commuter parking spaces, plus any new demand from the new Police HQ (likely to be no more that 65), can easily be accommodated at Pier Road, which currently 250 spare long-stay parking spaces on weekdays. It is not regarded as fundamental to the town's public parking provision if 608 commuter spaces at Green Street are reduced to 517, given that 250 spare spaces are available at Pier Road. In addition, the La Route du Fort/Cleveland road car park, which is some 2 minutes away from the new building, typically has spare spaces throughout the day.

The Deputy also mentions the potential additional impact of the occupation of Lime Grove House. Whilst the occupation of this building is unlikely to change overall parking numbers, the specific impact on the area depends entirely on where those who occupy the building have been relocated from. It is understood that the majority of those who will be occupying the building are currently located in the Grenville Street area and there would therefore be minimal additional impact on Green Street Car Park. Lime Grove House also provides parking for staff in its basement car park.

Transport assessment

The Deputy suggests that the Arup Transport Assessment and the 2011 Island Plan car parking proposals are based on out-of-date figures, as the 2011 Census identifies that there are now 5,000 more households in St. Helier than in 2001. Whilst the new Island Plan didn't have the latest census figures, it did have the latest local traffic and parking demand data, which fully reflects the current-day picture.

It should be noted that, despite the increase in population both in and outside of St. Helier, demand for parking in public car parks has actually reduced during that period. In the late 1990s, Pier Road (the least popular long-stay car park) would often be completely full, whereas in recent times it typically has 250 free spaces. The Island Plan sets a limit of 4,000 public parking spaces, and that number is determined predominantly by the need for commuter parking, not by residents' parking. That limit is consistent with the States Sustainable Transport Policy, which aims to reduce private commuter car use. To increase commuter parking would be to acknowledge that more commuting would be done by private car.

Longer-term car parking strategy

The States have a longer-term strategy for parking in town, which is embodied in the North of Town Master Plan and the Esplanade Quarter Master Plan, which will ensure an appropriate level of parking.

The Deputy is correct in that the first draft of the North of Town Master Plan suggested that Green Street Car Park could be extended to compensate for the loss of parking at the Town Park. This proposal was not taken any further however, as consultation identified that the public considered that Green Street was too far from the Town Park to be a reasonable alternative.

The approved North of Town Master Plan proposes that the parking lost at the Town Park will be replaced by provision at various private developments in that area, and by underground car parking at Ann Court and Minden Place. Funding has been identified in the Car Park Trading Fund as the replacement of Minden Place Car Park is

anticipated to be necessary by 2019. The Masterplan also identifies that 185 public spaces will be provided under Ann Court.

Providing additional spaces

The Deputy's comments regarding the cost of providing multi-storey car parking are noted, and it is acknowledged that the construction cost (ignoring land value) of an above-ground multi-storey car park could be funded by the income, *if the car park achieved full occupancy*. This is a crucial point. With spare capacity already in the system, achieving full occupancy without simply taking vehicles from other public car parks (and therefore generating no extra income) would appear to be unlikely.

Sustainable Transport Policy

Members will recall that, in December 2010, the States approved a Sustainable Transport Policy (STP) which, amongst other things, set a target of a 15% reduction in peak-hour traffic by 2015. This reduction is predicted to reduce demand for town commuter car parking by 2,000 cars, at least half of which would be from public car parks. Deputy Martin voted in support of the STP.

Much other work is being undertaken in support of the STP, such as improving the bus service and providing new cycle routes. Although a lot more needs to be done to achieve the 15% target, trends are encouraging. Recent surveys show that more people are choosing sustainable travel options, and this will continue to reduce demand in commuter car parks.

The STP includes recommendations on reducing commuter spaces, increasing cycle parking and increasing motorcycle parking. In terms of parking, the Police HQ scheme would appear to be fully aligned to some of the key recommendations of this approved States policy.

The STP also recognised that an appropriate level of strategically sited public parking is essential to the vitality of St. Helier, and another key recommendation was that the quantity of short-stay shopper parking should be increased and that proposals for an extension to Snow Hill should be progressed.

Further mitigation

Whilst the impact of the scheme on commuter parking can be accommodated, a number of measures can be put in place to provide further mitigation.

It is accepted that the provision of additional shopper parking within the area could provide much-needed support and ongoing benefits to traders in the east of town.

As required by one of the amendments to the Sustainable Transport Policy, a feasibility study to review the options to increase shopper parking at Snow Hill is underway. The most promising option could provide around 90 spaces and could potentially be delivered as a fast-track project for February 2015.

There is still further work to do, and funding and cost remains an issue, but if it were taken forward it would –

- support the economic development of this part of town through improving access for shoppers;
- provide spaces for visitors to the new Police HQ.

A report detailing the options and recommending the favoured scheme will be provided to the States early in 2013.

The introduction of an automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) pay-on-exit system will allow more flexibility in the use of the existing parking stock and provide real-time information for motorists (Sand Street Car Park trial commenced on 12th November 2012). Any commuters wishing to pay a premium tariff would be free to use short-stay shopper parking such as Sand Street (which typically has 200 free spaces available per day) or (in the future) Snow Hill, without incurring a fine. This has some potential to reduce pressure on the standard tariff long-stay car parks and is likely to result in more flexible use of the current car parking stock.

Finally, based on the Department's previous experience with the Town Park, it is likely that extra vehicles from Green Street will dissipate into other parking areas in town, private and public, with little practical impact.

In addition to a publicity campaign to help motorists when the Green Street spaces are no longer available, Parking Control Officers will be on site to direct motorists to the nearest available parking and help with enquiries. As part of the publicity campaign, there may be some merit in offering motorists incentives to park at other locations for a short period to help facilitate an early transfer of parking from Green Street. TTS will carry out a survey of motorists currently using Green Street Car Park to ask about their travel and parking choices, in case that car park becomes full earlier on weekdays, as anticipated.

In terms of parking, the Council asks members to recognise that the impact of the new Police HQ on commuter parking is manageable within the current system and is in line with the States approved Sustainable Transport Policy (which Deputy Martin supported).

5. Accessibility

Both the Deputy and the Parish of St. Helier Roads Committee have questioned the accessibility of the proposed building, including visitor parking.

The States of Jersey Police receives c. 80 visitors per day over 7 days with c. 2,400 per month, c. 29,000 per annum. With the exception of disabled visitors, there is no public parking for visitors immediately outside the building. This is due to both the nature of the proposed building and the need to provide appropriate counter-terrorism measures, which makes visitor parking difficult to accommodate under the building.

The new building is close to the town centre, closer than the current HQ and just minutes away on foot. Not only do similar situations prevail at many urban police stations in the United Kingdom, the same can be said of other public buildings in town. Most of the public buildings in town, many with higher visitor numbers than the

Police, have no visitor parking. Such buildings include Cyril Le Marquand House, Social Security, Housing and the Town Hall. The same also applies to the private sector organisations that occupy Grenville Street.

As an example, in 2011 the Social Security building at La Motte Street received c. 273,000 visitors over 5 days a week (9.00 a.m. – 5.00 p.m.) with daily visitors anything between 1,000 and 1,300. This is more than 10 times the visitor numbers to Police HQ.

It is therefore suggested that, in terms of visitor parking, the new Police Headquarters is adopting the well-established norm for public buildings in St. Helier.

As stated above, traffic and highways engineers, Arup Consulting, have estimated that peak visits by car would be c. 10 per hour. The fact that visits to Police HQ are spread throughout the day and at weekends does mean that parking will be available in the local area. Green Street Car Park typically has capacity in the afternoons, evenings and weekends, and Route du Fort Car Park typically has 20 free spaces during the day. Parking will also be available for those on motorbikes or cycles. Members should also note that the scheme includes a pedestrian access route to the new building from all floors of Green Street Car Park onto La Route du Fort.

It is accepted that Green Street Car Park is generally full from 9.00 a.m. to early afternoon, with limited availability available for visitors over this time. This is why the proposal is to allocate 3 spaces in Snow Hill Car Park, specifically for visitors to the States of Jersey Police and to provide facilities for those on motorbikes or on cycles. In addition, the La Route du Fort/Cleveland Road Car Park, which is some 2 minutes away from the new building, typically has more than 20 spaces available throughout the day.

People visiting the headquarters in an official role (e.g. Centeniers who visit for charging purposes) will be accommodated within the operational parking area underneath the building, where at least 5 spaces will be available as opposed the 3 outside the current station.

In terms of general access, discussions with TTS traffic have influenced pedestrian crossing locations, pavement and highways design and boundary treatments. The design proposal includes measures to ensure the development will be pedestrian-friendly, including the widening of the footway on La Route du Fort and the inclusion of a pedestrian crossing island to assist those using the proposed cycle and motorcycle parking spaces.

Whilst visitor parking arrangements have been dictated by both the nature of the site and security considerations, the proposals for visitor parking are no different to arrangements that are widely accepted at many public buildings in St. Helier.

6. Traffic

The Transport Assessment sets out the impact of the scheme in traffic terms, and the supporting highway plan recommends changes to the highway, access, egress and pedestrian arrangements. This assessment has been undertaken by a specialist traffic engineer in conjunction with the Transport and Technical Services Highways Authority, using up-to-date local traffic data.

Whilst the report identifies the traffic flows in the area, it also assesses the impact of those trips likely to be generated by the new Police HQ on the area. 9,000 cars enter St. Helier during the peak hour, of which around 75 are police staff on the way to work. These people travel to town today, and therefore the impact is a slight shift in the focus of the traffic movement to the Green Street roundabout area. This is not a significant impact and this report concludes that the development will have "....negligible impact on congestion" and that operational police cars will have "....ninimal impact on local road conditions". This does not suggest that the traffic implications of the scheme are a 'major concern' as suggested by the Deputy.

The additional traffic generated by a 500 space extension to Green Street Car Park, which the Deputy appears to support, would be a major concern in traffic terms. Such a development would have a significant impact on vehicle movements in the area, far in excess of that generated by the Police HQ.

The Deputy's report implies that consideration has been given to removing a signalised crossing from La Route du Fort. There is no suggestion that the crossing is to be removed. The text in the report simply highlights that the congestion at the Green Street roundabout is to some degree due to the pedestrian crossing, rather than the volume of traffic.

Members may wish to know that the Transport Assessment report, its conclusions, and the proposed access and egress layouts have been developed in conjunction with TTS traffic engineers. In addition to providing input into the current design, the TTS traffic is a statutory consultee as part of the Planning Application. As part of this process, it will provide comments on all aspects of traffic, pedestrian and highway issues. The Minister for Planning and Environment will consider these views when determining the application.

The Proposition appears to imply that the scheme will have a significant impact on traffic in the area of Le Route du Fort. The evidence from the transport assessment developed in conjunction with States Traffic engineers does not support this view.

7. The operation of the States of Jersey Police

Although not mentioned specifically by the Deputy, the Council would wish to take the opportunity to respond to some misunderstandings about how the States of Jersey Police operate and their likely impact on the area.

Unlike the Ambulance and Fire Services, which deploy their emergency response vehicles from their Headquarters, the States of Jersey Police largely deploy vehicles that are already out on patrol. This means that most emergencies which require sirens to be used are responded from wherever the patrol is, rather than from the Police Headquarters itself.

The States of Jersey Police has identified that c. 100 Police vehicles per annum (i.e. around 2 per week) leave headquarters on an emergency call-out. These vehicles will not generally use sirens immediately on leaving the building.

The above is also important when considering some of the concerns raised about Police vehicles having difficulty getting though the tunnel during busy times. In the first instance, as Police vehicles are generally deployed whilst on patrol, the tunnel being busy is no more problematic than it is at present. However, if the tunnel were to be blocked for whatever reason, there remain a number of other routes for vehicles to cross town in an emergency. <u>Concerns about the tunnel are therefore based on a misunderstanding about how the States of Jersey Police operate; any issues with access to the tunnel would be no different than exist today.</u>

The States of Jersey Police are determined to be good neighbours, and will implement management policies and practices to support this where possible. In support of this, the new building will be self-contained, with minimal external noise. Using a single site means there will be little movement of staff, equipment and vehicles between areas like Custody, Enquiry Desk and Control Rooms. Only operational vehicles will be kept at Police HQ.

8. <u>Financial implications</u>

The financial implications presented by the Deputy simply identify the £573,000 that has already been spent on the current scheme. Members should be aware that the implications of not proceeding with this scheme are likely to go far beyond this figure.

Whilst it is accepted that accurate costs are dependent on the particular site and the outcome of a detailed feasibility study, the implications on time, specific site issues and the possibility of temporary relocation of staff, will have an impact on the capital costs of the project. Whilst the total is difficult to assess, setting out the issues identified above provides a clear indication of the potential range of cost should an alternative scheme have to be developed –

Item	Potential cost £	Potential cost £
	(optimistic)	(pessimistic)
Fees expended	573,000	573,000
Inflation	1,000,000	1,500,000
External works/demolitions	1,500,000	2,500,000
Underground parking	0	1,500,000
Temporary relocation	0	3,000,000
Total potential additional costs	3,073,000	9,073,000

If a private sector alternative site was identified, the costs of the acquisition of the land would also have to be added to the above.

From the issues identified above, the financial implications of an alternative scheme could be a potential additional capital cost of anything between £3 million and £9 million, and considerably more if land had to be acquired from the private sector.

As identified above, further delay would mean that the maintenance issues and costs identified would have to be addressed to ensure that the States of Jersey Police could maintain its service to the community. This would mean that the majority of the maintenance work identified above would have to be undertaken, resulting in maintenance expenditure of at least £1 million over this period.

9. Summary

The Council would like to remind members that the new Police Headquarters scheme is currently the subject of a Planning Application which is to be determined by the Minister for Planning and Environment. The Council is firmly of the opinion that the statutory planning process, designed to consider developments against policy whilst consulting with the public, is the right way to assess the scheme and reach a decision.

It has already taken far too long to find a solution to provide replacement facilities for the States of Jersey Police. Members should be clear that the need for replacement is critical and further delay is unthinkable, both in terms of the continued impact on delivering modern policing, and the continued costs of maintaining the existing buildings.

Members should note that the proposed site meets the brief set by the States of Jersey Police <u>before</u> the Green Street option was considered. The building has been designed collaboratively and to modern standards, and has the flexibility to accommodate future changes in staffing, operations and technology into the foreseeable future. Even if a larger site were to be found, the internal space would not be built any bigger than currently specified.

The Deputy's Proposition attempts to stop this scheme without offering any viable alternative. The Council urges Members not to assume that an alternative site could be found quickly or that another site would be any better for the States of Jersey Police. An alternative site in private ownership would also be likely to incur considerable acquisition costs as well as the additional difficulty, delay and risk which are inevitably involved in such an acquisition.

It is the nature of Jersey that land is at a premium and <u>any</u> alternative site, whether privately or publically owned, will present its own challenges. Attempting to find an alternative site will therefore incur considerable delay and could add millions of pounds to the cost of the scheme.

The Council asks members to consider the broader benefits of this scheme, in particular the delivery of affordable housing, which is crucial in meeting the housing needs of local Islanders. Uncertainty over Police HQ will threaten the provision of this affordable housing and therefore the delivery of agreed States policy.

In addition, with most of the budget already allocated, the scheme could make a significant contribution to the local construction industry at a time when the States are looking to inject capital spending to support a key part of the local economy.

It is recognised that the scheme will have an impact on commuter parking in that area of town. It has been demonstrated, however, that the displacement of these spaces can be accommodated within the existing parking capacity. Members are reminded that, on 1st December 2010, the Assembly agreed the Sustainable Transport Policy, which included targets for reducing car journeys and commuter parking within the timescale of this scheme. Deputy Martin supported this policy at the time, but now appears to wish to undermine it through suggesting the need to increase car-parking for commuters.

Members will note the mitigation measures that exist, in particular the possibility of extending Snow Hill for shopper parking, which would assist town traders and help to alleviate concerns about visitor parking to the Police HQ.

Evidence from the Transport Assessment undertaken as part of the project does not support the view that the scheme will have a significant impact on traffic in the area, and arrangements for access and visitors are no different to those that are widely accepted in St. Helier.

Finally, the financial implications of not proceeding with this scheme are significant, and could easily run to many millions of pounds in additional capital and maintenance expenditure.

Overall, members have a choice between accepting a scheme and location which meets the current and future needs of the States of Jersey Police or accepting the extensive delays, additional costs and impact on the delivery of modern policing which would result from the Deputy's Proposition.

The Council urges members to reject this proposition.

POLICE RELOCATION PROJECT Overview of sites considered July 2012

Introduction

The following provides an overview of the sites examined as part of the Police relocation project since its inception in 1999.

Brief history

In 1999, it was first decided that an alternative site should be found for the Police.

In 2001, a full feasibility study was completed, which investigated 24 alternative sites and concluded that a site on the Esplanade was the most appropriate. This was not accepted politically and, in 2003, a further review of available sites undertaken by the Property Services Department identified the Summerland site as the preferred site. In 2005 a feasibility study was completed, and in 2006 a formal planning application was made for a new Police HQ on the Summerland site, which did not progress further.

In 2009, under the new leadership of the Police, work was undertaken to critically review all the requirements of the building, in particular space requirements. This lead to the proposals for a split site and formed the basis of the option of acquiring Lime Grove as part of the solution.

In August 2011, the option of acquiring Lime Grove became unavailable and a Project Group was established to find an alternative option. This Group, which included a senior officer from the Environment Department, undertook a review of available sites and identified options for further consideration (see Annex 1).

1999 Report into the relocation of the States of Jersey Police

A JR Knowles (construction contract consultants) report concluded that relocation of the Police was required, and a Wetherall Green and Smith report assessed alternative sites for the emergency services. These sites included –

- Rouge Bouillon site (Police and Fire)
- Rouge Bouillon site (Ambulance)
- Summerland Site
- Fields 1218 and 1219, Mont `a l'Abbé, St. Helier
- Hypothetical site at la Collette
- TA workshop, St. Helier.

2001 Review of sites

Colin Smith & Partners reviewed previous reports and assessed 24 alternative sites, including –

1.	Rouge Bouillon (Police and Fire)	13.	Jersey Gas Offices
2.	Summerland Site	14.	Esplanade Car Park
3.	Fields 1218 and 1219	15.	Island site
4.	Parish Yard, Westmount	16.	Island site annexe
5.	Savoy/Alton Hotel	17.	Waterfront site
6.	Curwoods site	18.	Abattoir, La Collette
7.	Norfolk Lodge Hotel	19.	Land reclamation site, La Collette 2
8.	Former Jersey College for Girls	20.	Colbacks, Queen's Road
9.	Steephill	21.	JEC, Queen's Road
10.	Le Coie Hotel	22.	Public Services Department site, Mont à l'Al

Stopford Road Gyratory
 Supermarket site, Gas Place
 Millbrook playing fields
 Parish yard, Westmount

This report concluded that the Island Site annexe was the most appropriate site. Subsequently, discussions with the Waterfront Enterprise Board led to a site being identified on the Esplanade Car Park (south-east corner).

2003 Review of sites

Proposals to locate the Police on the Esplanade Car Park (south-east corner) were included within a feasibility study which was presented to the Finance and Economics Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee. Due to political concerns about the proposed location, a group of Chief Officers, supported by Property Services, was asked to undertake a comparative appraisal of possible alternatives and report back to the Committee.

The above 24 sites previously considered by the feasibility group, together with four additional sites, were re-examined. Eight sites were reviewed in more detail as they fitted the basic criteria for the project, these were –

- Parish Yard, Westmount
- Rouge Bouillon/Summerland
- Former Jersey College for Girls
- Warwick Farm, St. John's main road
- Parish of St. Helier, Mont à l'Abbé
- Former Inn on the Park site, West Park
- Norfolk Lodge Hotel, Rouge Bouillon
- Esplanade Car Park site.

Of these, 3 were identified for detailed review –

- Parish yard, Westmount
- Rouge Bouillon/Summerland
- Esplanade Public Car Park (north).

These were assessed together with the Esplanade Car Park (south-east corner) site as originally proposed.

This report concluded that the Summerland Site as the most suitable and, on 20th November 2003, the Policy and Resources Committee endorsed this.

Scheme for the Summerland site

On the basis of the above recommendation, in April 2005, the Home Affairs Committee considered a feasibility study and approved the recommendation of a new building on the Summerland site. In November 2006 a full planning application was made, though the project was stopped before the application was determined.

The Lime Grove option

Following a review of the brief in 2009, a number of options were considered, including full build on the Summerland Site and the acquisition of Lime Grove, plus the provision of operational facilities at Rouge Bouillon. In April 2011, it was agreed that the option of acquiring Lime Grove and refurbishing /redeveloping facilities at Rouge Bouillon should be progressed.

Recent options considered

In August 2011, the option of acquiring Lime Grove became unavailable. A Project Team was formed to develop a way forward and its first task was to undertake a review of available sites. As part of a workshop on 25th August, the following sites were assessed against key criteria –

States of Jersey sites:		Other sites:
Summerland	Anne Court	Lemprière Street
Rouge Bouillon	Le Bas Centre	(land behind Cyril Le
Esplanade Car Park	Warwick Farm	Marquand House
Jersey College for Girls	Maritime House	Other office
Green Street Car Park	Harbour land opposite	developments which
Airport land	Maritime House	may emerge
Queen's House	Steam Clock site	
(St. Saviour's Hospital)	D'Hautrée School	
	St. Mark's School	

The outcome of this work was that the following options should be progressed in more detail –

- Full new build on Green Street Car Park
- Provision of office facilities at Maritime House and refurbishment of the Rouge Bouillon site
- Separate custody suite on Lemprière Street
- Separate custody suite on the Rouge Bouillon site
- Full build on the Summerland site.

This review of sites undertaken in August 2011 is summarised at the **Annex** to this Appendix.

Current position

The above options were developed into concept schemes by a specialist architect, and in September 2011 the Police Relocation Political Steering Group agreed that the option of a full build on Green Street Car Park should be progressed to feasibility stage.

In making this decision, the Steering Group noted that this site would not only meet the needs of the States of Jersey Police, it also will free up the whole of the Summerland site and part of the Rouge Bouillon site for alternative use.

In December 2011 a feasibility study on the site was completed, and in January 2012, the Political Steering Group agreed that the scheme for this site should proceed to Planning Application stage. Public consultation on the proposed scheme was undertaken in February 2012 and the scheme was re-designed in advance of making a Planning Application.

POLICE RELOCATION PROJECT

Review of site options undertaken in August 2011

1. Introduction

On 25th August 2011, the Project Team undertook a review of sites available to meet the needs of the States of Jersey Police relocation.

This work identified the initial options to be progressed as –

- **Option 1:** Full build to meet all requirements at Green Street Car Park
- **Option 2:** Build of office requirements on the Maritime House site, followed by refurbishment/provision of remaining facilities
- **Option 3:** Consideration of constructing custody facilities on the Lemprière Street site (which could support option 2)
- **Option 4:** Consideration of constructing custody facilities on the Rouge Bouillon site (which could support option 2)
- **Option 5:** Full build to meet all requirements at Summerland.

After the above meeting, some sites were proposed by those in the private sector. These are recorded here as they will be subject to further evaluation should the review of initial options not be successful.

2. Criteria

The Project Team identified the following criteria against which its assessment would be made.

- **1. Location**: Centrally located with good access to transport on or near the ring-road. Compatible with adjoining premises.
- **2. Requirements**: Ability of site to meet majority of requirements or office requirements at a minimum, including parking for operational vehicles and visitors.
- **3. Planning**: Site would be acceptable to Planning for its intended use.
- **4. Availability**: Site is available immediately or could be made available
- **5. Political**: The site would be acceptable politically.
- **6. States-owned:** The site is in States ownership.
- 7. **Build cost:** Extent to which site supports cost-effective development.
- **8.** Forgone value: Value of site for other uses.

3. Long list of sites for discussion

The Project Team identified the following 'long list' of sites to be evaluated.

States of Jersey sites

- Summerland
- Rouge Bouillon
- Esplanade Car Park
- Jersey College for Girls
- Green Street Car Park
- Airport land
- Queens House (St. Saviour's Hospital)
- Anne Court
- Le Bas Centre
- Warwick Farm
- Maritime House

- Harbour land opposite Maritime House
- Steam Clock site
- D'Hautrée School
- St. Mark's School
- South Hill
- Fort Regent

Other sites

- Lemprière Street

 (land behind Cyril
 Le Marquand
 House) Parish of
 St. Helier
- Other office developments which may emerge

4. Initial evaluation

The Project Team undertook the following initial evaluation of the sites against the above criteria (*see next page*).

planning y Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Other office developments	Lempriere St. (Land behind CLMH)	South Hill	Fort Regent	Steam Clock site	St Mark's School	D'Hautree School	Maritime House (plus extension)	Warwick Farm	Le Bas Centre	Ann Court	Queens House (St. Saviour's Hospital)	Airport Land	Green St Car Park	Jersey College for Girls	Esplanade Car Park	Rouge Bouillion	Summerland	Site
Comments Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N N Planning issues of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N N Planning issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y Y Y N N Y Y Y Y N N Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value Y Y Y N N Y Y Y N N Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value Y N N N Y Y Y N N N Y Y Y N N N N Y Y Y N N Meet office requirements or just office Y N N N Y Y N N N N Y Y N N Meet office requirements or just office Y N N N Y Y N N Meet office requirements, need to vacate, plans to use as decant for South Hill Y N N N Y Y N N N N Y Y N Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N N Y Y N N N N Y N N N N N N N N N		Y	z	z	?	?	?	Y	z	Υ	?	z	z	Y	Y	Υ	Υ	Υ	Location
Comments A vaiilability Patatates-owned Y Y Y ? Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y N Y Y ? Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y N Y Y R Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes N Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value Y N Y Y R Location?, not available, Historic building. N Y Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R Location, Planning? Currently in use P N N Y Y R N Hig value for other uses, poor location, currently occupied N N Y Y N Need view of Parish, Acquisition cost? Site shape/access? Need to consider to meet office part of requirements		?	Υ	~	~	?	~	~	Υ	?	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	?	Υ	?	Υ	Requirements
Available Political Political Political Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y Y P N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes N Y Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes N Y Y P Would it meet all requirements or just office N Y Y P N Location? Approved for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance P Y Y P N Location, Planning? Currently in use N Y Y P Location, Planning? Currently in use N Y Y P Location, Planning? Political issues? If deemed surplus shold be used for affordable housing N Y P N Location, Planning? Currently in use N Y P N Location, Planning? Political views N Y P N Historic and sensitive site with challenges, though pool site an option, cost, wrong location for Polic Need view of Parish, Acquisition cost? Site shape/access? Need view of Parish, Acquisition part of requirements		Υ	Υ	4	?	?	Υ	Y	Ν	Υ	Ν	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Planning
Comments Political cost Build gone Comments Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Y N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes N N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Can all requirements provide of requirements alternative use value of a land for a value of requirements of site and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance Y N Issues of negative impact on site and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance Y N Issues of negative impact of deemed surplus shold be used for affordable housing Y N Issues of negative impact of negative uses, poor location, currently occupied N N Issues of negative impact of negative uses, poor location, currently occupied N N Issues of negative impact of negative use of requirements		Υ	Z	?	?	z	z	?	Ν	Ν	Ν	Z	Υ	У	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Availability
comments Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y Can all requirements be accommodated?, Listed building. Y NI Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes NI Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value Y Would it meet all requirements or just office Y NI Location?, not available, Historic building. Y NI Location, Planning? Currently in use Y NI Location, Planning? Currently in use Y Cocation, Planning? Political issues? If deemed surplus shold be used for affordable housing NI Historic and sensitive site with challenges, though pool site an option, cost, wrong location for Polic Y NI Hig value for other uses, poor location, currently occupied Need view of Parish, Acquisition cost? Site shape/access? Need to consider to meet office part of requirements		Y	z	z	z	?	z	~	?	?	Z	?	z	Y	Z	z	Υ	?	Political
Comments Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Y Can all requirements be accommodated?, Listed building. N Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes N Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use valu Y Would it meet all requirements or just office Does not meet location requirements N Location? Approved for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance currently being used N Location, Planning? Currently in use Location, Planning? Currently in use Location, Planning? Currently in use Historic and sensitive site with challenges, though pool site an option, cost, wrong location for Polic N Hig value for other uses, poor location, currently occupied N leed view of Parish, Acquisition cost? Site shape/access? Need to consider to meet office part of requirements		z	Υ	~	~	~	~	~	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	~	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	States-owned
Comments Potential loss of site for affordable homes? Political issue? Can all requirements be accommodated?, Listed building. Issues of negative impact on site and of value of land for other purposes Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value of land for other purposes Planning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value of land for other purposes Planning issues re adapting historic building. Location? Approved for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance currently being used Location? Political issues? If deemed surplus shold be used for affordable housing Location, Planning? Currently in use Location, Planning? Political views Location, Planning? Political views Location, Planning? Solitical views Location, Planning		~	Υ	?	~	?	~	~	Υ	Υ	Υ	?	Υ	?	Z	Y	?	Υ	Build cost
Comments for affordable homes? Political issue? be accommodated?, Listed building. npact on site and of value of land for other purposes dapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use valu puirements or just office for nequirements ble, Historic building. for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resistance for housing and parking in NoT masterplan, political resista	7	. >		?	?		?		_	? c	? L		? [?	Forgone value
Review Further? Yes - prev scheme Yes - for custody Yes - full build Yes - full build Yes - full build No	requirements	Site shape/access?	currently occupied	istoric and sensitive site with challenges, though pool site an option, cost, wrong location for Polic No							rking in NoT masterplan, political resistance			ould it meet all requirements or just office	lanning issues re adapting historic building, cost, not suitable for requirements alternative use value	value of land for other purposes		es? Political issue?	

5. Sites reviewed further

Based on the criteria and initial evaluation, the Project Team reviewed the following sites in more detail.

Sites which could meet the full requirement:

Summerland site

This would meet the full requirements, but was not a preferred site as there were a number of site issues, including phasing and demolition, which made the project expensive. There was also a desire to vacate the site fully in order that its potential for alternative uses, such as the provision of affordable housing, might be realised.

Decision: On the basis that this had been worked up as an option already, it should be retained for comparison purposes.

Green Street Car Park

This could meet the full requirements and certainly the office requirements. As the site could be available in a reasonably clear format (having displaced car parking), this should be progressed further. As the site is being used for car parking, there would be little foregone value.

Decision: Evaluate as a site for the full Police Station.

Esplanade site

This could meet the full requirements and would potentially be well located. However, this was part of a scheme for office accommodation for the finance sector. There was concern that the development of a Police Station on this site would impact negatively on the value of the rest of the site, and that the value of this land should not be compromised. Land is in the ownership of the States of Jersey Development Company.

Decision: Do not evaluate further.

Former College for Girls site

Could accommodate the full requirement and potentially well located. However, the historic building has a number of restrictions which are unlikely to suit its intended use. Converting this accommodation was likely to be expensive – it was unlikely that the project budget would be able to afford the renovation of the building. More suited to housing and potentially a valuable site for the States to dispose of.

Decision: Do not evaluate further.

Sites which may be suitable to meet the office requirement only

Maritime House

There was the potential to build an extension to Maritime House on the car park which could provide the office accommodation required which, joined with Maritime House, would result in reduced building size and cost. It was recognised that this would need to be followed by refurbishment at the Rouge Bouillon site and that the current occupants of Maritime House would need to vacate (though initial plans to do this did exist). It was recognised that the site may have value as a housing site in the future, but possibly only once the current building had been demolished.

Decision: Evaluate as office site.

Sites which could be considered for a custody suite only

Lemprière Street

Its proximity to the Magistrate's Court would be a key benefit if a standalone custody suite were to be developed. It was recognised that this was Parish land and would have to be purchased. Whilst its value needed to be assessed, it was not thought to be a high value site.

Decision: Evaluate for custody suite only.

Rouge Bouillon (old School)

This site has already been considered for a standalone custody suite as part of the Lime Grove option and should be included in the evaluation.

Decision: Evaluate as a custody suite only.

6. Sites identified from the private sector

A number of sites were subsequently identified from the private sector, which may be suitable to meet the needs of the States of Jersey Police.

Whilst it is recognised that the purchase price of such sites would probably make them unaffordable within the budget, these sites will be further evaluated should the current option appraisal not be successful.

Additional sites identified include –

- Ann Street Brewery site
- Properties adjacent to the Rouge Bouillon site (e.g. 46a Rouge Bouillon)
- Office building at 47/49 La Motte Street
- Office building at 5/6 Esplanade.

Statement by the Chief of Police



STATES OF JERSEY POLICE

STATEMENT FROM MIKE BOWRON, CHIEF OFFICER

7th November 2012

In recent weeks, there has been a great deal of publicity about the proposed new Police Headquarters and I believe it is important for me to make the position of the States of Jersey Police absolutely clear.

There have been questions about whether the building is large enough for current operations or adequately sized for the future. I have already stated publicly that the proposed design is fit for purpose for the delivery of modern policing and will provide the kind of working environment that can only benefit the Force. The team at the States of Jersey Police has been fully engaged in the design process and has worked collaboratively with our architects and other specialists to develop the building. I am delighted with the outcome; the proposed new development meets the brief set by the States of Jersey Police and will provide a modern and flexible accommodation solution. Crucially, this will allow the Force to develop more effective working arrangements and provide the ability to respond to the changing demands of modern policing in the future.

There have been further questions about the location, including suggestions that alternative sites would be more appropriate. As far as I am concerned the site is ideal. It is located on the ring-road, is closer to town than the current headquarters, and it has been demonstrated that the nature of the traffic generated by both staff and operations can be accommodated on local roads. The nature of the operation of the States of Jersey Police is that Police Officers, unlike the other emergency services, largely deploy from vehicles that are already out on patrol, with very few from Police HQ itself.

Arrangements for visitors are appropriate to a town location, and I can confirm that professional partners who visit the building in an official capacity will be accommodated within the operational parking areas.

I continue to be deeply embarrassed about our current accommodation, and I am very concerned about the day-to-day impact it has on the effective delivery of the service. In my view it has already taken far too long to implement a solution, and make no mistake, the need for replacement premises is already critical. Further delay is

unthinkable, both in terms of the continued impact on delivering modern policing, ensuring the welfare of detainees, visitors and staff, and the continued costs of maintaining the existing buildings.

This development will provide the first ever purpose-built Police Headquarters in Jersey. I cannot stress enough how critical this development has become, and how the proposed building will make a significant contribution to the delivery of policing in the immediate and distant future.

Finally, I lead some of the finest officers and staff I have ever worked with in 32 years of policing in what is without doubt the worst accommodation I have ever worked in.