

BRIEFING PAPER - proposals in the Draft
Island Plan 2011, due to be debated by the
States on 21st June

**For consideration by the Parish Assembly
on 8 June 2011**

PARISH OF ST HELIER



The Parish Assembly is asked to discuss and put to the vote where necessary proposals in the Draft Island Plan 2011, due to be debated by the States on 21st June, in particular

- 1. the 14th amendment in the name of Deputy Dupre re Snow Hill**
- 2. the 18th amendment in the name of Deputy le Claire re Field 1248** (*map available at Parish Assembly*)
- 3. amendments 32 & 33 in the name of Deputy de Sousa and 35 re Field 1219** (*map available at Parish Assembly*)
- 4. the 38th amendments in the name of Constable of St Helier on the recommendation of the Roads Committee** (*map available at Parish Assembly*)
- 5. the main proposals of the plan in respect of St Helier**

The draft Island Plan (P.48/2011) was published in March this year following extensive work by States' members, officers of States' departments especially the Environment Department, scrutiny, consultation and independent review. Even so, States' Members exercised their right to bring amendments to the plan, and no fewer than 38 sets of amendments were lodged, by far the largest number of amendments to a single proposition in the time of the current Greffier of the States, and probably the largest number ever. Several of the sets of amendments also have several parts (the Constable of St Helier's amendment number 38 has 23 parts) so the number of individual amendments is, of course, much greater than 38. Subsequently 8 amendments to the amendments were tabled by Members. The complete list of amendments can be found on the States Assembly website (www.statesassembly.gov.je) under the tab 'Forthcoming Business – 21 June sitting, while the draft Island Plan itself and associated information can be found at

<http://www.gov.je/PlanningBuilding/LawsRegs/IslandPlan/IslandPlanReview>

The Minister for Planning and Environment has now considered all of the proposed amendments to the revised draft Island Plan and has published an initial response to them: this is explained in respect of the various amendments below. The inspectors are due to publish a report to the Minister setting out their views and recommendations to him about the amendments. In light of his consideration of the inspectors' report, and the public representations received, the Minister will determine his final comment on each of the States members' amendments and will lodge them in the States prior to the debate on the revised draft Island Plan (P.48/2011).

Part one: the 14th amendment in the name of Deputy Dupré re Snow Hill

Deputy Dupré's amendment in respect of Snow Hill car park, Proposal 20: Snow Hill Car Park, seeks to ensure that a study to investigate the feasibility of increasing the capacity of Snow Hill car park will be undertaken during the Plan period. (*Minister minded to accept*)

Deputy Dupré's report:

Paragraphs 8.105 and 8.106 of the draft Island Plan refer to Snow Hill car park and relevant extracts state –

8.105. Snow Hill Car Park: It was in 1987 that it was first proposed a feasibility study be undertaken to examine the potential of enhancing the capacity of this car park to enhance the level of short stay shopper car parking, in close proximity to the town. It is also identified as a recommendation in the Sustainable Transport Policy ...

8.106 ... It is considered that the feasibility of exploring the increased capacity of Snow Hill remains a long-term proposal that is not envisaged during the Plan period, but which will be kept under review.

It is now 24 years since the idea of increasing the size of Snow Hill car park was first suggested. This is surely the most sensible idea that has been totally ignored for so long! Every day there is a queue of cars

waiting to park at Snow Hill. It is close to town, it would help to improve access to Fort Regent, and, as Green Street Car Park is full of commuters, it would help serve the people from the east of the Island. It would also, hopefully, help to make the town side of Snow Hill a more attractive place. At the moment it looks a disgrace – sparse grass and not a flower in sight. Obviously the exit from the car park would need to be looked at, as at present, it is difficult to exit from there. It may mean traffic lights, but that may be a good thing too, as drivers coming from the top of Green Street often have a long wait to rejoin the traffic at the roundabout. I hope that the Minister will undertake this long-awaited feasibility study and just get on with it!

Additional notes:

Note 1

The plan period is 2011 to 2020

Note 2

This matter has been given recent consideration by the States Assembly in its debate on the Sustainable Transport Plan (P.104/2010) which took place on 30th November last year. The Constable of St Helier tabled an amendment to that plan, “to bring forward, in conjunction with the Property Holdings Department, by the end of 2011, proposals to provide increased shopper parking at Snow Hill”. The Minister successfully amended the Constable’s amendment to include the caveat ‘subject to availability of funding for feasibility studies’ and to extend the deadline to the end of 2012. The following debate took place:

The Connétable of St Helier (proposing his amendments)

... I want to briefly refer to the proposals for car parking in the amendments. Perhaps characteristically, people who took issue with my amendments only focused on the reference to Halkett Place, they did not seem to see that there is an effort to bring forward a shoppers car park at Snow Hill, one that makes use of that cutting and maximises its potential for shoppers car parking, right next to the town centre. This amendment is seeking to really tie the Minister down to work with Property Holdings and to bring forward increased capacity for shoppers in Snow Hill ...

The Connétable of St. Brelade (The Minister for Transport and Technical Services, proposing his amendment to the amendments):

There are many significant issues to consider with regard to the possibility of a shoppers’ car park at Snow Hill, and this will involve Jersey Property Holdings, the Planning Department, T.T.S. and Education, Sport and Culture. Various schemes involving parking, housing and new access have been mooted but detailed feasibility work, and its associated funding, are required to bring a scheme forward. My amendment will provide for a deadline of 2012, rather than 2011, and for the proposal to be subject to the availability of funding to enable this work to be completed thoroughly.

Deputy Paul Le Claire:

The car parking in Snow Hill is obviously a difficult one to plan correctly for. Obviously accessibility to Snow Hill, which is a group that is currently being led by the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture - I am sure he would be pleased to hear his name associated with something else other than schools - he is doing a body of work right now with the Constable of St. Helier and Deputy Pitman in that regard. I do not have a problem really with this one but I would just like to point out, something the Minister said in the last amendment, which made it sound very subtly enticing for possibly the odd Member that voted with it. We are only talking about a year’s difference. In actual fact, no we are not. We are not talking about a year’s difference at all. This is the end of 2011 to the end of 2012, so it is not a year’s difference from where we are, it is 2 years difference from where we are, and if it is anything like the air quality strategy, goodness knows when we will be debating it.

The Connétable of St. Helier:

I do not want to antagonise my fellow Connétales but ... actually it will not make any difference because they all voted against me on the last amendment, so you could argue you cannot have a worse position than that. It is just quite interesting to me that both the Minister and the Constable of St. Mary tried to effectively divide the Constable of St. Helier and the Deputies of the town from the rest of the Island to say: "Well, our shopping lists are just as important. The particular junction is just as important." I think what Members have got to understand, and I do not know how many times I have said this in the last 13 years, we all have a stake in St. Helier and this amendment in particular should appeal to the country Constables because they need more shopper parking, and so do their constituents, and providing more shopper parking in Snow Hill is really important. That site is right next to the town centre and we have been talking about it for years. That is why I put this in as a specific proposal. Having said that, I think the Minister has a much better argument here than he had for the previous amendment. It probably will take 2 years to work up a scheme for this particular cutting. There are lots of complexities but at least let us make sure it is done in those 2 years and that other very important schemes out west and up north and out east do not take priority because we all have a stake in improving the parking situation in St. Helier.

Senator Paul Routier:

I think a lot of Members are keen on improving shopper parking at Snow Hill. I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister for Transport and Technical Services, that in the lead-up to this Christmas that he was to suspend States Members parking for the Christmas period because there are spaces, if you walk through that car park on a regular basis, as I do, that were left empty during the Christmas period, so I would suggest from 20th December to, say, 1st January States Members parking should be suspended.

The Deputy of St. Mary:

This amendment, once again, talks about funding and we talked about funding before. We cannot do pedestrian safety measures fast enough because of the funding. Never mind the fact that the rate of return on safety measures is colossal. If you avoid one accident you save not only the blood and the heartache but you also save financially at the hospital and so on. But this is a proposal where instead of what the Constable said, which was to bring forward proposals by 2011, it has now become to carry out a review of the proposal by 2012. Not only that, it is subject to the availability of funding for feasibility studies. That rings alarm bells and, as someone has said already in the debate, it is almost a pity that we did not go straight to the Constable of St. Helier's amendment about increasing the budget for the whole transport policy because we are tripping over this again and again. The half million... once you have a rolling programme year on year, it does not go all that far, and it certainly does not go far enough. Here is another case in point, that an ideal place to put some extra shoppers' car parking - I know there are issues around it - is stumbling on this: "We cannot even find the money to look at the problem." We had the same with Fort Regent. The very first thing that was said about improving Fort Regent: "We have not got the money and it is going to be very difficult." I am sorry, I find this very negative and very disturbing and sad. To follow Senator Routier with his wheeze for getting a few more spaces up there right now, we could also take out some of the white lines and repaint them for a few spaces for the micro cars at the near end to town, and then you would get another 2 or 3 spaces out of that.

Deputy Judy Martin:

Just briefly, I think what the Deputy of St. Mary has just said is a total move away from what the Constable of St. Helier is asking, and I would just like to ask and remind everybody it was not long ago that the Car Park Trading Fund had over £9 million for a multi-storey at Ann Court, was prepared to borrow £12 million, and put parking charges up by 25p a car [Approbation] and there was not much objection until it all fell apart within a year and nothing happened. None of that park... it is still gravel, and it is still temporary parking, so where has that money gone? If Snow Hill is not going to be your new shoppers' car park you might as well shut shopping down in town.

Deputy Andrew Green:

I think we need to just remind ourselves what the Constable of St. Helier has asked the Minister to do and then look at the amendment in that light. The Constable of St. Helier has asked to bring forward in conjunction with Property Holdings Department by the end of 2011 proposals to provide increased shopper car parking at Snow Hill. He has not said you have to borrow or find funding. Let us think a little bit out the box. He said to bring proposals. What is wrong with asking a contractor or some private person if they would be prepared to provide that car parking to an agreed service level agreement without any funding from ourselves so that they can work-up the scheme. We could just tell them what we expect them to provide. Let us be a bit imaginative. Let us not keep finding reasons for not doing things. I think the timescale the Constable has allowed is quite sufficient.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

I just must comment on something the Constable of St. Helier said. He does not seem to have understood my gist at all. I spoke on the previous amendment not to divide the Constables and to say that one area of the Island was more valuable than the other. I spoke to say that in matters of safety each area should be able to be judged on its merits to provide safety for the best benefit for the people as a whole. What I would say, the Constable said that we all have a stake in St. Helier. Absolutely right, and I wish the Connétable of St. Helier would remember that when he looks at things like residence parking, which have moved whole areas of St. Helier out of the reach of people from other Parishes, whether they have family there, members of elderly relatives they like to visit on a regular basis, and areas of course where people have traditionally parked for one or 2 hours on the disc zone to do their shopping. Commuter spacers for shopping: I think the Constable needs to understand that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Deputy Jeremy Maçon:

Very quickly, I am struggling with this amendment because, as I understand it, I believe that Transport and Technical Services have done reviews of Snow Hill before. They have done a lot of work behind there so if the Minister can just explain why he feels that this timeline is needed when he just wants proposals to do another review, when in fact there have been several reviews into Snow Hill. If the Minister could just clarify that for me, because I do not understand it at the moment.

Deputy Ben Fox:

We had a very productive weekend doing reviews with groups of people, including the Constable of St. Helier of the day - not this Constable, a previous one - and if public services would like to dust off their files they will find every suggestion under the sun, from the realistic to the not so realistic, but the temporary measure is as long as you keep the access to the big tunnel for emergency use it is quite easy to clear out all the cars that are there, have a shoppers parking as an interim measure, and that will give you time to work out all the other ones once you have dusted the file out. It is all there and some of it ... it had architects there, it had engineers and technicians. It was not an amateur thing. It was a professional thing and there are about 5 lots, if I recall, if not 6 lots there of very valuable information that you could use.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I thank those Members who spoke. I think Deputy Le Claire mentioned there being more than a year involved and, yes, he is right, but I think if there was not movement during 2011 he would be quite right to stand up in the House and ask what was going on, and I would expect him to do that. The Connétable of St. Helier mentioned we all have a stake in St. Helier but, I think bouncing his comments against those of the Connétable of St. Mary, there is a balance to be struck. In terms of Senator Routier, clearly I am quite happy to canvas Members with regard to suspending States Members parking during the Christmas period, and will take a view on that. In terms of funding, the Deputy of St. Mary mentioned the funding issue, and of course those of us who were at the fiscal policy review yesterday heard that money is extremely tight, and I am conscious of that. With regard to Deputy Martin's comment regarding the Car

Park Trading Fund, we have that shaped-up, shall we say, going towards the Ann Court proposals. We are not quite there yet but there has been a proposal that that take place, that there be car parking there underneath a housing development, together with the Phillips Street shaft, and I think that our Car Park Trading Fund will be exhausted by the time that is done. In terms of design, there are proposals, as Deputy Fox and Deputy Maçon mentioned, and I take on board Deputy Green's comment, but those designs suggest that in terms of value for money Snow Hill is not ideal and that the cost of a car parking space individually is far greater than could be achieved in other places. Notwithstanding that comment, I think Snow Hill does lend itself to a car park but I think we have to try and obtain better value for money in the present economic climate. I think once again my amendment is sensible and pragmatic and achievable, and I would urge Members to accept my amendment, and I ask for the appel.

Note 3

The Deputy of St Mary has lodged an amendment to this amendment to include the requirement for the desirability of increasing the capacity to be investigated as well as the feasibility of so doing. In his report he states:

The word "feasibility" on its own could be taken to imply that increasing car parking (presumably for shoppers) on this site is automatically a good idea, and that all that is necessary to establish is whether it is possible.

Nevertheless, it cannot just be a question of feasibility – can it be done – but also of desirability – should it be done – as there are also potential downsides and issues, some of which are listed in paragraph 8.105 of the Island Plan, as follows

Difficulties of access

Headroom for vehicles accessing the cavern

Use of the space as a pedestrian and cycling route

Impact on the historic aspect of the site.

I would add –

Cost

Cost of alternative ways to achieve the same end

Risk and degree of the solution being future-proof compared to the alternatives. There are also possible spin-off benefits – one could, for example, imagine a link into a future access to Fort Regent, be it by cable-car, lift or whatever. There could be a roof garden extending the gardens along the ramparts. It would seem sensible to include these considerations in any study and indeed foolhardy not to.

Part two: the 18th amendment in the name of Deputy le Claire re Field 1248

An amendment made by Deputy P.V.F Le Claire to add to the list of sites to be zoned for Category A housing at Policy H1: Category A housing sites (on page 246): '4. Field 1248, Highview Lane, St. Helier (approx 3 acres/7 vergées)'
(Minister minded to reject.)

Deputy le Claire's Report

1. The need for social rented housing and first-time buyer homes cannot be underestimated. There are rising numbers on the Housing Department's list for the former, and there are no new sites likely to emerge for first-time buyers in the foreseeable future. As far as I am aware, there are currently no plans to develop the remaining 2 Island Plan H2 sites in the near future.
2. Field 1248 was identified and approved by the States as a suitable site for Category A housing under Policy H3 of the 2002 Island Plan, subject to consultation. Policy H3 was added to the final draft of the Island Plan because the Housing Needs Survey published in early 2002 had identified that the draft Plan consulted upon in 2001 had insufficient provision for Category A housing. My concern is that the removal of 3 Category A sites from the draft Plan is likely to lead to a similar shortfall in the new Plan. That is why I am proposing that Field 1248 be designated as a Category A site.

3. The site had scored very highly in meeting the criteria of the 2002 Island Plan's spatial strategy. These were: (a) Integration with the Built-up Area; (b) Efficiency of use of land-use resources; (c) Accessibility; (d) Minimising environmental impacts; (e) Least constraints and ease of implementation; and (f) Equitable distribution of development impact.

4. In 2007, the Ministers for Housing and Planning and Environment invited the Connétables to put forward sites for housing the elderly and first-time buyers. Field 1248 was put forward to 2 separate Parish Assemblies in St. Helier and was supported unanimously. Accordingly, it was included in the consultation process on sites for elderly persons and first-time buyer homes in 2007/8. The Minister did not put the site forward in P.75/2008, following objections from Deputy J.A. Hilton of St. Helier acting on behalf of local residents, based on loss of agricultural land and potential traffic generation.

5. In the autumn of 2008, a planning application was submitted to construct 28 first-time buyer and 26 social rented apartments for elderly persons on Field 1248. This was eventually refused permission on the grounds that it would prejudice the proposals in the Island Plan Review, and also that the States hadn't formally approved an amendment to the Island Plan. Appeal to the Royal Court was dismissed on the second ground of appeal only. My amendment affords the opportunity for the States Assembly to decide on the suitability of the site.

6. A new proposal has emerged to provide –

(a) 24 first-time buyer homes (4 x 4 bedroom and 20 x 3 bedroom);

(b) 21 social rental homes (10 x 2 bedroom cottages and 11 x 2 bedroom apartments).

The owner and prospective developer of the site have offered the Parish of St. Helier 10 social rental homes for free. If the Parish is not minded to accept them for some reason, then the value of the homes would be spread across the costs of developing the site (approx c. £1.6 million) and that would allow for the other homes to be sold at a lesser cost. This is exactly what the developer has said he feels is his contribution to the Island's needs. The Parish of St. Helier would benefit from having some sheltered housing, whereas at this time it has none. The Parish would also have an immediate income and a property portfolio worth £2 million. It would also reduce the pressures on other States Services by keeping the over-55s in the community where they belong, and not in a private nursing facility or in the General Hospital – potentially at great cost.

Part three: amendments 32 & 33 in the name of Deputy de Sousa and 35 re Field 1219

Amendment 32 to the Island Plan Strategic Policy Framework (relating to the Town of St. Helier)

At the end of paragraph 2.22, after the words 'its public realm and infrastructure.' insert the words 'In particular, it is imperative that to create an acceptable urban living environment in the Town, adequate provision of good quality and accessible public open space must be planned for and made.' "

(Minister minded to accept.)

Deputy de Sousa's Report

This is straightforward and fundamental to the quality of life for Town residents. There is a constant increase in development in St. Helier, with a higher density being adopted. Therefore, if Town residents are to put up with this, surely they should have relevant outside space to enjoy.

Amendment 33 to Policy BE5: Tall buildings

to replace the words 'Tall buildings, defined as those either above five storeys in height, or rising more than two storeys above their neighbours, will only be permitted where their exceptional height can be fully justified, in a Design Statement, in urban design terms.' with the following words

'Tall buildings, defined as those either above five storeys in height, will only be permitted where their exceptional height can be fully justified, in a Design Statement, in urban design terms. Development which exceeds the height of buildings in the immediate vicinity will not be approved'

(Minister minded to accept subject to an amendment.)

Deputy de Sousa's Report

It has been apparent for a number of years that developments are gradually getting taller. This can have a detrimental effect on the quality of life in general. There needs to be tighter restrictions and guidelines for building over 5 storeys. On the Esplanade Quarter there has been a steady incremental creep on the height of buildings, each one going up by one storey on the last.

Amendment 35 to remove Part Field 1219, Grande Route de Mont a l'Abbé, St Helier as a Category A housing site.

(Minister minded to reject.)

Deputy de Sousa's Report

At present, Field 1219 may be surrounded by development which may cause it to be viewed as being within the Built-up Area (BUA). In Section 4: Built Environment 4.9 the Plan states: "there is no deliberate relaxation of the Built-up Area boundary in this plan to meet development need." I believe we should look at redevelopment or brown-field sites before rezoning agricultural land that is actively being used for this purpose. Category A housing is in short supply, but surely continuously rezoning agricultural land is not the answer. As a Government, we are custodians responsible for looking after the future of the Island. There needs to be more logical forward planning to safeguard against the erosion of Green Fields.

Part four: 38th amendments in the name of Constable of St Helier on the recommendation of the Roads Committee

1 Amendment to Policy GD1 - General Development Considerations (page 55), in paragraph 5c, after the words 'space for parking' insert the words ', including for visitors and servicing;''

(Minister minded to accept.)

2 Amendment to Policy GD3 - Density of Development (page 59), after the words 'commensurate with good design' insert the words ', adequate amenity space and parking;''

(Minister minded to accept.)

Note: an amendment has been tabled to this amendment by the Deputy of St Mary: After the word "parking" insert the words "(bearing in mind the potential for reducing the need for car ownership by the creation of car pooling schemes and other methods)". In his report the Deputy states: All space is precious. The land bank is finite on Jersey, as we are all aware, and it is absolutely essential to use space in the best way possible. This requirement is even more acute in the more urban areas. If town-dwellers are to have adequate open space, whether private, within a housing development, or public, then we have to take the allocation of space seriously. We have to show by our decisions in the Plan that the talk about making town a nice place to live is not just hot air.

If this section of the amendment of the Connétable were to be carried unamended, then there would be a blanket requirement in the Island Plan to provide "adequate parking" without any consideration of what that might mean in practise, or of the space which is therefore lost to other uses. I notice that other amendments talk of minimum room size standards, and adequate sound insulation. The Connétable's

amendment demands, and rightly so, adequate amenity space. All these are legitimate and important demands on space.

So this amendment qualifies the idea of providing adequate parking by suggesting that by the use of car-pool schemes, and perhaps by other methods also, precious land would be saved, and therefore could be applied to other uses.

In the Appendix, I copy some slides of a presentation on this issue by Michael Glotz-Richter, who works for the Ministry of Environment and Transport in the city of Bremen, as senior project manager for 'sustainable mobility', as a picture is worth a thousand words.

In summary, the Connétable's amendment as it stands would impose an unfortunate restriction – this amendment is designed to bring some flexibility into the space equation.

(Minister minded to accept.)

3 Amendment to Policy GD4 - Planning obligations (page 61), in the second paragraph, after the word, 'including' insert the words 'the provision of amenity space, public parking'

(Minister minded to accept.)

4 Amendment to Policy GD9 - Signs and advertisements (page 69) at the end of the Policy insert a new paragraph as follows-

'The implementation of a network of pedestrian and cycle routes, particularly in urban areas, may require extensive signage to ensure awareness and safety. Transitional and/or time-limited signage may be approved that is larger and more intrusive than would otherwise be approved.'

(Minister minded to accept subject to further amendment)

5 Amendment to Policy NE8 - Access and awareness (page 105) after the words, 'coast and countryside' insert the words ', and which assist in the provision of the Island's provision of off-road walking and cycling routes,'

(Minister minded to accept.)

6 Amendment to Policy HE1 - Protecting listed buildings and places (page 112) at the end of the Policy insert a new paragraph as follows-

'Planning applications in respect of listed buildings or places will be exempt from planning fees where such fees would not have been payable were the building or place not listed.'

(Minister minded to accept subject to further amendment)

Note: an amendment has been tabled to this amendment by the Deputy of St Mary: For the words "where such fees" substitute the words "to the extent that such fees".

(Minister minded to accept subject to further amendment)

7 Amendment to Objective BE2 - Regeneration of St Helier objectives (pages 128 - 129), after paragraph 5 insert a new paragraph as follows-

'Promote and enable access to the countryside for the residents of St Helier through the creation of a St Helier Country Park', and in Proposal 9: Public Realm Strategy (page 135) after the words 'of St Helier's public realm.' insert a fifth bullet point as follows-

'Consult upon and develop the proposal to designate a St Helier Country Park in the countryside immediately to the north of the Town as shown on the Map attached at Appendix 1'.

(Minister minded to accept.)

8 Amendment to Objective BE2 - Regeneration of St Helier objectives (pages 128 - 129) for paragraph 8 substitute the following paragraph-

'8. Create a 'walkable' and 'cyclable' town - with a permanent and continuous network of safe and continuous routes for pedestrians and cyclists to help promote modal change in transport choices;'

(Minister minded to accept.)

9 Amendment made by Connetable of St. Helier to in Policy BE1 - Town centre vitality (page.136 - 137)

a) after paragraph 6 insert new paragraphs as follows

'7. support the provision of improved cycling and public transport links serving the Core Retail Area

8. support the provision of adequate off-street parking for shoppers and visitors to the Core Retail Area;' and

b) in paragraph 7(d) (as originally numbered) after the word 'pedestrians' insert the words 'and cyclists;'"
(*Minister minded to accept.*)

10 Amendment to Proposal 11 - St Helier Regeneration Zones (page 148) after the words '5. Old Harbours' insert a new area as follows '6. Eastern gateway', and modify Map 4.1 accordingly as shown on the map attached at Appendix 2."

(*Minister minded to accept.*)

11 Amendment to Policy BE7 - Shop fronts (page 162) at the end of paragraph 1 delete the word 'and', and insert a new paragraph as follows '2. it improves facilities for the storage and collection of refuse, including recyclables; and' and renumber the following paragraphs accordingly."

(*Minister minded to accept subject to further amendment*)

12 Amendment to Policy BE9 - Street furniture and materials (page164)

a) in paragraph 4, after the words 'street trees' insert the words 'and benches', and

b) after paragraph 4 insert a new paragraph as follows-

'5. street trees are planted in the ground rather than in planters wherever possible.'"

(*Minister minded to accept.*)

13 Amendment to Policy ER2 - Protection and promotion of St Helier for shopping (page 184)

a) after the words, 'facilities for shoppers' in the first paragraph insert the words ', including provision of off-street parking for shoppers, and permeable access for cyclists, where possible,' and

b) after the second paragraph insert a new paragraph as follows-

'Proposals for the refurbishment or extension of pre-existing retail premises outside the Core Retail Area will be permitted provided that the development accords with other retail policies of the Plan'"

(*Minister minded to accept.*)

14 Amendment to Policy ER6 - Take-away food outlets (page 188) after the words 'General development considerations' at the end of the first paragraph, insert the words, ', and having regard to their impact on neighbouring uses, especially residential accommodation.'"

(*Minister minded to accept.*)

15 Amendment to Policy EVE2 - Tourist Destination Areas (page 220) at the end of the third bullet point, after the words 'public transport users' insert the words 'and associated signage'

(*Minister minded to accept.*)

16 Amendment to section 8.36 - Footpath provision and enhancement (page 300) delete from the list of improvement lines to be abandoned 'La Pouquelaye' and 'Tower Road'

(*Minister minded to accept.*)

17 Amendment to Policy TT2 - Footpath provision and enhancement (page 301)-

a) In the title, after the word 'enhancement' insert the words ', and walking routes'; and

b) after the first paragraph, insert a new paragraph as follows-

'The ability of development to contribute to the improvement of the Island's provision of off-road walking routes will be pursued, especially where safe routes between residential areas, schools, play space, sporting and cultural facilities, et cetera. can be identified.'

(Minister minded to accept.)

18 Amendment to Policy TT5 - Road safety (page 309) after the words, 'pedestrian safety measures' in the first paragraph insert the words ', including improved pedestrian crossing facilities'

(Minister minded to accept.)

19 Amendment to Policy TT10 - Off-street public parking provision in St Helier (page 322)-

a) in the first paragraph, for the words 'unless the total level of public off-street car provision falls below 4,000 spaces (2009 levels)' substitute the words, 'unless the new spaces will be provided for the use of shoppers and visitors',

b) in the second paragraph, after the words 'car parking space', insert the words, 'at new sites capable of providing parking for shoppers, visitors and residents, and at', and

c) in the final paragraph, after the words 'will not be permitted' insert the words ', except where parking for shoppers, visitors and residents can be provided on a temporary basis.'

(Minister minded to accept.)

20 Amendment to paragraph 8.119 (page 323) after the words 'the public realm' insert the words ', including the provision of cycle routes'

(Minister minded to accept.)

21 Amendment to Policy TT11 - Private car parks in St Helier (page 325) after the word 'permitted' insert the words 'except where the provision of such car parks will contribute to reducing vehicular penetration of, and congestion in, core areas'

(Minister minded to accept subject to further amendment)

22 Amendment to Proposal 20 - Parking guidelines (page 327) after the word 'develop' insert the words ', consult upon,

(Minister minded to accept.)

23 Amendment to Policy NR8 - Safety zones for hazardous installations (page 366) in the last paragraph,-

a) after the word 'public', for the words 'will be the overriding consideration' substitute the words 'and the extent to which any risks can be managed or mitigated will be the overriding considerations';

b) before the word 'requirements', insert the word, 'reasonable'

(Minister minded to accept.)

The Constable of St Helier's Report

Introduction

The 2011 draft Island Plan has a lot to say about St. Helier, and I welcome many of its proposals. Not that the majority of them are new: previous versions of the Plan have backed the need to regenerate our town and to focus new development in the urban areas, not only for reasons of environmental sustainability, to safeguard the Island's countryside and beaches which are so precious to us all, but also to encourage people to choose to live in St. Helier for reasons of quality of life as well as of convenience.

The fact that I have lodged more than 20 amendments to the Plan should not be taken to mean I don't support it; it's simply that important quality of life issues for St. Helier, such as open space provision, parking and safe cycling and walking, need to have more emphasis than the draft Plan currently gives them. For the States cannot have it both ways: if St. Helier is to be expected to take the majority of the 4,000 new homes proposed for the Island in the next decade, the capital must be provided with the open space that its residents, workers and visitors need. La Collette 2 reclamation site was promised to provide

'a significant area of open space' but no longer, we are told on page 286; the Waterfront is now earmarked for a new financial quarter, leisure uses and residential accommodation, rather than generous open space which was envisaged at first; sites such as Ann Court, currently an essential car park, are due to receive dense residential developments, while the Town Park very nearly lost much of its area to flats – fortunately the combined opposition of the Parish's Deputies and Constable persuaded the Minister for Planning and Environment to rethink. St. Helier needs more open space, not less; the Millennium Town Park should be the first of several new parks to be created this century, not the last, and it is for this reason that my amendment 7 seeks to start the process of developing a Country Park for the Town. The majority of these amendments have been considered by the St. Helier Roads Committee and helpfully modified by its members; a couple were suggested by the Committee. The amendments have also been considered by the Parish Assembly of St. Helier.

Amendments 1, 2, 3, 7: amenity and open space

These amendments seek to ensure that all Islanders, no matter where they live, are not short-changed in terms of their access to amenity space. The importance of open space is recognised in various parts of the Draft Plan, especially in Section 7. However, the results of the audit carried out by JPC Strategic Planning and Leisure Consultants referred to in pages 279–283 are ambiguous to say the least. What are we to make of the statement in paragraph 7.45, for example?

'Provision varies widely across the Island, with differences in provision in the predominantly urban parishes compared to the rural parishes. However, as the Island is relatively small and easily accessible, the provision of facilities needs to be considered on both a local level and at an island-wide level.' (p. 281)

The first sentence appears reluctant to state the obvious fact that urban dwellers have less ('different') access to open space than residents of rural communities; in 7.48 the main observations of the study include the statement that 'there is an abundance of natural greenspace and adequate amenity greenspace provision, *however, the quantity of and accessibility to open spaces of these types is more challenging* (my italics) in urban areas', while provision of outdoor sports facilities is sufficient '*with some issues of local access* (my italics) particularly in urban areas.' (p. 282) The idea that Jersey does not necessarily need to follow UK best practice in terms of open space provision is hinted at in the next statement made by the consultants: 'there is an under supply of parks in the Island. However, their provision needs to be taken in context with provision of other types of open space, particularly in rural areas. In urban areas under-supply of parks *may* (my italics) have more significance, particularly if future development needs are to be predominantly met in the urban areas.' The final main observation of the study has no caveats: 'there is an under-supply of play space across the Island.' In section 7.49 it is acknowledged that more work is required 'in particular, to assess the robustness and applicability of the proposed standards to the existing and future population projections for the Plan period.' It is natural for consultants to recommend more work should be done but surely the key question facing the States in the Island Plan debate is, do we do something about the under-supply? Are we uncomfortable about the application of UK Best Practice Standards being applied to Jersey? That appears to be implicit in Proposal 18 – Open Space Strategy, which includes the proposal to 'develop *Jersey standards* (my italics) for the provision, quality and accessibility of open space.'

Proposal to develop a St. Helier Country Park (amendment 7)

The idea that all users of the Town should be able to access such a park came from a visit I made several years ago to Eastleigh Borough Council and an introduction to the Itchen Valley Country Park, 440 acres of countryside managed and protected for the benefit of the densely populated towns and city in the immediate vicinity

(<http://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/leisure-and-culture/countryside/itchen-valley-countrypark/visiting-ivcp.aspx>)

As I was shown this area by some Council members, I found myself wishing that St. Helier could benefit in a similar way from close and convenient access to the countryside. Accordingly, at an early stage of the consultation process, I made the suggestion that the new Island Plan should consider the opportunity of creating a new country park easily accessible from the Town. Given the findings of the audit of open space referred to above, and the stated aim of the Plan to concentrate new development in the Town area, it would seem logical that we start the consultation necessary to provide, if possible, a country park beginning at the town's 'back door.' Thanks to the work of the National Trust, there are already a number of 'Dons' to the north of the Town, especially along Vallée des Vaux, in itself a natural gateway to the countryside. But in spite of the Green Lane network in this part of the Parish and a few woodland footpaths, there is still very little access to the countryside here; taken in conjunction with my amendments 5 and 17 this amendment, if adopted, would allow the consultation process with landowners to begin that might lead to a greater degree of access to the countryside, albeit properly managed and controlled, and the kind of safe, off-road, circular routes that have been created in the rural and coastal areas of the Island. Grands Vaux Reservoir presents a particular opportunity for increased public access as does the pond, currently cordoned off by high fencing halfway up Grands Vaux below Stafford Lane. The area of the proposed country park shown on the map in the Appendix is for guidance only. While Vallée des Vaux and Grands Vaux have areas of woodland that seem to me to be ideal for greater public access and enjoyment, there are also potential sites in the western part of the Green Zone north of St. Helier. Consultation would also be required with the Parishes of St. Saviour and Trinity, as the proposed area impinges on these parishes to the north and east.

Amendments 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 19, 21, 22: parking

During the last few years the St. Helier Roads Committee has been routinely rejecting planning applications for new residential developments in the parish which do not provide at least one space of off-street parking per unit of accommodation. These rejections are only advisory and the Roads Committee's concerns have been overridden frequently in the past. While it is recognised that it is not always possible to provide this standard when older properties are being refurbished, or in respect of forthcoming proposals to convert outworn offices into residential accommodation, especially in the Core Retail Area, or in Conservation Areas, the Committee believes that wherever possible, urban dwellers should be given the same right to own a private car that is enjoyed by those living in more rural areas. Indeed, given the difficulties of accessing the best of the Island's open space and outdoor sports facilities referred to in the study above, it is particularly important that this is the case. This is not to say that the strategic aim of reducing dependence on the private car is not a worthy one, although the distinction should be made between car use and car ownership. Clearly there is insufficient capacity for on-street parking to cater for the parking needs of residents of the most densely populated urban areas, which is one of the reasons why Residents' Parking Zones have been introduced by Transport and Technical Services in conjunction with the Parish in parts of St. Helier. If planning applications to increase the number of units of residential accommodation are not accompanied by an increase in off-street parking provision, the pressure for on-street spaces will only increase.

Shopper parking needs to be encouraged if town retailers in the Core Retail Area are to be able to attract customers to their shops in the face of competition from Internet shopping and out-of-town shopping facilities that offer more convenient parking. The Draft Island Plan, if unamended, would make it impossible for much-needed shortstay parking to be provided on new sites capable of serving the town centre, and would prohibit the temporary use of building sites for such uses. The construction of new private car parks can also assist in removing the need for commuters to add to the congestion of the town centre, especially in accessing the many private non-residential parking spaces that have been permitted as part of new developments, and should therefore be permitted when certain criteria are met (amendment 21).

It is accepted that the Island Plan defers the detail of future parking standards to be part of forthcoming supplementary guidelines. However, not only should there be consultation about what these standards

should consist of (amendment 22), the peculiar provisions of Policy TT10 – Off-street public parking provision in St. Helier (page 322) need to be challenged. Rather than accepting the arbitrary ceiling to the number of off-street car parking spaces the town requires ('4,000 at 2009 levels'), amendment 19 seeks to allow the Minister the freedom to approve the creation of new off-street car parking spaces for the use of shoppers and visitors to the Town.

Amendments 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20: walking and cycling

The Draft Plan's re-emphasis of the need to promote safe walking and cycling is to be welcomed. These amendments seek to enhance the provision of walking and cycling routes, both in the Town and around the Island, that are safe, convenient, permeable, continuous and properly marked. Wherever possible, pedestrian crossings, and offroad walking and cycle routes should be provided as part of new developments, as there is no doubt that the risk of injury to the most vulnerable road-users is a powerful disincentive to reduce dependency on the private car for those journeys which could be made on foot or by bicycle. Opportunities to provide such safe routes between housing developments and major educational, social and cultural facilities need to be taken. Amendment 16 seeks to retain 2 important Road Improvement Lines in St. Helier; the Parish is currently engaged in a process of buying up land, at considerable expense to ratepayers, to provide footpaths on La Pouquelaye and Tower Road, and the Parish Roads Committee considers it vital to maintain Road Improvement Lines in these 2 cases. Despite the unpopularity of road signs and the risk of visual clutter, the proper signage of safe walking and cycling routes is paramount if people are to use them, especially visitors to Jersey, and this also applies to public transport links (amendment 15).

Amendment 6 – application fees for listed buildings

This amendment takes the opportunity to seek to amend the current unfairness of the owner of a listed building being required to pay planning fees for a minor alteration or extension to their property which would be exempt were it not a listed building. It is likely that minor developments of listed buildings will cost more anyway, and it seems particularly unfair, therefore, to make the owner pay planning fees in these cases.

Amendment 10, 11, 13 – St. Helier Regeneration Zones and the Core Retail Area

It may be an oversight that the urban area to the east of the Town, including Havre des Pas, has not been proposed for designation as a Regeneration Zone. Considering the depredations this area has suffered in recent years, in particular through the folly of siting the incinerator on La Collette 2 adjacent to the Island's Ramsar Site, it must be considered a high priority for regeneration (amendment 10). Amendment 11 seeks to improve the ability of shops to store refuse and recyclables; amendment 12 to add 'benches' to the list of street furniture to be encouraged in the town area, and to ensure that wherever possible street trees are placed in the ground rather than in planters. Map 5.2 (p. 185) showing the proposed Core Retail Area leaves a number of premises that are currently in retail use, such as Romerils, 'out in the cold'. This apparent anomaly would be rectified if amendment 13(b) were to be adopted.

Amendment 14 – take-away food outlets

Amendment 14 addresses another anomaly that exists over the protection given to the neighbours of take-away food outlets in the countryside (page 188, Policy ER6) which is not currently also afforded in the urban area.

Amendment 23 – Safety Zones for Hazardous Installations

One of the most surprising and worrying features of the draft Plan is that it suggests (final bullet point on page 286) that the new open space designed to wrap around the La Collette 2 reclamation site (and hopefully to hide at least a part of the eyesore of the new incinerator) is to be effectively 'out of bounds'. Due to concerns about the potential of a Buncefield-type incident at the fuel farm, the long-awaited linear park that was supposed to provide St Helier residents, in particular, with ample space to walk, jog or cycle around the reclamation site, is to be closed off. Amendment 23 is designed to challenge this significant

threat to the open space provision made in the name of ‘Health and Safety’ by requiring proper risk assessment and risk management to be undertaken before a blanket prohibition is enacted on access to the open space at La Collette.

Part five: the main proposals of the plan in respect of St Helier

Note: the below information is reproduced from P.48/2011

Principles underpinning the Plan

The revised draft Island Plan is founded on a series of key principles. These principles are a particularly important part of the Plan because they provide the basis from which everything else in the Plan follows. Previous Island Plans have contained similar such principles but expressed them as a series of objectives – the revised draft Island Plan takes a different approach and presents them as a set of strategic policies. In this way, these policies can be actively used to inform and explain the fundamental basis for planning decisions.

This subtle difference in approach is significant. Previously, there has been a passive acceptance of strategic principles in earlier Island Plans and they have perhaps not enjoyed the detailed scrutiny that other, more detailed, site specific policies have been subjected to. This has, however, caused subsequent controversy and difficulties when those same strategic principles are applied and implemented: a good example of this, from the 2002 Island Plan, is the spatial strategy of that Plan. This clearly stated that the Island’s housing need would be met by extending the Built-up Area boundary and rezoning greenfield land on the edge of urban areas, specifically to meet housing needs: this was a strategic objective of the Plan.

This, however, was deemed to be incredibly controversial when specific sites in these locations were considered for housing development at all stages in the planning process. In light of this, members’ attention is drawn to the strategic policy framework and the key strategic messages that this framework provides. These are set out in the revised draft Island Plan, which is summarised here –

• **Sustainable development**, which sets out where development should be located. Specifically, strategic Policy SP1: Spatial strategy is based on meeting the Island’s development needs according to a clear hierarchical sequence that focuses development on the Island’s Built up Area and on brown-field land, as follows:

- Development within the main Built-up Area of the Town of St. Helier (*For planning purposes, the Town of St. Helier is represented by the extent of development associated with the town, and which includes parts of the parishes of St. Saviour and St. Clement, as defined on the Proposals Map*);
- Development within the Built-up Area outside the Town of St. Helier, including those parts of the Island’s urban environment identified and defined in the hierarchy of settlements and defined on the Proposals Maps;
- Development of brown-field land outside the Built-up Area, to meet an identified need and where it is appropriate to do so;
- In exceptional circumstances, the development of land outside the Built-up Area to support the rural economy or parish communities, to meet an identified need and where it is appropriate to do so.

This part of the Plan also sets out how different forms of development will be assessed according to the principles of a sequential test and how – at Policy SP2: Efficient use of resources – land and buildings should be used and energy use made more efficient and carbonneutral. In particular, land should be developed at its optimum density to ensure that we use the limited developable land that we have on a small island wisely, to avoid the need of having to release significant areas of countryside to meet our development needs.

- **Protection of the environment**, which sets out how the Island's unique identity and character, expressed through the nature and quality of its natural and historic environment, should be protected.

This policy (at SP4: Protecting the natural and historic environment) states that a high priority will be given to protecting the Island's natural and historic environment. This is reinforced by a set of more detailed policies which enhance the protection of the Island's biodiversity and countryside, including the designation of a new Coastal National Park, as well as providing new policies which reflect the recent changes to the historic environment protection regime.

- **Economic growth and diversification**, which sets out how the Island Plan will seek to protect and facilitate the maintenance, enhancement and provision of land and development opportunities to support the maintenance and growth of the Island's economy.

- **Travel and transport**, which sets out how the planning system can help to reduce the need to travel and how it can provide choice to encourage the way we travel and in particular, reduce the extent of our dependence on the private car.

- **Quality of design**, which sets out: how development proposals will be tested against urban design principles to ensure that they deliver quality in design and architecture.

Detailed policies

The main body of the Plan provides the detailed planning policy framework that will be used over the next 10 years to guide planning decisions. This part of the Plan is divided into a set of themed topic chapters. Each chapter provides the policy context within which it has been developed; a set of objectives and indicators setting out the direction of policy and how it will be measured; together with a series of detailed policies, with their own reasoned justification. To assist members, a summary of each of these topic chapters and some of the key policies within them is set out below:

General development

In the case of almost every planning application, there are a number of generic issues against which development proposals are to be tested to see if they are acceptable, and these are contained in this chapter of the plan. Specifically Policy GD1: General development considerations sets out a comprehensive set of criteria against which all planning applications can be considered. It provides a useful starting point for anyone considering making a planning application and will help ensure that planning applications are comprehensively and consistently assessed. Policy GD5: Skylines, views and vistas is a new policy that specifically requires the impact of development on distant views and skylines to be a material consideration. Its introduction is in direct response to pressure for development around the Island's sensitive coastline.

Natural environment

This chapter maintains and enhances the levels of protection to be provided to the Island's sensitive coast and countryside, as well as introducing new policy to protect biodiversity throughout the Island and enhancing protection for trees, woodland and boundary features that are so important to the Jersey scene. The basis for the protection of the countryside is work which identified the elements that make the varied landscape of the Island what it is (*Countryside Character Appraisal (1999) Land Use Consultants*). This has been used to identify the most sensitive parts of the coast and countryside, which are proposed for designation as a Coastal National Park for Jersey: this also embraces the Island's offshore reefs (see Policy NE6: Coastal National Park).

Protection for the remainder of the countryside has been simplified, by the deletion of the Countryside Zone policy which features in the 2002 Island Plan, such that it is now designated as Green Zone. The Built-up Area boundary has also been rationalised such that an extra 586 vergées of countryside is now

proposed for protection as Green Zone, compared with that protected by some form of countryside protection (either Green Zone or Countryside Zone) in the current Plan.

Historic environment

The policy regime for the historic environment has been refreshed, principally to reflect the changes made to the historic environment protection regime and the introduction of a single category of protection – Listed buildings and places. The draft Plan also provides a policy regime for Conservation Areas which will be designated, following full consultation, in due course in the form of supplementary planning guidance.

Built environment

The built environment chapter provides the policy framework for the regeneration of St. Helier. The Plan recognises that more detailed land-use planning work needs to be done, in the form of master-planning for key Regeneration Zones which are identified in the Plan, but that the emphasis must be on quality and investment in improving the amenities of the urban environment to promote urban living. The Plan also allows for other detailed planning work to be carried out for other parts of the Island – at Jersey Airport, Five Oaks and in the Island's rural settlements – to improve and enhance the different characters of these areas and, in the case of the Airport, to provide new development uses. Where emergent policies and proposals are consistent with the Plan, they can be adopted as supplementary planning guidance by the Minister, following consultation with key stakeholders. Where, however, proposals emerge which challenge the strategic direction of the Plan – for example, where rezoning outside the Built-up Area boundary is proposed – further revision of the Island

Plan will be required, to be considered by the States, in accord with the processes set out in law.

Economy

The draft Plan recognises the changed economic circumstances of the Island and seeks to ensure that the planning system can respond appropriately by protecting existing land and buildings in economic activity use, whilst making provision for and enabling economic development and diversification. At Policy E1: Protection of employment land, the Plan seeks to introduce new protection for existing land and buildings in economic use, whilst recognising that the development of the waterfront and continuing structural change to the Island's economic base will, as is already happening, release land from office and tourism uses, which can help regenerate the town through their conversion or redevelopment.

The Plan identifies that the need for office accommodation over the Plan period can be principally met within the Waterfront and Town Centre, whilst the need for light industrial and warehousing space can be met through the potential use of States-owned land, such as La Collette and non-operational land at Jersey Airport, as well as the proposed change to the permitted development rights which would permit a 5% increase in floor-space of existing light industrial buildings without the need for express consent.

With regard to retailing, the draft Plan seeks to uphold and enhance the maintenance of the existing hierarchy of shopping centres, with particular emphasis on the need to protect the vitality and viability of St. Helier town centre and the central markets. It is evident, from the recent introduction of major new entrants into the Island's food retail market, that Island Plan policies are able to accommodate enhanced local competition without compromising spatial planning objectives. This approach is, therefore, continued in the revised draft Island Plan.

The Plan also responds to the Rural Economy Strategy and seeks to protect agricultural land, to support agriculture as well as the diversification of the rural economy, including support for tourism. The Plan also recognises, however, that whilst exceptions may be made in the countryside to support development that is essential to agriculture, where development becomes redundant to the agricultural industry the land should be restored to ensure the maintenance of the Island's countryside character, rather than new uses being introduced which may erode and harm it.

Housing

There can be no doubt that housing and, in particular the location of new housing development, is the most contentious and controversial subject area to be tackled by the new Plan: few issues raise fiercer passions in the local community. The approach adopted in the revised draft Island Plan is consistent with the sustainable principles which underlie the whole document by seeking to make best use of already developed land and focusing the Island's development needs into the Built-up Area. It is envisaged that, by adopting this approach, the Plan will provide for the residential regeneration of St. Helier and help to enhance urban living by, at the same time, raising space standards and seeking to secure and enhance the quality and provision of open space in the urban areas.

The evidence for the extent of housing need, and particularly affordable housing, has been thoroughly challenged and scrutinised at the E.i.P., and has been upheld by the Inspectors as a justifiable basis on which to proceed and plan for. And in this respect, the Plan seeks to provide for the 4,000 homes that are estimated to be required to 2020, 1,000 of which should be affordable shared equity and social rented homes. Whilst the demand for homes is estimated at 4,000, the Plan identifies a potential supply of 4,700 homes: this level of potential 'over-supply' is considered essential given the vagaries of the release of land for housing development by the private sector (i.e. some sites might not come forward for development), and particularly to ensure that the necessary level of affordable housing is achieved.

The Plan sets out new and varied mechanisms to deliver more affordable homes in Jersey. First, the Minister has introduced a new policy (at Policy H3: Affordable housing) which requires that a proportion of all new residential development (above a certain threshold) must be affordable housing. The thresholds and proportions of affordable housing to be provided are to be changed over time on an incremental basis to enable this new policy mechanism to bed-in and to become established after its commencement in 2012. It is, however, envisaged that after 5 years, 20% of all new housing provided on sites of 2 or more homes, will be 'affordable'.

Because this policy is new and will take to time to become fully operational, the Plan seeks to ensure that provision of affordable homes can also be achieved over the early part of the Plan period: it does this in 2 ways. First, the Minister has sought to rezone 3 sites for new Category A homes, which will deliver about 125 homes (see Policy H1: Category A housing sites). The Minister also thinks that it is appropriate to seek to use States-owned land and property to help deliver a greater proportion of new affordable housing and to this end has identified those sites which are currently and potentially to be released from the States property portfolio, as providing more affordable housing. It is considered that around 150 affordable homes can be provided through the development of these sites, in whole or in part, for this use.

Significantly, this revised draft Island Plan also sets out a new policy which will enable decision-makers to consider the type of homes being provided as part of a development proposal as a material consideration, relative to the latest evidence of identified need for different types of housing. For the first time, therefore, it will be possible to influence the form of residential accommodation that is to be provided – whether it is in the form of flats or houses – to ensure that it is helping to meet what is actually required (see Policy H4: Housing mix).

The Plan also seeks to introduce a new minimum density standard policy – to be determined and set through the publication and adoption of supplementary planning guidance – for all new housing developments over 1.125 vergées (0.2 hectares) (see Policy GD3: Density of development).

Social, community and open space

Basic social and community services are essential for the well-being of any community and include education, healthcare and leisure facilities, together with the availability of and access to open space. The revised draft Island Plan makes provision for the proposed new development of St. Martin's Primary

School, as well as the potential for new playing facilities to be provided to serve Haute Vallée, First Tower, Les Landes, Grouville and St. John's Schools. It also enables development of the Health and Social Services property portfolio to meet the need for healthcare facilities.

Significantly, the Plan identifies, categorises and protects the Island's open spaces – including commercial sports facilities – and will require the enhancement of the quantity and quality of open space provision as part of new development (see SCO5: Provision and enhancement of open space): new Open Space and Public Realm Strategies are required to inform this and will be developed over the Plan period. The Plan also introduces a policy framework for the provision of new allotments, and the protection of existing facilities.

Travel and transport

This chapter of the revised draft Island Plan seeks to complement and assist the implementation of the new Sustainable Transport Policy, recently approved by the States. The planning system can mainly do this by influencing the location of development so that people have a real choice about their mode of travel. The Plan also seeks to assist the development of cycling and public transport by requiring direct contributions for the enhancement of new facilities: in relation to the Eastern Cycle Route, it requires contributions to be made by major new development in the east of the Island (see Policy TT3: Cycle routes) and, in relation to the bus service, it requires contributions to be made by major new development to enhance the bus service where it is inadequate (see Policy TT8: Access to public transport).

The Plan's approach to parking provision reflects that in the Sustainable Transport Policy, as well as the North of Town Masterplan. The Minister also proposes to introduce new supplementary planning guidance on parking standards, based on a range of minimum and maximum standards: this will be the subject of further consultation ...

Natural resources and utilities

Wise and efficient use of resources is a fundamental principle that underlies the revised draft Island Plan, and this chapter gives detailed effect to this with a suite of policies designed to protect and promote the wise use of water and energy resources, as well as protecting air quality. In terms of energy use, this Plan introduces new policies into the planning process requiring renewable energy production as part of new development (see Policy NR7). It is also cognisant of the potential for the emergence of off-shore utility-scale renewable energy development during the Plan period and provides a policy regime to manage this. The provision and availability of aggregates is an essential element of the Island's economy, and the Plan addresses and updates the basis of supply, ensuring a land-bank of permitted reserves or alternatively-sourced material. The use of secondary and recycled materials is also encouraged.

Waste management

The Plan gives effect to the Solid Waste Strategy and is also cognisant of the emergent Liquid Waste Strategy. Of particular note is that the Plan updates and responds to the need to continue to dispose of residual waste, involving landfill, and identifies La Gigoulande Quarry as the preferred disposal route, subject to a number of key tests: the Plan presents an effective presumption against further land reclamation during the Plan period, which is consistent with other policies in the Plan to protect the marine environment.

In terms of liquid waste, the Plan introduces new policy regimes for the introduction of sustainable drainage systems (SuDs: see Policy LWM3) and the Minister will be issuing more detailed supplementary planning guidance on the potential introduction of these systems very shortly.

Implementation and monitoring

To be successful the Plan relies on effective implementation. Much of this will be achieved through the effective control and regulation of development, through the normal day-to-day planning application process, in accord with the aims, objectives and policies of the Plan. It will, however, also entail positive

action on behalf of the Minister for Planning and Environment, other Ministers and other agencies in respect of, in particular, master-planning and the development of States-owned land. Putting the Plan into practice will, therefore, require integrated work and assistance from those States departments and agencies who are directing resources towards land and land use, in a way that helps to contribute towards the objectives of the Plan: any new Island Plan is a corporate policy document and does not just relate to the remit of the Minister for Planning and Environment.

The importance of continually scrutinising the performance of the Plan and any changing circumstances has already been alluded to but cannot be overstated. The Island Plan should not be viewed as a product but a process, and one that will be required to adapt and change as the circumstances of the Island alter over time. It is the intention to prepare an Annual Monitoring Statement to report on the performance of the Plan, as set out in this chapter.

Conclusion

The Island Plan is the principal document for the planning and use of land in Jersey. By influencing the way in which land is used and development takes place, the Plan is able to make a vital contribution to the well-being of the local community, the success of the local economy and the quality of the local environment. The current Plan was completed in 2002 and needs to be replaced. The importance of adopting a new up-to-date Plan can not be over-emphasized and has been supported by the independent Planning Inspectors. This new Plan is essential to properly address the complex land use issues which face the Island now and over the next 10 years: notably, the intense pressures from competing uses to develop the Island's scarce land resources and, particularly, the need to provide more affordable social rented or shared equity homes to meet a clear and pressing need. The revised draft Island Plan has been prepared following a comprehensive review process and the most open and rigorous process of engagement and scrutiny in which States members have already been able to participate and contribute. It is consistent with the strategic objectives of the States and fully embraces the concept of 'sustainable development'. As such, it seeks to strike the right balance between the protection of the environment and the development needs of the community. The independent Planning Inspectors, having seen many such development plans, have commended the Minister, in very general terms, in having produced a plan which could stand comfortably alongside the better examples in the U.K.

The Minister for Planning and Environment asks the States to bear the following points in mind when asked to vote on the proposition –

- if the government of the Island is to achieve order and control over the use of land in the future, then it is imperative that there is a comprehensive up-to-date plan against which individual land-use decisions can be made;
- although the new Island Plan provides such a framework and the Minister has certain aspirations for its implementation, the Plan does not itself:
 - commit landowners to any specific action;
 - commit the States or any of its Ministers to any executive action;
 - commit financial or manpower resources;
- the new Plan is flexible and will be subject to future monitoring arrangements.

In asking the States to accept the proposition before it, the Minister is confident that it is providing the opportunity for putting in place a clear and balanced framework of realistic policies and proposals. With careful monitoring and review, it should be possible to ensure orderly and more sustainable development over the next 10 years, in a manner which best serves the interests of the Island.