

Island Plan interim review (1)

GD3: density

Further guidance for the Inspectors

Introduction

As part of the consultation on the topics and participants for the Examination in Public, Deputy Young has sought to question the exclusion of any consideration of the density of development.

The Inspectors are of the view that this matter is not part of the current review of the Island Plan and is not, therefore, an issue for general discussion at the EiP.

This view is challenged by Deputy Young and further guidance from the Minister has been requested.

Points raised by Deputy Young in relation to density

- *i disagree with the decision of the Inspectors to exclude me from raising this issue , of the high density of development outside built up areas .
This is an integral part of the policies to deliver the housing we require. It is not being done per se , but because of the need to deliver housing units and the consequent windfall yield of housing which is expected , the housing policy includes it .
My point is that no evidence, by way of extra housing units, has been produced to justify this policy . The Ministers own response to the consultation makes reference to this density policy and his remarks indicates some openness to review it.
Can i request you ask the Inspectors to reconsider and seek the instructions of the Minister on it in the light of what i have said*
- *For the avoidance of doubt I wish to participate in the following sessions :
17 Jan - Open hearing - amend policy requiring high density of development in existing built up areas outside the main built up area - request inspectors visit Les landes Avenue - Samannah*

Response

The Minister does not wish the Inspectors to widen the scope of their Examination to consider Policy GD3: density for the following reasons:

1. In publishing his proposals to amend the 2011 Island Plan in July 2013, the Minister clearly set out that he wished to revise parts of the Plan only and that the scope of the review was limited to a small number of policies and proposals which did not include Policy GD3.

To accede to any request to broaden the scope of the review at this stage would be inappropriate and unfair.

2. The Minister has already clearly indicated his willingness to consider whether Policy GD3 requires review, outwith the current scope of the 2011 Island Plan interim review, as part of his response to P.71/2013.

This position has already been accepted by the States Assembly and Deputy Young (see appendix 1)

3. Policy GD3 is an integral policy tool which seeks to contribute to the Plan's strategic policy objectives set by Policy SP1: Spatial strategy and Policy SP2: Efficient use of resources, and cannot be considered in isolation. To seek to consider a policy such as this in an isolated and *ad hoc* manner is inappropriate.

It is considered that the other policies proposed for revision by the Minister do not challenge the existing strategic framework of the Plan in such a way as this would.

4. The assumption made about the yield from windfall development outside the Town of St Helier is based on a projection of historical trends from this source of supply: there is no in-built supposition about the impact of increasing density on these sites (see paras. 6.66 – 6.67 of the Minister's proposed revision of the Housing Chapter). The provision of Cat B homes, as predicted in the Plan, is not, therefore, dependent upon Policy GD3.

5. The only issue of density consideration arising from this limited review of Island Plan policies concerns the anticipated levels of yield from those sites proposed for rezoning under the auspices of Policy H1 and Policy H5.

All of these sites have been the subject of initial site assessments where indicative levels of yield have been provided for each specific site to enable consideration of the likely scale of development upon each as well as their overall contribution to affordable housing provision.

APPENDIX 1

Extracts from Hansard Official Report of States Assembly Tuesday 02 July 2013.

p.76

The States are asked to decide whether they are of opinion (a) to request the Minister for Planning and Environment to carry out an interim review of the Island Plan policies adopted by the States in June 2011 to take account of economic circumstances, and consider the practical consequences and effect of the policies of the Island Plan 2011 as set out in sections 6(a)–(i) of the attached report, with the review to include, but not be limited to, the following policies: Housing Policies H1, H2, H3, H5 and multi-generation homes; ERE7 Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses; SP5 Economic Growth and Diversification; E1 Protection of Employment land; SP1 Spatial Strategy, for settlements outside the main built-up area; GD3 Density of Development; NE6 Coastal National Park; SCO6 Allotments; GD8 Percentage for Art; and to further request the Minister, if he considers that amendments are needed to the Plan in light of his review, to conduct the required public consultation under the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 and, having taken account of the results of this public consultation, to bring forward for approval by the Assembly any amendments to the policies of the Island Plan that are deemed appropriate, no later than June 2014; (b) to request the Minister for Treasury and Resources to allocate sufficient funds from central reserves to enable the Minister for Planning and Environment to carry out the interim review in accordance with paragraph (a).

p.84

Deputy J.H. Young:

Yes. I think maybe the Minister is asking me to clarify. I intended that there would be flexibility in the proposition, in fact I hoped I made that clear, particularly to allow the priority work to go ahead of the other matters. They are all priority but the proposition does intend that by the end of June 2014 all of those matters - and indeed any other matters that the Minister considered appropriate - would be included and the review completed. But there would be that flexibility to allow the Minister to conduct that work. As he says, if he wishes to split it into 2 parts I would be entirely content with that.

Deputy R.C. Duhamel:

In that case I think with those comments I am happy to accede to the Deputy and would support other Members to agree with that so we can curtail the discussions.

Pour: 23 (incl. Dep. Young and Duhamel)

Contre: 13

Abstentions: 7