

From: Progofficer@aol.com  
To: dparker@pioneerps.co.uk  
CC: k.pilley@gov.je, P.Thorne@gov.je, r.buchholz@gov.je, m.stein@msplanning.co.uk, zstiles@pioneerps.co.uk  
Sent: 09/09/2010 09:12:16 GMT Daylight Time  
Subj: Re: Examination in Public - Statements CRM:00000070603357

David

Thank you for your email, which has been forwarded to the Inspectors.

The Inspectors have already indicated that they do not intend to suspend or postpone the EiP.

Regards

Helen

---

In a message dated 08/09/2010 12:31:14 GMT Daylight Time, dparker@pioneerps.co.uk writes:

Helen,

This is very disappointing and does not bode well for a transparent and robust Inquiry process; in that respect I note your final comment and must advise you it is precisely my intent to have a lengthy debate regarding the statistics that purport to justify the proposed policies. The absence of such a debate would imply that the Inspectors take the statistics at face value (which rather undermines the central purpose of the Inquiry) and as my evidence demonstrates that the figures should not be relied upon such an assumption would prejudice the Inquiry.

You will also note that appendices that you propose to disregard are referred to within the body of my document and it is my experience that Inspectors find it convenient to have such material appended so that all parties are aware of it – the alternative would require interested parties to source the material themselves which hardly saves Inquiry time.

Furthermore, regarding new submissions, I note that draft Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (“draft AHSPG”) dated August 2010 (albeit that the electronic document is identified within the document properties as having been created on the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2010) and associated Viability Model has now been included upon the draft Island Plan Review EiP Core Document list (Core Document references SD10 and SD11).

As you will recall from my previous letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2010, I am extremely concerned as to the hitherto unavailability of the Viability Model for comment, despite that it is specifically referred to within the Inspectors’ topic questions (for which the deadline for the submission of written statements has now passed).

It would appear that this unsound approach is now to be hugely compounded by the publication of a draft AHSPG within which are included a host of previously unsuspected policies (and wording which does not confirm with that included within the proposed draft Affordable Housing Policy H3).

This document has not been subject to any public consultation prior to this, its first airing in the public domain. A document such as this is of central importance, particularly given the intention of the States to introduce within the draft Island Plan an entirely new approach to affordable housing delivery alongside the existing planning system.

The two documents are clearly so deeply intertwined in terms of proposed Policy H3 it would be entirely inappropriate to allow the EiP of the draft Island Plan (and specifically the proposed Policy H3) to proceed without the AHSPG first having undergone the appropriate consultation processes.

As it stands, not only have interested parties / members of the public been unfairly deprived of the ability to comment upon the AHSPG as part of the SPG development process, but they have also been prevented from responding to the AHSPG in connection to the proposed introduction of the draft Island Plan policy upon which it purports to expand. The same is true of the associated Viability Model.

It has been brought to my attention (albeit not by yourself) that the Inspectors are prepared to accept 500 word submissions commenting specifically on the AHSPG, and that these must be submitted no later than the 13<sup>th</sup> of September 2010. This is despite my frequent requests for further information in respect of the Viability Model to be made available prior to the original submission date. As a session participant such as myself has not been formally made aware of the option of submitting a 500 response on the AHSPG by the 13<sup>th</sup> of September 2010, I am understandably greatly concerned that other interested parties and the public in general have similarly not been made aware of this opportunity. If this was the case it would be grossly unfair and inappropriate.

With regard to the extent of this proposed 500 word written statement I would also like to express my disappointment and grave concern. As I have already emphasised, the AHSPG is of central importance and it would be wholly inadequate to respond to its contents within a 500 word statement and within the ridiculously short timescales proposed. In addition, the Viability Model itself necessitates a detailed and prolonged examination of each of the assumptions included, and ideally, to have been publically consulted upon prior to the commencement of the EiP of the draft Island Plan.

The approach being taken by the States as a result of their desire to introduce Policy H3 come what may and regardless of any due process is autocratic, draconian, and potentially extremely damaging - not only in terms of overall housing delivery, but also in terms of the perceived accountability and transparency of the planning system itself.

In summary, I request that this aspect of the EiP is either suspended to allow a full and proper consultation process to be undertaken with regard to the AHSPG and the accompanying Viability Model, and / or an opportunity is provided, within appropriate and reasonable timescales, to make full representations in response to the AHSPG / Viability Model to the EiP Inspectors.

Regards,

**David Parker**  
Managing Director



**t:** 0844 979 8001

**f:** 0844 979 8030

**m:** 07788 140240

**e:** dparker@pioneerps.co.uk

Pioneer Property Ltd. Registered in England No: 3800761

---

**From:** Progofficer@aol.com [mailto:Progofficer@aol.com]

**Sent:** 08 September 2010 12:02

**To:** David Parker

**Cc:** k.pilley@gov.je; P.Thorne@gov.je; r.buchholz@gov.je; m.stein@msplanning.co.uk

**Subject:** Examination in Public - Statements

David

The Inspectors have received your statements on the housing topics which are to be discussed at the EiP and note with regret that these exceed the word limits which were set by a very large margin. The word limits were set for two reasons. The first was to keep the amount of material within manageable proportions – not just for the Inspectors but for all the parties. The second was to produce an element of fairness – so that all parties had the same opportunities to make their points.

The Inspectors intend to disregard all the material in appendices 2 and 3. Should there be specific points of critical importance in those appendices the Inspectors will accept a statement of not more than 100 words which identifies those points (but not introducing any new material). This should be available within a week – ie by 15 September.

Appendix 1 seems to be a detailed 8–page response to Appendix B to the Housing Written Statement (which itself is only 1 page long) and it includes an alternative assessment of affordable housing need.

The Inspectors will reluctantly consider this, but have asked the States whether they can provide a brief response to it in advance of the EiP, in order to avoid lengthy debate about the statistics at the EiP.

Regards

Helen Wilson