

Jersey Draft Island Plan Examination in Public

**Day 7 - 29 September 2010 (from 3.00 pm)
Natural Resources & Utilities and Waste Management**

General notes for participants in all topic sessions

The Inspectors have been appointed to provide an independent review of the (Draft) Jersey Island Plan. After the EiP they will write a report to the Minister for Planning and Environment recommending, with reasons, which aspects of the Draft Plan should be retained and whether, and if so what, changes should be made. They will take into account all written submissions including the Minister's own proposed changes in response to consultations, published in a schedule dated 20 June (EiP library core document IP8). Participants should also look at the Minister's response to the Strategic Environmental Assessment dated 13 August which recommends changes to a number of policies throughout the Plan.

They have also selected key topics for debate. Participants for the debates have been selected to represent a range of views. The Inspectors are looking to them not simply to re-state their views (which they will have read) but to challenge or support the views of others. It will be helpful if there is a lively and constructive debate. The sessions will be held in an informal atmosphere, with no cross-examination. The Inspectors are conscious that some participants from organisations, or members of the public, may not have experience of these events; they are a relatively new phenomenon in Jersey. Those participants can be assured that they will not be put under pressure, but that the Inspectors are very keen to hear their views in order to get a rounded picture of the issues

However the Inspectors are also looking where possible for specific proposals as to recommendations they should make; in particular they would welcome debate on specific suggested changes to the policies in the draft plan. Some participants have already couched their representations in this way but others have not.

Generally the timetable for the EiP is tight. Participants should therefore seek to keep their comments succinct and not to repeat views already expressed (though they may wish to express support for the views of another participant).

Participants should if possible have read the representations from other participants in the session, and also the relevant written representations from other parties.

The Minister will be represented at all sessions by officers from his department who will normally be invited by the Inspectors to respond to the points raised. Other Ministers and officials will be participating in topics of particular interest to them (housing for example); however the Inspectors want to hear a wide range of views also from organisations and individual members of the public.

Specific comments for Day 7 participants

The Inspectors issued a list of questions on 29 July. The topics for this session and its continuation the following morning, share a technical underpinning, but in other regards span several disparate matters. Specialists have been invited for particular issues, with a more generalist group invited to contribute throughout. It is hoped that this will facilitate debate that is well informed and brings a range of different perspectives. This Note concerns questions 1 and 2 being considered on Day 7 of the EiP. A separate Note is being issued with respect to questions 3, 4 and 5 being considered the following morning.

Question 1 Concerns the important topic of future minerals supply, in particular those found on the island: sand, gravel and crushed rock aggregates. Very little by way of construction can take place without these materials; as the Draft Plan notes (paragraph 9.4) "...it is vital that a ready and adequate supply is always available, ..."

It seems clear that the States' strategy has moved since 2002 from one favouring local supply to one, in the Minerals Strategy, envisaging bulk importation and now, in the Draft Plan, a reversion towards local reliance. Is that a fair if doubtless over-brief summary of the evolution of approach?

The Draft Plan continues from paragraph 9.4 as far as 9.74, providing the supporting text to Draft Policy NR6. Elements of that text may be seen as subjective (references to environmental impacts for example) but a great deal is numerical or otherwise objective, factual information such as tonnages, dates and land areas. At the outset, does any participant have significant concerns regarding the accuracy of the factual information in these paragraphs?

Does anyone wish to contest local supply as the preferred approach?

Paragraphs 9.75 to 9.80 provide the supporting text to Draft Policy NR7 regarding Secondary and Recycled Materials/Alternative Aggregate Production. This section of the Plan is necessarily more discursive with little by way of hard data. However, does anyone wish to contest the approach taken, and if so in what way would they like to see it amended?

Taken together, will Draft Policies NR6 and NR7 meet the objectives of the Plan, in particular to ensure adequacy of supply?

The final section of Question 1 concerns the Simon Sand and Gravel site. It is important, of course, to stress that any future planning application would need to be considered at the time on its merits, and cannot be fettered by this EiP process. However, the policy context can be debated and influenced. In particular do paragraphs 9.81 to 9.86 and Draft Policy NR8 provide the right framework for this site or others?

Question 2 looks at solid waste. The waste hierarchy (Draft Plan Fig 10.1 illustrates) is a widely accepted approach which has not been flagged up for debate today. Even so, there remains the problem of irreducible residual waste at the bottom of the hierarchy, and how this should be disposed of.

Paragraphs 10.82 to 10.101 provide the context to Draft Policy WM8. Following a similar approach to that above, does anyone have serious reservations regarding the factual data, volumes, locations, dates etc, set out in those paragraphs. Paragraph 10.88 lists 4 potential disposal routes, quarry fill and restoration, further land reclamation, export and sea disposal. Reasons are given for rejecting the last two. Unless any participant wishes to suggest otherwise it will be assumed that only the first two options remain open for consideration.

Any future planning application would need to be considered on its merits, but do participants support the approach in Draft Policy WM8, which identifies La Gigoulande Quarry (Granite Products) as the preferred future site when capacity at La Collette is exhausted, with a presumption against other sites except where a proposal meets listed criteria. Do the respective durations of filling at La Collette and expected quarrying at La Gigoulande sufficiently coincide so as not to present a serious problem? Are the criteria for other potential sites supported? While noting the undertaking in paragraph 10.101 (that filling at Simon Sand and Gravel will not be permitted during the present Minister's tenure of office) the Inspectors would welcome participants views regarding that site, in particular having regard to any points previously made concerning the criteria based section of Policy WM8.

If export and sea disposal are both discounted the only alternative to land fill (including super-fill – ie land raising) is land reclamation. Paragraphs 10.102 to 10.110 provide the context leading to Draft Policy WM9. Although the text identifies benefits for land reclamation (including providing an alternative to green field land for development) on any reading the text and Draft Policy now see further reclamation as a last resort when other options have been found wanting. Do participants agree with this approach and with the analysis in the Plan that led to it?