

**Jersey Draft Island Plan Examination in Public****Day 2 - Wednesday 22 September 2010 (afternoon session)  
Natural Environment*****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 2 participants – pm**

The Inspectors issued a list of questions on 29 July. Those for the pm session subject to this note were numbered 5 and 6. It is expected that Question 5 will take up most of the time; Question 6, although important, raises fewer separate issues.

**Question 5:** Policy NE6 *Coastal National Park*. From the outset there has evidently been a high level of public support for the creation of a Coastal National Park. Does any participant wish to question in the broadest sense the creation of such a National Park?

It has been suggested that the ‘highest level of protection’ envisaged within the Policy could implicitly lead to less protection being afforded to the more general countryside: a two tier approach to the Island’s rural areas. Do participants agree? If so, should the Plan be modified and in what way?

The Policy includes the ‘strongest presumption against all forms of development [within the National Park] for whatever purpose’. Do the listed exceptions adequately recognise that there are existing dwellings, businesses and other, including tourism, activities within the National Park boundaries? Conversely could these exceptions provide a Trojan Horse for harmful development? In short is the Policy too restrictive, insufficiently protective or does it strike the right balance?

Suggestions have been made both to enlarge and reduce the designated area, which (paragraph 2.55) has its origins in protection afforded to St Ouen’s Bay as early as 1978 and has been informed by the Countryside Character Appraisal 1999. It would be impracticable today to seek to review precise detailed boundaries, but several Participants have raised suggestions as to how in broad terms the extent of the Park might be amended. Any recommendation to do so arising from this discussion would need to be considered by the Minister and, if accepted, then taken forward in detail by the States.

Mr Dubras, National Trust, Council for the Protection of Jersey Heritage have each suggested localities where the Park might be enlarged. Jersey Environmental Forum question the exclusion of the Ramsar site at St Clements, and Mr Morel questions why the edge stops at Mean High Water Springs. In broad terms, should the extent of the Park be enlarged?

Mr Troy conversely argues for reduction: he questions inclusion of river valleys extending inland and also residential/commercial areas such as Bouley Bay, Greve de Lecq and Five Mile Road. In broad terms is there a case for reducing the extent of the Park?

This leads then the question of management arrangements for the Park. The States have stressed that the Island Plan is a land use document; it is not a corporate or business plan. Others have argued that even so Proposal 5 leaves too much uncertainty regarding management arrangement for the Park. Should the Plan be modified in this regard and if so in how?

**Question 6:** The two boat owners associations represented here today have raised concerns that the Draft Plan Policy NE5, Marine Zone, makes inadequate provision for recreational boating facilities. Should the Policy be amended in this regard and if so what should it include?