

**Jersey Draft Island Plan Examination in Public**

**Day 3 - Thursday 23 September 2010 (morning)**

**Historic Environment; Built Environment, Social, Community & Open Space**

*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 3 (am) participants**

The Inspectors issued a list of questions on 29 July. On this occasion they will not be issuing a further list of detailed questions but will work through the five questions in turn. It is expected that questions 1-3 will take up the bulk of the time (which is limited to half a day). The following commentary may help to focus the debate.

The Inspectors' 29 July notes said: *Compared with some other chapters there have been relatively limited responses to Draft Chapter 3, Historic Environment, and most are detailed points that can be responded to in writing by the States without benefiting from oral discussion. One issue warrants further discussion. Similarly there has not been a substantial amount of response to Draft Chapter 7, Social, Community & Open Space. The greater part of the discussion is therefore focused on Chapter 4, Built Environment. The subjects do, however, overlap, making linked sessions an appropriate forum.*

**Question 1** The AJA have suggested that Policy HE1 may be “overly restrictive in its policy towards old buildings” (para 7.1) and both the Chamber and the IoD make points referring to the need to review listed buildings policy (and the Chamber note that some are in a poor state of repair). Others support the policy as it stands. What specific changes, if any, need to be made to Policy HE1 or to other policies in this section of the Draft Plan to deal with this issue?

**Question 2** Many respondents have commented on the policies relating to St Helier. Some are concerned about the amount of development which the Draft Plan proposes for the town. There is a fair degree of support for the policies relating to tall buildings, and a more mixed but generally supportive response on the question of higher densities. But there is criticism that there is a lack of vision about the future of the town. The question of the future of the waterfront has also been raised; while the specifics of the Esplanade scheme are clearly relevant it is the longer term future of that area, and its implications for the town as a whole, which are of concern in the Island Plan context. In the light of all this, what changes if any should be made to Objectives BE1 and 2 or to other policies? (Participants should note that there will be a specific debate about retail policies as they affect St Helier later, and also that the North of Town Masterplan is not before the Inspectors, but is being prepared separately and will need to be “complementary to the draft plan”, as the States put it).

**Question 3** A number of policies in the Plan deal with the question of design: Policy SP7 is complemented by a number of general development control policies (notably GD7 and Proposal 2) and by some of the policies in the Built Environment section. The Minister “has and will publish supplementary planning guidance” (1.36) and indicates his wish to “give priority to the objective of promoting better design....” (see 1.40/41). Are the policies in the Draft Plan likely to achieve that objective? Or are they, as some suggest, too prescriptive? What changes, if any, need to be made to moderate or strengthen these policies?

**Question 4** A number of respondents have suggested, in respect of various parts of the Draft Plan, that insufficient attention has been paid to the needs of people with disabilities. Is this the case? Should there be a specific objective or policy to deal with this issue?

**Question 5** There are references to designing out crime and other public safety issues in the Draft Plan – for example in Policy GD7 (point 7) and in BE1 (point 11). The States of Jersey Police, however, suggest in their letter of 29 November 2009 that more is needed. What changes if any are needed to deal with this point?