

Jersey Draft Island Plan Examination in Public**Day 3 - 23 September 2010 (afternoon)****Historic Environment; Built Environment, Social, Community & Open Space (continued)***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 participants – pm

The Inspectors issued a list of questions on 29 July. Questions 1 to 5 on this aspect of the EiP were the subject to the Day 3 morning discussions. The afternoon continues with consideration of Questions 6 to 9. This note is intended to assist the debate.

Question 6 Some representations on the Draft Plan in essence suggest that it is unduly focussed on conservation to the detriment of regeneration and growth, others in essence the opposite. Is it in fact the right approach to seek a ‘balance’ between conservation and regeneration? Should the two be seen as complementary rather than in opposition? If there is a tension within the Plan, where does it lie and should it be amended? If so, in what way?

Question 7 Demolition. In some ways this topic is a sub set of the previous one. Is Draft Policy GD2 unduly onerous? Is it, as has been suggested, akin to Listing every building?

Question 8 Participants for Question 8 need to be aware of the States’ existing Supplementary Planning Guidance 13 *The Use of Planning Obligations* (EiP Library reference Core Document SD1) which is founded on Policies in the extant Island Plan. The document is not of itself subject to examination at the EiP. **Please note too that the scope of Question 8 in today’s discussion excludes the question of affordable housing provision, since this important topic is being very fully considered within the sessions on housing.**

Draft Policy GD4 sets out the scope for planning obligations associated with grants of planning permission. These have been criticised by some as too onerous. Should any amendment be made and if so what?

More specifically Draft Policy GD8 encourages but does not of itself mandate percentage contributions for public art associated with what are seen as appropriate developments. This is seen by some, and when taken with other possible planning obligations, as akin to a stealth tax on development. Others argue that, as well as bringing public benefits, public art can enhance development value. Where do participants stand on these issue? Should the same approach be taken in urban and rural areas?

If a percentage for public art is to be required, should the Plan do more to indicate how the work is chosen and commissioned? The developer funds the work, but should there be an expectation of public involvement in the choice, should the Plan say more about steering that choice towards local artwork/craftwork? Or should this be primarily a matter for the developer?

Question 9 concerns St Helier’s shopping centre. Draft Plan paragraph 4.37 – 4.42 set a useful context. Participants are urged to refresh their reading of this leading up to Draft Policy BE1. Similarly paragraphs 5.52 to 5.61 provide a useful introduction to Economics Policies ER1 and ER2 together with the associated Maps 5.1 and 5.2. The EiP will be discussing the town centre again tomorrow within the Economics session, while the Transport debate next week will include a discussion regarding the most appropriate locations for improved pedestrian facilities.

There is a close synergy between these topics. The built environment of the town centre - in the terms of paragraph 4.37, the mix, function and form of the buildings, and the design and use of the spaces between the buildings – is an essential component of a town centre’s economic vibrancy and vice versa. And improvements for pedestrians are an important component of the whole. Participants need not feel constrained to make artificial distinctions and may wish to range across any aspect so far as it bears on the town centre. It would be helpful though if today the greater focus is on the physical attributes of the centre, tomorrow somewhat more on the range and nature of the retailing and other businesses and next week on whether the identified locations for pedestrian improvements are in line with what are seen as the overall aims for the centre. .

The Draft Plan amends the defined town centre and core retail area from those in the 2002 Plan. Are these changes supported by participants, and if not in what ways might they be changed?

Are the development criteria, 1 to 5, in Policy BE1, read together with Policy ER2, the most appropriate to protect and promote the vitality of the town centre? Are the matters to be supported, 6 to 12, the most appropriate aims? If not, in what ways might the Policy be amended?