

Jersey Draft Island Plan Examination in Public

Day 4 - Friday 24 September 2010, 10.00 to 11.30 am

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 4 participants (10.00 – 11.30 am session)

The Inspectors issued a list of questions on 29 July. Questions 1 to 9 on this aspect of the EiP were the subject to the Day 3 discussions. The first part of Day 4 rounds off with Questions 10, 11 and 12. It has not been possible to achieve a unifying theme for this one particular session. Participants should not feel the obliged to comment on each question and are thanked for their patience during discussions that might not be of central interest to them.

Question 10 Draft Proposal 12 concerns a Regeneration Zone for Jersey Airport, shown by an indicative boundary on the Proposals Map. Concerns have been raised about resulting uncertainty and possible loss of agricultural land. The Minister is now minded to amend the Plan to confirm that the Masterplan would be produced as Supplementary Planning Guidance, following consultations, and also amend the boundary to include only land administered by the Airport. Does this meet the concerns?

AJA may also wish to comment on whether the Zone would go any way to meeting concerns regarding a perceived lack of opportunities for business/employment development in the western parishes?

Question 11 is essentially an audit type check. Are the States' Education and Health Authorities satisfied with the provisions of Policies SCO1 and SCO2, and if not what changes would they like to see? Other Participants should of course also feel free to comment.

Question 12 is somewhat similar but with respect to Open Space, with additional and more specific concerns raised with respect to the new areas proposed along the coast at La Collette and in the vicinity of Fort Regent. With regard to the land at La Collette, is the concern respectively the possible effect of the Storage Depot on users of the Open Space and in turn the possible effect of users of the Open Space on the Ramsar site? Participants need to be aware of submissions made by TTS regarding La Collette 23 March 2010 and a subsequent plan for the area dated 23 August, the exact status of which needs to be clarified.