



PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

Draft Island Plan – White Paper

**Built Environment**

Minister's Response to consultation

27<sup>th</sup> May 2010

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
<b>Built Environment</b>											
DP742		Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	4	Built Environment	Supporting	Proposals 1-14 & Policies BE1-BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP744		Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	4	Built Environment	Objecting	The AJA restates our comments in paras. 6.5 to 6.8 inclusive. We are extremely concerned the 2009 Draft Plan does not make provision for the Island's built requirements.		Reject	It is considered that the draft Plan makes adequate provision for the Island's development needs over the next 10 years, and specifically makes provision for the Island's housing needs	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already adequately addressed
DP299		Mrs Penelope Lee			BE: Introduction	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP519		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects		BE: Introduction	Neither	Although the 2009 Draft Plan stipulates minimum densities will have to be achieved within the Built-Up Area there is no indication of what standards will be required. Without any guidance we therefore cannot understand how the forecast for housing yield has been calculated.	Intensifying density in the Built-Up Area will necessitate further guidance about what does not constitute over-looking, or over-bearing development and standards for rights of light, without which the implementation of the Plan's principal thrust will be thrown into doubt.	Noted	Proposal 10, Policy GD3 and the supporting justification, at 1.17, together with Appendix A, all seek to indicate the Minister's intent to develop and publish guidance about the adoption and application of minimum density standards.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as this issue is already adequately addressed.
DP561		Deputy John Le Fondre			BE: Introduction	Supporting	Built Environment - higher and more land-efficient densities - I fully support the application of higher densities in urban sites. Using St Helier as a prime example (but not the only place where higher building could be permitted), it would seem to me that as St Helier sits in a valley, it is well placed to bear taller buildings. This with the caveat of good design, better internal spatial standards, appropriate (and realistic) parking standards and good amenity space. If this can be achieved then living in St Helier will be an attractive proposition, and that can only be good for this Island.		Noted	Support for an increase in density on urban sites noted. Policies GD3 and BE5 seek to deal with the development and application of minimum density standards and proposals for the development of tall buildings respectively	Support is noted by the Minister
DP919		mr daniel wimberley			BE: Introduction	Objecting		THE URBAN AREAS Many fine words!! e.g. 4.4 focussing development - no mention of quality of life. Plus 4.8. Disappointing and underperforming . . . We develop every last site in town for housing, the Sunshine Hotel, the old Tantivy site at Georgetown, trees, somewhere to sit out in the sunshine, somewhere for the children to play? You've got to be joking? Why does it matter to a country deputy? Because I cannot in conscience vote for packing more people into St. Helier at higher densities, however well-designed those densities are, unless there is an absolute commitment to spending the necessary care,	Reject	The draft Plan makes it clear that the urban focus of the Spatial Strategy must be balanced with the need to ensure that the existing and future residents of the Island's Built-up Area have access to a high quality environment which includes an appropriate level of amenities and facilities. This is clearly set out in the Plan and is explicitly referenced in the Objectives for the Built Environment at BE1, as	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already addressed

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								effort and money to ensure that living in town is every bit as desirable, albeit in a different way, as living in the country. That is the only morally and politically acceptable ways forward. The MTP is essential in this regard. (So is Fort Regent . . ) Not an option. I notice it is seen 4.14 as a development site in one paragraph. REC that this reference be removed.		well as throughout the supporting justification and the whole of this section of the Plan. Reference to the Town Park site is misconstrued - it is a development opportunity in the sense that it is proposed to developed as park which, of itself, has the potential to serve as a catalyst for regeneration in this part of the town.	
DP929		mr daniel wimberley			BE: Introduction	Neither	4.2 RED Houses is an urban area!		Noted	Red Houses is already identified as an urban area: it is defined as a secondary urban settlement in the hierarchy of settlement types in Jersey, as shown on Map 2.2.	Noted by the Minister
DP993		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		BE: Introduction	Objecting	section 4.5: Amend words 'St Heller's harbours' to 'Jersey Harbours	Reference to the Trading Operation and consistency with Jersey Airport	Reject	It is not a reference to a Trading Operation but a reference to the spatial entity of the harbours in St Helier.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP300		Mrs Penelope Lee			BE: Objectives and Indicators	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP994		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		BE: Objectives and Indicators	Objecting	Section 4.14: Amend words 'St Helier's harbours' to 'Jersey Harbours ; Make reference to the Port Operational Area	Reference to the Trading Operation and consistency with Jersey Airport	Reject	Reference here is to the spatial entity of the harbours of St Helier and not the portfolio of the States of Jersey Harbours trading operation. The spatial extent of these areas will be defined through Proposal 11.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1037		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Objective BE 1	Built Environment Objectives	Objecting	The redevelopment and regeneration of the town needs to cover all parts of the town and not just fragmented parts. The theme of creating a sustainable living environment must be at the heart of any scheme. The Built Environment must connect with both domestic and global imperatives in terms of the environment and emissions together with demands on natural resources and the generation of waste. The quality of buildings and their energy and environmental impact must start forming part of the States strategic thinking and direction. Proposal 9 - it is important to engage fully with all key stakeholders to ensure that the community fully accepts the strategic aims and objectives thus helping to keep each area special to those who presently and in the future live or work in and visit the town. Environment and Sustainability should form part of the policy objective statement.		Noted	Objective BE1 relates to the whole of the built environment and not just parts of St Helier Objective BE1 is clear and explicit about creating a sustainable built environment as a place to live, work and visit Environment and Sustainability are integral to the Strategic Policies of the draft Plan out of which these specific objectives (such as BE1) emerge.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as these issues are adequately addressed
DP301		Mrs Penelope Lee		Objective BE 1	Built Environment	Supporting	Much of St Helier has been allowed to become a squalid slum.	Some of the potentially attractive old houses should be restored into family homes from their current neglected state of bedsits. Housing should	Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
					Objectives			introduce a licensing system to ensure these properties are upgraded.			
DP88		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective BE 1	Built Environment Objectives	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1172		Mrs. Celia Scott Warren		Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Supporting	believe there is merit in making interconnecting vibrant neighbourhoods within St. Helier districts, to enhance the sense of community.	I accept that most new homes should be built in the St. Helier area, with some additional village housing in northern parishes where it is supported by parishioners. I feel that creating interconnecting vibrant neighbourhoods in St. Helier would improve town-living for residents, for the reason stated above.	Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the qualified support for these objectives
DP302		Mrs Penelope Lee		Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP465		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Objecting	The Trust is concerned to see the use of the term showcase for the town's heritage features.	The heritage features of St Helier are its historic character, scale, grain and spatial quality and it is essential that the design-led high quality built environment should seek to build upon, enhance and be compatible with these elements and not simply highlight St Helier's flagship heritage sites.	Minded to accept	It is clear, from other parts of the draft Plan, specifically the Historic Environment chapter, that the Minister is seeking to adopt a holistic approach to the protection, maintenance, enhancement and promotion of the Island's historic environment. It is acknowledged that this objective is inconsistent with this approach highlighting as it does, specific heritage features, rather than the contribution that the historic development of the built environment makes, in its entirety, to the character and sense of place in the built environment.	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to delete the word 'features' from Objective BE2
DP466		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Objecting	The Trust is uncertain as to the reasoning behind the stated objective of a space for a special building which celebrates 21 st Century Jersey. Indeed it is to be hoped that the Waterfront as a whole will finally be designed and constructed in a cohesive manner, which fully reflects and celebrates the aspirations and needs of Jersey's community. Unfortunately to date the Waterfront has suffered piece meal development due to a lack of strategic vision, investment, transparency and public engagement/ accountability.	It is crucial that these issues are addressed as part of the planning objectives for the area, so that a real sense of community ownership/benefit is re-established and a balance achieved between private and public sector led development.	Reject	The St Helier Waterfront provides an opportunity for the development of architecture and new buildings which can contribute towards the current and future identify of the Island, expressed through its built form. This need not be achieved at the expense of, or without reference and integration with its context.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP493		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Objecting	We are disappointed the 2009 Draft Plan continues the prescriptive Planning approach, focussing on what we cannot do with our Built and Natural Environment. It is very negative in setting out what we cannot do and there is little about what we can achieve. What is the vision for the Coastal National Park ? Where is the vision for St Helier, which is no		Reject	The Vision for St Helier is set out within the objectives for the regeneration of the Town at BE2. Further detail will follow in relation to the development of master plans for specific areas of the town, as set out at Proposal	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							longer seen as a town but a regional Capital. Maxing out density and scale of St Helier to provide all our built needs will result in significantly changing its scale and character.			11, and be complemented by other proposals, such as that for the Public Realm Strategy, which affect the whole of the town. It is the nature of planning policy frameworks, given the role that they play in providing a basis upon which to make planning decisions, that they are regulatory in nature. The development of area-based master plans and development briefs for key sites will provide more positive guidance relative to the development opportunities and potential for different parts of the town, as evidenced by the North of Town Masterplan.	
DP821		Mrs Susan Kerley		Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Objecting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the objection in relation to this objective which relates to that made by NTfJ
DP846		Mr Rod Mcloughlin		Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Neither	In relation to the redevelopment of Fort Regent, there are a number of important cultural imperatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Ensure that the redevelopment is undertaken consistent with the Gibb conservation statement.</li> <li>o Ensure that any redevelopment recognises that the Fort currently provides the only performance space capable of accommodating orchestral concerts and popular events requiring a seating capacity in excess of the 625 provided by the Jersey Opera House.</li> <li>o Take advantage of the opportunity to improve interpretation of the historic site and access to areas affording views of the surrounding areas.</li> <li>o Take account of the potential (identified in the Public Art Strategy) for public art. Another key site identified for public art which appears on list of St Helier sites for regeneration is the Town Park.</li> </ul>		Noted	Noted	Noted by the Minister
DP89		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective BE 2	Regeneration of St. Helier Objectives	Supporting	Support with caveat I would like to see BE2 include an emphasis on supplying family-sized accommodation in the regenerated St Helier, i.e. 3 bedroom apartments. As offices are moved towards the Waterfront, I think developers should be encouraged to convert that previous office space into light and airy family-sized apartments.		Noted	The objective clearly states the desire to create attractive residential areas and implicit within this is the assumption that to be attractive they must cater for the Island's housing needs. The delivery of this objective is covered in more specific detail by Policy HE4:Housing mix, which seeks to provide the Minister with an ability to influence the	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already adequately dealt with



Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										type of residential accommodation provided by making this issue a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The addition of a specific accommodation type into a series of objectives also may become dated as supply and demand changes over the Plan period.	
DP261		Mr Mike Waddington			Regenerating St Helier	Objecting	No Vision for St Helier Having decided that new residential developments must be concentrated in St Helier, the Draft Island Plan does little to inspire us, eg: a. what is the Vision for St Helier's future? But where are the masterplans to describe this? C. those masterplans that have been prepared are either stalled or not joined-up with each other- why not, and when will this be resolved? d. We seem not to be learning from the studies already commissioned or the buildings completed- do they work? If so how well? Can we do better? E. where is the Town model? F. why doesn't it promote the idea of attractive urban living? My Vision for "Polycentric St Helier" St Helier must become a sustainable and polycentric, compact city. "Polycentric St Helier" simply means: a. it is divided into distinct neighbourhoods b. each would be 5 minutes walk (1/4 mile) in size in any direction (pedshed) c. each would have a name and a unique sense of place. each would have a park, public square or civic space e. each would be connected by pedestrian and cycle links f. each would have a good mix of uses, shops, offices, affordable and open market homes etc. g. car share schemes, free parking for electric vehicles, residents parking and so on would be provided h. free bicycle share schemes would be provided- like Velib in Paris i. new homes would be spacious, and volumetric j. good design would add value k. the best of our architectural heritage would be celebrated l. local business as well as the States would sponsor the neighbourhoods m. people would identify with their neighbourhoods and take ownership of them n. in this way we could, once again, rediscover our collective pride in St Helier		Reject	The vision for St Helier is set out in 4.17 and has been informed by a number of strategic pieces of work leading up to the publication of the Draft Plan, including Willie Miller's St Helier Urban Character Appraisal; the St Helier Development and Regeneration Strategy (EDAW); and a number of pieces of work related to the development of the St Helier Waterfront (Hopkins and Shepley). It is acknowledged that further work is required to provide specific, more detailed, policies and proposals underneath this overarching vision for the town and this will be achieved by a number of work streams identified in the draft Plan as set out at Proposal 8; St Helier Conservation Areas; Proposals 9: Public realm Strategy; and, perhaps most significantly; Proposals 11: St Helier Regeneration Zones. All of this work will seek to build on, and enhance the local identity and character of these areas, seeking to enhance the quality of the local infrastructure, facilities and amenities of these specific areas, reflecting the conceptual view set out in the representation made. Such work will also need to be complemented, in particular, by the Sustainable Transport Policy, to address issues of accessibility, movement and traffic management.	The Minister notes the conceptual approach proposed but is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP303		Mrs			Regenerating St Helier	Supporting	St Helier needs a great deal of work to improve a		Noted	The draft Plan acknowledges that	Noted by the

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Penelope Lee			ing St Helier		neglected environment.			there needs to be considerable attention, effort and resources directed to St Helier in particular to realise its regeneration and potential, as set out in the draft Plan	Minister
DP922		mr daniel wimberley			Regenerating St Helier	Objecting	REC a real commitment to the resources, care and effort needed for the regeneration of the town area needs to be in the Plan.		Noted	The specific attention given to the urban focus of the Spatial Strategy and the implications of this for St Helier in particular is considered to be explicit in the draft Plan.	The Minister notes and endorses the comments made but is not minded to amend the draft Plan as these are already addressed
DP467		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey		Protecting and Enhancing the Town Environment	Supporting	The Trust fully endorses and very much welcomes the acknowledgement of the economical and cultural value of St Helier's historic environment and hopes that the designation of St Helier's conservation areas will be seen as a key priority.		Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the qualified support for this part of the draft Plan
DP932		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society		Protecting and Enhancing the Town Environment	Neither	Built environment: It is important to devote resources to ensuring that the urban areas in particular are improved through regeneration whilst at the same time protecting streetscapes and facades of interest in order that St Helier does not develop into a copy of any regional UK town.		Noted	The townscape interest of St Helier will be assessed and appropriately protected as part of the work to define and designate conservation areas, as set out at Proposal 7 and 8.	The Minister notes the comments made but is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already adequately addressed
DP1005		Mr John Mesch	Council for the Protection of Jersey's Heritage	Proposal 8	St Helier Conservation Areas	Supporting	7. We strongly support the proposal to designate Conservation Areas, especially in St. Helier (Proposal 8) and wish to see it expressed as firm Policy. This would enable conservation areas to be designated as and when required, without the need to update the plan again.		Noted	Proposals 7 and 8 clearly set out the Minister's intent to designate Conservation Areas during the Plan period, starting with St Helier, as indicated by Proposal 8.	Support is noted by the Minister
DP304		Mrs Penelope Lee		Proposal 8	St Helier Conservation Areas	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP516		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 8	St Helier Conservation Areas	Supporting	We welcome the Policies to introduce Conservation Areas, providing Proposal 7 is rewritten to make it clear they will be specific area with single identifiable unique character. Also include same comment for Proposal 8, St Helier Conservation Areas. We have heard suggestions the whole of St Helier may be designated a Conservation Area, within which there will be areas of 'indeterminate' and 'poor' conservation character. Please can we have these sections re-written to avoid risk of such absolute nonsense arriving at a later date.		Noted	Conservation Areas will be designated during the Plan period. Work is ongoing, in parallel with the review of the island Plan, to develop proposals for St Helier. These proposals will be published and consulted upon separately, with any designation being adopted and issued through supplementary planning guidance.	The Minister notes the qualified support for this proposal
DP90		Mr		Proposal	St Helier	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Stephen de Gruchy		8	Conservation Areas						by the Minister
DP921		Mr Daniel Wimberley			Improving the Public Realm	Objecting	Streets form 80% of open space in the urban areas. Can we have a policy about these spaces? Or a much clearer commitment to making this important area of land work for all the community, bearing in mind especially the needs of children?		Noted	The draft Plan explicitly acknowledges that streets are an important and integral element of the public realm (see para 4.33). It is considered that the commitment is clearly shown to ensure that the quality of the public realm in St Helier is protected and enhanced.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already adequately addressed
DP305		Mrs Penelope Lee		Proposal 9	Public Realm Strategy	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP403	Mrs Stephanie Steedman	Mrs Stephanie Steedman		Proposal 9	Public Realm Strategy	Supporting	The public realm strategy for St Helier needs to include an holistic approach and think creatively. Connections and routes are important, as is making the most of every ounce of public open space. There are some under utilised spaces in the town, which do not fall easily into the definition of open space, but could be important parts of any strategy. The Town Market is an under utilised resource and is suffering from changes in consumer behaviour. Could leisure activities be developed in the Market alongside existing uses? It is a publicly administered space; could it provide more facilities for town residents? The Odeon currently provides a large space. Could this be used for a leisure related activity? Any strategy should give consideration to areas on the edges of the town for leisure related purposes, for example, allotments. These locations would be within walking distance of the town.	The strategy proposes to increase the population of the town - the strategy needs to provide people with spaces for leisure related activities.	Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP468		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Proposal 9	Public Realm Strategy	Supporting	The Trust welcomes the public realm strategy and would simply add that the town's public spaces would benefit from a cohesive design policy/guidelines in relation to public street furniture, lighting, and use of materials as per Policy BE9.		Noted	There is potential for policy/guidelines in relation to public street furniture, lighting, and use of materials to be an integral element of or to subsequently be developed as a element of the proposed public realm strategy	Support is noted by the Minister
DP528		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 9	Public Realm Strategy	Supporting	Proposals 1-14 & Policies BE1-BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP822		Mrs Susan Kerley		Proposal 9	Public Realm Strategy	Supporting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP848		Mr Rod Mcloughl		Proposal 9	Public Realm	Supporting	The commissioning of public realm and open space strategies is welcomed from the cultural perspective;		Noted	Any public realm strategy would seek to ensure consistency and	Support is noted by the Minister



Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		in			Strategy		both should link effectively with the Public Art Strategy commissioned by ESC's Public Art Advisory Group in 2009 . The opportunity to engage with stakeholder organisations like the Public Art Advisory Group, the Jersey Arts Trust and the Jersey Heritage Trust in the production of such strategies is encouraged. In particular, the Public Realm Strategy could profitably address inter-agency collaborative working to address small-scale aesthetic aspects of the public realm and its management, a responsibility which appears to fall between agencies at present.			complementarily to the Public Art Strategy commissioned by ESC's Public Art Advisory Group in 2009. It would also seek to address the issues of the management and maintenance of the public realm through engagement with those key agencies and stakeholders involved in this important, but often overlooked, aspect.	
DP91		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 9	Public Realm Strategy	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP562		Deputy John Le Fondre			Town Centre Vitality	Supporting	Core Retail Area - the Town proposals map identifies the core retail area in pink. As noted before I strongly believe that we need to support the key retail centre of St Helier, particularly the Central (and fish) markets and surrounding areas. I have already expressed my concerns over the level of retail offering being generated on the Esplanade Quarter (and potentially elsewhere on the Waterfront), however I note that the Esplanade Quarter (etc) is not shaded in pink to encompass the core retail area, and I again express my concern over the level of retail offering on that specific site, particularly when it is not to be regarded as a core part of the retail offering of St Helier. By foot it is not far from King Street / Broad Street, and I think every effort should be made to encourage workers on that site to shop on the high street rather than at some new store immediately underneath them. Yes, a limited number of facilities will be required on site, but not to the level presently envisaged particularly in these present economic times.		Noted	Policy SP3 will seek to ensure that major new retail development is firstly directed to the Core Retail Area of the town, and Policy BE1 seeks to ensure that the vitality of the core retail area, as defined on the proposals map, is protected. Policy BE2; existing consents (for Liberty Wharf) and ER2-ER8 facility the provision of other retail uses within St Helier Town Centre and the Built-up Area, in accord with the sequential test and where they are appropriate in scale.	The Minister notes the qualified support for this section of the draft Plan
DP306		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 1	Town Centre Vitality	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP405	Mrs Stephanie Steedman	Mrs Stephanie Steedman		Policy BE 1	Town Centre Vitality	Neither	The dynamics of the town are changing as a result of the development of the Waterfront and the relocation of offices to the Esplanade area. In conjunction with this retailers are under facing increased competition from internet retailers and the accessibility of off-island goods. There has also been a decrease in the number of visitors to support local retailers. Combined with this, out of town retailers have capitalised on the preference for shoppers to park close to retail outlets. St Helier needs to address all of these issues and more if it wants to remain competitive. The land use strategy provides the decision making framework about land uses to	Without visitors, the catchment area for St Helier is finite. If you want to keep St Helier vital, user numbers need to be increased. Planning policies are just one part of the strategy for achieving this.	Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the comments made in relation to this issue

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							support the vitality of St Helier; however, the issues affecting the town need to be addressed holistically. Should the States be investing in technology to promote the town? For example a town/ retailers web-site telling people what's on, what's in stock, what does it cost etc?? Revitalising the Market. Supporting and promoting tourism.....are just a few suggestions.				
DP536		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Policy BE 1	Town Centre Vitality	Supporting	Proposals 1-14 & Policies BE1-BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP688		Mr Andrew Fleet	Style Group Ltd	Policy BE 1	Town Centre Vitality	Objecting	Policy BE1 supported by Objective BE1 contradicts Policy E1 , where the former encourages new development on previously developed sites, which in the main are likely to be the former employment sites and then Policy E1 seeks to protect all employment sites.		Reject	There is not considered to be any contradiction: the combination of the application of Policy E1 and BE1 should seek to ensure that development in the Town Centre is related firstly, to employment activity; and , secondly, to retail use.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP847		Mr Rod Mcloughlin		Policy BE 1	Town Centre Vitality	Neither	Paragraph 4.22 draws attention to the importance of a vibrant town. One aspect of such vibrancy concerns the impact of the creative industries and, in particular, artists whose skills can act as a magnet for visitors. The Cultural Strategy identifies the importance of providing studio space for artists. This can be provided on a temporary basis in circumstances where properties awaiting redevelopment fall vacant prior to the start of the redevelopment or where they fall vacant. The economic conditions noted at pp. 182-3 may result, for instance, in some office accommodation providing suitable space. There may be an opportunity for the Planning Department to encourage use of temporary space for artists during such periods and consideration might be given to incorporating this into Policy BE1.		Noted	It is considered that Policy ER5 would enable the use of premises by artists within the defined Town Centre, whether for permanent or temporary use.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issue is already addressed
DP92		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 1	Town Centre Vitality	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1039		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy BE 2	Delivery of the St Helier Waterfront	Supporting	The policy is agreed but with reservations. The longer the delay in commencing the works, the more the supplementary planning guidance (April 2006) and the Masterplan (April 2008) will become outdated. The change in finance availability and markets means that large capital sums to fund the "up front" costs are not available and finding a Developer for the site will be difficult , if not impossible for a considerable period. By the time a Developer is found the		Qualified support noted	Whilst changed economic circumstances are recognised, Jersey's economic performance remains heavily dependent upon the financial services sector and, as a consequence, the draft Plan seeks to respond to the requirements for new office accommodation: the St Helier	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan.

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							requirements for the buildings may well have changed and indeed so may the need for large car parks. The draft plan should recognise that a further review will be required before commencing the project.			Waterfront remains critical in this respect and the planning framework set out by Policy BE2 facilitates this provision. Policy BE2 does not preclude the revision of the planning framework in the future, as the need arises. This can be dealt with as supplementary planning guidance, and adopted and published by the Minister for Planning and Environment.	
DP307		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 2	Delivery of the St Helier Waterfront	Objecting	The Esplanade Quarter will be a financial disaster for the Island.	Given the world economic situation this development should be shelved.	Reject	The Esplanade Quarter development is required to provide new office accommodation: ensuring the provision of sufficient modern office space to meet the requirements of the financial services industry is a key aim of the Plan.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP538		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Policy BE 2	Delivery of the St Helier Waterfront	Supporting	Proposals 1-14 & Policies BE1-BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP679		Mrs Sue Lissenden		Policy BE 2	Delivery of the St Helier Waterfront	Objecting	The Waterfront development began badly and has gone on in a disastrous way. It remains a disgrace, in spite of all strategies, policies, guideline, and objectives. Get a grip!		Noted	The planning framework set out in the draft Plan seeks to provide for a higher quality and integrated implementation of future development on the St Helier Waterfront	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP920		mr daniel wimberley		Policy BE 2	Delivery of the St Helier Waterfront	Objecting	Open Space: There should be a commitment to a standard in the Plan, not left until later. And it should be a criterion in BE2		Noted	The planning framework for the St Helier Waterfront provides for the creation of a high quality public realm with the creation of a number of public squares and other public spaces.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP93		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 2	Delivery of the St Helier Waterfront	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP308		Mrs Penelope Lee			Managing Change	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP563		Deputy John Le Fondre			Managing Change	Supporting	Ref para 4:58 SoJDC - I believe I have a reasonable understanding of the proposals in relation to SoJDC - effectively it is segregation of duties between designing a package for development (to be the role of the Regeneration Steering Group - effectively the		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							Public etc), and implementation / delivery of that package, with the latter role to be performed by the revamped WEB (ie SoJDC). Therefore I believe these principles (subject to the detail) should be fully endorsed.				
DP564		Deputy John Le Fondre			Residential Regeneration	Supporting	Yield from Town - if height could be increased for residential development (subject to good design, internal spatial standards, good amenity space), I believe that yields could be encouraged upwards, and I think this particular nettle needs to be grasped.		Noted	The need to increase the density of development, and to make the most efficient and effective use of land, is a strategic principle of the draft Plan, as set out at SP2, and supported by GD3. The policy context for dealing with proposals for tall buildings is set out at BE5.	Noted by the Minister
DP565		Deputy John Le Fondre			Residential Regeneration	Supporting	Ref para 4:67 Amenity Space - agreed Ref para 4:69 Internal Spatial Standards - agreed - I would potentially suggest that a further 10% increase (subject to evaluation of the financial impact) should be considered. Some developers always build to a minimum, therefore that minimum should be constantly reviewed. If apartment style living is to be encouraged, internal space and good design is critical.		Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the support for these parts of the draft Plan
DP309		Mrs Penelope Lee		Table 4.1		Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP310		Mrs Penelope Lee		Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP529		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Supporting	Proposals 1-14 & Policies BE1-BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP718		Mr Kenneth Renouard		Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Neither	Higher density development in town may in turn lead to greater social problems, an issue that has already been highlighted in Jersey. Redevelopment in St Helier should include an emphasis on communal space and open areas. These areas could be for the enjoyment and use of residents, commuters and visitors alike. The quality of the environment we live will influence whether we experience more or less social problems in the future.		Noted	It is acknowledged that there is a requirement to ensure the new guidance seeks to ensure the provision of minimum standards that provide for a good quality living environment for town residents. It is also acknowledged elsewhere in the draft Plan, at SCO4, SCO5, SCO6 and Proposal 9 and 17, that there is a need to ensure that community facilities and infrastructure, particularly open space, is protected and enhanced.	Noted by the Minister
DP741		Paul	The	Proposal	Guidelines	Objecting	9.1 Although the 2009 Draft Plan stipulates minimum		Noted	Estimated yields for the capacity	The Minister is

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Harding	Association of Jersey Architects	10	for Residential Regeneration		densities will have to be achieved within the Built-Up Area there is no indication of what standards will be required. Without any guidance we therefore cannot understand how the forecast for housing yield has been calculated. Intensifying density in the Built-Up Area will necessitate further guidance about what does not constitute over-looking, or over-bearing development and standards for rights of light, without which the implementation of the Plan's principal thrust will be thrown into doubt.			of the Town of St Helier to accommodate new residential development are set out in table 4.1. The methodology underpinning this work will be set out in a report on this particular aspect of the Plan. Proposal 1 and Policy GD3 identify and acknowledge the need and intent to publish supplementary planning guidance related to density standards.	not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues identified are addressed
DP873		Mr Stephen D Smith	Health Protection Services	Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Neither	Housing densities are an emotive issue and care is needed to ensure suitable and sufficient properties of the correct mix of accommodation are provided for those living in Jersey particularly as there is a proposal for majority development in town areas. Proposed high-density developments have been unpopular with local residents in other jurisdictions because of the problems they can cause i.e. noise and anti social behaviour, lack of green space and unsuitability for families, high maintenance and repair costs. Innovative architecture and design is needed that offers a sense of space and light within the homes whilst minimising high rise schemes. In all new developments there needs to be provision of suitable communal green space.		Noted	The Proposal explicitly acknowledges that care is needed to ensure that, by increasing the density of development, social issues do not arise as a consequence of the standard and design of the properties provided. Accordingly, it is acknowledged that the Minister will prepare and issue supplementary planning guidance setting out minimum standards for internal and external space, including amenity space. Other parts of the Plan seek to protect and promote communal open space provision and enhancement.	Noted by the Minister
DP883		Mr Andrew Heaven	Health Improvement (Public Health Department)	Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Neither	In order to ensure health improvement is actively included within the planning process, supplementary planning guidance for health improvement should be developed with the Public Health Department to support the following areas: Ensure planning requirements for the development of housing is consistent with existing health policy (to promote exercise and mental health) and the practice of trading off public and private amenity space does not result in an environment that discourages exercise or demotes mental health. We need good quality housing that is spacious enough for multiple occupancy, provision of safe play areas for children and provide secure bike parking facilities for adults and children.		Noted	The department is happy to engage with the Public Health Department in the development of supplementary planning guidance	The Minister notes the comments made and will act on them accordingly
DP933		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Supporting	Development density: There has to be a more imaginative approach to housing stock, for example consideration should also be given to encouraging multi generational living by ensuring that new build houses have a capacity for 'dower' type extensions to be added, or are retained within those properties that have them This would serve to assist with the care of the elderly, provide 'down sizing options' ,		Noted	This may be consistent with the proposal to increase the density of development and could be considered relative to Policy GD3. This issue is dealt with, where it relates to extensions to existing residential accommodation in the Green Zone, at NE7(e).	The Minister notes the qualified support for this policy



Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							provide young working families with greater family support and increase efficiency of capital in the housing stock.				
DP94		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 10	Guidelines for Residential Regeneration	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP634		Richard Plaster	Jersey Electricity plc		Regeneration Zones	Supporting		We note proposals to relocate the fuel farm and gas farm from its current location. We would support any movement of these hazardous installations away from our La Collette Power Station and the associated distribution infrastructure, because we continue to be concerned that an incident at either of the fuel farm or gas farm could have serious consequences on the services we provide, ongoing electricity supply and the safety and security our staff.	Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the support for the proposals outlined for La Collette and the Port
DP985		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		Regeneration Zones	Objecting	Section 4.72: Make reference to Port Operational Area and the need to protect the working of the port during any development. Possibly combine the two Regeneration Zones into one 'Jersey Harbours Regeneration Zone' which could be sub-divided into the two current proposed regeneration Zones'. Similar to Proposal 12: Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone. Section 4.75 : Reference to the Trading Operation and existing agreed Port Masterplan. Significant factual inaccuracies within current wording.	The Minister for Economic Development and Harbour Master must be consulted before any 'area-based Masterplans, development briefs, design frameworks or design codes' are adopted for the two Regeneration Zones within the Port Operational Area in order to confirm that the port is not adversely impacted by development. This is in line with the requirements of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002. The two zones impact both the commercial port and existing marinas, other areas of the port are not included within either Zone, and a co-ordinated approach is required for the whole area. Consultation with the Jersey Port Users Association, Jersey Marine Traders Federation, St Helier Boat Owners Association and other stakeholder groups must be included in any regeneration plans. The two Regeneration Zones which overlap with the Port Operational Area should be developed in very close consultation with Jersey Harbours to ensure the port regeneration is not impacted by their development, I believe that the Island Plan should represent Jersey Harbours in a similar way to Jersey Airport, with more clarity and focus around the primacy of a Port Operational Area. Currently there is notable policy inconsistency between the two Trading operations, and it would seem logical to take a similar approach to both 'ports'. Whilst designated as a regeneration zone, until an alternative Port operational area is designated, fit for purpose and operational (for e.g. LoLo Operations at to move to La Collette), it is	Reject	There are a number of key issues emerging from this representation: The need for consultation with stakeholders: Proposal 11 makes it explicitly clear that any guidance will be developed in consultation with key stakeholders; Co-ordinated approach for St Helier harbours: the Old Harbours and La Collette and the Port are shown as separate zones, because they are different in character and function. It is, however, acknowledged that there is a degree of inter-dependence between them. Clearly, the development of master plans for both, on the basis that it involved consultation with stakeholders, would identify the relevant issues of inter-dependence. Spatial representation of harbour regeneration zones: there is no planning justification to separate out the harbour regeneration zones and to treat them separately. The harbours at St Helier are physically contiguous with St Helier and it is appropriate to show them as such. Jersey Airport has no such spatial relationship with St Helier	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>important that the existing Port Operational area is able to change and adapt and be available for direct and indirect operational functions. Planning permissions must be given against those, and not Regeneration Zone requirements. There should be a separate Proposal (e.g. 12B) for Jersey Harbours Regeneration Zone, with clarity with regard to 'Permitted Developments' within a well defined Port Operational Area (existing TT35). There is also notable policy inconsistency between Jersey Harbours and Jersey Airport, another Trading Operation. It would seem logical to take a similar approach to both 'ports'. Overall, the Draft Plan is confusing with regard to the operational port of St Helier and Jersey Harbours. It would be clearer if a section could be defined containing all port planning guidelines. The Port of St Helier is the Island's lifeline link with 99% of the Island's freight passing through an already constrained area. The need for a safe and secure commercial port is unquestioned. This requires unimpeded access with water deep enough for the largest vessels expected to use the port, which may require dredging, and comes with the risk of noise, dirt and danger associated with loading and unloading cargo. For an Island economy, there are limited alternatives to the use of sea transport for the movement of freight. Air freight is used for limited high value and express deliveries only. As a consequence, shipping will continue to provide the only effective way to move the vast majority of freight into and out of the Island. The provision of sufficient port capacity will remain an essential element in ensuring sustainable economic growth. The Designated Port Operational Area (TI35 in the current Island Plan) has been removed from the Draft Plan. This is unacceptable. The designated port area must be defined, respected and protected during any development of the surrounding area. The harbour in St Helier has been split into two Regeneration Zones encompassing most, not all, of the port operational area. The port operational area must be considered as a whole as operational areas are not currently split along the same lines. For example, 30% of the Island's freight arrives onto the New North Quay yet this area is included in the 'Old Harbours' Regeneration Zone. Also although the site of current major development, the Elizabeth Marina is not included in either Regeneration Zone. We would recommend that the Designated Port Operational Area (DPOA) be</p>		<p>and, as such, is shown separately. Port Operational Area: the policy regime applicable to the use of the Port is set out at TT15. The definition of the Port Operational Area will be addressed, by amendment of the draft Plan, as acknowledged in response by the Minister to comments made on TT15. Marine leisure use: This is made reference to at Policy NE5 where there is a presumption against the provision of any new marina facilities. The development of additional facilities to serve marine leisure users at established sites, such as the Old Harbours, should be dealt with through the development of supplementary planning guidance.</p>	

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								<p>included in the Plan, taking primacy over the two proposed Regeneration Zones in the Draft Plan. They could be contained in a new 'Proposal12B Jersey Harbours Regeneration Zone' with the two proposed Zones taken out of Proposal 11 and included within this new section, which will bring clarity and focus to considerations regarding the greater harbour area, which are currently spread throughout the Plan. The Designated Port Operational Area should not be considered 'urban redevelopment' until an alternative location for the port has been developed and operational. Most importantly, the port area must be considered as a whole, and planning permission within the Port Operational Area not based purely on regeneration or urban redevelopment philosophies i.e. the planning permission for Port operational developments must not be based on how the port and its development may or may not meet urban design / regeneration requirements This is alluded to in 8.156. Until a new fit for purpose port area has been developed, the existing Port Operational Area, whilst designated as a regeneration zone, must be able to change and adapt to provide as efficient and operation as possible and it cannot have a planning regime aimed solely at regeneration imposed on it. There is no redundant land with the Port Operational Area. The operational port area is always going to impact on surrounding property and facilities through a variety of 'bad neighbour' issues, such as noise, dust and operational use and design. Such issues have already arisen with existing developments which are acting as a constraint on the practical operation of the port already. The ability to ensure the continuous operation of the port as a lifeline link should be taken into account when considering development on surrounding land. In the UK, a draft National Policy Statement for Ports is currently under consideration. This is a useful document which should be used to promote best practice in development at and around the port. It sets out the 'the broad need for ports capacity looking ahead to 2030 and beyond, taking account in particular of our forecasts of port freight demand and the regional and local economic benefits of port activity. It also restates the Government's long-standing policy that this need can be best be met by an efficient and competitive ports industry operating in a free-market environment'. This UK National Policy statement should be considered and encapsulated</p>			

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								as appropriate with in Island Policies. Jersey Harbours has a policy to encourage warehouses to be located close to ship to reduce lorry movements. This should be reinforced by the Island Plan. Delays at the port, for example due to adverse weather, can result in a backlog of goods or vehicles (freight and passenger) which can impact on the road infrastructure. This needs to be taken into account at the planning stage. Any development in or around the port areas must take into account health and safety, and security issues. Proportionally protective security measures need to be designed into Regeneration Zones at an early stage of development. Ref: 4.75 The Trading Operation is not recognised as the responsible authority for future development of the port. There is no reference to the existing Port Masterplan. It is incorrect to state that 'crucially revenues from the current port operation cannot support a major capital improvement', although it may not be funded through the normal capital programme. It is also incorrect to state that a new port is only achievable through the realisation of the value of development in the Elizabeth Harbour area. This only applies to Ro-Ro operations. 'Old Harbours' - the New North Quay is included in this Zone. This quay currently accounts for approximately 30% of the Island's freight traffic. It must be considered as part of the operational port until such time as the facility is located elsewhere. The Marine Leisure industry provides a valuable growth area for the Island's economy and is not specifically mentioned in the Plan. Any regeneration of the Old Harbour needs consideration to the underlying need of the Island for additional moorings. The Plan should make reference to the fact that existing resources are stretched and need to be addressed.			
DP989		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		Regeneration Zones	Objecting	Full consideration and reference should be made to the Harbours Trading Operation and Administration responsibilities as defined within the applicable Laws.	As an Island economy, Jersey is reliant on the provision of commercial port services and benefits from a growing marine leisure industry. Unlike other jurisdictions, Jersey Harbours is also responsible for the provision of coastguard services from the Island and its territorial waters. There is no reference within the Draft Island Plan to the Trading Operation, Jersey Harbours, as defined by Articles 25 to 27 of the Public Finance (Jersey) Law 2005 and Public Finances (Transitional Provisions - States Trading Operations) (Jersey) Regulations 2005. Regulation 3(4) defines 'the trading operation to be undertaken by Jersey Harbours shall be the administration,	Reject	Such detailed reference is superfluous and not relevant to the draft Plan	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								management, operation financing, development and maintenance of the harbours of Jersey and their associated facilities. The Harbour Master is responsible for the 'administration of harbours and territorial waters' - Harbours (Administration) (Jersey) Law 1961. This is clearly of significance to those areas of the draft Plan which refer to harbours, in particular, St Helier Harbour and the Regeneration Zones which have been proposed.			
DP311		Mrs Penelope Lee		Map 4.1	Town Regeneration Zones	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1000		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours	Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Objecting	Propose that consideration of use of land at St Helier Harbour should be included in the suggested Jersey harbours regeneration zone.	To ensure a co-ordinated approach to the development of the port operational area.	Reject	St Helier Harbour is included in the proposed Town Regeneration Zones. The Zone boundaries are not necessarily prescriptive.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP1120		Mrs J Jones		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Objecting	Bath Street - road reversal May I suggest that Minden Place is kept which I hope it will be as its location is ideal for shoppers and it does not affect a residential area, that instead of the traffic being one way from Minden Car Park going North up Bath Street, that the traffic from the North comes down as usual to Minden Car Park but leaves via Phillips Street with option to St Saviours Road or back via Belmont Road to the car park	This will achieve an area that can be paved area giving Mino's and others cafe access, tree planting etc without stopping access to Minden Car Park. Small as the area would be it is another gain for pedestrian only access except in emergencies.	Reject	Detailed proposals for the North of Town masterplan are presently the subject of detailed consideration and will be presented to the States for consideration and approval.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan presently as detailed proposals for the North of Town are presently the subject of consideration.
DP312		Mrs Penelope Lee		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP416		Mr Marc Burton	Institute of Directors	Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting	The plan needs to have a more co-ordinated approach for St. Helier. The North Town Masterplan is in consultation but appears to be outside of the Island Plan. This must be co-ordinated and incorporated into the final document. Likewise for other studies recently completed by EDAW etc. What the Plan needs to address is the Masterplan for St. Helier. Whilst the plan maybe a general document, it should set out the parameters and timescales for establishing the co-ordinated vision for St. Helier i.e. Town, Waterfront, La Collette, Harbours etc; See attached letter	See attached letter	Reject	The vision for St Helier is set out in 4.17 and has been informed by a number of strategic pieces of work leading up to the publication of the Draft Plan, including Willie Miller's St Helier Urban Character Appraisal; the St Helier Development and Regeneration Strategy (EDAW); and a number of pieces of work related to the development of the St Helier Waterfront (Hopkins and Shepley). It is acknowledged that further work is required to provide specific, more detailed, policies and proposals underneath this overarching vision for the town and this will be achieved by a number of work streams identified in the draft Plan as set out at Proposal 8; St Helier Conservation Areas; Proposals 9: Public realm	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already addressed



Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										Strategy; and, perhaps most significantly; Proposals 11: St Helier Regeneration Zones. All of this work will seek to build on, and enhance the local identity and character of these areas, seeking to enhance the quality of the local infrastructure, facilities and amenities of these specific areas. The North of Town Masterplan is one of the work streams identified as is complementary to the draft Plan.	
DP469		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Objecting	Given that public intervention maybe required to initiate the development of these zones, the Trust believes that any such master plans should be subject to States approval and rigorous public engagement and consultation.		Reject	The Proposal makes it explicit that there will be extensive engagement with stakeholders in the development of master plans. Whilst the proposal seeks to include provision for the Minister to adopt and issue any such guidance, where States intervention is required, such as that involved in the North of Town for example, the Minister would be required to take the issue before the States as a matter of course.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP530		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting	Proposals 1?14 & Policies BE1?BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP606		Mr Bruce Willing		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Objecting	St Helier must become a sustainable and polycentric, compact city. "Polycentric St Helier" simply means and divided into distinct neighbourhoods, each about 5 minutes walk (1/4 mile) in size in any direction. To achieve this each district would have its own identity and management structure, subordinate to the Parish, but allowing residents to be able to express a social identity linked to the district. Each neighbourhood would have: A name and a unique sense of place A park, public square or civic space Connecting pedestrian and cycle links A mix of uses, shops, offices, affordable and open market homes etc. Car share schemes, free parking for electric vehicles and residents parking and so on would be provided Free bicycle share schemes - like Velib in Paris The new homes would be spacious and volumetrically efficient and of good design, thus adding value. The best of our architectural heritage would be celebrated and local business as well as the	For more than a millennium Jersey has developed a system of government that largely reflects its French past, with an emphasis on Parish identity, enshrined in a municipal system within each Parish under the leadership and control of the Connétable. This historical emphasis on 'small government' is an essential part of the Jersey character. It is what makes "Jersey Special". This is not reflected in the DIP, which focuses on the archaeological and physical rather than the social organisation and practice within the island. It is therefore is the second flaw in the document as it can be argued the social structure of the island is a key factor in raising political and public concern over social breakdown, which is a key generator for initiating the DIP in the first place. What is needed is an understanding of a polycentric approach to town development, one that reflects the actual culture of the island and allows it to be	Reject	The vision for St Helier is set out in 4.17 and has been informed by a number of strategic pieces of work leading up to the publication of the Draft Plan, including Willie Miller's St Helier Urban Character Appraisal; the St Helier Development and Regeneration Strategy (EDAW); and a number of pieces of work related to the development of the St Helier Waterfront (Hopkins and Shepley). It is acknowledged that further work is required to provide specific, more detailed, policies and proposals underneath this overarching vision for the town and this will be achieved by a number of work	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already addressed

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							States could sponsor the neighbourhoods. In this way people would identify with their neighbourhoods and take ownership of them, once again, rediscovering a collective pride in St Helier.	reflected within St Helier.		streams identified in the draft Plan as set out at Proposal 8; St Helier Conservation Areas; Proposals 9: Public Realm Strategy; and, perhaps most significantly; Proposals 11: St Helier Regeneration Zones. All of this work will seek to build on, and enhance the local identity and character of these areas, seeking to enhance the quality of the local infrastructure, facilities and amenities of these specific areas, reflecting the conceptual view set out in the representation made. Such work will also need to be complemented, in particular, by the Sustainable Transport Policy, to address issues of accessibility, movement and traffic management. Whilst the social organisation of the Island is acknowledged, a land use plan can only seek to maintain and bolster the social fabric of the Island through land use planning policies, which is what the draft Plan seeks to do. Notwithstanding, it is not necessarily considered that there is a strong level of social organisation below the parish level in Jersey, particularly in St Helier where, unlike many urban centres of a similar size, there are very few are based names for different parts of the town, perhaps reflecting a lack of social identity and cohesion?	
DP667		Deputy James Reed	Education, Sport and Culture	Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Neither	A Steering Group has been appointed, by a decision of the States in January 2010, under my chairmanship in my capacity as ESC Minister, 'with the aim of producing a cohesive and realistic plan for the future development of Fort Regent'. The Steering Group will have regard to any existing planning policies that may apply to Fort Regent, and it plans to report back to the States in the early part of 2011. In the meantime, I would ask that the new Island Plan should take into account the formation of this Steering Group, and should allow scope for the Steering Group to make recommendations for the future of Fort Regent. At this early stage it is known whether any		Noted	The establishment of a Steering Group to examine the future of Fort Regent is entirely consistent with and complementary to the proposal to develop a masterplan or development brief for the Regeneration Zone centred on Mont de la Ville (Proposal 11(2))	The Minister notes and supports the comments made

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							recommendations will have planning policy implications, and any such consequences would of course be discussed with Planning.				
DP823		Mrs Susan Kerley		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP849		Mr Rod Mcloughlin		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting	Once again the opportunity to include cultural objectives in master-plans associated with the regeneration of St Helier is to be encouraged, particularly as they might involve the application of planning obligations or percentage for art contributions. It will be important that the opportunity is taken to consider projects generated by percentage for art as affording an opportunity to contribute to the wider character of the area rather than simply an adornment to a particular development. They also afford the opportunity to distinguish the different regeneration zones by reference to their character and history. This also applies to development outside town. (Consultation with the Cornite des Connetables in the preparation of the Public Art Strategy revealed a desire on the part of the parishes to be involved in local percentage for art project briefs.)		Noted	The potential for master plans to seek to develop, nature and enhance the specific identity and character of an area is noted and welcomed	Support is noted by the Minister
DP95		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP975		Mr. Maurice DUBRAS		Proposal 11	St Helier Regeneration Zones	Supporting	Built Environment This section of the Plan is comprehensive and I have no time now to delve into the detail. Having been born and brought up within the Town, I applaud much of what has been done in recent years to return it to the pedestrians. I have views on some of the proposals but am not in a position to comment now-rather too late! However, I do feel bound to say how pleased I am to note that the Town is being seen as a whole though with several regeneration zones. I firmly believed that the former Waterfront Board was not given sufficient mandate to consider those areas alongside the Waterfront as within its mandate to ensure integration. I shall watch this 'space' with more than a passing interest.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP313		Mrs Penelope Lee			Planning for Other Urban Areas	Objecting	No more development outside of St Helier		Reject	The Spatial Strategy proposed in the draft Plan seeks to ensure that all of the Island's existing Built-up Area contributes in some way to meeting the Island's development needs, which will involve some development outside of the defined Town of St Helier. The draft Plan also	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										proposes a mechanism which enables some development to take place in some of the Island's northern rural parishes where there is clear justification to allow small-scale development in support of these smaller communities. To just limit the Island's development needs to St Helier is not considered to be sustainable.	
DP116 6		Kevin Pilley			Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone		Para. 4.82 requires amendment to state that any land-use masterplan or development brief for Jersey Airport will be adopted and published as supplementary planning guidance by the Minister for Planning and Environment following consultation and engagement with key stakeholders, including local residents.	To promote consistency with Proposal 12 and to provide clarity and to remove ambiguity.	Accept	Para. 4.82 requires amendment to state that any land-use masterplan or development brief for Jersey Airport will be adopted and published as supplementary planning guidance by the Minister for Planning and Environment following consultation and engagement with key stakeholders, including local residents.	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan
DP437		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union		Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Objecting	We are concerned that these proposals will mean the loss of good agricultural land and we would seek assurances that this is not the case. See attached letter		Reject	The map is indicative only and the text makes reference to the fact that the commercial masterplan for the Airport is being developed which will relate to all of the landholdings of Jersey Airport, which includes land out with the airport operational boundary. The commercial masterplan remains to be the subject of a planning assessment, which will need to consider the land use implications of any proposals which emerge. It is not known, at this time, what form any proposals might take, but it is identified that non-operational land at the airport may have the potential to provide for commercial/industrial floorspace (see 5.113). The development and adoption of any land-use masterplan for the Airport will be the subject of consultation with all stakeholders. Any proposals which have implications for agricultural land would fall to be considered under Policy ERE1 and Policy NE7.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP825		Mrs			Jersey	Supporting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by		Noted	Noted	Support is noted

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Susan Kerley			Airport Regeneration Zone		the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals				by the Minister
DP976		Mr. Maurice DUBRAS			Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Supporting	Similarly, the Airport Regeneration Zone concept. I have remained frustrated by the lack of an integrated approach for that critical area. To my mind it is an appropriate one for the consideration of introducing new elements of industry to the Island as part of the hoped-for diversification policy espoused by previous economic development sponsors.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1067		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Proposal 12	Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Supporting	Jersey airport should be encouraged to work with the private sector in redeveloping adjacent land to the airport, the income generated should go directly to the airport for future maintenance and infrastructure.		Noted	Any proposed development of land out with the operational area of Jersey Airport will need to be considered within the context of other policies of the Plan relating to the Green Zone (NE7); safeguarding agricultural land (ERE1) and protecting open space (SCO4).	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP11		Matthew Waddington		Proposal 12	Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Objecting	4.76 & map - tighten to limit development & regeneration zone to areas inside airport boundaries - clarify what kinds of development are contemplated within that zone and what difference it makes to what would otherwise have been permitted there.	Para 4.76 is much too vague about what regeneration means at the airport. The map also needs to tally with the text - the text only talks about the airport itself, but the map appears to show the regeneration zone stretching outside the airport towards the airport garages and Les Ormes. The text needs to make clear whether this is intended or not - if it is then this is a major aspect of the plan worth more than one vague paragraph. I would object to any effective expansion of the airport, or its associated industries, in this direction (but the plan is not clear as to what is and is not counted as "non-aeronautical sources" and "commercial development activity"). Open space should not be up for grabs for development simply because it is near the airport entrance. Nor should it be assumed that developments of all sorts should be allowed to claim a need to be next to the airport. Nor should building over green land outside the airport be disguised as "regeneration" on a par with regenerating run-down parts of St Helier. Nor should it be assumed that areas next to the airport should be treated as if they were part of the airport itself (not least because that would just lead to a logic of constant creeping expansion with no sensible basis). If this is not what is intended then the plan should make that much clearer and not offer scope for developers to exploit lack of clarity.	Accept	The map is indicative only and the text makes reference to the fact that the commercial masterplan for the Airport is being developed which will relate to all of the landholdings of Jersey Airport, which includes land out with the airport operational boundary. The commercial masterplan remains to be the subject of a planning assessment, which will need to consider the land use implications of any proposals which emerge. It is not known, at this time, what form any proposals might take, but it is identified that non-operational land at the airport may have the potential to provide for commercial/industrial floorspace (see 5.113). The development and adoption of any land-use masterplan for the Airport will be the subject of consultation with all stakeholders, including local residents. Any proposals which have implications for agricultural land would fall to be considered under Policy ERE1 and Policy NE7. To provide greater clarity, however, it is considered appropriate that the boundary for the Airport Regeneration Zone is	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to revise the boundary of the Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone



Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										amended to include that land administered by Jersey Airport only and which will be the subject of the Jersey Airport Masterplan.	
DP531		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 12	Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Supporting	Proposals 1?14 & Policies BE1?BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP611		Mr Bruce Willing		Proposal 12	Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Supporting	This is a good idea, but needs to be included within an overall plan for Quennevais and may go as far as St Peter's village. (If the harbour area in St Helier is to be included in that town's regeneration, then so should the airport be included in a proper plan for the regeneration of Quennevais and St Aubin.)		Reject	Apart from transport and employment links, there is considered to be no overriding planning justification to integrate development at Jersey Airport with Les Quennevais and St Peter's Village. Indeed, it is likely to be more desirable, from the perspective of preventing urban sprawl and maintaining the specific identity of each area, that any existing open land between Les Quennevais and St Peter's Village and Jersey Airport, is maintained.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP96		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 12	Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP995		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours	Proposal 12	Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone	Neither	Suggest there could be another specific 'Jersey Harbours Regeneration Zone' proposal along the same lines as this .	We would recommend that the Port Operational Area be included in the Plan, taking primacy over the two proposed Regeneration Zones in the Draft Plan. They could be contained in a new 'Proposal12B Jersey Harbours Regeneration Zone' with the two proposed Zones taken out of Proposal 11 and included within this new section.	Reject	St Helier's harbours have a physical and spatial relationship with the town of St Helier which is why they are included in the St Helier Regeneration Zones: Jersey Airport does not have this relationship, which is why it is treated separately.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP532		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 13	Local Development Plan	Supporting	Proposals 1?14 & Policies BE1?BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP97		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 13	Local Development Plan	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP314		Mrs Penelope Lee		Proposal 14	Village Plans	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP352		Mr Tony Gottard		Proposal 14	Village Plans	Neither	add footnote at end of Proposal 11, 12, 13 and 14 referring to Article 6 Planning and Building (Jersey)	Reference to Article 6 would make clear the basis on which the Minister is able to issue and adopt	Accept	Reference to Article 6 would make clear the basis on which the	The Minister is minded to amend

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							Law 2002	supplementary planning guidance for different parts of the Island		Minister is able to issue and adopt supplementary planning guidance.	the draft Plan to insert the relevant footnotes
DP434		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union	Proposal 14	Village Plans	Objecting	We are deeply concerned that this proposal will allow developments on an Island-wide scale on good agricultural land. These policies, if adopted, would fly in the face of all the other intentions to protect our countryside from further developments and must be withdrawn. As the population is allowed to increase there is bound to be tremendous pressure to allow such developments as can be demonstrated by the recent rezoning of good agricultural land for first time buyers and retirement homes. We have been assured that the increase in demand for houses that will be inevitable with the proposed increase in the population can be satisfied by the development of brown field sites and therefore it will not be necessary to develop in the countryside.		Reject	The Minister will need to weigh the impact of any development proposals emerging from the proposed development of Village Plans on the countryside, including the loss of agricultural land, with the potential community benefit to be delivered by them. Clearly, proposals for new development in the villages will need to be supported by evidence of need and a justification relative to the social fabric of the parish and its community facilities and institutions.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP476		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Proposal 14	Village Plans	Objecting	The Trust would suggest that any village plans relating to the small settlements around the Parish Churches must include an historic character appraisal in order to highlight the significant attributes and special qualities of these areas, so that these are not undermined by unsuitable development and creeping urbanisation. The Trust would also recommend that any proposed village development plans should be subject to States approval.	Without such survey work there is a real danger that the special quality of Jersey's rural historic settlement areas will indeed be compromised, as illustrated by the recent re-development of M&S in St John and the improvements to the area immediately around St Martin's Parish Hall.	Reject	The proposal makes it clear that any development proposals must set out any potential impact upon the character of the villages. This should be based on an understanding and appreciation of the historical evolution of the settlement and should seek to minimise and ameliorate any adverse implications. The Minister will need to balance the impact of new development upon the historic fabric and character of existing settlements against the potential community benefit of new development, as evidenced by need. The Minister proposes to adopt village plans as supplementary planning guidance following extensive public consultation, and does not intend taking them to the States as a matter of course.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP535		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Proposal 14	Village Plans	Supporting	Proposals 1?14 & Policies BE1?BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP613		Mr Bruce Willing		Proposal 14	Village Plans	Supporting		It is entirely logical to initiate 'village plans', but they must be consistent with the overall planning structure and pay particular attention to the social	Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the qualified support

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
								and environmental aspects of their development within each Parish.			for this proposal
DP950		Deputy Philip Rondel	Parish of St John Working Party	Proposal 14	Village Plans	Supporting	The following key proposals by the Parish of St John were unanimously approved at a Parish Meeting held on 3 rd March 2010. 1. Support for the key principle of Proposal 14 in The (Draft) Jersey Island Plan 2009 (DJIP 2009) 2. There is a presumption that all future development on rezoned land in St John will be Parish-led 3. That Supplementary Planning Guidance procedures for future development in St John be introduced 4. That two Consultation Zones - around the rural settlements of St John's and Sion - be established 5. That the Parish of St John Working Party (The Working Party) represent the Parish as a "key stakeholder" in future consultations with the Planning Department - as defined under the DJIP 2009 6. That comprehensive and inclusive consultation take place on all issues considered under the DJIP 2009 within the Parish in the future		Noted	The support for the proposal is noted but the presumption that all future development on rezoned land in St John is parish-led cannot be delivered by the Island Plan. Decisions related to new development proposals should be related to land-use planning considerations rather than their delivery mechanism and whether or not that mechanism is vested with the parochial authority, provided that the outcome meets a specified planning need (e.g. for affordable homes)	Support is noted by the Minister
DP98		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 14	Village Plans	Supporting	Support with caveat Whilst I am supportive of the concept of Village Plans I think they should be prepared by the Planning Dept in consultation with the relevant parochial authorities, the public and other stakeholders. If parochial authorities were responsible for preparing village plans I think there would be a danger of a lack of consistency of approach across the Island arising.		Noted	Whilst there may be consistency in the manner and form in which the plans are prepared and presented, each Village Plan will be required to ensure that it secures the relevant engagement and approval of various statutory agencies. The Minister for Planning and Environment will need to consider the Village Plans, not only from the perspective of the development needs and aspirations of that village or parish, but also with regard to the proper planning of the island as a whole, and ensure consistency with the planning framework for the Island provided by the Island Plan. It is considered that there is considerable advantage to be secured from encouraging a community-led approach to these matters in that it can seek to achieve greater community involvement and ownership of the outcome. The Planning and Environment Department is and will assist in the development of Village Plans, as appropriate.	The Minister for Planning and Environment is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP315		Mrs Penelope Lee		Map 4.3	Green Backdrop Zone	Supporting			Noted	Noted	The Minister notes the support for the

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
											designation of Green Backdrop Zone
DP1041		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy BE 3	Green Backdrop Zone	Supporting		This must be protected at all costs to retain Jersey's character and image.	Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP542		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Policy BE 3	Green Backdrop Zone	Supporting	Proposals 1?14 & Policies BE1?BE3 - St Helier and other Regeneration / Local Development Zones We welcome and support the principal thrust of these sections, the proposals and Policies.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP543		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Policy BE 3	Green Backdrop Zone	Objecting	We believe this is the appropriate place to address skylines, views and vistas.		Reject	Skylines, views and vistas, as addressed by Policy GD5, are material to other parts of the Island other than those designated as part of the Green Backdrop Zone. On this basis, it is appropriate that skylines, views and vistas throughout the Island, including those out with the GBZ, can be considered as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, under Policy GD5.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP566		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy BE 3	Green Backdrop Zone	Objecting	Green Backdrop Zone - this comment probably applies to other zones as well - to me extensions to existing homes should be allowed, particularly where it may encourage multi generational living. This (in my view) would have a number of social benefits, including preservation of the family unit. Obviously loop holes have to be explored and closed where possible, however there needs to be a degree of flexibility built into policies such as BE 3, because it appears quite proscriptive as presently constructed, and as potentially interpreted.		Reject	The policy regime to be applied by the GBZ does not preclude the extension of existing dwellings, but simply requires the impact of any such proposal to be considered upon the landscape setting and character of the area. The policy ensures that this becomes a material consideration in the determination of any planning application affecting the GBZ.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP977		Mr. Maurice DUBRAS		Policy BE 3	Green Backdrop Zone	Supporting	Green Backdrop Zone Coming closer to home, I am glad to see the maintenance of this zoning. As a critical element of the lower part of St. Lawrence, it has been relied on to protect the escarpment from inappropriate development; this must be retained		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP99		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 3	Green Backdrop Zone	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP100		Mr Stephen de		Policy BE 4	Shoreline Zone	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Gruchy									
DP104 2		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy BE 4	Shoreline Zone	Neither	Sufficient time will be needed for such protection to be put in place.		Reject	The Shoreline Zone policy is already in place in the 2002 Island Plan	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP316		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 4	Shoreline Zone	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP978		Mr. Maurice DUBRAS		Policy BE 4	Shoreline Zone	Supporting	Shoreline Zone As a part of the continuum of or extension to the Coastal National Park, this affords one element of protection to the 'meat in the sandwich' with the Green Backdrop Zone on the other side. As certain pressures due to the monetary affluence of some of the island community are manifest with acquisition of coastal land for sea-view homes, it is critical that the planning authority retains some powers to avoid further spoiling or loss of scarce shoreline open space.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP101		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 5	Tall Buildings	Supporting	Support with caveat I am of the view that this policy should apply where a building would rise "two or more" storeys above its neighbour (as opposed to the present wording of "more than two storeys").		Reject	The current policy is considered to contain a definition of 'tall buildings' that is sufficiently robust enough to ensure that it can be applied appropriately to those development proposals which require the issue of height to be a significant material consideration	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP104 3		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy BE 5	Tall Buildings	Supporting	Taller buildings will have benefits in that they will improve the efficiency of land use and density provided that tight design standards are applied.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP317		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 5	Tall Buildings	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP567		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy BE 5	Tall Buildings	Supporting	Tall Buildings - as noted above I believe we should encourage taller (well designed) buildings in St Helier. I think a tall building these days should be more than 5 storeys (I would personally suggest 7 in St Helier - perhaps just within named regeneration zones).		Noted	Despite the great variety of building styles and forms in the town, there is a relatively high level of consistency in building height: the vast majority of buildings in St Helier are in the range of 2.5-3.5 storeys. On this basis, it is considered appropriate to define a tall building as five storeys in height, or more than two storeys above it's neighbour. The criteria set out in the policy do not preclude the approval of a tall building above five storeys in	The Minister notes the qualified support for this policy



Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										height.	
DP102		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 6	Building Alterations and Extensions	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1044		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy BE 6	Building Alterations and Extensions	Objecting	The criteria should include not only design and appearance but should also Building be performance related.		Reject	The requirement to address the environmental performance of a building or an extension to a building is a requirement of Policy SP2 and GD1(1).	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP318		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 6	Building Alterations and Extensions	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP103		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 7	Shop fronts	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP319		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 7	Shop fronts	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP104		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 8	Frontage Parking	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP320		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 8	Frontage Parking	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP105		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 9	Street furniture and materials	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP321		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 9	Street furniture and materials	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP850		Mr Rod Mcloughlin		Policy BE 9	Street furniture and materials	Supporting	The emphasis placed on appropriate street furniture and materials is welcomed, particularly as it affords an opportunity for a more 'legible' approach to the built environment with street furniture chosen to complement the essential character of particular areas . Paragraph 4.113 rightly draws attention to the importance of ensuring that the General Development Order 2008 does not provide a lacuna in the measures adopted to ensure that the smaller details of the streetscape contribute positively to the ensemble. Reduction of 'visual clutter' is greatly to be welcomed, although provision of appropriate street furniture may also include the opportunity to design interpretation panels and display sites for cultural information which enhance public enjoyment of open		Noted	The support leant and the comments made in relation to this policy are noted.	Support is noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
							spaces and reflect the quality of the cultural offering . Currently, there is a shortage of tastefully designed display areas to promote cultural activity supported directly or indirectly by the States or the Parishes. Centre Ville provided examples of this some years ago and it is effectively handled on the continent in ways which reinforce cultural distinctiveness. Such provision affords the opportunity for the States to help maximise the value of the investment it makes in the cultural organisations.				
DP1045		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy BE 10	Roofscape	Supporting		Early consideration as part of the planning process will eliminate a lot of problem.	Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP106		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy BE 10	Roofscape	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP322		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy BE 10	Roofscape	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP612		Mr Bruce Willing		Policy BE 10	Roofscape	Objecting	There is a stricture on the raising of roof heights when replacing the M&E equipment on office buildings. The DIP needs to acknowledge that environmental considerations will be included within the Planning decision process, in case the introduction of this new requirement unnecessarily harms the overall environmental performance of the building in the future.	Constraints on building heights and the placing of M&E equipment, unconstrained use of colour and overly restricted requirements for the overall heights of building will mitigate against successful contemporary development, the continued development of a 'Jersey vernacular' and the full exploitation of technology, which will allow sustainable and environmentally friendly buildings to be developed within the DIP and ultimately the agreed Island Plan.	Reject	The proposed policy already acknowledges that environmental considerations will be material to the decision making process (see 4.120 and 4.121) which also sets out the requirement for building owners, developers and architects to explore all options to enhance the environmental performance of buildings whilst also seeking to ensure that the design of plant and machinery is integral to the building rather than simply seeking to site it on the roof of the building.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan