



PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

# Draft Island Plan – White Paper

## **Natural Resources**

### 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
Natural Resources											
DP116 3		Jason Simon	Simon Sand & Gravel	9	Natural Resources and Utilities	Neither		Having said that I'd like to take this opportunity to commend you and your many colleagues on putting together a Draft Island Plan that makes a serious attempt to control development at the outset whilst allowing future indicators, demands and trends to be taken into consideration during the development period. I have also previously mentioned my thoughts on this matter and allowing long term planning permissions to have a revision period built in, say 5 years from the end of the permit, to take account of changes in thinking, government plans etc, can only be a positive step forward.	Support noted	The option is always available for quarry operators to make new or revised applications in response to changing circumstances. In a similar vain, in view of the long-term nature of mineral operations, Policy NR9 'Restoration, Aftercare and After Use', allows for the submission of a detailed 'restoration and after use scheme' and changes to approved restoration schemes at a later date, to accommodate unforeseen circumstances.	Support is noted by the Minister
DP117 9		Mr Roger Corfield		9	Natural Resources and Utilities		A small number of changes also need to be made to Chapter 9 (Natural Resources and Utilities), as follows: Page 355, para 9.13, second line Omit "...the Environmental Protection Team of the Planning and Environment Department.." and substitute with "Jersey Water" This is a request from Jody Robert. He makes the point that historically anything in a WPSA has gone to Jersey Water. EP do not want to see every planning application within a WPSA (i.e. 60% of apps). He screens the application list and the app team sends him any others they feel are relevant to him. Page 357, Proposal 20 Isn't this a policy? Page 369, para 9.52, first line Should read "principal" Page 377, Table 9, point 5 Omit "and" from the end of the sentence Page 380, Para 9.69, last sentence Should read "...estimates in Table 9.2 and..." Page 382, para 9.74, first sentence Should read "...factors that impact upon this." Page 385, Policy NR7, third para The end of the para should read "...any required 'Site Waste...". Page 388, Policy NR8, point 3 near the end Should read "...employment opportunities; and" Page 395, Policy NR11, penultimate line Should read "...essential for the proper..." For your information, I have received a detailed letter of representation from Simon Sand, which will take some thinking about. I assume you will want to register this.			Recommendation 1: On Page 355, para 9.13, second line Omit "...the Environmental Protection Team of the Planning and Environment Department..." and substitute with "Jersey Water" Recommendation 2: Page 357, Proposal 20 should become a policy and the third line should be amended to read: "...measures to help reduce water consumption and help conserve the Island's water resources" Recommendation 3: On Page 369, para 9.52, the first line should read "principal producers" Recommendation 4: On page 370, 9th line, omit the words "...in 2009". Recommendation 5: On Page 377, Table 9.1, point 5, omit the word "and" from the end of the sentence Recommendation 6: On Page 380, para 9.69, the last sentence should read "...estimates in Table 9.2 and..." Recommendation 7: On Page 382, para 9.74, the end of the first sentence should read "...factors that impact upon this." Recommendation 8: On Page 385, Policy NR7, the end of the third para should read "...any required 'Site Waste Management Plan". Recommendation 9: On Page 388, Policy NR8, the end of the second point 3 should read "...employment opportunities; and" Recommendation 10: On Page 395, Policy NR11, the penultimate line should read "...essential for the proper..."	Officer updates noted and agreed

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
DP617		Jason Simon	Simon Sand & Gravel	9	Natural Resources and Utilities	Objecting		In previous correspondence I have commented on this policy at length. I will not go over these again except to highlight my objection to the continued reliance on the outdated suggestions, put forward by Arup's in their reports of the 1990's, by P&E. Particularly, the cessation date suggested for SS&G when it is clear that there will still be reserves available after this date.	Reject	The Jersey Mineral Study (1998) undertaken by Arup is a seminal work which provided the initial basis for the formulation of the original Jersey Mineral Strategy (2000) by the former Planning and Environment Committee. The Mineral Strategy was effectively adopted as part of the current Island Plan (2002). The new draft Plan incorporates a revised Mineral Strategy, which takes account of responses to the Green Paper and changing circumstances since 2002, including: subsequent planning permissions for mineral extraction; updated information on resource availability; recent UK Government guidance on minerals planning; and other matters referred to in the document. The proposed revised Mineral Strategy provides the framework for the policies in the draft Plan. It is significantly different from the original strategy, which looked to reduce extraction of primary aggregates locally and promoted a shift to bulk importation of aggregates. Most notably, the revised strategy looks to maximise local supply of rock aggregates. It is true that the revised strategy continues to include the winding down of sand extraction at Simon Sand and Gravel Ltd in St. Ouen's Bay by 2018. This has been the planning position and the expectation of interested parties since the Island Plan was approved by the States in 2002 (i.e. effectively giving 15 years notice). It is also worth noting that a similar policy was included in the St. Ouen's Bay Planning Framework, which was produced in recognition of the unique character of the Bay (1998). It is accepted that, for wider sustainability reasons, arguments can be made for maximising local sand production, where this is environmentally acceptable. However, any mineral strategy must aim to strike the right balance between the Island's needs for aggregates (including sand) and the need to	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>protect the Island's local environment. The view has been taken and maintained that continued sand extraction at Simons would have an unacceptable impact on the sensitive and fragile coastal dune land character and ecology of the Bay and that importation provides a more acceptable alternative source. The Countryside Character Appraisal (1999) explains the essential character of this part of St. Ouen's Bay, highlights the threat to local character from continuing sand extraction and calls for the highest levels of protection from development. It is worth noting that when the operator applied successfully for its latest planning permission in 2003 (P/2003/1318), which involved upgrading the works, it was opposed by an alliance of 5 of the Island's main heritage, conservation and environmental bodies. Whilst acknowledging that the company owns land immediately to the north of its permitted operational area (Field 246A) and there are other smaller fields nearby with the potential to supply sand, any proposals to extend operational activities are, on balance, not considered appropriate. It should also be borne in mind that if this additional land was used for extraction, it would only extend the life of the quarry by 10-12 years and, in any event, it will be necessary to shift towards importation of sand.</p>	
DP621		Ms Sarah Le Claire		9	Natural Resources and Utilities	Objecting	That the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 and associated orders and policies applicable to micro-generation on private property should, in principle, be extended to commercial and other buildings, even if some further qualifications are needed; That a positive statement about the possible long term advantages of utility scale renewable energy to the future of this Island during this century be added prominently to the introductory passages of chapter 9 of the Island Plan or to the specific decisions themselves; That a statement should also be added that all major planning decisions, whether about renewable energy or other long term questions, involve a balance of priorities which can change over	Renewable Energy is dealt with in the Island Plan White Paper in Chapter 9 - 'Natural Resources and Utilities'. The current Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 allows some sorts of micro generation to be installed without the need for planning permission. They mainly relate to personal dwellings "within the curtilage of a dwelling house". It would be desirable to extend this encouragement to public, commercial and other buildings. The Island Plan White Paper then goes on to deal with possible utility scale generation of renewable energy and makes the point that the whole area of the Island and its territorial waters are considered as one for	Reject	The issue of permitted development rights, relative to the proposed relaxation of restrictions governing the use of micro-generation on commercial properties, is not a matter for the Island Plan. It is considered that the policy regime in the draft Plan does not preclude this use and, it is being proposed that the draft Plan be amended to actively promote energy efficiency in new buildings through a new policy in the draft Plan that reflects the 'Merton Rule' and subsequent variations by requiring	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to introduce a new policy to encourage energy efficiency in new development, otherwise the Minister is not minded to

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
							time.	<p>planning purposes with the intention of safeguarding the visual, ecological and other aspects of the coastline which need to be managed "so that it [the coastline] can continue to enjoyed by generations to come ". This is the background to two draft decisions Nos. 2 and 3 (pages 362 and 363) which set out the considerations which will be taken into account in deciding whether exploratory proposals, or proposals for development of utility scale schemes, should be allowed to proceed. The plan then goes on to dismiss on-shore wind generation on a utility scale and covers other on-shore renewable energy production in Policy decision No 4 (page 365). A common thread in all three policy decisions is to state in full all the many conditions which any proposal will have to fulfil to be considered for planning permission. All three decisions frequently use terms such as 'unacceptable' (visual impact, impact on features of ecological, archaeological, or historic importance, impact on the character of the immediate and wider background etc) or 'unreasonable' (impact on neighbouring uses and the local environment etc). It is safe to say that confronted by this list of subjective criteria (who is to judge the 'unacceptability' or 'unreasonableness') it is extremely unlikely that any developer will risk investing in utility level schemes on the grounds that the qualifications would open the way for small groups to hold up a decision for a very long time. All decisions of this magnitude are a balance of priorities and that balance will have to be struck at some time in the future bearing in mind all the advantages and possible disadvantages of a particular proposal. There should, therefore, at least be a balancing statement or paragraph in this chapter to the effect that the value of secure and sustainable sources of energy will grow in importance throughout the coming century. These issues will no doubt be gone into in greater detail in the draft Energy White Paper - Fuel for Thought, which will be circulated later this year. If, however, the Island Plan is agreed as drafted then much of the discussion of utility scale renewable energy in the Energy White Paper will be rendered nugatory as the Island Plan will have already weighted the odds strongly against any such schemes. This would be a great pity as there is already a potential scheme for a wind farm off St Aubin's Bay. There is also quite a promising study on tidal</p>		<p>new development above a specified threshold to incorporate renewable energy production (floorspace of 1000sqm or 10 or more residential units). Not only would this encourage the greater use of and reliance on renewable energy sources (e.g. photovoltaic energy, solar-powered and geo-thermal water heating, energy crops and biomass), it would also encourage energy saving measures to reduce the cost of providing 10% renewable (e.g. greater insulation, greater use of terraces and other energy efficient building forms, condensing boilers, passive stack ventilation, improved interior day lighting standards etc). Balance of priorities: it is considered that the draft Plan provides sufficient information at the introduction to this section to clearly state the context within which decisions related to renewable energy proposals will be made. It is important to acknowledge that the Plan is a land use Plan and thus it is relevant and appropriate to clearly set out the parameters against which decisions will be made, which is what the draft Plan seeks to do.</p>	<p>amend the draft Plan.</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
								energy off the north-east coast and there may well be others While it is no doubt politically reassuring to be able to point to all the conditions which would have to be met if any such schemes were ever to be realised it will also have to be understood that unless the States itself wishes to develop such schemes, utility companies operating in this area will be deterred by the defensive nature of the decisions as they are currently drafted in the Island Plan			
DP757		Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	9	Natural Resources and Utilities	Neither	13.1 The 2009 Draft Plan gives no consideration to the benefits that would arise from careful reclamation providing additional Built-Up area in conjunction with landfill of countryside sites, the latter will only repair landscape character and create additional fields.		Noted	The relative merits of terrestrial landfill and marine land reclamation are set out in the Waste Management Chapter (paras. 10.87 - 10.110). Among the advantages of land reclamation discussed, is its ability to make available development land. Although the draft Plan gives priority the terrestrial landfill option, it does recognise that there may be instances where it is appropriate to support further land reclamation where it is proven to be in the Island's strategic interest. Policy WM9 provides for such an eventuality.	Noted by the Minister
DP365		Mr Paul Garlick			NR: Introduction	Objecting	Jersey Gas suggest that there is a change to policy context item 9.4 the first bullet point re "to introduce an integrated energy policy to secure and affordable and sustainable energy supply.....". There is a typing error here. However, our major concern is that the document "Fuel for Thought, Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007)" may be used to inform the Island plan. Jersey Gas's suggested change would be to either commit to undertaking a significant review of the stance outlined in the "Fuel for Thought Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007)" or to declare that the document is withdrawn, that it will not act to inform the Island Plan and a revised Energy Policy will be drafted. Jersey Gas have been informed by PED that a new Draft Energy Policy will be issued in the first quarter 2010 and it will have a different focus. However, as at the date of this communication the new Draft Energy Policy has not been issued to Jersey Gas.	As highlighted above in item 1, the document "Fuel for Thought, Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007)" assigned what we consider to be an inappropriate carbon intensity to imported electricity. The document went on to discuss and promote fuel switching to electricity for heating purposes. Given that Jersey is a small and limited market such a policy direction could lead to the withdrawal of competing fuel(s) in the short term which would actually undermine the stated Energy Policy objectives. It would undermine security by reducing the diversity of the fuels available, act to increase energy prices on the Island (electricity is not the cheapest fuel now, European generated electricity is likely to rise in price in real terms in the future) and it acts to promote a wasteful form of energy (grid electricity is not sustainable now nor is it likely to be for the foreseeable future). Also as highlighted in item 1, specifically related to the objective NR1, we are of the opinion that the direction set by the Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007) will undermine the incentives to promote renewable energy and not as the objective requires "encourage the use of renewable energy". Jersey Gas's position with regard to Jersey's Draft Energy Policy (September 2007) is outlined in a	Reject	The respondent makes many detailed and technical challenges to information that is not presented in the Island Plan Green Paper and that are not relevant to this review. There is considerable discussion with all the fuel industry stakeholders in the ongoing development of the Energy White Paper of which the Jersey Gas Company is fully involved. These discussions are considering the assertion by Jersey Gas that the department should not accept the legally declared carbon intensity of electricity supplied to Jersey by EDF. The respondent is incorrect in asserting that the forthcoming Energy White Paper will promote fuel switching to electricity. These issues are better dealt with in the context of the Energy White Paper as are the potential challenges in realising utility scale renewable energy for Jersey. The Island Plan simply provides a spatial planning framework within which to consider applications for renewable energy installations should they come	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
								presentation attached to this document as appendix 1.		forward over the lifetime of the Plan.	
DP1164		Mr Howard Snowden	Jersey Water	Objective NR 1	Natural Resources and Utilities Objectives	Neither	The penultimate bullet point in Objective NR1 states "to support the appropriate development and siting of new facilities and infrastructure by utility companies" We trust this can be interpreted such that the Planning & Environment Minister would give special consideration for future essential water supply infrastructure works.		Noted	Policy NR13 'Utilities Infrastructure Facilities' covers future proposals for additional utility infrastructure and is generally supportive. Where Jersey Water propose "essential" water supply infrastructure, which does not meet the locational requirements of Policy NR13, the proposal will have to be determined on its individual merits having regard to Policy GD1 'General Development Considerations' and other relevant policies of the Plan.	Amend Policy NR13 to read: "...will be permitted provided that the proposal is required to meet a proven need and is: 1. within the grounds of an existing utility infrastructure facility; or 2. within the Built-up area."
DP198		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective NR 1	Natural Resources and Utilities Objectives	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP370		Mr Howard Snowden	Jersey Water	Objective NR 1	Natural Resources and Utilities Objectives	Neither	We are pleased to see that as part of this objective, the protection of the Island's water resources is included, however, there is no mention of the ongoing diffuse pollution of water from nitrates and any action plan on how to overcome this problem.		Support for the objective of protecting the Island's water resources is noted.	Through Policy NR1, the draft Plan looks to protect the Island's water resources (sea, surface water and groundwater) from any development which can adversely affect their quality. It is true that diffuse water pollution from nitrates (i.e. the cumulative effect of day to day activities over a large area, rather than from a point source) is not specifically mentioned in the Plan. It is also accepted that the Island needs to start making progress in addressing diffuse sources of pollution (such as nitrates), which are a major risk to water quality. However, this is not regarded as a matter for strategic land use planning policy, beyond what the draft Plan provides for. Nitrates are among a number of substances that are responsible for water pollution, albeit, they are probably among the principal causes of water degradation locally and present one of the greatest threats to nature conservation (through enrichment of water - eutrophication) and drinking water sources (through contamination). Nitrates are a major component of	The Minister notes the comments made but 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
										many fertilisers and a natural product of the breakdown of organic matter. It seems likely that most nitrate pollution in the Islands groundwater etc originates from intensive farming activities (growing and livestock), which are outside the control of the Island's Planning Law. Where developments requiring planning permission would give rise to nitrate pollution (e.g. by reason of their waste water discharge or surface water run off), they will be governed by the requirements of Policy NR1 'Protection of Water Resources'. Where planning permission is not required, reliance will have to be placed on the 'Water Pollution (Jersey) Law, 2000, or other non-land use planning controls and mechanisms to protect water quality from contamination. As most diffuse pollution of water from nitrates originates from agricultural land, the solutions will involve, among other things: - improved controls over the application of fertilisers to land; - promoting good agricultural practice; and - encouraging catchment sensitive farming (involving careful management of land sensitive to the ecological health of the water environment). None of these potential solutions fall within the role of land use planning under the Island's Planning Law.	
DP1068		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Indicators NR 1	Natural Resources and Utilities	Supporting	Chamber supports this drive but there has been little evidence of the States driving to achieve this or even set ambitious targets.		Noted	The success or otherwise of the Plan in meeting these objectives will be judged by annual monitoring of key indicators. This will allow for the review of policies which fail to perform satisfactorily.	Noted by the Minister
DP266		Mr John Banks			Water Resources	Neither	I have not seen the Island Plan but for many years, we have greatly exceeded the amount of fresh WATER on Jersey, and I assume that the authors of that plan have also taken water very much for granted, if it has been considered at all. After the earthquake at Haiti, the water requirement of 80,000 to 90,000 residents must surely come before the water required to build houses (mining cement etc) out of the total rainfall received by Jersey" each of the 10 years. I1e cannot live very long without water but we cant-live well enough without houses!		Comment Noted	The Plan does address water resources. There is a recognised need to address increased demand for this precious commodity and a requirement to: -reduce wasteful use of expensive treated potable water; and -lessen the pressure for the development of new water resources (e.g. new reservoirs). Policy NR1 looks to protect the quality and quantity of water resources and Proposal 20 aims	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
							Incidentally, the Meteorological Department can barely get a 24 hour weather forecast right, so I very much doubt whether the authors of the Island Plan have got their 10 year forecast right! See attached letter			to encourage water conservation. Para. 9.8 of the draft Plan refers to previous advice to the Council of Ministers that projected water demand to 2035 could be accommodated within the existing service infrastructure. However, Jersey Water is now looking at the possibility of extending Val de La Mare Reservoir at some point in the future. The company's other plans for the introduction of metered supplies Island wide should have a significant impact on reducing treated water consumption. See also response to DP1077	
DP102 2		P Le Saux			Protection of Water Resources	Objecting	General concerns regarding ability of plan and planning officers to control development in the countryside and manage water resources. see attached letter		Objection noted	Environmental Protection are in the business of working towards a healthier Island environment. We would assume that the pollution incidents were historic and that he is now aware that there is a dedicated Pollution Hotline in place (709535). There is also suitable, proportionate, and enforced legislation in place to deal with the problems he has encountered. Environmental Protection, the regulator of the Water Pollution Law (among others) are able to comment on planning applications and Environmental Impact Assessments with an aim of pre-empting potential pollution issues and ensuring adequate thought is put to mitigating against them from an early stage.	Comments noted by Minister but minded not to amend plan
DP371		Mr Howard Snowden	Jersey Water		Protection of Water Resources	Neither	The ongoing diffuse pollution of both surface and ground water resources from nitrates is an issue for both Jersey Water and private water supplies. There is no mention of this within the Island Plan. The levels of nitrates recorded in most water resources during the spring months are above the 50 mg/l limit. Jersey Water has time-limited dispensations under the Water (Jersey) Law 1972 which allows nitrate levels in treated water to be above 50 mg/l, but not exceeding 70 mg/l for 30% of its annual regulatory samples. The present dispensation period (which is the second) is for 5 years duration and expires on the 31st December 2013. Continuing dispensations may not always be forthcoming in future years and action needs to be planned to make serious efforts in reducing nitrate levels in water resources. Since the		We would accept these points as noted.		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
							introduction of the Water Pollution (Jersey) Law 2000, Jersey Water has advocated the designation of Water Catchment Management Areas (WCMA) under the law, in order to reduce nitrates and improve the quality of water resources. We should like to see reference made for the need to reduce nitrate levels in water resources and the plans that the States have for the designation of WCMA's to achieve this, included within the NR1 objective. We would re-iterate our suggestion that the protection of water resources from diffuse nitrate pollution, under the Water Pollution (Jersey) Law 2000 and the possible use of WCMA's to achieve this, is included in Clause 9.11. In Clause 9.12, it is stated that Water Catchment Management Areas (WCMA's) have been 'explored'. The context in which WCMA's are mentioned in this clause can be interpreted as such that they are not being considered further. This is contrary to the fact that the Water Resources section is currently undertaking a field trial in the Val de la Mare catchment to study the effect of controlling the amount of fertiliser applied to the fields. We note that in Clause 9.13 the Environmental Protection Team is consulted on proposed developments within the Water Pollution Safeguard Areas (WPSA). Jersey Water was instrumental in the setting up of the WPSA in 1987 and at present we too are consulted when applications are made for developments in these areas. We should like to continue to be consulted on such applications, to ensure the continued protection of water resources.				
DP769		P Le Saux			Protection of Water Resources	Neither	think that all streams that discharge into the sea via escarpments and valleys should be given National Park Status. I think a further study of these streams should be made to understand the exact role they play from the exact extent of the catchment areas that create them through the wetlands water meadows, ponds or pond reservoirs created by farmers for watering their crops, nature walks before discharging into the sea. eg St Ouens Marsh - starts St Ouens Parish Hall to La Salione. Rozel Manor Valley - starts west if rue du Hucquet to St Catherines. Le Couperon - starts La Rue des Pelles to Rozel Bay Mourier Valley - starts La Maison, St John to Les Mouriers Greve de Lecq - starts St Marys Village to Greve de Lecq	If we do not understand the workings, the importance and the full extent of the wetlands and catchment areas of these streams we will end up with no stream, no pond/reservoirs, no nature walks and no nature. This is contrary to Policy NR1 (to protect the Islands water resources including surface and groundwater quality through prevention and inappropriate development and encouragement of water conservation measures) By recognising the catchment areas and protecting them from being turned into housing estates. I think it would be of more benefit to the island just in the amount of water it saves. Having followed the St Ouens Marsh stream in detail your Plan 2009 has not given these streams the recognition they deserve.	Reject	The extent of the National Park boundary has been determined having regard to the Countryside Character Appraisal (LUC, 1999) and includes those character areas of the highest quality which warrant the highest level of protection from development. The character areas reflect different landscape types, but have been determined through a detailed comprehensive study of a range of natural features and attributes and the relationships between physical and cultural influences. Whilst a further study of the Island's streams has much merit, for land use planning purposes, the Countryside Character Appraisal is regarded as providing a sound and objective basis for determining protective countryside zones. The extent of the proposal	Noted by the Minister, but minded to reject proposed changes to 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
										Coastal National Park actually includes valleys which are contiguous with the coastal areas, including the north coast valleys (e.g. Les Vaux de Lecq and Mourier Valley), the St. Martin's Valleys (e.g. Rozel Valley and St. Catherine's) and the valleys leading from the St. Ouen's Bay Escarpment. In any event, the St. Ouen's marsh area and stream is largely protected by draft Green Zone Policy and any larger housing developments will need to satisfy Policy NR1 'Protection of Water Resources'.	
DP899		P Le Saux			Protection of Water Resources	Objecting	I notice on your plan that C3 Map 2.2 page 91 does not give a complete picture of one of the most important streams in St Ouen. On your large scale map, C3 extents only half way up the road from La Saline to St Ouens Parish Hall. The stream has a catchment area beyond Route de Trodez to the north, Route de Vinchelez to the east and beyond Rue a L'eau to the south. All the streams and historic stone dams pass water through the wetlands and St Ouens Marsh, which is situated on both sides of the Route de Marias, area before discharging on to the beach at La saline. I would like to see a Open Space/Buffer Zone minimum 300m formed on either side of the stream and associated streams extending from the Parish Hall to La Saline and these wetlands and catchment areas preserved and protected.	If we do not understand the workings, the importance and the full extent of the wetlands and catchment areas of these streams we will end up with no stream, no pond/reservoirs, no nature walks and no nature. This is contrary to Policy NR1 (to protect the Islands water resources including surface and groundwater quality through prevention and inappropriate development and encouragement of water conservation measures) By recognising the catchment areas and protecting them from being turned into housing estates. I think it would be of more benefit to the island just in the amount of water it saves. The pond/reservoirs store some of the water passing through and introduce pond life to the area. The Island Plan 2020, protects this area, La saline to St Ouens Parish Hall, by including it under the umbrella of Green Zone and Agricultural Land as it was highlighted by the colour of the maps the proposed Island Plan 2009 disappoints me due to the fact it is not highlighted on your large scale Plan and the that Area C3 stops a long way short. This is not a forward step this is a backward step. Until now this Area has been protected for two reasons A planning dispute was settled about 1973 by the first ombudsman panel ever held with reference to planning and development, States members, Parish Officials and other parties formed the panel. The outcome was declared that the East boundaries of fields 422 and 423 were to be the end of the building line of the St Ouens Village development and no development would be allowed beyond this line because it would be classed as an extension into the countryside and that the area was to be classed as a very sensitive area due to the close proximity of the marsh, ie a Buffer Zone was created around the Marsh. Recently Planning refused a building application in	Comments Noted	See response to DP769 above. Map 2.2 on page 91 of the draft Plan shows the different character types identified in the Jersey Countryside Character Appraisal, based largely on landscape forms and a range of environmental and cultural assets and influences. It is accepted that the St. Ouen stream has a catchment area which extends well beyond the identified boundaries of the C3 character area (St. Ouen's Bay Escarpment and Valleys), but this additional catchment area falls into a different character area (E1 North-West Headland - St. Ouen). Contrary to what is inferred, the draft Plan protects the additional catchment area by its inclusion in the Green Zone, with its restrictive policy, just as in the current 2002 Island Plan. Irrespective of what may have been decided by certain parties in 1973, for land use planning purposes, it is the Island Plan, approved by the States, which sets the framework for the development and use of land in Jersey. It is the most important document for the planning and use of land and lies at the heart of the Plan-led system.	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
								this area because the site was in an area of open and natural land with an environmentally sensitive location which would result in the creeping domestication and permanent loss of an area of open land which would be harmful to the natural character of the immediate vicinity.			
DP1069		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy NR 1	Protection of Water Resources	Supporting	This issue must be placed far higher on the Environmental Agenda than it has been to date.		Comment Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP372		Mr Howard Snowden	Jersey Water		Water Conservation	Supporting	We note and welcome the proposals to improve water efficiency and conservation. Jersey Water will be commencing a water efficiency campaign alongside its plans to introduce universal metering. The campaign will promote the benefits of using water-saving domestic devices and we shall also be giving advice on water saving tips. Water audits will be offered to commercial customers with the aim of reducing water wastage. We welcome Proposal 20 - Water Conservation, which will require new developments greater than 1,000 m <sup>2</sup> or 10 dwellings, to have a 'water conservation strategy'. We would also recommend that such developments include provision for collection and storage of roof drainage water for external uses such as garden watering. Such installations would have the dual benefit of attenuating surface water drainage flows and reducing the demand for treated water in the summer months due to garden watering.		Support Noted	Notes: Proposal 20 places emphasis on reducing and managing demand for water. The recommendation that provision be made for the collection and storage of roof drainage, is addressed in the supporting text for Proposal 20 (para.9.18, 4th bullet point) among a list of potential water saving measures. The storage of rainwater for later use is also prominently highlighted in the drainage hierarchy set out in Policy LWM3 'Surface Water Drainage Facilities' (p.457). It is questionable whether Proposal 20 'Water Conservation' is or should be a policy!	Recommendation 1: On Page 357, Proposal 20 (Water Conservation) should become a policy.
DP199		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 20	Water Conservation	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP35		Mrs ani Binet			Energy Resources	Supporting	I support the idea of reducing energy use by improving the energy efficiency of the existing built environment and by setting high standards for all new buildings, and the idea of encouraging home owners to produce their own green energy, but I do not think the policy goes far enough, as well encouraging micro generation by reducing the planning restrictions on certain micro generators I believe that it should be written into the planning policies that new builds, as well as being energy efficient should also, to some extent, be energy self sufficient. By using good eco design new buildings could have the micro generator technologies built in to the very fabric of the building so that they are properly designed to work with these technologies enabling them to be much more efficient than installing these new technologies on buildings later	It would increase the energy efficiency of new buildings and decrease the islands dependency of fossil fuels and imported nuclear energy thereby reducing the vulnerability of the island and the environmental impacts from fossil fuel emissions and nuclear waste disposal, as well as going further to meet the goal of 'Secure, Affordable, Sustainable Energy'.	Noted	More detailed policies encouraging renewable energy technology in new builds are asked for. Energy standards for buildings, as set by the Building Bye-Laws in Jersey, are presently the subject of review. Work is also underway to develop, publish and adopt supplementary planning guidance which seeks to promote and encourage the more energy efficient design and construction of buildings, particularly homes. To actively promote energy efficiency in new buildings it is considered appropriate to incorporate a new policy in the draft Plan that reflects the 'Merton Rule' and subsequent variations by	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to require new development above a specified threshold to incorporate 10% renewable energy production.



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
							on.			requiring new development above a specified threshold to incorporate renewable energy production. Not only would this encourage the greater use of and reliance on renewable energy sources (e.g. photovoltaic energy, solar-powered and geo-thermal water heating, energy crops and biomass), it would also encourage energy saving measures to reduce the cost of providing 10% renewables (e.g. greater insulation, greater use of terraces and other energy efficient building forms, condensing boilers, passive stack ventilation, improved interior day lighting standards etc).	
DP366		Mr Paul Garlick			Energy Resources	Objecting	Item 9.20 remove the comment with regard to imported electricity being 90% free from fossil fuel emissions. Item 9.21 remove reference to the Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007). Item 9.22 modify to exclude the suggestion that Jersey's Draft Energy Policy of September 2007 would achieve secure, affordable and sustainable energy and remove reference to the options put forward by the Green Paper. Item 9.23 modify to refer to a future Energy Policy direction promoting sustainable energy solutions and commit to a full reassessment of the location of the fuel farm and the necessary future appropriate storage capacity for hydrocarbon fuels. Item 9.24 and 9.25 to change text to adopting a more realistic stance, a stance that recognises that electricity is imported from Europe has a significant carbon footprint particularly marginal loads such as that of Jersey and even more specifically heating load.	Item 9.20 as indicated in items 1 and 2 above the Draft Energy Policy of September 2007 makes inappropriate assumptions about the carbon footprint of imported electricity. Item 9.21 Jersey Gas have been told by PED that the Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007) is to be withdrawn and replaced with a new Draft Energy Policy in the first quarter 2010 which will have a different focus. Item 9.22 as highlighted Jersey Gas have been told by PED that the Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007) is to be withdrawn and replaced with a new Draft Energy Policy in the first quarter 2010 which will have a different focus. Also as evidenced in this document and the attached presentation, included as appendix 1, Jersey Gas are of the opinion that the Green Paper of 2007 would not achieve secure, affordable and sustainable energy for the Island. Item 9.23 as highlighted Jersey Gas do not feel it is appropriate to refer to the Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007) as we have been told by PED is to be withdrawn and replaced with a new Draft Energy Policy in the first quarter 2010 which will have a different focus. Jersey Gas believe that any new Draft Energy Policy that dovetails with other Islands strategies should commit to reassessing the location of the fuel farms and hydrocarbon fuel storage capacity. Such an assessment should look into the full benefits of hydrocarbon pipeline connections to Europe. The current situation is that PED have advised Members of the States of Jersey not to undertake such a review. Jersey Gas are of the opinion that PED's position as expressed through the Minister for the Planning and Environment ahead of the States debate on the proposal Natural Gas Pipeline; Strategic Study	Reject	The respondent suggests that the Energy Policy Green paper 'Fuel for Thought' (sept. 2007) has been withdrawn and thus comments referring to it should be removed. This is not the case. The Green Paper was a consultation document that still stands but the forthcoming Energy White Paper will develop the thinking put forward in the options Green Paper. P157/2009 is referred to and this was defeated in the States although the Minister has expressed that he would welcome solutions from the industry in relation to improved fuel security. The respondent makes many detailed and technical challenges to information that is not presented in the Island Plan Green Paper and that are not relevant to this review. There is considerable discussion with all the fuel industry stakeholders in the ongoing development of the Energy White Paper of which the Jersey Gas Company is fully involved. These discussions are considering the assertion by Jersey Gas that the department should not accept the legally declared carbon intensity of electricity supplied to Jersey by EDF. The respondent is incorrect in asserting that the forthcoming Energy White Paper will promote fuel switching to electricity. These issues are better dealt with in the context of	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.157/2009), had views that could be challenged. See appendix 2 in which the Minister's opinions are recorded along with Jersey Gas's comments. Item 9.24 Jersey Gas believe that the comment with regard to moving away from imported hydrocarbon fuels is or may be a reference to fuel switching to grid electricity as promoted by the Draft Energy Policy Green Paper (September 2007). Fuel switching to grid electricity will not move the Island away from hydrocarbon fuels, as stated circa 50% of electricity generated in Europe is from hydrocarbon sources. Item 9.25 Jersey Gas believes that the comment suggesting renewable energy at the utility scale is entirely possible over states the current situation. We believe that readers should be presented with information with regard to the technical challenges, the potential costs, problems associated with and likely timescales for renewable energy at the utility scale.		the Energy White Paper as are the potential challenges in realising utility scale renewable energy for Jersey. The Island Plan simply provides a spatial planning framework within which to consider applications for renewable energy installations should they come forward over the lifetime of the Plan.	
DP419		Mr Marc Burton	Institute of Directors		Energy Resources	Neither	The document refers to the promotion of the use of renewable energy sources. How this will be met is another question and the Island Plan appears to be silent on how renewable energy can be utilised and where for example wind turbines etc. could be sited. Whilst we acknowledge that the Island Plan is for a ten year period and that renewable energy may take longer to establish, thought should be given now to its utilisation and planning requirements to facilitate the harvest of our natural resources; The introduction of the new building bye-laws is essential to meeting the objectives of the Island Plan in terms of energy consumption and this matter needs to be addressed at the earliest opportunity, particularly now that the byelaws are under review and will be deferred; The Island Plan stays partly silent on how energy consumption can be reduced. Thought should be given to state requirements i.e. ECO Homes, BREEAM for commercial and residential developments etc. This is particularly relevant to affordable and social housing to ensure standards are improved. The building bye-laws (as and when they are changed) should not be the only means of improving standards. Has consideration been given to providing incentives to improve energy efficiencies i.e. tax breaks, fast track planning etc?; See attached letter	See attached letter	Accept	Energy standards for buildings, as set by the Building Bye-Laws in Jersey, are presently the subject of review. Work is also underway to develop, publish and adopt supplementary planning guidance which seeks to promote and encourage the more energy efficient design and construction of buildings, particularly homes. To actively promote energy efficiency in new buildings it is considered appropriate to incorporate a new policy in the draft Plan that reflects the 'Merton Rule' and subsequent variations by requiring new development above a specified threshold to incorporate renewable energy production. Not only would this encourage the greater use of and reliance on renewable energy sources (e.g. photovoltaic energy, solar-powered and geo-thermal water heating, energy crops and biomass), it would also encourage energy saving measures to reduce the cost of providing 10% renewables (e.g. greater insulation, greater use of terraces and other energy efficient building forms, condensing boilers, passive stack ventilation, improved interior day lighting standards etc).	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to require new development above a specified threshold to incorporate 10% renewable energy production.
DP602		Mr Paul Le Claire			Energy Resources	Neither	Funding for the life of the plan by making sure that any renewable energy policy is environmentally		Noted	The Tidal Power Commission will be putting forward recommendations to	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
							licensed and led with money ensuring a PLACE in Jersey for strong environmental solutions by being licensed by planning and paid through the department			the Minister for Planning and Environment for the development, licensing and consenting of renewable energy. The development of a detailed renewable energy policy is being undertaken by the Tidal Power Commission who will advise the Minister for Planning and Environment. The Minister is likely to then take a Report and Proposition to the States that will establish support for the principle of developing renewable energy and the appropriate regulating, consenting and licensing regime that should support this.	
DP48		Mr Jamie Copsey			Off-shore Renewable Energy	Supporting		I do think that this is one exception which should be encouraged as a development, wherever it may be. I appreciate this may be non-negotiable. However, I do feel that we have the luxury of concerning ourselves with the visual impact of such installations. I would like to see this point balanced by consideration of the volume of renewable energy such installations may provide; if it generates significant quantities of energy then visual concerns should be over-ridden. What we consider now to be a visual scar, in time becomes a point of interest. Wind turbines on the sutra pass leading into Edinburgh now provide an inspirational view, demonstrating how human innovation can be used to harness the worlds resources not simply exploit them. Bring on wind turbines and tidal energy in Jersey! This should also apply to personal installations of renewable energy sources. Planning regulations should promote greater energy self-sufficiency, arguably at all other costs.	Noted	The respondent suggests that there potentially too much emphasis paid to the visual impact of wind turbines in the planning process should such an application come forward. Stakeholder views are accounted for in the Environmental impact Process. Should an application come forward for a surface piercing renewable energy installation in Jersey waters an Environmental Impact Assessment would be mandatory. EIAs are iterative processes with stakeholder views being taken into account throughout the process. Visual impact, among many other considerations, would be addressed. It is quite possible that diverse and possibly opposing opinions would be bought forward and it will be for the Minister to make a planning decision based on the evidence in the round. It may be that a further stage of Examination in Public (Public Enquiry) is sought to further evaluate the evidence. Energy standards for buildings, as set by the Building Bye-Laws in Jersey, are presently the subject of review. Work is also underway to develop, publish and adopt supplementary planning guidance which seeks to promote and encourage the more energy efficient design and construction of buildings, particularly homes. To actively promote energy efficiency in new buildings it is considered appropriate to incorporate a new policy in the	The Minister notes the comments made about off-shore wind energy The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan to require new development above a specified threshold to incorporate 10% renewable energy production.

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
										draft Plan that reflects the 'Merton Rule' and subsequent variations by requiring new development above a specified threshold to incorporate renewable energy production. Not only would this encourage the greater use of and reliance on renewable energy sources (e.g. photovoltaic energy, solar-powered and geo-thermal water heating, energy crops and biomass), it would also encourage energy saving measures to reduce the cost of providing 10% renewable (e.g. greater insulation, greater use of terraces and other energy efficient building forms, condensing boilers, passive stack ventilation, improved interior day lighting standards etc).	
DP200		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 2	Exploratory, appraisal or prototype off-shore utility scale renewable energy proposals	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP201		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 3	Off-shore utility scale renewable energy development	Supporting	Support with caveat Due to the potential huge impact of such schemes (visual, on the marine environment, etc) I think the policy should make the holding of a public enquiry mandatory.		Rejected	The respondent calls for a public enquiry in the case of an application coming forward for a renewable energy installation. An Environmental Impact Assessment would be mandatory for any such application and this includes a significant amount of stakeholder consultation but there remains the potential for the Minister to call a Public Enquiry if a scheme was of a sufficient scale and impact. An Environmental Impact Assessment is mandatory for an application for renewable energy and will take into account the many areas outlined in the policy. EIAs are transparent processes that include stakeholder involvement at all stages so the final EIA should represent the results of an iterative process. However, the Minister for Planning and Environment may decide that an application is of sufficient impact and scale that a	The Minister notes the comments made but 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
										Public Enquiry is warranted and thus the policy as written does not preclude the potential for an enquiry to be called. To make a Public Enquiry mandatory as requested does not take into account that it might not be warranted depending on the type of application received but also does not preclude it.	
DP632		Richard Plaster	Jersey Electricity plc	Policy NR 3	Off-shore utility scale renewable energy development	Supporting		We note the comments on the potential for wind power, tide power etc. Over the coming decade or so, we expect these technologies to emerge in Channel Island waters - although there is presently considerable risk and uncertainty with such ventures (technical, commercial, regulatory, political risk etc). We would however be concerned should proposals for national parks etc. preclude large areas of the offshore resource from being available (or being made available on an economic basis) for new technologies as they emerge. In this regard we also need to consider that any renewable resource held offshore will require cabling to land power ashore with associated infrastructure at landing points.	Reject	Concern is expressed that there National Park Status would exclude renewable energy applications in offshore waters along with the necessary associated infrastructure. It is not expected that National Park Status will limit potential applications from progressing assuming that an acceptable Environment impact Assessment accompanies an application. It is not intended that National Park Status would exclude renewable energy applications in offshore waters along with the necessary associated infrastructure. The Department remains committed to forwarding renewable energy subject to evidence that there is not an unacceptable impact on the natural environment. The latter would be assessed by an Environmental Impact Assessment and perhaps even an Examination in Public should the scale and potential impact of the project be deemed substantial enough.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP949		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy NR 3	Off-shore utility scale renewable energy development	Supporting	Energy: There will be an increasing need to develop renewable energy sources in future and any restriction on their development would be unwise at this stage. Current opinion indicates that wave and tidal energy offer the best potential which have less visual impact but nevertheless will require careful consideration of other impact.		Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP871		Mr Stephen D Smith	Health Protection Services		On-Shore Renewable Energy	Neither	We agree that Jersey should consider renewable forms of energy and in particular tidal energy as Jersey's large tidal range makes it attractive as a test-ground for proving tidal technologies. We would be concerned about on land wind farms because of the low frequency noise associated with them. There needs to be an agreed mechanism as in the UK where electricity generated by for example domestic apparatus can be sold back to Jersey Electricity Company as this is not possible at present.		Noted	The Plan acknowledges that there is not the capacity for on-shore utility scale wind installations. The capacity to sell renewably generated electricity back into the local grid does exist locally but it is acknowledged that the current situation needs to evolve and this is addressed in the draft Energy Policy White Paper The Plan acknowledges that there is not the capacity for on-shore utility scale wind	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
										installations. The capacity to sell renewably generated electricity back into the local grid does exist locally but it is acknowledged that the current situation needs to evolve and this is addressed in the draft Energy Policy White Paper	
DP1070		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy NR 4	Proposals for on-shore renewable energy production	Neither	A macro scale review should be encouraged and form part of an overall process and strategy for the Island.		Noted	The Energy Policy White Paper will address the potential for renewable energy in detail and provides more detailed policies in respect on on-shore renewable energy	Noted by the Minister
DP202		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 4	Proposals for on-shore renewable energy production	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP203		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 5	Safety Zones for Hazardous Installations	Supporting			Support noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP258		Mr Colin Myers		Policy NR 5	Safety Zones for Hazardous Installations	Supporting	The States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service should be noted as the regulator and consultee for the Fuel Farm at La Collette and the Airport Fuel Storage facility with the Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate noted as the regulator and consultee for the LPG storage sites at La Collette and Les Ruettes St John. The Home Affairs Department should be noted as the regulator and consultee for the explosives site at Crabbe. In addition to proposals for new developments at La Collette being referred to the Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate and the States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service, proposals should also be submitted to the La Collette Hazard Review Group, which is a working group consisting of stakeholders from both States Departments and operators of the major hazards. Reference to consultation being made with the Health and Safety Executive should be replaced by consultation with the Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate.	To reflect the arrangements for regulating the major hazards sites and to include the Hazard Review Group in the consultation process for La Collette. The clarify the legal responsibility for regulating the hazardous installations at La Collette, the Airport and Crabbe. To correct the reference to the 'Health and Safety Executive' following comment from the UK Health and Safety Executive	Accept suggested changes	For the reasons set out by Mr Myers.	Recommendation 1: Amend from the end of the third sentence of para. 9.41 to read:" Proposals for new development at La Collette will be considered within the context of this work. They will be assessed in consultation with the Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate, the States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service, the La Collette Hazard Review Group and other

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
											La Collette users, as appropriate, against the current Health and Safety Executive's Planning Advise for Developments near Hazardous Installations (PADHI). Similar processes will be employed for developments within the vicinity of other hazardous installations in the Island, which will include consultations with the appropriate regulators."Recommendation 2: Amend Policy NR5 to read:" In considering development proposals within the following safety zones associated with hazardous installations, as designated on the Proposals Map, the Minister for Planning and Environment will consult those regulators identified in brackets and other relevant stakeholders to determine the appropriateness

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
											of the development: 1a. La Collette Fuel Farm (The States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service); 1b. La Collette LPG Storage Site (Health and Safety Work Inspectorate); 2. Les Ruettes LPG Storage Site, St. John (Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate); 3. Airport Fuel Storage Site (The States of Jersey Fire and Rescue Service); 4. Crabbé Explosive Storage Site, St. Mary (The Home Affairs Department). Developments within the vicinity of the hazardous installations at La Collette will also be the subject of consultations with the La Collette Hazard Review Group. In all cases, the health and safety of the public will be the overriding consideration. Developments that would conflict with the requirements of health and



Page 21 of 38

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
											include:"5. The Gas Holder, Tunnel Street (The Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate).
DP965		Mr John Nicholson		Policy NR 5	Safety Zones for Hazardous Installations	Neither	On Friday I stood in for Peter Thorne at a meeting to discuss the Tunnel Street Gas Holder, also attended by Colin Myers (Director of Health & Safety), Graham Spence (Jersey Gas, Michael Maguire (Fire Service) and Michael Long (Emergency Planning). Jersey Gas have commissioned a Quantified Risk Assessment for the low pressure water sealed gas holder (dating from the 1920's, and holding reserve stock), which identifies that there are risks of failure, and potential for off-site issues, which are considered to be 'tolerable' against the usual HSE framework. However, as yet, no land-use risk matrix has been developed (as has occurred at La Collette) - Graham Spence agreed to see if their consultants could add this to the current Assessment. Obviously this is still a 'work-in-progress' but I thought it worth flagging-up both in relation to the Island Plan Review, and the North Town Masterplan, where housing is indicated at the perimeter of the prospective town park, adjacent to the Jersey Gas land holding. Colin Myers also identified that the Jersey Gas Assessment should be independently reviewed, and appeared to be aware of the medium-term intention of Jersey Gas to decommission the gas holder, vacate the site and redevelop it, so releasing funds for the development of a second gas production plant - the location of which is yet to be considered (and given the Health & Safety / Land Use issues with the first production plant at La Collette could be problematic).		Noted	This makes absolute sense because the gas holder is currently used to hold reserve stock and has recently been the subject of a 'Quantified Risk Assessment', Recommendation 1: Amend the second sentence of para. 9.40 to read: "...Jersey Airport fuel store; Les Ruettes in St. John (where LPG is stored); and the gas holder at Tunnel Street (where reserve stock is held)." Recommendation 2: Amend the list of hazardous installations set out in Policy NR5 to include: "5. The Gas Holder, Tunnel Street (The Health and Safety at Work Inspectorate).	The Minister is minded to amend the plan
DP238		Mr Kevin Bowler			Mineral Resources	Supporting	These are the comments made on behalf of Granite Products Ltd. We support the Island Plan, and in particular its objectives for minerals planning and the need to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, these being:- To ensure, so far as practicable, the prudent, efficient and sustainable use of minerals and recycling of suitable materials. To	See attached letter	Support for the Island Plan and its objectives for	The letter does highlight the sustainability aim of securing mineral supply indigenously and proposes that all workable sand reserves at Simons Sand Ltd's site are worked and not limited by an "arbitrary time" restriction. This matter is addressed in	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
							conserve mineral resources through appropriate domestic provision and timing of supply. To safeguard mineral resources as far as possible. To prevent or minimise production of mineral waste. To secure working practices which prevent or reduce as far as possible, impacts on the environment and human health arising from the extraction, processing, management or transportation of minerals. To protect internationally and nationally designated areas of landscape value and nature conservation importance from minerals development. To secure adequate and steady supply of minerals needed by society and the economy within the limits set by the environment. To maximise the benefits and minimise the impacts of minerals operations over their full life cycle. To protect and seek to enhance the overall quality of the environment once extraction has ceased, through high standards of restoration, and to safeguard the long-term potential of land for a wide range of after-uses. To encourage the use of high quality materials for the purposes for which they are most suitable. Aim to secure mineral supply indigenously, to avoid exporting potential environmental damage, whilst recognising the primary role that market conditions play. To that end we would seek the maximisation of local resources and in particular not to impose arbitrary time weighted restrictions on extraction if local reserves are available. In particular we would propose that all workable sand reserves at Simons Sands are worked and not limited to 2018. Consider the benefits, in terms of reduced environmental disturbance and more efficient use of mineral resources, including full recovery of minerals, of extensions to existing mineral workings rather than new site. Take account of the benefit, including the reduction in carbon emissions, which local supplies of minerals would make in reducing the impact of transporting them over long distances by road. Recognise the important role that quarries can play in providing historically authentic building materials in the conservation and repair of historic and cultural buildings and structures. Enable the minerals industry, so far as is practicable, to secure productivity growth and high and stable levels of employment. Take account of the opportunities for enhancing the overall quality of the environment and the wider benefits that sites may offer, including nature and geological conservation and increased public accessibility, which may be achieved by sensitive design and appropriate and timely restoration. Consider the opportunities that sites may offer for providing networks of habitats. In		minerals planning is noted.	the response to DP617.	

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
							order to avoid the possibility of mineral working resulting in dereliction, ensure land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place through the provision of guidance on suitable or preferred after-uses and reclamation standards, and the use of conditions and legal agreements, as appropriate. See attached letter				
DP1012		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		Policy Context	Neither	para 9.65: To be considered as part of the 'Jersey Harbours Regeneration Zone'	To ensure this is not considered in isolation from other aspects of port development.	Noted	It is accepted that there may be other means by which Jersey Harbours will create adequate facilities for importing the Island's future sand requirements, as plans are developed for the 'La Collette and the Port Regeneration Zone.	Minister minded to amend Plan Amend Point 5 of the modified minerals strategy set out in Para. 9.65 to read:"5. Creating appropriate facilities at St. Helier Harbour for importing all the Island's future sand requirements..."
DP204		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective NR 2	Minerals Objectives	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP480		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey		Supply of Aggregates	Supporting	The Trust welcomes the confirmation that extraction at Simon Sand will not be extended beyond 2018 given the ecological significance of the duneland system.		Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP967		Jason Simon	Simon Sand & Gravel		Supply of Aggregates	Objecting	Objective The purpose of this response is to submit my views on the ability of the Island to provide itself with a locally available supply of sand for the next 18-20 years, possibly even longer, challenge the opinions put forward by the P & E committees (P&E) in the Draft Island Plan and its current thinking regarding the Islands future supply of sand and present some potential future after use options for the quarry site for general debate and consideration.	Introduction I commenced working for Simon Sand & Gravel Limited (SS&G) in 1989 and worked in all aspects of the business, both manual and administrative roles, rising to the position of Manager. In 1994 I supervised the change from a sole trader business to a registered company. Between 1995 & 2004 I held the position of Managing Director and for the past 5 years I have been the owner of SS&G. I believe that my experience gained during the last 20 years gives me the necessary credentials to be able to comment on this issue with some authority. As a key stakeholder in mineral extraction I have been involved with the many draft Island Plan Stakeholder Meetings which commenced back in November 2007. You may ask why I have left it till such a late stage in the consultation process to challenge its legitimacy and I answer simply that I wished to allow the process to take its course. But after two years of discussion my judgement in the	Reject - No change to plan	This response addresses each broad area of contention in the order they are raised. 1. Extending the Life of the Quarry The draft Plan recognises: - there have been changes since the Jersey Mineral Strategy was produced; - the importance of sand to the local construction industry; - there are 10-12 years worth of reserves of sand in addition to those currently permitted for extraction. There is also sympathy for the owner/operator who wishes to extend the life of a quarry, which has been a family business in the Bay for 100 years or so. To do so would extend / maximise the life of an important locally available resource and so have wider sustainability advantages. However, the overriding concern is that it would increase the	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>belief that the process would be heading towards a satisfactory common sense conclusion was, I now feel, incorrect and it is imperative that I make my opinions known. One of my biggest concerns regarding the P&amp;E current thinking on sand supplies for the Island is the departments, planners and officers continued reliance on the outdated report produced in the mid to late 90's by Arup which formed the basis for their intended proposition to take to the States called the Jersey Mineral Strategy 2000 - 2020 (JMS). A proposition that was not put forward for debate and therefore was never approved although it was used to guide policy making for the 2002 Island Plan. In the 10 years since the JMS was produced a lot of things have changed politically, economically, ecologically and I intend to highlight these points in my response. Local Resource SS&amp;G quarry two types of sand and shale stone from privately owned land in St Ouens Bay that was zoned for extraction in 1976. The current permit was granted in 2003 for a 15 year period. The products, supplied solely for the Island, are all primary aggregates and no other operations (recycling, landfill etc.) currently take place on the site. Sand is an important commodity to the local construction industry and there are reserves, in addition to those currently permitted for extraction, which would be beneficial to the Island to extract. Whilst importation will eventually become necessary maximising extraction of the local sand resource will assist with keeping building costs down, has less of an impact environmentally because of its proximity to the end users and most importantly the government maintain some control over the operation. Reserve It is anticipated that the sand reserves within the site boundary and approved for extraction will meet local supplies, at the current demand rate, until the expiry of the latest permit. Due to the fluctuations in the various sand deposit layers it is difficult to give an accurate figure on this reserve but an educated estimate from the area left to be extracted would be in the region of 630,000 - 700,000 tonnes. Another reserve, owned by the company, that falls within the area zoned in 1976, but is presently being used for environmental mitigation, does not form part of the extraction area for the current permit. An early indication towards maximising the extraction of the local sand resource would allow SS&amp;G time to alter its current restoration programme thus</p>		<p>adverse impact on the sensitive coastal dune land environment, a significant area of which has been replaced with a large body of open water. It would also serve to overturn a longstanding commitment to wind down the quarry and would simply delay, for a relatively short period, the inevitable requirement for importation. (see also the response to DP617). 2. Allowing for recycling operations (sand &amp; soil) on site It is agreed that this would help to reduce demands for quarry sand. The draft Plan encourages recycling and Policy WM4 allows for any proposals for recycling to be considered on their merits. 3. Suitability of the product Although the Arup study and original Mineral Strategy highlight the limitations of the product for certain uses, this is not regarded as a primary reason for justifying the winding down of the quarry. 4. Alternatives to the use of sand The comments about the impact of less sand-intensive construction methods (i.e. timber frame and steel frame buildings) and increased recycling in contributing to the conservation of local sand resources over recent years are noted and understood. 5. Ecological Issues It is accepted that the findings of the EIA, produced in conjunction with Simon's 2003 planning application provide detailed information on a wide range of environmental issues. The application was effectively in accordance with the original Mineral Strategy and the permit provided the company with sufficient time and comfort to confidently invest in modernising its plant and machinery, on the understanding that it would cease operating in 15 years. The EIA was a requirement to allow a proper assessment of the environmental effects and served to ensure significant impacts were avoided or mitigated. What did id say? There is no doubting the quality of restoration and environmental management carried</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>preventing the loss of a reserve which is being buried under more soil. The yield from this reserve is estimated at 250,000 to 300,000 tonnes or between 4-5 years supply. There are also potential reserves under several smaller fields, which fall within the zoned area for extraction, immediately adjacent to the current site. Some of the fields are not in the ownership of SS&amp;G. These smaller reserves could yield a further 3-5 years of sand at the current annual rate of extraction.</p> <p>Maximisation Of Local Resource If the option to maximise extraction of local sand reserves was adopted it would potentially result in the Island being able to supply sand for itself for the next 18-20 years. This exceeds the 2018 closure date, suggested by the consultants Arup, in the JMS report of 1999, by a further 8-10 years. Inevitably, the importation of sand and other aggregates into the Island will occur with the consequence that a berthing facility will need to be built somewhere on the Island and it looks likely that this might be operational before 2018. Adopting this scenario would see imported and locally available sand competing in the market place as well as giving the customer the ability to be able to choose the sand most suitable for their purpose. Another option, that would extend the life of the locally available resource, is the adopting of operation specific recycling at the Islands quarries. This idea would see that sand and soil excavated around the Island was brought to the sand quarry site for recycling meaning that, for certain applications, the recycled material could be mixed with the primary aggregate. As well as extending the life of sand reserves this has the additional benefit of recycling sand and soil that might otherwise end up at the La Collette landfill site. The fact that Granite Products Limited has been granted an extension to their quarry site, which contradicts the JMS stated Preferred Mineral Strategy, by allowing them to extract beyond 2020, must be seen as a positive move by P&amp;E towards maximising locally sourced materials. As such SS&amp;G should be given the same opportunity to be able to amend its future plans to allow for the maximisation of its resource. This option has benefits socially, economically and environmentally which can not be ignored in favour of early importation. Is it not hypocritical of us as a community to say "I don't want sand quarrying in my Island but please can you supply me some of your resources?" from who or where</p>		<p>out by the company around the lagoon that has been created by quarrying. 6. After Use The draft Plan encourages the development of appropriate 'restoration and after use' schemes in association with mineral extraction sites and provides for applications to be considered on their merits (Policy NR9). It also supports the idea of terrestrial landfill, where this might contribute to the restoration of suitable existing mineral workings (Policy WM8). Whilst La Gigoulande is the preferred / designated option, the draft Plan recognises that Simon Sand and Gravel may wish to bring forward proposals, which might provide opportunities to restore dune habitats in the area (para 10.98, p.435).</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>ever we decide to source it from. It will be an entirely different matter when we do not have a resource available to us locally. Suitability One of the disadvantages of maximising local supply according to the JMS report states "retaining sand with a limited range of applications" and over the years much has been said regarding the suitability of the sand quarried from St Ouens Bay. Most of it misleading and inaccurate comments and articles from politicians, civil servants and consultants who did not have the correct facts or had not bothered to investigate the matter fully or even contact the business directly for information. I continue to strongly dispute this point as SS&amp;G quarry supply several different products with a good range of applications. These include sand for concrete and blocklaying, sand for plastering, rendering and pointing, black sand for backfill of trenches and foundations and shale stone for pipe bedding, garden landscaping, drives and pathways. All our products meet the current British Standards and European Number specifications for their particular areas and uses. Another comment often heard is the fact that granite dust has to be added to our sand when it is used to make large volumes of concrete. I respond to this point and say that although the sand supplied for concrete is a fine wind-blown deposit (of which 94% is less than 1.18mm in size) it must be understood that this is a naturally occurring resource which we only process to ensure that it contains particles no larger than 4mm. Granite dust is added to the concrete products manufactured by Granite Products Limited and Ronez Limited but this is not a unique practise specific to Jersey. Stone quarries the world over produce a lot of fine stony dust as a by-product during the processing of stone and one way to move this product on is to add it into the manufacturing of concrete and blocks. It should be noted that approximately a third of our annual output is supplied to these two companies who use it in the manufacturing of their concrete products. To date, I am unaware of any specific limitations on the products we supply and since SS&amp;G has been supplying the Islands construction industry, for the last 100 years, I have yet to hear of any structurally defective building issues that arose directly as a consequence of our sand being used in there construction. Sustainable Alternatives Sand or Silicon Dioxide (SiO2) is composed of Silicon and Oxygen. On Earth, silicon</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
								is the second most abundant element, after oxygen, making up over a quarter of the Earths crust by mass. Because of this global availability it is unlikely that nothing will replace sand on its economy and will always make it the first choice. In places where it is not readily available the next alternative is a product called broken sand (stone broken down into fine sand). This method requires stone to be heavily processed although it is something not currently undertaken in Jersey. If this option was given some consideration it would seem imprudent to do so as the Island has finite stone resources and stone turned to sand would deplete the reserves quicker, use a lot of energy to produce and eventually lead to the need for stone to be imported earlier than necessary. Ultimately, this alternative would seem fool hardy when we have sand reserves on the Island available to quarry. In other specialist concrete jobs, sand can be replaced with alternative materials to increase the properties of the final product, such as pearlith (to produce light weight concrete) or magma ash (to produce heat resistant concrete), but these are more expensive. As it is very unlikely that a replacement for sand will be found soon the only plausible option to look at, as an alternative, is the use of other materials in the construction and building industry. This is already being practised in Jersey and is done in various ways but the two biggest alternatives are timber frame housing and steel frame with glass town/office buildings. Both these methods require considerably less sand in there construction. As well as having good environmental and sustainable credentials they reduce our reliance on sand with the result that the Islands reserves are protected and extend the quarries operational life. The following table shows the figures for the last 10 years output from SS&G quarry. The figures shown are in 5 year blocks and include the annual average for each period. The forecast tonnage for 2009 is likely to be between 64-66,000 tonnes. Tonnage Statistics - 2000 to 2009 Year Tonnage Year Tonnage 2000 63,252 2005 74,468 2001 89,325 2006 78,494 2002 83,274 2007 64,751 2003 73,436 2008 66,905 2004 70,886 2009 66,000 (forecast) 5 Year Average 76,034 70,123 The effect of these alternative materials, along with other influences such as adding granite dust to concrete products and more recycling, can be identified. Using the average figures from the last 5 years a reduction			

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>in supply of almost 8% can be seen when compared with the first half of the decade. This may not sound significant but this reduction equates to approximately 29,555 tonnes over that period and demonstrates clearly that, although this method is not a direct alternative for sand, using alternative building materials and other practises positively increases the longevity of the Islands sand reserves. Turning once again to the JMS and in particular a sustainable framework for mineral extraction the following suggestions are made. To conserve minerals as far as possible, while ensuring an adequate supply to meet needs of the local community. To minimise production of waste and encourage efficient uses of materials, including appropriate use of high quality materials and recycling of wastes. The current alternative materials and methods, mentioned earlier, are already contributing to the conservation of the local supplies of minerals. Almost all the sand extracted from SS&amp;G quarry is used to meet local demand with less than 1% which has no commercial value, being used for landscaping of the site, which is evidence for the highly efficient working of this sand reserve. Ecological Issues</p> <p>There are a lot of comments made in the JMS referring to the potential impacts the continued extraction of sand might have on the immediate environment. All the observations made on environmental and socio-economic issues raised were not substantiated in the report by any further study and therefore can only be seen as conjecture. Whilst applying for our latest permit SS&amp;G was charged by P&amp;E with supplying an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to add weight to the planning application. In June 2003 our EIA was presented along with the application for consideration which led to the approval and permit being granted at the end of Aug 2003. The EIA contained extensive study and research into many topics including, hydrology and hydrogeology, flora and fauna, landscape, archaeology, geology, noise, vibration and dust, traffic and access. Also put forward in the document were mitigation measures which are still in place today and involve the annual monitoring of flora and fauna, invertebrates and green lizards. Because the EIA and subsequent annual monitoring reports were produced at least three years after the completion of the JMS the factual evidence they contain has not been taken into consideration when deliberating this Island</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>Plan Review. Evidence which I feel would positively support the adoption of maximising the Islands supply of locally available sand as well as disproving many of the unfounded ecological points raised in the JMS. One point raised in the JMS was the loss of land that continued extraction would have on all quarry sites. However, with the removal of sand from below the water table at the SS&amp;G site a large reserve of fresh water has been created. Jersey Water actively abstract water from boreholes on the Sand Dunes and this unofficial reservoir greatly increases the quantity of water held back for Island wide consumption which would otherwise have found its way to the sea. Although this change of use from land loss to water reservoir can be seen to be detrimental one of the facts compiled from the annual monitoring is that the continuing restoration and management of dunescapes around the quarry site hold more plant and wildlife, especially green lizards, when compared to areas of the quarry that have yet to be extracted. The JMS when discussing a sustainable framework for mineral extraction make the following suggestion. To encourage sensitive working practises during extraction and to preserve or enhance the overall quality of the environment once extraction is completed. Throughout its long history SS&amp;G has always been aware of its duty of care to the environment and it is something that I am justly proud of. Although we have always had self believe in our working practises and environmental management skills until the annual monitoring reports were put into place we had no data to prove there effectiveness. After several years of reporting and monitoring this data is now available and substantiates our past efforts. Quarrying with Conservation has been the motto of SS&amp;G for some years now and extraction of sand from the site has always been done whilst being mindful of the immediate environment and its inhabitants and as such it will continue to receive the due consideration it merits. Potential After Use The potential for after uses are many however, the final solution for the area must take into consideration the Islands community needs as well as the immediate environmental concerns. I have listed below what I consider to be options that warrant more discussion. One option is to consider the quarry as an alternative to a berth at the harbour. This could be done be using an offshore berth positioned in St Ouens Bay with an</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>underground pipe line directly into the quarry site allowing imported sand to be delivered by ship straight into the quarry site. When the berth was not in use it can be made to be submersed below the sea water so as not to detract from the view. This would have the benefits of not requiring handling at the harbour thus avoiding the costly port dues as well as reducing heavy lorry traffic collecting sand from the harbour/town areas. Another consideration is the maintenance of the site as a large body of fresh water for Island wide consumption. Adopting this after use would benefit from implementing the maximising of local resources option as the more sand extracted the more fresh water can be retained. This unofficial reservoir will have obvious benefits for the Island not least the fact that it will not cost the public anything to create. One negative point that has already been highlighted as a concern, by Jersey Airport, is the close proximity of such a large body of water to the end of the runway. The option to reinstate the site, using inert landfill, must also be given due consideration. Again, it would not cost the public money to set up unlike another reclamation site or other possible alternatives. It also has the added benefit of longevity as it will take a considerable amount of time to reinstate the site. I conservatively estimate that we would have a void volume available of approximately 4 million tonnes, if the maximising of the supply of local resources option was taken, which is an area roughly equal to the current La Collette landfill site and would provide the Island with an inert landfill for a period of 10+ years. SS&amp;G has proven over the years that with careful management of the site it has been able to excavate a valuable resource with minimal impact and in enhance the habitat for wildlife. If the after use to reinstate the land, using inert landfill, was given approval then I am confident that I can manage the reinstatement in such a way that it will be of greater benefit to the immediate environment and its inhabitants. However, I am mindful that after the decision was taken by SS&amp;G to progressively restore the site rather than waiting until extraction was completed has meant that we have unwittingly created a wildlife reserve making the decision to reinstate the site a difficult one. Tourism may also be a plausible after use for the site. This could take the form of some kind of outward bound centre offering recreational activities such as rambling,</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>orienteering, mountain bikes, etc. As there will also be a large lake created, once extraction is completed, the opportunity to offer sailing, canoeing, windsurfing, etc. training in a safe environment before heading out on to the seas will exist. As fresh fishing is a very popular recreational activity filling the reservoir with fish would be a credible option to consider. There is also the idea of offering small buildings for holiday makers, similar to the eco-friendly apartments that have been built at Les Ormes, and a campsite with space for visiting caravans and motor homes making it an ideal place for visitors to explore St Ouens Bay and the Island. One or all of these holiday/tourist based ideas could easily be accommodated on the site and as long as the activities were not of a disruptive or intrusive nature the after use option for eco-tourism must be seen as a realistic option. Conclusion All of my views could be seen to be orientated or weighted in favour of business activities as I am a businessman however, do not discount them because of this fact. Having lived and worked this particular area of St Ouens Bay all my life I have attempted to keep my comments as impartial as possible looking at the Islands needs rather than my own. No-one wants to see it managed correctly and ultimately made available for future generations to enjoy more than I do. Finally, I strongly believe that it is not the function of P&amp;E to determine that all sand must be imported. Should it not be upon the States to create a business environment where there is competition between my company and any importer of sand rather than imposing a requirement on my business to close down altogether? Given that the land has been used for the extraction of sand for the last 100 years (with permits being issued since 1965) P&amp;E need to have a very good reason for saying why such a long established and approved use should be discontinued.</p>			
DP205		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 6	Supply of Aggregates	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP479		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Policy NR 6	Supply of Aggregates	Objecting	<p>Whilst appreciating the benefit of having a sustainable, local supply of crushed rock aggregate the Trust believes that the Minister should ensure that the stated policy also acknowledges the need to safeguard and protect the coastal environment around Sorel Point in terms of landscape, ecology and geology. It is noted that this is referred to in Policy</p>	<p>However, the revised mineral strategy must ensure that an appropriate balance is struck between securing supply of aggregate and the further destruction of a sensitive coastal site.</p>	Reject / Disagree	<p>The primary purpose of this policy is to ensure a steady supply of aggregates, because this is essential to the Island's future prosperity and quality of life. The policy is balanced in that it recognises the need to minimise adverse environmental effects by</p>	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
							NR8 in relation to extended workings.			adopting a sustainable (environmentally favourable) approach. This also accords with UK Government Guidance on minerals planning. The requirement for a 10 year 'land bank' of permitted reserves for crushed rock, will effectively act as an indicator of when new permissions for aggregate extraction are needed. Any applications will have to be assessed against Policy NR8 (New or Extended Mineral Workings) which makes adequate provision for ensuring that the environmental impacts of such proposals are properly considered. This will provide the means for protecting the coastline around Sorel Point from unacceptable environmental impacts associated with future proposals to extend Ronez Quarry. Other relevant policies which look to protect the character of the coast and biodiversity include GD1 (General Development Considerations), NE6 (Coastal National Park), NE7 (Green Zone), NE1 (Conservation and Enhancement of Biological Diversity), NE2 (Species Protection). Recommend - Add "areas of ecological importance" to the criteria listed in 2a of Policy GD1.	
DP837		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy NR 6	Supply of Aggregate s	Supportin g	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP206		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 7	Secondary and Recycled Materials / Alternative Aggregate s Production	Supportin g			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP207		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 8	New or Extended Mineral Workings	Supportin g	Support with caveat The first numbered point 5 seems unnecessary given that the JCRA has powers to ensure that monopolies do not abuse their market position.		Support Noted	At present there is a 'duopoly' operating in the Island for quarrying of crushed rock. Clearly, if a 'monopoly' situation were to occur, where one operator could exercise control over price and/or output it would be a cause for concern (e.g. providing	The Minister is minded to omit criterion 5 from Policy NR8 and the corresponding bullet point in

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
										potential for abnormal profits), which could pose a risk for the local construction industry and work against the Island's economic interests. Preventing a monopoly situation arising is, I think, a laudable aim, which I believe is a reasonable consideration (among many) in helping to formulate and support the Jersey Minerals Strategy. However, it is fair to say that the Island's Planning and Building Law is concerned with land use matters and is not designed to safeguard competition and consumer choice. As this law does not specifically provide for competition issues to be addressed in the planning consent process, criterion 5 should be removed from the policy and any such matter should be addressed by the JCRA and the Island's competition laws, which are designed to protect consumers from any unfair monopoly business activities / anti- competitive behaviour.	the explanatory text (para. 9.83)
DP438		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union	Policy NR 8	New or Extended Mineral Workings	Supporting	The protection of good agricultural land is regarded as positive.		Support Noted	Comment - The protection of good agricultural land is actually referred to in the supporting text for the policy (para. 9.84). Policy ERE 1 is the main policy requiring the safeguarding of agricultural land. See also Policy NE7 (Green Zone) and Policy GD 1 (General Development Considerations).	Support is noted by the Minister
DP208		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 9	Restoration, Aftercare and After Use	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP481		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Policy NR 9	Restoration, Aftercare and After Use	Supporting	The Trust fully endorses and very much welcomes this policy.		Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP838		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy NR 9	Restoration, Aftercare and After Use	Supporting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP209		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 10	Use Of Planning Conditions On	Supporting			Support 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
					Mineral Workings						
DP224		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 11	Use of Legal Agreements	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1013		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		New Off-loading Facilities for Imported Aggregates	Neither	para 9.97: This could be less specific within the Plan. It should be the responsibility of Jersey Harbours to provide appropriate facilities as identified.		The need to be less specific about the type and nature of the new facility required for future sand imports is accepted.	This can be determined as part of comprehensive development plans for the port area and/or the La Collette and Port Regeneration Zone. The important planning requirement is that adequate facilities are made available to ensure a continuous supply of sand to the building industry when local production ceases.	Minister is minded to make the following amendments: Recommendation 1: That the text is amended at the end of the third sentence of para. 9.100 to read:"...as part of the 20 Year Port Masterplan study. It is clear now that the extent and nature of the facility needs to be reviewed , given: - the recently extended life expectancy of La Gigoulande Quarry; - the new strategic approach to mineral planning, which looks to maximise opportunities for local production of crushed rock aggregate; - the possibility that planning permission will be forthcoming for the working of additional crushed rock resources at La

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
											Gigoulande and Ronez; and - the proposal to produce a comprehensive plan for the 'La Collette and the Port Regeneration Zone'. Ultimately, Jersey Harbours will have responsibility for making adequate provision for sand importation as part of emerging plans for the development of the port. Recommendation 2: That the beginning of Policy NR12 is amended to read: "The Minister for Planning and Environment will support the provision of adequate aggregate importing facilities (principally for sand imports) at St. Helier Harbour and will seek to ensure, in consultation with Jersey Harbours, that the facilities are provided at the earliest opportunity, prior to 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
											ceasing of sand extraction at Simon Sand and Gravel Ltd in 2018. Detailed proposals for the facilities..."Recommendation 3: That the symbol for the 'Aggregates Import Facility' is removed from the Draft Island Plan Proposals Map and Town Proposals Map.
DP210		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 12	New Off-loading Facilities for Imported Aggregates	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP1165		Richard Plaster	Jersey Electricity plc	Policy NR 13	Utilities Infrastructure Facilities	Objecting	In terms of our own long term capital spend, the main development which we foresee impacting the Island Plan is the need for a site for a compact, fast start generating plant similar to our current gas turbine generators. For strategic and emergency supply reasons, it is important that this be sited remotely from the present two generating sites at La Collette and Queens Road. Our clear preference is for a site to be identified at the airport where we have the potential of utilising the current aero fuel supply and our new 90kV Western Primary substation.		Noted	Policy NR13 allows for the development of new infrastructure facilities within the grounds of existing facilities and within the Built-up Area. Jersey Airport is not within the BUA and the extent of land required, relative to the existing facility is not known. Despite much work with the JEC in relation to the development of the Energy Policy White Paper and the context of the resilience of Jersey's energy supply, this matter has not previously been raised. There is a need to establish the basis of the requirement and the anticipated timescale for provision. The strategic preference for a location at Jersey Airport can be considered within the context of the Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone (Proposal 12).	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP211		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 13	Utilities Infrastructure Facilities	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP212		Mr Stephen de		Policy NR 14	Telecommunications Masts	Supporting			Support 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									
DP213		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy NR 15	Satellite TV Receiving or Communication Antennae	Supporting	Support with caveat To avoid the horrible sight of multiple dishes on a building, I think that the policy (final paragraph) should be amended to state a presumption against the approval of individual dishes in a multi occupancy building i.e. a presumption that approval will only be forthcoming for a communal dish.		support noted and it is agreed that the policy should be more pro-active in encouraging the use of communal satellite dishes, where appropriate	That the final para. of Policy NR15 is amended to read: "Where there are proposals for larger housing developments and buildings in multiple occupancy, developers will be expected to provide carefully sited communal satellite dishes, to avoid the unnecessary visual clutter associated with a proliferation of individual antennae and reduce the overall impact on the environment.	The Minister is minded to amend the draft Plan