



PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

# Draft Island Plan – White Paper

## **Economy**

### Minister's Response to consultation

27<sup>th</sup> May 2010

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
<b>Economy</b>											
DP1008		Mr John Mesch	Council for the Protection of Jersey's Heritage	5	Economy	Objecting	9. In Section 5 on the economy it is remarkable that the second largest industry in Jersey, which is larger than tourism and agriculture combined, the one producing a third of all domestic waste and two thirds of inert waste and the one having the greatest impact on all aspects of the environment including the size of the Island's carbon footprint is not mentioned at all. It is recognised that the activities of the Construction/Demolition industry is controlled by enforcing planning and environmental policies laid out in the draft plan. Nonetheless, the seriously damaging effects this industry has on the natural environment and global warming should be addressed directly in the draft plan. (As a matter of interest it takes 50 years to recover the carbon expended in the construction of an energy efficient building).		Noted	The construction industry is indeed a significant part of the Island's economy but it only has an indirect impact upon economic land use issues addressed in this section of the Plan. The effects of this industry are dealt with more directly in other sections of the plan, such as the waste management and general development control policies sections.	Noted by the Minister
DP608		Mr Bruce Willing		5	Economy	Objecting	The Employment Land Section, in Section 5 of the DIP needs to be reviewed to ensure that Tourism, in particular, is not compromised by the removal of the 'Change of Use' provision and this broader approach that at least reviews the proposal for a MEP, submitted to Housing by the JFU in 2001.	Buried in Section 5, the Economy Section of the DIP is the "Protection of Employment Land" subsection. There is no link within it to the statement in the Introduction to the DIP of the need to "maintain a strong, environmentally sustainable and diverse economy" . It is almost as if the Planning Department has not consulted with the Economic Development Department in drafting this part of the DIP. This part of the DIP fundamentally affects two economic sectors, Agriculture and Tourism. If the States Strategic Plan's key requirement (shown in bold above) is to be met, this section of the DIP needs revision. The land would be valued at £600,000 per acre, which would include all ancillary land and would include the removal and clearance of all structures to return the area to a green field site The scheme would be voluntary and only available for a specified period of time. Any grower offering their unit for the scheme would be able to rent back the unit at a nominal charge until such time as the States wished to start development of that land. The future use of the land would be dictated by the States of Jersey in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Island Plan for the benefit of the people of Jersey." Regrettably the MEP was not adopted. If it had of been we probably would not be faced with a housing shortage 21e nine years later, a factor that directly relates to meeting the requirement for Affordable Homes. It is recommended that this MEP proposal be re-visited within the DIP. Tourism: The 'Change	Noted and minded to review	The glasshouse exit strategy referred to was proposed in last Island Plan, however the assessment was that many of the sites either fell outside of the Spatial Strategy or were in prominent landscape areas. However Policy ERE7 proposes a mechanism for dealing with the problem of derelict glass and it is accepted that sites may become redundant during the plan period. Accordingly a review of this issue would be appropriate.	The Minister notes the comment and is minded to review the issue of redundant glass.

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 Use' regulations have underpinned the establishment and maintenance of the Financial and Legal services sector over the past thirty years by allowing local hotel and guest house owners a 'soft landing' as the economic conditions within their sector changed in parallel with the global tourism market. If the Protection of Employment Land section in the DIP is allowed to stand, it will remove 'Change of Use' to the detriment of the economy as a whole and the Tourism sector in particular.			
DP628		Mr Alan Le Rossignol		5	Economy	Neither	Ideas have often been expressed about diversifying the economy and this is an urgent concern which should also have been aired before the Island Plan. There should be a clear Policy on increasing economic diversity to guide the land use plan. Presently the cross-section of economic activity is dangerously skewed to the finance industry with the result that the cross section of people in the island is odd. We used to have a much wider agricultural base and with trends to buy local produce and avoid transporting goods needlessly it occur to me that we should be promoting growers. With the world population increasing it may well be extremely important in the future to produce more food in the island. We used to have a mushroom farm, strawberry farm, tomato growers, flower growers and small market gardens producing a variety of vegetables and fruit. The continued loss of good agricultural land and glasshouses is short sighted. Several glasshouse areas are identified for development in the Island Plan. It seems to be foolhardy to re-allocate those glass house areas for "development" just because they are not viable at this time. They may once again be vital for re-developing a more diverse economy and I feel they should be encouraged to be used for agriculture. There seems to be much money spent on promoting finance and perhaps subsidies should be considered to promote agricultural expansion. I feel that it would be short sighted to accept that redundant glasshouses are no longer viable- we may be desperate to have glasshouses again in the future. Small growing businesses may prove to be successful economic concerns in the near future.		Noted	There are 2 key policies in the plan that aim to support the States strategic aim of a diverse economy SP5 and EO1. These are new policies and close liaison is expected with the Economic Development Department to ensure that these aims are met. Only a very small number of outworn and poor quality glasshouses have been identified in the plan for much needed category A family housing. The number of sites expected to be removed by the Minister following objections by the constables has further reduced this number.	Noted by the Minister
DP323		Mrs Penelope Lee			E: Introduction	Objecting	Immigration needs to be tightly controlled, we are currently importing problems.		Noted	The Plan responds to the Migration Policy as approved and adopted by the States	Noted by the Minister
DP37		Ms Chantal Gosselin			E: Introduction	Neither	Widen the horizons of tourism to provide a greater contribution to the economy and social fabric of the community.e.g Historical / Marine Biology/ Ecological Health or Cosmetic Surgery/ Educaiton/Langage/Sports Activities-the Is it goes on.	We need a more diverse profile of sources of income. We are experts in tourism but have a very narrow approach to marketing ourselves-simply as a holiday destination [ and even that we keep narrowly to just one or two markets in Europe and	Noted	Some of these comments fall outside the control of the Island plan. With regards to creating a marine centre or similar this would be subject to either; 1.	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
							Why cannot we focus on becoming a Marine Biology Centre with our unique range of species both above and below the sea. This would not just attract tourists during all seasons, but also educational tourism visit schools/universities /research centres.etc We are also well positioned to develop a research entirely not alternative power sources-why don't we give a tax break to all companies wanting to set up business developing solar/hydro or wind power? So we become a centre of excellence for such areas	the UK!!-there is a global market out there we could be harnessing!] But we have other attractions to offer and could develop more attractions that attract a wider more diverse audience. These centres would also acts as tourist attractions for the annual holiday/short break market, egg. Along the lines of the Eden Centre. [Cornwall has also become a cosmetic surgery holiday attraction!!] Turning Plemont in to a Marine centre or Alternative power research centre would add social cultural as well as economic benefits. Investing in Olympic level sports facilities- a ski slope and ice rink/ indoor multipurpose arena would add tourist as well economic appeal.		States funding, and no States department has made a formal representation to put this idea forward, or 2. Private funding and equally no formal representation have been made. In either case existing policies are adequate to support such a proposal if it came forward and met the criteria of the policy (EVE1).	
DP987		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		E: Introduction	Objecting	Marine Leisure is not specifically mentioned within the plan, yet it arguably provides a valuable growth and diversification opportunity for the Islands economy. There should be a separate policy for Marine Leisure.	The Marine Leisure industry provides a valuable growth area for the Island's economy and is not specifically mentioned in the Plan. As well as the economic advantages, it provides valuable social, environmental and cultural opportunities for the Island. Growth also presents opportunities for tourism, sport and recreation in support of other States policies. A separate proposal should be made for Marine Leisure	Reject	The marine leisure industry is an important one to the economy and indeed has benefits to the Island's cultural, sporting and social opportunities. There are other areas of the plan however, such as the proposals related to the master planning work on the port areas that should address these points. A marine leisure policy is not warranted for inclusion into the economy section.	Minded not to support insertion of new marine leisure policy into Economy section.
DP568		Deputy John Le Fondre			E: Objectives and Indicators	Neither	Economy - as previously noted, certain parts of Town are looking very 'tired', run down, and with an increasing risk of vacancies. Hence new development on the Esplanade Quarter needs to be very carefully considered as regards the impact on the existing Central Town economy.		Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP853		Ed Le Quesne			E: Objectives and Indicators	Neither	I am not putting forward an item by item comment on the proposed plan, but would like to suggest a real change in mindset for Jersey as we are facing a very different world with a rising cost of energy and a growing concern about climate change. I would like to commend the case put forward by Michael Shuman, at a Chamber of Commerce lunch lecture in February It was well-summarised by Harry Candle in the JEP. (see attached) It is a real wake-up call for Jersey. He said that the TINA mindset (There is no alternative) believes in attracting Toyotas (i.e. big global companies) promoting exports (develop potato exports rather than local food) reassuring locals (big office buildings at the Waterfront and more immigration is what we need!) my examples in brackets for his 3 points. An example this month is to promote the case for an extra supermarket in Jersey, which will take more money out of the Jersey		Noted	These are laudable aims and ideas that are relevant at the States strategic policy level	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
							economy. The LOIS mindset (Locally owned, import substitution) looks forward to the time when oil prices are much higher and self-sufficiency becomes important. He mentioned the Transition Towns initiative in UK as similar. In the USA, it goes by the name of BALLE (Business Alliance of Local Living Economies) www.livingeconomies.org gives more details of what looks like a fast growing movement, as the massive amounts invested in mega banks have little effect on the small local economies. In Jersey we have the world's biggest banks, top 500, but can't organise a simple thrift club for ordinary people at St. Martin LOIS also has lots of good effects on civil society, with more participation He listed 6 P's Planning Plug the leaks where money is spent away rather than locally People Support local entrepreneurs Partners Compete through collaboration between local businesses Purse Harness pensions locally Our pension contributions could be invested in local enterprises Purchasing Support local campaigns i.e. Think twice, buy local Policy-making Remove the anti-LOIS bias. Don't keep inviting outside firms				
DP107		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective E 1	Economy Objectives	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP29		Mr Terence Tanner		Objective E 1	Economy Objectives	Neither	It's no good talking about a diverse economy the States must make it possible for diversification to happen the Tax structure is solely written around the finance sector and personal taxation?	Because the finance sector is so movable it has no roots to hold it to our Island.	Noted	These comments are noted, but fall outside of the control of the Island Plan	Noted by the Minister
DP324		Mrs Penelope Lee		Objective E 1	Economy Objectives	Objecting	Economic growth should only be allowed to provide employment for the existing population. The increase in low wage employment frequently taken by immigrants should be discouraged		Noted	This is not an issue directly controlled by the Plan	Noted by the Minister
DP108		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP116 1		Mr Roberto Lora		Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Objecting	We refer to the above mentioned property, and in particular the Threat to Hotels and their current Market Valuation or the property sale, exit strategy presented by the Draft (Jersey) Island Plan September 2009.	Without wishing to be too specific, Policy E1 of The (Draft) Jersey Island Plan 2009 presumes against the loss of employment land. During the current Island Plan (2002) period, many commercial sites in the countryside and St Helier have been allowed to be re-developed as an exception to Policy (C5) & (C6) to provide housing. This option to provide additional housing would be lost if Policy E1 is approved by the States, and could significantly affect our business. This Policy also presumes against the loss of employment land in town, and therefore for all such sites in the built up area, any proposals for them to be redeveloped for housing	Minded to support with adjusted wording	It is recognised that this policy is too prescriptive towards tourism based employment sites and that previous attempts to protect primes site tourist accommodation from other forms of development was not successful and dropped. Equally it is recognised that there is a sufficient supply of office accommodation and that outworn or poor quality sites could be a positive source for	Minister minded to support amendment to policy EO1

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
								would have to be accompanied by a Viability Test involving for instance, marketing these properties (namely our hotel) at a reasonable commercial rate for 12 months prior to making an application! This will severely restrict the early release of land for housing, and only if it proves that no purchasers are available, will an application be considered for residential development! In conclusion we believe that the (Draft) Jersey Island Plan 2009, hinders our market value, based on sale of the property (not as a going concern!) and affects the industry as a whole, in terms of equity in hotel properties and the support of the banking/finance industry. Also we believe this is not in the interest of the island as a whole for the reasons outlined and is potentially, extremely bad news. This Island Plan 2009 obviously requires serious discussion and re-drafting!		urban housing regeneration. For these reasons an amended policy is proposed that takes on board these points to be drafted as; There will be a presumption against development which results in the loss of land for employment use as supported by the Strategic Policy SP5Policy SP 5 'Economic Growth and Diversification', unless; 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue, having regard to market demand. Applications will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the size, configuration, access arrangements or other characteristics of the site make it unsuitable and financially unviable for any employment use and confirmation by full and proper marketing of the site for 12 months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises; or 2. The existing development is predominantly office or tourist accommodation; or 3. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 4. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic and any alternative employment use would continue to generate similar environmental problems'	
DP388		Vallois		Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Neither	Careful monitoring is mentioned under 5.22 however, it is questionable whether planning have the resource to "carefully" monitor this policy.	there is evidence that conditions placed upon businesses are not adhered to and cause problems for surrounding neighbours, pollution, health and safety etc particularly outside of St Helier therefore there are concerns that bringing in such a policy is enforceable in realistic terms.	Noted	The monitoring is related to the success of the policy i.e. loss or gain of employment sites, which can be monitored through the application process. The monitoring of conditions related to noise etc is often under the control of other departments such as Public Health.	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
DP518		Mr Paul Harding	The Association of Jersey Architects	Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Objecting	<p>The section about 'Protection of Employment Land', between Paras. 5.18 and 5.22, will have a major effect on redundant redevelopment or conversion of existing sites that have been used for employment such as offices, hotels, other tourist accommodation, restaurants, working farm buildings, etc. - in fact virtually all types of buildings where Islanders work ? for alternative uses. This contradicts the principal Economy Objective within E1, stipulating the principal criteria should be to "encourage a balanced and more diverse economy and assist all sectors of the economy to adapt to change in the market place ". We submit Policy E1 will have exactly the opposite effect, to prevent building uses adapting to changes in the market place. This policy underscores the presumption against changing use of any buildings used for employment for other purposes.</p>	<p>The AJA submits that Planning Policy should not be used to distort market forces as this Policy seeks to achieve. About ten years ago the Planning Department and Planning Committee of that time attempted to prevent redundant hotels changing use and this failed. The Isle of Man used their planning policy in a similar way to distort market forces and they ended up with an important part of their building stock consisting of boarded up buildings. Imposing distortions of this nature is contrary to a key aspect of States strategic aims, referred to in Para. 5.7, of encouraging competition and the free market place.</p>	Minded to support.	<p>It is recognised that this policy is too prescriptive towards tourism based employment sites and that previous attempts to protect prime site tourist accommodation from other forms of development was not successful and dropped. Equally it is recognised that there is a sufficient supply of office accommodation and that outworn or poor quality sites could be a positive source for urban housing regeneration. For these reasons an amended policy is proposed that takes on board these points to be drafted as; There will be a presumption against development which results in the loss of land for employment use as supported by the Strategic Policy SP5 Policy SP 5 'Economic Growth and Diversification', unless; 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue, having regard to market demand. Applications will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the size, configuration, access arrangements or other characteristics of the site make it unsuitable and financially unviable for any employment use and confirmation by full and proper marketing of the site for 12 months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises; or 2. The existing development is predominantly office or tourist accommodation; or 3. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 4. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution,</p>	Minister minded to support amendment to policy EO1

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
										or unacceptable levels of traffic and any alternative employment use would continue to generate similar environmental problems'	
DP689		Mr Andrew Fleet	Style Group Ltd	Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Objecting	Policy EI is contradicted by Policy BEI supported by Objective BEI where the latter encourages new development on previously developed sites, which in the main are likely to be former employment sites. The requirement to undertake marketing of a former employment site for a 12 month period is unrealistic. If the employment use has ceased to trade from the location then an early sale of the property is often required. If the demand exists for employment in the location then it will be identified in a 3 to 6 month time period. If a time period for marketing is required (and this is questionable) it should be restricted to a 6 month period .		Agree	Remove the explicit reference in point 1 "for 12 months", so that the revised version reads: 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue, having regard to market demand. Applications will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the size, configuration, access arrangements or other characteristics of the site make it unsuitable and financially unviable for any employment use and confirmation by full and proper marketing of the site on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises; or Supplementary planning guidance will be written to provide more information on what is expected in terms of length of marketing as it is recognised that different types of employment sites will have different sensitivities to the length and method of marketing required. This policy has also been put forward to the inspector with some amendments to exempt office and tourism accommodation from the policy, which will further reduce impact of this policy.	Minister minded to agree to proposed changes.
DP775		Seamus Morvan	Morvan Hotels	Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Objecting	Our following submission seeks to ensure that policy is put in place that is effective in allowing tourism businesses to flourish in line with market demands in the future. We are committed hoteliers of long standing but we do have serious concerns with regard to the actual effect of proposed policy in the following areas:  I. Employment Land - I understand that there is a need to generate significant yield of homes from current brown field sites within the life of the new plan. This is made more necessary given the low number of re-zoning proposals from within the Green Zone.	#N/A	Minded to support amendment to policy	It is recognised that this policy is too prescriptive towards tourism based employment sites and that previous attempts to protect primes site tourist accommodation from other forms of development was not successful and dropped. Equally it is recognised that there is a sufficient supply of office accommodation and that outworn or poor quality sites could be a positive source for urban housing regeneration. For	Minister minded to support amendment to policy EO1



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>If employment land is 'protected' in respect of tourism sites (due to a presumption against their loss), sites are unlikely to be yielded up for homes from this sector, nor will tourism operators be able to use the capital from such re-developed land to re-invest into other market driven tourism business opportunities. Indeed, this policy will serve to devalue tourism sites generally, as they will lack their underlying 'switch value' into housing, thus reducing their desirability to tourism investors, leading to a reduced ability to raise finance for tourism investment into tourism sites generally. This would be contrary to the desirable aim of the States to facilitate a more diversified economy.</p> <p>There is a need for permeability, with tourism sites both allowed to enter and exit tourism land use, if the tourism industry is to flourish in line with the customer demands in the future. Out dated product must be able to exit the industry and new product encouraged to come on-line. If the policy, in its effect, serves to artificially keep out of date hotel products within the industry (often without the economies of scale needed in today's high cost environment), this will act as an economic barrier to the creation of new tourism investment and will weaken the industry further.</p> <p>As a group of companies, we are committed to tourism and have a long history of investment into the sector. We have many sites that could comfortably grow in terms of the number of hotel beds, yet, without the capital realized from flexibility within our portfolio of sites, we do not feel that we would be able to take our business forward.</p> <p>Our following submission seeks to ensure that policy is put in place that is effective in allowing tourism businesses to flourish in line with market demands in the future. We are committed hoteliers of long standing but we do have serious concerns with regard to the actual effect of proposed policy in the following areas:</p> <p>1. Employment Land - I understand that there is a need to generate significant yield of homes from current brown field sites within the life of the new plan. This is made more necessary given the low number of re-zoning proposals from within the Green Zone.</p>			<p>these reasons an amended policy is proposed that takes on board these points to be drafted as; There will be a presumption against development which results in the loss of land for employment use as supported by the Strategic Policy SP5 Policy SP 5 'Economic Growth and Diversification', unless; 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue, having regard to market demand. Applications will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the size, configuration, access arrangements or other characteristics of the site make it unsuitable and financially unviable for any employment use and confirmation by full and proper marketing of the site for 12 months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises; or 2. the existing development is predominantly office or tourist accommodation; or 3. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 4. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic and any alternative employment use would continue to generate similar environmental problems'</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>If employment land is 'protected' in respect of tourism sites (due to a presumption against their loss), sites are unlikely to be yielded up for homes from this sector, nor will tourism operators be able to use the capital from such re-developed land to re-invest into other market driven tourism business opportunities. Indeed, this policy will serve to devalue tourism sites generally, as they will lack their underlying 'switch value' into housing, thus reducing their desirability to tourism investors, leading to a reduced ability to raise finance for tourism investment into tourism sites generally. This would be contrary to the desirable aim of the States to facilitate a more diversified economy.</p> <p>There is a need for permeability, with tourism sites both allowed to enter and exit tourism land use, if the tourism industry is to flourish in line with the customer demands in the future. Out dated product must be able to exit the industry and new product encouraged to come on-line. If the policy, in its effect, serves to artificially keep out of date hotel products within the industry (often without the economies of scale needed in today's high cost environment), this will act as an economic barrier to the creation of new tourism investment and will weaken the industry further.</p> <p>As a group of companies, we are committed to tourism and have a long history of investment into the sector. We have many sites that could comfortably grow in terms of the number of hotel beds, yet, without the capital realized from flexibility within our portfolio of sites, we do not feel that we would be able to take our business forward.</p>				
DP858		Gerald Fletcher	Jersey Hospitality Association	Policy E 1	Protection of Employment Land	Objecting	<p>2. the proposed development would serve tourism objectives, as envisaged in Objective EVE 1, can be shown to result directly in a significant and proportionate benefit in terms of economic activity on a site or sites elsewhere in the Island; 3. the tourism operator in question wishes to exit the industry. 3. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 4. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic and any alternative employment use would continue to generate similar environmental problems'</p>	<p>A similar approach to that suggested above could be applied to Policy E1, by adding a further subsection which would provide flexibility in respect of tourism related development. (Suggested Policy wording revisions are made in BOLD ) 'There will be a presumption against development which results in the loss of land for employment use as supported by the Strategic Policy SP5 Policy SP 5 'Economic Growth and Diversification', unless; 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue, having regard to market demand. Applications will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the size, configuration,</p>	Minded to support with adjusted wording	<p>It is recognised that this policy is too prescriptive towards tourism based employment sites and that previous attempts to protect prime site tourist accommodation from other forms of development was not successful and dropped. Equally it is recognised that there is a sufficient supply of office accommodation and that outworn or poor quality sites could be a positive source for urban housing regeneration. For</p>	Minister minded to support amendment to policy EO1

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
								access arrangements or other characteristics of the site make it unsuitable and financially unviable for any employment use and confirmation by full and proper marketing of the site for 12 months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises; or 2. the proposed development would serve tourism objectives, as envisaged in Objective EVE 1, can be shown to result directly in a significant and proportionate benefit in terms of economic activity on a site or sites elsewhere in the Island; 3. the tourism operator in question wishes to exit the industry. 3. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 4. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic and any alternative employment use would continue to generate similar environmental problems'		these reasons an amended policy is proposed that takes on board these points to be drafted as; There will be a presumption against development which results in the loss of land for employment use as supported by the Strategic Policy SP5Policy SP 5 'Economic Growth and Diversification', unless; 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue, having regard to market demand. Applications will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the size, configuration, access arrangements or other characteristics of the site make it unsuitable and financially unviable for any employment use and confirmation by full and proper marketing of the site for 12 months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises; or 2. The existing development is predominantly office or tourist accommodation; or 3. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 4. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic and any alternative employment use would continue to generate similar environmental problems'	
DP109		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective EO 1	Office Policy Objectives	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP325		Mrs Penelope Lee		Objective EO 1	Office Policy Objectives	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP1046		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber	Policy EO 1	New Office Developm	Supporting	This policy is agreed. Chamber would like to see an incentive to refurbish and re-use vacant offices and other buildings within St Helier, particularly if vacant		Comments noted and	- The re-development of outworn office space is seen as an important part of the	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
			r of Commerce		ent		space increases when the Waterfront is developed. This could be by way of reduced planning fees for such building or the removal of GST from building refurbishment costs. Out of town offices and home working should be permitted and encouraged as there would be environmental and sustainable benefits. Where new offices are created their environmental impact should play a significant part in any approvals as well as their appearance.		agreed with	regeneration of town. - There is a policy aimed at encouraging businesses run from the home (EO4). - Policy GD1 would cover the environmental issues surrounding office develo	
DP110		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EO 1	New Office Development	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP111 1		Mr Ben Ludlam	C Le Masurier Ltd	Policy EO 1	New Office Development	Objecting		Again the plan is unclear; the development within the Town Centre is acceptable but should not be limited by 5.35 which indicates this should be primarily in the Esplanade Quarter. This is highly arbitrary and does not allow the market to operate freely.	Reject	This policy does not limit new office development to the Esplanade Quarter area only - 5.35 states that other areas within the town and the regeneration areas are also acceptable for office development. it is recognised however that the Esplanade Quarter area will represent , if developed, a significant area for office development. Policy EO1 also includes Pier road/Commercial Buildings, North of Town master plan area and Gloucester street as potential new office areas.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP326		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy EO 1	New Office Development	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP111		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EO 2	Conversion of Upper Floors of Existing Commercial Buildings for Office Accommodation	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP112		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EO 3	Other Small Scale Office Developments	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP104 7		Ray Shead	The Jersey	Policy EO 4	Businesses Run	Supporting		This is to be encouraged.	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
			Chamber of Commerce		From Home						
DP113		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EO 4	Businesses Run From Home	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP327		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy EO 4	Businesses Run From Home	Supporting	Providing this does not entail increased traffic, particularly large vehicles		Noted	The policy and the supplementary guidance would not allow businesses run from the home that increased traffic or encouraged the use of large delivery vehicles.	Noted by the Minister
DP936		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society		Retail	Supporting	New retail floor space: The debate over the possible entrance to the Island of a 'third supermarket' demonstrates how muddled thinking has become in an effort to appear to be 'doing something'. There is nothing to stop new operators starting in the Island through acquisition and therefore attempts to encourage a new entrant through preferential treatment are unnecessary and potentially discriminatory.		Noted and agree with comments		Noted by the Minister
DP114		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective ER 1	Retail Policy Objectives	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP328		Mrs Penelope Lee		Objective ER 1	Retail Policy Objectives	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP1048		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy ER 1	Retail Expansion in the Town Centre	Supporting	Chamber is supportive of the policies which seek to maintain the viability of the town centre and existing village shopping centres. It is agreed that there is sufficient retail capacity already as correctly identified by DTZ. Economic Indicators E1 are coarse and not adequate to analyse the unique retail character of St. Helier and project the likely impact of change on town centre retailing. Recommendation. The draft IP should be reviewed under the objectives and values described in the UK Government's Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) published 29/12/09. In particular KPIs Annex D Page 32 A9 to A13. There should be a bias towards maintaining town centre commercial activity and an economic impact assessment should be prepared as a planning requirement when a proposal for a significant development is made. Springboard and ATCM have launched a new research tool aimed to deliver performance monitoring and benchmarking for town and city centres -link: <a href="http://www.milestoneuk.org/">http://www.milestoneuk.org/</a>		Agree with comments	With regard to indicators, the current indicators are to be reviewed and amended to follow indicators in Strategic Environmental Assessment document which follow PPS4 objectives and values. Comparisons to UK retail town centres benchmarks is a difficult area and not always useful to judge Jersey against, given the Island's unique characteristics and so not always useful to follow the 'Milestone' approach .	Minister minded to support
DP1112		Mr Ben Ludlam	C Le Masurier	Policy ER 1	Retail Expansion	Supporting		C Le Masurier Limited have extensive land holdings in Bath Street and Commercial/Broad Street,	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
			Ltd		in the Town Centre			when, further, applications are made for development these will comply as far as possible with ER1. There should be a common goal to encourage public / private partnership in development and which should actively be pursued by the Planning Department in a co-ordinated inter governmental States of Jersey Dept approach, to improve St Helier.			
DP115		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 1	Retail Expansion in the Town Centre	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP329		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 1	Retail Expansion in the Town Centre	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP569		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy ER 1	Retail Expansion in the Town Centre	Objecting	Land Between Broad Street and Commercial Street - I would be extremely concerned over this proposal. This seems a deliberate policy to shift the main centre of Town. It would in my view significantly devastate the areas in the region of the Central Markets, West's centre, Queen Street etc. This needs to be very carefully considered, obviously Chamber of Commerce needs to be consulted etc. I would probably not be able to support this as a proposal. I do agree that in theory some further route between Broad Street and the Esplanade Quarter might be a good idea except for the logistical issue of getting through from Commercial Street to the Esplanade, and then one would still need to walk the length of the Bus Station. Hence I am unclear as to how this could be achieved, and whether it is either practical or desirable.		Reject	It is not envisaged that the entire area be re-developed to retail as many existing non-retail businesses will remain. The DTZ report identified this area as the obvious future town retail expansion area that can also link well with the new offering on the Island site (liberty Wharf).	Concerns noted by Minister but minded not to amend Plan
DP1049		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy ER 2	Protection and Promotion of St Helier for Shopping	Supporting	Chamber is supportive of the policies which seek to maintain the viability of the town centre and existing village shopping centres. It is agreed that there is sufficient retail capacity already as correctly identified by DTZ. Economic Indicators E1 are coarse and not adequate to analyse the unique retail character of St. Helier and project the likely impact of change on town centre retailing. Recommendation. The draft IP should be reviewed under the objectives and values described in the UK Government's Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) published 29/12/09. In particular KPIs Annex D Page 32 A9 to A13. There should be a bias towards maintaining town centre commercial activity and an economic impact assessment should be prepared as a planning requirement when a proposal for a significant development is made. Springboard and ATCM have		Agree with Comments	With regard to indicators, the current indicators are to be reviewed and amended to follow indicators in Strategic Environmental Assessment document which follow PPS4 objectives and values. Comparisons to UK retail town centres benchmarks is a difficult area and not always useful to judge Jersey against, given the Island's unique characteristics and so not always useful to follow the 'Milestone' approach.	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
							launched a new research tool aimed to deliver performance monitoring and benchmarking for town and city centres -link: <a href="http://www.milestoneuk.org/">http://www.milestoneuk.org/</a>				
DP116		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 2	Protection and Promotion of St Helier for Shopping	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP330		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 2	Protection and Promotion of St Helier for Shopping	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP1167		Kevin Pilley		Map 5.2	Town Centre	Neither	Title for map 5.2 needs to be changed to Core Retail Area	To promote clarity and remove ambiguity	Noted	Will Update Title	Noted by the Minister
DP1050		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy ER 3	Protection And Promotion Of Local Shopping Centres	Supporting	Chamber is supportive of the policies which seek to maintain the viability of the town centre and existing village shopping centres. It is agreed that there is sufficient retail capacity already as correctly identified by DTZ. Economic Indicators E1 are coarse and not adequate to analyse the unique retail character of St. Helier and project the likely impact of change on town centre retailing. Recommendation. The draft IP should be reviewed under the objectives and values described in the UK Government's Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) published 29/12/09. In particular KPIs Annex D Page 32 A9 to A13. There should be a bias towards maintaining town centre commercial activity and an economic impact assessment should be prepared as a planning requirement when a proposal for a significant development is made. Springboard and ATCM have launched a new research tool aimed to deliver performance monitoring and benchmarking for town and city centres -link: <a href="http://www.milestoneuk.org/">http://www.milestoneuk.org/</a>		Agree with comments	With regard to indicators, the current indicators are to be reviewed and amended to follow indicators in Strategic Environmental Assessment document which follow PPS4 objectives and values. Comparisons to UK retail town centres benchmarks is a difficult area and not always useful to judge Jersey against, given the Island's unique characteristics and so not always useful to follow the 'Milestone' approach.	Noted by the Minister
DP117		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 3	Protection And Promotion Of Local Shopping Centres	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP331		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 3	Protection And Promotion Of Local Shopping Centres	Supporting	The increase in take away food and drink in out of town locations has led to litter in the countryside of huge proportions. No further licences should be granted for this form of business until the Parishes/States arrange for this litter to be removed		Noted	This is an issue for the Parish and licensing authorities	Noted by the Minister
DP389		Vallois		Policy ER 3	Protection And Promotion	Supporting	I would like to emphasise the five oaks and bagatelle parade area	In considering protection and promotion of this area I would urge the department to take into account the uniqueness of the area in which there	Noted	Traffic issue are considered as part of any planning application for commercial use in such areas	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
					Of Local Shopping Centres			are 4 major roads and 1 lane adjoining a small roundabout of which gets severely congested at certain times of the day due to not only work time traffic of bagatelle road and st saviours hill being access to town centre from eastern and northern parishes but also the large amount of schools that are located within St Saviour which add to the traffic congestion at peak times of the day.		and covered by existing policies in the plan such as strategic policy SP6 (reduce dependence upon car), general development policy GD1 and transport policies including TT9 (travel plans).	
DP118		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 4	Development Of Local Shops	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP332		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 4	Development Of Local Shops	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP119		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 5	Development of Evening Economy Uses	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP21		Mr David Seymour	Seymour Hotels of Jersey	Policy ER 5	Development of Evening Economy Uses	Neither	With regard to proposals for new night-clubs and other uses with the potential to cause noise or other disturbance, the Minister will pay particular attention to the impact on nearby homes, (Add: hotels, offices and shops) and the character and amenity of the area.	The impact of large numbers of revellers standing outside smoking, shouting, singing and just entering and exiting late night pubs and clubs located near hotels, offices and shops is often disregarded by planning authorities but the effects are significant. Hotel guests complain about noise emanating from the streets late at night, threatening behaviour of large drunken crowds when returning to their hotel after dining in one of the Islands' restaurants and disturbed sleep - there is ample evidence to suggest that the visitor economy is at risk of this aspect of the late night economy. Hotel staff are also subject to threatening behaviour and verbal abuse when trying to keep unwanted persons out of premises late at night as well as having to clean up the disgusting mess of vomit, urine and take-away rubbish left in doorways by the morning - shops and offices are similarly affected.	Accept amendment to plan	Amend plan as suggested but issues surrounding disturbances caused by members of the public to hotel guests and staff are not matters under the control of the planning law.	Minded to amend plan
DP333		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 5	Development of Evening Economy Uses	Objecting	St Helier is a no-go location for many local people. We do not want to go to an environment of drunks and violence. The 'night time economy' ie selling as much alcohol as possible needs to be reduced and more strictly policed.	St Helier should be run for the needs of locals to be considered first.	noted	This is a parish/licensing authority issue.	Noted by the Minister
DP120		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 6	Take-Away Food Outlets	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP334		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 6	Take-Away Food	Supporting	The spread of take away food locations to the countryside should be stopped. Existing locations closed down. This has led to a massive increase in	Unless the Parishes/States organise a comprehensive clean up of the litter disfiguring our countryside all out of town take aways should	Noted	This is a Parish/licensing authority issue	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
					Outlets		litter thrown on the edges of roads, in the hedgerows and countryside.	be closed down			
DP570		Deputy John Le Fondre			Food Retailing Proposals	Supporting	Major Food Retail Outside of St Helier - Presumption against - agreed - I think the possibility of a third supermarket on the Island is not sustainable if one supports the local economy. Depending upon the operator, it could potentially seriously damage the wider retail local economy of this Island.		noted		Noted by the Minister
DP1051		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy ER 7	Food Retailing Proposals	Supporting	Chamber is supportive of the policies which seek to maintain the viability of the town centre and existing village shopping centres. It is agreed that there is sufficient retail capacity already as correctly identified by DTZ. Economic Indicators E1 are coarse and not adequate to analyse the unique retail character of St. Helier and project the likely impact of change on town centre retailing. Recommendation. The draft IP should be reviewed under the objectives and values described in the UK Government's Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) published 29/12/09. In particular KPIs Annex D Page 32 A9 to A13. There should be a bias towards maintaining town centre commercial activity and an economic impact assessment should be prepared as a planning requirement when a proposal for a significant development is made. Springboard and ATCM have launched a new research tool aimed to deliver performance monitoring and benchmarking for town and city centres -link: <a href="http://www.milestoneuk.org/">http://www.milestoneuk.org/</a>		agree with comments	With regard to indicators, the current indicators are to be reviewed and amended to follow indicators in Strategic Environmental Assessment document which follow PPS4 objectives and values. Comparisons to UK retail town centres benchmarks is a difficult area and not always useful to judge Jersey against, given the Island's unique characteristics and so not always useful to follow the 'Milestone' approach.	Noted by the Minister
DP1113		Mr Ben Ludlam	C Le Masurier Ltd	Policy ER 7	Food Retailing Proposals	Objecting		The application of the policy is extremely arbitrary and so is the use of Sequential Testing. It is also contra to the Economic Development Departments report/strategy on retailing.	Reject	The policy fits within the strategic aims of the plan (SP1 - spatial strategy, SP3 - sequential development). The sequential test is not arbitrary and is flexible to allow development outside of the town where evidence shows that they will not harm the vitality or viability of the town centre. See comment on DP410.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP121		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 7	Food Retailing Proposals	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP335		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 7	Food Retailing Proposals	Supporting			Support noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP410		Mr Nathan Fox		Policy ER 7	Food Retailing Proposals	Objecting	While some of the issues raised by EDD in response to earlier drafts have been addressed, there has been no practical movement in respect of the development of a new food retail competitor. The revised Island Plan White Paper still contains numerous policies that any proposed large food retail development would have the greatest difficulty in meeting while	Background EDD has been involved in the Island Plan review process in an attempt to ensure that the revised Island Plan, when completed, will not preclude the entry of an additional large-scale competitor into the food retail market. Such a competitor should reduce the problem of market concentration and exert downward pressure on	Reject	1. Capacity Studies The representations by EDD essentially comprise the view that the DTZ Jersey Retail Study is not appropriate as a material consideration in informing planning policy and determining	Minister not minded to support proposed amendments

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>remaining commercially viable. Realistically, the development of a new-build competitor to resolve the issues of over-concentration in Jersey's food retail market is all but precluded by the Island Plan as currently drafted. EDD is of the opinion that issues of market concentration could be much more effectively addressed were a system of sequential testing to be implemented which, once an appropriate site was established, acted to modify the related policies concerning large retail developments to facilitate development of that site. See attached letter</p>	<p>food prices to consumers. The entry of an additional competitor into the Island's food retail market is widely supported by the public, as evidenced by a Statistics Unit survey in December 2008 which revealed 84% support for the entry of a new large food retail competitor. Key concerns Strategic Development has studied the revised Island Plan White Paper, in comparison with the earlier July version of that document, in light of the requested amendments to the 'Economic' section policies regarding retail development (ER policies) that it has previously submitted to the PED. Although some of EDD's points have been incorporated (notably that Policy ER2 now refers to 'retail efficiency' and the DTZ report is no longer referred to as a 'material consideration', although its assumptions are still embedded in the document) the majority of the concerns previously raised by EDD remain. EDD's key concerns are that any prospective large food retail development will be unable to meet the policy requirements of the Island Plan as these include- An assumption of little or no demand for additional food retail based on a land-use survey. The advice of the States Economic Adviser makes it clear that capacity considerations alone cannot be used as a basis for decision making in this area. Overprotection of existing retail centres limiting retail efficiency. A general presumption against the development of a large food retail competitor outside of the town centre, with the removal of the 'Countryside Zone', potentially acting to further restrict acceptable development opportunities. A 'sequential test' which would act to establish a preference order for prospective sites, but which does not interact with the ER policies. 1 - Demand levels The artificially low assumption of demand stems from reliance upon the DTZ report, a capacity analysis that describes itself as ' primarily a land use planning study' and which ' does not consider retail prices or the number of food store operators on the Island' This report was quoted in the July version and referred to as a 'material consideration' in respect of future retail developments. The term 'material consideration' was removed by PED at the request of EDD in the September version. While the removal of the DTZ report as the sole material consideration for judging the need for additional retail developments is a positive step, the Island Plan text retains comments extracted from that report in key areas. These include a statement that</p>		<p>planning applications. They also comprise suggested amendments to the Draft Plan, the effect of which would be substantially to weaken planning control over large food store developments and other out-of-centre retail developments. In the UK, most local planning authorities have commissioned similar retail studies to form part of the evidence base for their development plan policies; and such studies are widely accepted by Planning Inspectors and the Secretary of State as being appropriate to inform policy. The essential requirement of such a study is to answer the questions 'how much new retail floorspace, of what type, will be needed, where, and by when?', and then to find ways of accommodating the identified needs in accordance with sound principles of town and country planning. This enables the development plan to plan positively for accommodating expected needs for new development. Clearly if there is no need for new development, it is not necessary to identify and allocate sites for it; and in such a case, criteria-based policies are normally sufficient to cater for unexpected needs which might arise during the plan period. This is the approach which has been adopted in Jersey with the Jersey Retail Study and Draft Island Plan. It therefore accords with good planning practice. In addition to forecasting quantitative retail development needs, such capacity studies also assesses qualitative needs for new food stores and other retail development. If this shows that the existing stores are obviously out-dated, inefficiently laid out, or badly operated, it would lead</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>population and per capita growth will permit a 'modest amount of additional food retail floorspace in or on the edge of the town centre ' and ' there is no quantitative capacity for additional food store floorspace up to 2015' .This seems to indicate that while DTZ is no longer explicitly relied upon, the revised Island Plan White Paper still predetermines that the Island is not in need of additional food retail development. In making this statement, the Plan is clearly inconsistent with the retail strategy and, in particular, the policy of introducing greater competition into the food retail market which is overwhelmingly supported by the public. This places a significant hurdle in the way of a new large food retail development. Policies ER 7 and ER 8 require that a 'demonstrable' or 'quantitative and qualitative' need be established for an additional non-central retail development. This will probably be hard if not impossible to achieve when the stated position of the determining body is that this need does not exist. Therefore, far from being an enabling document, the Plan is a barrier to EDD retail policy. The States Economic Advisor has expressed concern over the use of capacity studies in recent advice (attached). 2 - Detriment of existing centres The criterion that 'detriment' must not be caused to the 'vitality or viability of St. Helier town centre' remains within Policy ER7. This seems to be a tightening of the criteria in comparison with the 2002 Island Plan which used the term 'unreasonable detriment' in this instance. 'Detriment' is open to interpretation, but could be seen as a reference to the flow of expenditure and customers. If a development can violate policy on the grounds that it might attract expenditure and customers, (as addressed in EDD's initial response to the White Paper,) any such development can be refused. As any new food retail competitor would only enter the market if it had an expectation of making a profit (by serving customers and receiving income), any non-central retail development that is expected to be commercially successful would appear to be against Island Plan policies as it might well reduce the flow of business to the existing centres of St. Helier. It is difficult to see how market concentration can be effectively addressed when operator's in particular geographic positions enjoy special protection under the Island Plan. Requirements of Policies ER7, ER8 (if unreasonably detrimental) and ER2 (by reference to ER7) can not be met by any</p>		<p>to the conclusion that there was a qualitative need for modernisation, either through refurbishment of existing stores, or development of new stores. They also consider whether there is a good range of types of food stores and other retailing. In the case of the DTZ report, this qualitative review identified the need for up to two discount food supermarkets on the Island, and the Retail Study recommended that such stores should be developed in order to widen the range of food stores and introduce one or more additional retailers. It is therefore not correct that 'the revised Island Plan White Paper still predetermines that the Island is not in need of additional food retail development'. However the review of qualitative needs did not identify any other clear qualitative deficiencies in the existing provision of food stores on the Island. The department is therefore of the view that the Jersey Retail Study 2008 carried out by DTZ is a reliable part of the evidence base for the Island Plan, and is important for informing policy for new retail development. 2. Retail Strategy It is noted that EDD does not include in its representations any definition of 'retail efficiency'. If that is to be an objective of the Island Plan, it will be necessary to define it in terms which would enable it to be assessed by developers or retailers putting forward proposals for new stores, and measured by PED when considering planning applications. It is considered that such a definition should not be so narrow that it excludes the impact of proposed new retail development on existing fixed capital investment, existing Jersey</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>development that is detrimental to the vitality and viability of St. Helier town centre. The States Economic Advisor has addressed concerns about the effects of non-central retail developments on the vitality of town centres in general in his recent advice (attached). 3 - Presumptions against Many of the economic policies in the Island Plan White Paper contain presumptions against large retail developments outside of St. Helier town centre. This effectively places a burden on the applicant to establish that the proposed development meets policies in other respects or alternatively that there was such benefit to the development (against a backdrop of DTZ which asserts that there is no need for such development) that the policy should be overridden. This is not in keeping with EDD's policy to reduce concentration in the food retail market. Policies ER2, ER4, ER7, ER8, and ER10 presume against the development of a large food retail competitor in a non-central location. In addition to these restrictions, the 'Countryside Zone' classification has been removed from the revised Island Plan White Paper, with the result that significant areas of non-urban space have moved into the 'Green Zone', and accordingly are subject to a more rigorous 'test' for development, with a consequent reduction in the likelihood of new development being approved. This would act to restrict edge-of-town sites, should it be found that no central, non-central or other sites within the Built-Up Area were suitable. 4 - The sequential test Policy SP 3 details a sequential approach to development. In terms of retail development this appears to restrict development of sites outside the town centre until it can be established that there are no suitable site in more central locations. EDD understands that this was included following discussions concerning the desirability of developing the Island Plan so that it could meet the requirements of both PED and EDD. However, given a (not unrealistic) set of circumstances in which a non-central site were to be the only possible location, the sequential test would not properly engage with the other policies, which would contradict the purpose of the test by continuing to restrict development. The proposed development must still meet all of the criteria of the policies detailed above. It is therefore not clear how the sequential test acts to meet EDD's requirement. EDD is concerned that the sequential test might prevent the consideration of a development too early on in the chain. It would be</p>		<p>businesses, and the economy of Jersey as a whole. If 'retail efficiency' is to an objective of the Plan, it should be balanced by wider objectives covering non-economic issues such as protection of the environment (as indicated in the concluding paragraph of the economic advisors report), and quality of life on the Island. 3. Removal of Countryside Zone This has made the old 3 zoned sequence of countryside policies more straight forward by reducing and simplifying the zones to 2 - Green zone and Coastal National park. Both these zones are new and do not wholly reflect the previous policing wording. The new green zone policy respects that there are different character areas within it for example and there is now supplementary planning guidance that indicates what type of development is permitted in each distinct character area, based upon the 1999 land use character appraisal study. The development of large retail outlets within this revised zone would be judged it's merits and have to comply with policy ER7 and other relevant policies in the Plan. 4. Sequential Test The draft policy was re-drafted following discussions with EDD prior to the completion of the draft plan and the use of the DTZ report as the sole material consideration for judging the need for additional retail developments was removed. This was replaced with a new policy criterion that new retail development outside St Helier Town Centre should not cause an unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre; so as to replace the assessment of need in the Jersey Retail Study with a new impact test. This amendment should</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
								desirable from EDD's perspective if the latter stages of the sequential test included the options of 'outside town but within the built up area' and then 'edge of the built up area'. It is understood that, at this point in the sequential test, there would be a higher burden of proof required related to the benefit of the development to the Island, or some mechanism such as a public planning inquiry in relation to this. Having reflected on the approach to retail in the draft White Paper, and recognising that the Island Plan will cover a long period of time, EDD would welcome a further discussion with PED on the merit of applying a modified sequential approach to retail provision in general, rather than restricting this to major food retail only. See attached letter		obviate the need for the amendments proposed by EDD - but is less liberal because it includes a need criterion. This would help to avoid serious adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre and wastage of existing fixed capital investment through over-provision and consequent store closures. it is considered that this is a more appropriate way forward than the amendments proposed by EDD. The latter would amount to a virtual carte blanche to developers of out-of-centre superstores, because the sequential approach would in effect become the principal determinant of acceptability. In view of the relative greater difficulty in developing urban rather than out of centre sites for large food stores, it would be simple for developers to demonstrate that such stores could only be developed on out-of-centre sites. If there was no need or impact test, there would then be no effective way of restraining over-provision of food stores or other retail development.	
DP571		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy ER 7	Food Retailing Proposals	Objecting	Food retailing Proposals - compared to the stated written presumption against major food retail development occurring outside of Town the actual policy seems rather more ambivalent. In my view this needs significant strengthening. It would seem to me that if an aggressive and litigious operator came to the Island, they would purport to demonstrate the need for their services, and therefore could potentially force the Minister into having to approve a scheme even if it was not supported by the various stake holders locally (including the Government). The wording of this policy should be a matter of legal advice.		comments noted	legal advice is being sought on the key planning new and revised policies	Noted by the Minister
DP1052		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy ER 8	Retail Warehouses	Objecting	Flexibility is required; conversion may be an option outside of St Helier if it is not to the detriment of other retail areas.		Reject	The potential impact development to the vitality and viability of the town is a key test and should not be watered down.	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
DP122		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 8	Retail Warehouses	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP336		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 8	Retail Warehouses	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP123		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 9	Retailing within Industrial Sites	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP124		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 10	Retail Development Outside The Built-up Area	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP337		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 10	Retail Development Outside The Built-up Area	Supporting			Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP1053		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy ER 11	Farm Shops	Supporting		Chamber is supportive of farm shops which have provided further choice for consumers but supports this policy which seeks to prevent the rezoning of agricultural land to retail use over a period of time.	Support noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP125		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ER 11	Farm Shops	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP338		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ER 11	Farm Shops	Supporting	Additional take away business should be prohibited.	Litter from take away food and drink is blighting every road and hedgerows in the Island. We need Parish/States action to get this rubbish removed.	Reject	This is a Parish/licensing authority issue	comments noted minded to reject
DP432		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union	Policy ER 11	Farm Shops	Objecting	It is felt that 100 sq.m. (gross) is unrealistically small and there is a danger of the outlet being too small to be viable. See attached Letter	It is felt that every outlet should be dealt with on its own merits.	Reject	It is recognised that farm shops can only be operated profitably where they are able to sell non-seasonal produce, imported goods, and some non-food goods (such as craft products, garden supplies, home wares, toys, etc), because of the seasonality of local agricultural produce and the need to retain a loyal customer base throughout the year. There are already examples on Jersey of farm shops selling such ranges of goods. The 100sqm (gross) floor area is practical; because it would ensure that the scale of non-local	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
										and non-food goods would be limited, and not such as to threaten the vitality and viability of St Helier Town Centre or any of the village centres, whilst being sub-serviant to the principal farming business activity.	
DP893		Mr Iain Norris		Policy ER 11	Farm Shops	Supporting	5.87 Sale of local produce should be a major justification. Guidelines regarding quantities need to be agreed and documented. 5.89 Recognises that farm shops may need to bring in non-local produce but that conditions may be imposed. What conditions are being considered because depending on the percentage of local vs imported produce that can be sold it may make the proposal non viable. Guidelines therefore need to be available for the applicant to consider at the business planning stage.		Agree	It is recognised that it may sometimes be desirable to attach conditions to planning permissions, restricting the ranges of goods which may be sold or the amount of floorspace which may be used for the sale of non-local and non-food goods. It is suggested that these should be of the form: 'The farm shop hereby permitted shall not be used for the sale of [insert proscribed goods].' 'Not more than [insert percentage] of the farm shop hereby permitted shall be used for the sale of non-locally-produced foods or non-food goods, assessed on average over the course of a year.' The list of proscribed goods will be a matter of judgement, depending upon the remoteness of the farm shop from existing village centres and its potential to serve a local community; but should probably include clothing and footwear; electrical goods; audio-visual equipment; furniture and floor coverings; jewellery, watches and clocks; newspapers, magazines and books; tobacco products; CDs, DVDs, and other recorded materials; chemists', medical and beauty products; bicycles and accessories; motor parts and accessories; post office goods and services. The percentage of the farm shop which may be used for non-locally produced goods or non-food goods is a matter of judgement. However, it is considered that 50% would be a reasonable proportion. This could be assessed on average over a year, because there could be	Minister minded to support

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
										times when there will be very little local produce available for sale, but at other times, it will be abundant. In order to maintain adequate sales and profitable operation, therefore the condition should allow a substantial proportion to be used for non-local or non-food goods for some parts of the year.	
DP940		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ER 11	Farm Shops	Supporting	Farm shops: The growth of farm shops, where they truly support the local industry, is to be welcomed. There is a clear difference between a 'farm shop' and a 'shop on a farm'. There has been a trend toward the development of 'farm supermarkets' that do less to support the local industry and turn into 'Trojan horses' to develop out of town retail and industrial offerings. The emphasis must be on supporting the traditional covered market in St Helier that forms such a distinctive feature of the town.		support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP339		Mrs Penelope Lee			EIW: Current Position	Supporting			Support noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP996		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		EIW: Current Position	Neither	Section 5.90 Could be re-titled 'Light Industry, Warehousing and Port Operations' support for Section 5.94	ref 5.90: The port is an industrial area and vital to the Island's economy. It must be protected as such and not threatened by alongside development. ref 5.94: We are pleased to see Marine Leisure defined as an emerging industry, and would like this see this strengthened and supported elsewhere in the plan (see other comments). The RYA and British Marine Federation have produced a useful reference document - 'Planning Guide for Boating Facilities'. We would recommend that this is considered as best practice. The types of facilities which should be supported are: o Harbours, marinas and moorings o Designated anchorages o Launching and landing sites o Boat yards for building, storage, repairs and maintenance o Onshore facilities including shower and wash facilities, laundry, waste disposal and car parking o Clubs and teaching facilities o Car and trailer parking	Reject	The port is covered elsewhere in the plan (regeneration zones, transport section - port operations) and the port operational area is now to be included on the revised proposals map.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP235		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Objective EIW 1	Light Industrial & Warehousing Policy Objectives	Supporting			Support Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP997		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours		EIW: Policies	Neither	Further policy considerations	Use of land at La Collette - this area is part of the port (see TT35) and the policy and priority should be for port related use in this area. It is currently Jersey Harbours' policy to locate warehouses close	Comments noted	The future land use of la Collette will be subject to the master planning work that is currently being undertaken and this will be	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
								to ships / appropriate port area to minimise lorry movements on the roads. This should be supported by the Island Plan.		included in any supplementary guidance or updates to the plan document following the completion of this work.	
DP241		Mr Andrew Morris			Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Objecting	My family and I strongly object to the proposal to extend Thistle Grove. It is important to realise the history of Thistle Grove when considering any proposed extension. Thistle Grove has developed over time via piecemeal change of use approvals of what was an existing agricultural site. This has now led to what exists, which is a culmination of low quality, unsightly agricultural buildings, having various usages in terms of companies, scattered around the site. With the recent development of Regal's industrial building, whose mass is totally out of character and scale to the surrounding area, the site has become an eyesore. The surrounding area is made up of single storey dwellings with the occasional two storey house; many of which are of historic importance. This Regal's building would unfortunately set a precedent for any further extension to this site, which would further add to an unsightly overmassed development. Any future development of the industrial site will entail tall buildings of large volume in order to meet the market demand for this type of building whose criteria requires high eaves heights in order for storage and usage and large floor areas to make them economically viable. Therefore, if Thistle Grove is to be extended and redeveloped, it would lead to high buildings of large floor area. This would be totally at odds with the surrounding countryside character. The siting of Thistle Grove is in the heart of the countryside zone. There is no precedent, other than the existing unacceptably designed Regal's building, which would lead one to believe that this area could support an industrial site. The boundaries of the site, although hidden in some areas at this time by high hedges, which are uncharacteristic to the Jersey countryside, do not screen this area from the rest of the parishes of St John and St Lawrence. As this part of the island is relatively flat, any proposed development would be seen from vistas across the countryside and therefore would be unacceptable. Any amount of boundary treatment would not screen these buildings and would in itself only be seasonal and take an extremely long time to establish. Currently the road infrastructure to this area is unsuitable for heavy industrial traffic. Although the roads of La Rue de la Mare Ballam and La Rue des Bois are wide, they are limited by their size further to the south and further to the north. Heavy traffic		Comments noted but not supported	1. Design The current site is indeed very unsightly and should the site be re-zoned then it would have to be done in a comprehensive manner that would in the Department's opinion improve the existing site in terms of both providing modern and much sought after light industrial units and remove and improve upon the existing unsightly developments. The height, size, volume and location of the new units would be very carefully designed to minimise the impact of the development on the surrounding area. This would be done through the submission by the developer of a detailed development brief that would first need to be approved by the Minister before a planning application could be submitted. The brief would, as a minimum need to include issues of design together with all of the other concerns listed in the representation, including traffic, access, boundary treatments, and waste, on site operations and landscaping. 2. Location The location of this site is adjacent to an existing protected industrial site and the re-zoning proposal would be extending into adjacent sites that are currently in some form of semi-light industrial use. This industrial site is the only one of those protected on the island that can be extended in this manner and there is an evidenced need for this type of development on the Island. 3. Road Infrastructure/Access The existing industrial site is on a prime road network which is capable of serving the proposed extended site area. Access will	Comments noted by Minister but minded not to support removal of Thistle Grove light industrial extension from 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>would have to negotiate the thinner sections of road which would have a serious effect on road, pedestrian and traffic safety. It should also be noted that the roads of La Rue de la Mare Ballam and La Rue des Bois have very high speed traffic. These roads are a long straight stretch which have fast moving traffic over and above 40mph. We have made representation to the Constable and Deputy of St John together with the police, complaining about the speed of vehicles which, at some periods, exceed 70mph. Although we have complained about this, nothing has been done in order to control these speeds and it's therefore an ongoing problem. If Thistle Grove was to expand, this would add further traffic onto these roads which would have an impact on the surrounding infrastructure and residential properties, which would have a serious effect on the existing amenity. Any increase in the numbers of people working on this proposed industrial estate would also have serious implications on traffic movements, not only at peak times, ie morning and evening, but also during the day via deliveries and traffic movements to and from these buildings. This would be wholly inappropriate for this quiet rural and residential area. This area of St John and St Lawrence has a very high water table and in times of heavy rainfall existing soakaways, road gullies and farmland do not cope. It would therefore imply that any future development at Thistle Grove would have an effect on this water table. I would suggest that the disposal of rainwater from this site would be a serious problem to overcome. The statement in the proposed Island Plan, "It is expected the proposed use will not have any significant impact on neighbouring uses and local environment" is, quite frankly, not true. As can be seen from my statements above, it will have an effect on the local residents in terms of traffic, noise, environment and also visual amenity and, dependant upon usage, air quality (air quality would be affected by increased traffic also). The statement in the proposed Island Plan that, "Existing boundaries are well established with a number of mature trees and hedgerows that provide good screening around most of the site" can only be described as woolly. Any screening in terms of vegetation is not permanent and is seasonable and can be altered or removed extremely easily which could further erode the visual amenity in this countryside setting. I would argue that the existing screen is inadequate and, due to its age, could not be described as sustainable. The proposal to give the boundary treatment and location of any development</p>			<p>only be served from this primary road and all other access points, such as that serving the Fencing Centre on la Rue de la Mare Ballam will be closed. 4. Waste Water Sufficient measures will need to be taken to ensure that waste water and all other services meet the current standards and regulations, such as those of Building control. 5. Boundary Treatment Successful boundary treatments, including buffer zones and other landscaping measures, will be essential to the success of the potential development to ensure that it's impact is minimised and this will be subject to approval at both the development brief and application stages.</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
							careful analysis is not, in my opinion, a valid reason for allowing this proposal to be brought forward. In my opinion, the very nature, size and type of buildings proposed in this area are wholly inappropriate for a countryside rural setting and would have an irreversible effect on the environment of the area. With regard to access, I would suggest that, due to the high speeds of traffic on this road as mentioned above, any access into this estate would be unacceptable, noting that the existing access onto La Grande Route de St Laurent/La Rue de la Mare Ballam/La Rue des Bois is currently dangerous due to the existing chicane to the south and also the entry of the existing road of La Rue de la Scelletterie. This existing small side road is limited for its vision lines by the existing registered listed house of Caen Lodge - therefore no improvement can be made. It should also be noted that St John is a rural parish with a large equestrian following and for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to use this road as they currently do with any increased traffic would be dangerous. The proposed Island Plan statement made in sections 5.117 to 5.120 does not provide enough detail and protection to this area to give me any belief that the site is appropriate for its proposed usage and should therefore be reconsidered. To summarise: I object to this proposal as it is completely out of character for its countryside setting and the infrastructure cannot take any further increase in traffic due to the physical restraints of the roadways and high speed traffic together with pedestrian and user safety. This proposal would irreversibly damage a countryside setting, affecting the amenity of local residents, the environment and the local biodiversity of the area. Finally, I live just to the north of this property and, whilst accepting that La Rue de la Mare Ballam is a main arterial route within the island, I do not wish to see any further increase in heavy traffic which would affect the air quality and increase the noise and vibration from heavy vehicles that already exists from Ronez, northern quarries and the traffic that serves the industrial sites further to the north into St John. I would therefore be obliged if you would remove this proposal from the proposed Island Plan and site industrial sites at more appropriate areas, closer to the ports and town, where developments and the population are to be targeted in this Island Plan, ie La Collette and La Collette 2.				
DP340		Mrs Penelope Lee			Provision of Light Industrial	Objecting	I agree totally with the other comment by A Morris regarding the proposed development at Thistlegrove. This is totally inappropriate for the area and will	Increase in traffic, increase in litter, ugly buildings like the Regal building.	Comments noted but	See Comments made in DP241	Comments noted by Minister but 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
					and Warehouse Land		create larger vehicle traffic, often travelling at high speeds. This proposal should be dropped		rejected		remove of Thistlegrove light industrial extension from Plan.
DP426		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union		Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Neither	Care should be taken to ensure that good agricultural facilities are not lost from the Industry (Ref: Para 5.114). See attached letter		Noted	Policy ERE5 should ensure that all relevant agricultural buildings remain in agricultural use.	Noted by the Minister
DP935		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society		Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Supporting	New locations for light industry / warehousing: There may be a need to supply additional warehousing, although this should be concentrated in the industrial areas and not spread into the agricultural heartland.		Comments noted	Where there are genuine redundancy issues with agricultural buildings, then these should be re-used for appropriate uses, including in some cases for light industrial.	Noted by the Minister
DP1054		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Objecting	Future warehousing of this nature should be sited at la Collette, this was always the intention. Low costs and appropriately sited locations such as East of Albert should Warehousing be considered. The type of facility run from these buildings needs to be considered as Objectives some activities which can attract higher rents may displace other activities to more rural locations with high levels of related transport needs.		comments noted	In order to fulfil the demand levels for light industrial use, La Collette will be required as part of the overall supply to meet this demand, but currently there is no certainty on availability at La Collette until master planning work is complete. Given the current levels of demand, length of time in which la Collette will come on stream and suitability of Thistlegrove, this site is required to meet current demand levels. The type and nature of occupants of the proposed re-zoned light industrial site will be subject to approval in the development brief and planning application.	Comments noted by Minister but minded not to support removal of Thistlegrove light industrial extension from Plan.
DP126		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP22		Deputy Rondel		Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Objecting	I should like to comment On the Thistle Grove Industrial/Commercial site in that the are proposed goes well beyond the current site and is proposed to include la Bienvenue Farm, a new farming unit has only just been built within in the last several years. Northend Vineries a current glass house complex which is still in use north end Fencing Centre poly tunnels. la Rue de la Scelleterie which has several polly tunnels which could be removed and the land returned to green fields at little expense to the	See Attached letter	Reject	In order to develop the site in an orderly manner it is necessary to include Bienvenue farm. The site area as designated on the draft proposals map will be subject to a separate planning brief that will outline the areas of development and which will first need approval of the minister for Planning & Environment before 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
							owner. I appreciate that commercial sites need to be found around the Island but having seen a new farm built on land behind Thistle Grove only a few years ago when the farmer had a perfectly good operation working the family farm half a mile away, only for that chicken farm to be sold to developers and Greenfields behind Thistle Grove be covered in concrete and the chicken farm and huts to continue in operation. If this farm is allowed to be come an industrial zone in this plan, will we see yet another operation move to yet another Greenfield given the farming community are permitted to ride-roughshod over the planning laws? I accept Northend Vineries will at some time in the future no longer be viable and the site will become a brown field site the remainder Northend Fencing Centre poly tunnels and la Bienvenue Farm are a bridge too far.			submission of a planning application. Should this re-zoning be approved and an application then be submitted by the owners of Bienvenue farm for a replacement elsewhere on a green field site, then this will be dealt on its merits under the policies of the day.	
DP254		Mr & Mrs Lee		Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Objecting	As you can see we live adjacent to the current Thistle Storage Industrial Park and are concerned about the proposed plans for the extension of the area.	Would it not be more efficient to have an industrial Park near the town and harbour to prevent heavy vehicles having to travel on Jersey's already congested roads. At present St Lawrence main road is relatively busy and to enlarge the area to the extent on the Island Plan, will many industrial units, would generate an enormous increase in the volume of traffic, presumably most of this increase would be heavy goods vehicles. As you are aware this particular main road has some fairly narrow stretches, which already cause traffic problems unlike some of the other major roads on the Island. We appreciate that there is already an industrial area here, however they are set back from the main road and at present generate a manageable amount of traffic movement To incorporate the fencing centre and two of the local firms would be an enormous area containing a huge amount of large warehouses causing a large increase of traffic volume coming up the main road. At present at least some of the traffic i.e. For the fencing centre assumably uses St John's main road. Also I see in last night's JEP that 'The United Nations has estimated that food production must increase by 50% over the next 20 years'. Getting rid of two farms does not seem a good way to go about this! On a more personal level we gather our property at present is in an Industrial Zone and on the new Island Plan is to be changed to residential. If the above proposed plan goes ahead would it not be appropriate to include our site in the plan being as though we are going to be sandwiched between the new development on the north, south and east sides will be the main road being on the west! At present the access to the	Objections noted but not supported	The development of this site will be in addition to any sites developed near the harbour areas, such is the size and nature of the demand for light industrial development. La Collette and the harbour areas are subject to further master planning work and this may release more light industrial land, but this is a longer term supply option and compromised by the Buncefield report which will restrict development opportunities at la Collette. The site is on a primary route that already serves an existing industrial site and 3 other commercial businesses where the proposed site is to be re-zoned and so the traffic movements are expected to be acceptable levels. The access points for the site will be off the main road. Although there will be the loss of farming units, the requirements for additional light industrial use mitigates this loss. It appears that an error in the 2002 zoning of the light industrial area was made and this has now been corrected. There will be no development to the south of the property and the other areas are existing light industrial uses.	Minister notes comments but minded not to amend 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
								Industrial estate is very close to our driveway and property. Again if this plan proceeds I assume this access will be moved further north to avoid more disturbances to our property.			
DP341		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Objecting	Agree totally with the other people objecting about the proposed development at Thistlegrove	More ugly buildings in the countryside, a large increase in traffic, often driven at high speeds, more litter thrown on the road and hedgerows.	Comments noted but rejected	See DP241	Comments noted by Minister but minded not to support removal of Thistlegrove light industrial extension from Plan.
DP633		Richard Plaster	Jersey Electricity plc	Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Supporting		We note the potential for La Collette Phase 2 and the proposals to make this area suitable for industrial warehousing, potential new harbour etc. We would be comfortable with this use, but would be concerned if proposals emerge that this area be used for housing. Our La Collette Power Station is located at the north end of this site and by its very nature is a heavy engineering , industrial site . With its likely continued use for standby emergency and peak load generation, it will never be an ideal neighbour to domestic developments, but we don't believe industrial or warehousing type developments should be a problem.	Support noted	Housing is not planned for this area.	Noted by the Minister
DP699		Conneta ble Deidre Mezbourian		Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and Warehouse Land	Objecting	From: The Connétable of St Lawrence, Mrs Deidre Mezbourian, Deputy John Le Fondre, Deputy Edward Noel, Senator Alan Maclean As elected Members of the States, we submit the following comments for consideration regarding the proposal to extend the Thistlegrove Light Industry Site in St Lawrence. The St Lawrence Roads Committee supports our views with regard to the comments about traffic. Lack of Suitability It is regrettable that this former agricultural site has, over a number of years, received approval for change of use thereby allowing the site on a busy main road and in the middle of the countryside zone to be used for light industry. However, whilst we accept that this is the case and that industrial use is made of the site, we consider the proposal to extend is inappropriate for an area in the middle of the countryside zone. We regret that within the Draft Island Plan there is a negligible amount of information regarding these proposals (four paragraphs only, 5.117 to 5.120). We are told that the proposed boundary treatment and location of any new development within the proposed site will be subject to careful analysis as part of the approval of a development brief. We are told that a full development brief will be presented to the Minister for approval before the submission of a planning application It is clear that any development should		Comment noted - see comments below.	1. Design The current site is indeed very unsightly and should the site be re-zoned then it would have to be done in a comprehensive manner that would in the Department's opinion improve the existing site in terms of both providing modern and much sought after light industrial units and remove and improve upon the existing unsightly developments. The height, size, volume and location of the new units would be very carefully designed to minimise the impact of the development on the surrounding area. This would be done through the submission by the developer of a detailed development brief that would first need to be approved by the Minister before a planning application could be submitted. The brief would, as a minimum need to include issues of design together with all of the other concerns listed in the	Comments noted by Minister but minded not to support removal of Thistlegrove light industrial extension from 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>take place in a co-ordinated manner. It is unacceptable that proposals to increase a light industry site within the middle of the countryside zone have been included for approval within this Draft Island Plan without first addressing issues such as: Design Service infrastructure Boundary Treatment Layout Landscaping Access Traffic Parking We submit that these matters must be addressed prior to receiving States consideration to extend the site. We note that the areas of land adjacent to the existing site which have been identified as being suitable for extension, include the existing commercial operations of North End Vineries, the Fencing Centre and Bienvenue Farm, together with two residential dwellings and workers accommodation. It is unclear to us whether the intention would be to re-zone surrounding green fields in order to increase the area of the site. We would not support re-zoning of green fields in order to extend this light industry site. We would not support the re-zoning of the existing poly tunnel site and submit that the area should be returned to agricultural use if no longer needed for poly tunnel use. We refute the assertion within the Draft Island Plan document that "it is expected the proposed use will not have any significant impact upon neighbouring uses and the local environment". It is clear that this will not be known until the following matters have been addressed: Design Service infrastructure Boundary Treatment Layout Landscaping Access Traffic Parking We note that the Transport &amp; Technical Services Department consider the existing access points on La Rue de la Scelleterie to be unsuitable. Although if approved the access would be relocated to La Grande Route de St Laurent, a primary network road, the problem of traffic would not be resolved. It would lead to an increase in heavy industrial traffic and the inevitably of damage to the infrastructure, as well as affecting the amenity of neighbouring properties. We receive complaints from the public regarding heavy vehicles using narrow country roads and have no doubt that this too would be exacerbated should expansion be approved. The current Island Plan aims to reduce the detrimental impact of traffic upon people's lives and to limit the impact of noise and other nuisances; these considerations should also be taken into account when considering the viability of this proposed extension to the Thistlegrove site.</p>			<p>representation, including traffic, access, boundary treatments, and waste, on site operations and landscaping. 2. Location The location of this site is adjacent to an existing protected industrial site and the re-zoning proposal would be extending into adjacent sites that are currently in some form of semi-light industrial use. This industrial site is the only one of those protected on the island that can be extended in this manner and there is an evidenced need for this type of development on the Island. 3. Road Infrastructure/Access The existing industrial site is on a prime road network which is capable of serving the proposed extended site area. Access will only be served from this primary road and all other access points, such as that serving the Fencing Centre on la Rue de la Mare Ballam will be closed. 4. Boundary Treatment Successful boundary treatments, including buffer zones and other landscaping measures, will be essential to the success of the potential development to ensure that it's impact is minimised and this will be subject to approval at both the development brief and application stages.</p>	
DP802	Mr Michael Stein	Mr Michael Stein	MSPlanning Ltd	Policy EIW 1	Provision of Light Industrial and	Supporting	North End Vineries, The Fencing Centre & Bienvenue Farm, La Rue de la Scelleterie, 51. Lawrence, JE3 1FZ Re-Zone Land as Extension to Exist in a Industrial Estate	I write in response to the Draft Island Plan White Paper and to the proposal to re-zone the above site as an extension of the Thistlegrove light industrial site. The North End Vineries site	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
					Warehouse Land			(including the Fencing Centre and Bienvenue Farm), as an extension to the Thistlegrove industrial site, is ideally suited to accommodate the required light industrial use because it can be developed in a manner that maintains the Island's environment whilst also contributing to the States of Jersey's commitment to creating a genuinely diverse economy. Moreover, the extension of the existing industrial estate will meet a pressing, and genuinely strategic, need for light industrial and warehouse land and as the only additional light industrial land provided in the Draft Island Plan is therefore crucial to developing the Island's economy. Finally, it will also enable inappropriate uses in the town of St. Helier and the Built-Up Area to relocate and release their existing sites for much needed residential development. I understand this case will be referred to the Independent Inspector and we will be given the opportunity to make representations at his Examination in Public. Please advise me when this is likely to take place and whether we will be able to make our representations to the Inspector in person			
DP127		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EIW 2	Protection of Existing Industrial Sites	Supporting	I feel that the policy should be amended to make it explicit that change of use/conversion to residential accommodation will not be permitted.		Noted but change to policy not required	The policy is designed to protect existing industrial units from other non related development types (including residential) and this is already explicitly stated: "Within the boundary of these sites, the introduction of non-industrial uses will not normally be permitted, unless related to and ancillary to the industrial use." There will always be unforeseen exceptions and residential development that is ancillary to the industrial use may still be permitted on a site, for example a care takers or site managers flat.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP342		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy EIW 2	Protection of Existing Industrial Sites	Objecting	Strongly object to the proposal to increase Thistlegrove		Objection Noted	See DP241	Objection by Minister but minded not to support removal of Thistlegrove light industrial extension from Plan.
DP572		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy EIW 2	Protection of Existing Industrial	Neither	Jersey Steel - there is an anomaly between the written Plan and the proposals map. In a number of places within the written plan Jersey Steel is referred		Comments noted and agree	Amend draft proposals map to include Jersey Steel as protected light industrial site	Minister minded to amend draft proposals map 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
					Sites		to as being a protected site for industrial purposes. However the draft proposals map has redefined the land as built up area. This needs to be rectified, as it would infer that the protection of light industrial has been removed and the site rezoned for housing.				include Jersey Steel as protected light industrial site
DP661		Conneta ble Peter Hanning	Parish of St Saviour	Policy EIW 2	Protection of Existing Industrial Sites	Neither	Another prime example of the 'laissez-faire' attitude is the manner in which Rue des Pres Trading Estate has spiralled out of control. What was intended to be a light industrial estate accommodating a variety of potentially bad neighbour commercial enterprises, has now been permitted to adapt into retail outlets and showrooms. More disturbing is the emergence of residential accommodation being created in such a potentially dangerous environment.		Comments noted	Unauthorised works will be subject to enforcement action where they do not comply with planning permissions. The limited numbers of residential units at Rue des Pres are related to businesses where on-site residency is required for care takers and staff.	Noted by the Minister
DP128		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EIW 3	Proposals For New Industrial Buildings	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP129		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EIW 4	Relocation Of Bad Neighbour Uses	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP130		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EIW 5	Extensions or Alterations To Existing Industrial Buildings	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP131		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EIW 6	New Industrial Development In The Countryside	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP664		Mr F J Fokkelman		Policy EIW 6	New Industrial Development In The Countryside	Neither	With reference to the 2010 draft Island Plan review, your attention is drawn to the change of use route which is often used by the agricultural sector. Many out of town commercial areas were originally agricultural buildings such as potato packing and storage sheds. Over time many of those have been transformed into industrial and commercial parks. An example may be given as the premises off the Route du Mont Mado. The premises were originally established for potato packing. A planning consent was obtained for part of the premises to be used for uses out with agriculture and first a glazing business was established, which moved from their premises in town to St. John. This was followed by any number of other businesses, commercial vehicle repair, distribution of bottled water etc. Whilst there is clearly no objection to the growth of the economy,		comments noted	There are strong policies in the new plan that protects existing agricultural developments from change of use to other forms of development. Similarly, the new farm shops policy places restrictions on the development of these in order to protect the vitality of the town and markets.	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 spreading of commerce all around the island will cause increased traffic on the roads, since clearly the economic hub in the Island is the St. Helier area and its adjacent areas. It also causes urban - rural commuting, since it is unlikely that employment can be legally restricted to persons living in the immediate vicinity to the business concerned. Even farm shops, which appear to be fully acceptable in the draft Plan, often become much more than a facility to sell farm produce, and can develop in large scale businesses, often along unsuitable and narrow roads. If it is intended to restrict development to the St. Helier and adjacent areas, it would seem logical to encourage businesses which serve the entire Island to become established in the St. Helier and adjacent areas, rather than all over the Island.				
DP440		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union		Rural and Marine Economy	Neither	Land Sub-Committee: We would like to see the establishment of a Land Sub-Committee consisting of members of the Planning Department and representatives of the Agricultural / Horticultural Industry who would meet to discuss any proposals to take land out of the Industry. We trust you will give this request due consideration. Farmers and growers are the guardians of the countryside and a viable Agricultural Industry is the most cost-effective way of managing the environment. The preservation and protection of agricultural land will encourage a sustainable and diverse Agricultural Industry. A vibrant Industry supplies high quality produce and creates employment. A potential future world food shortage has been widely documented and we feel that the Industry together with government have a shared moral responsibility to work together in a world increasingly threatened by food shortages and climate change.		Noted	This issue is not necessarily material to a land use planning framework. It is relevant to note, however, that consultation is undertaken with the Environmental Management and Rural Economy Team (EMRE) in relation to any applications which affect agricultural land. The planning application process remains open to general scrutiny and any comment from the JFU relating to proposals affecting agricultural land are welcomed.	The Minister notes the comments made but is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP937		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society		Rural and Marine Economy	Neither	Agriculture and the economy: The use of GVA is a blunt instrument in assessing economic contribution of the agricultural sector. Considerable contributions are made by the sector to the overall efficiency of the economy that are uncharged, for example the provision of 'public' goods, the maintenance of road side verges, and the provision of north bound freight that improves operations and leads to cheaper import costs. It should be stated that a buoyant agricultural industry is the most economic way to maintain the countryside.		Comments noted	The comment is noted	Noted by the Minister
DP675		Mrs Sue Lissenden			ERE: Objectives	Supporting	The Countryside Renewal Scheme is excellent, provided it is adequately prepared and monitored.		Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP343		Mrs Penelope Lee		Objective ERE 1	Rural Economy Objectives	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
DP236		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Proposal 15	Stewardship in Agriculture	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP344		Mrs Penelope Lee		Proposal 15	Stewardship in Agriculture	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP425		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union	Proposal 15	Stewardship in Agriculture	Supporting	We welcome any proposals that encourage good agricultural practice. We also welcome any assistance, particularly financial, that helps the Industry to maintain and enhance the environmental and aesthetic value of the countryside. See attached letter		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP470		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Proposal 15	Stewardship in Agriculture	Supporting	The Trust very much welcomes the Minister's commitment to supporting stewardship of the countryside. However, it is essential that this is accompanied by a commitment to maintain at the very minimum the existing level of funding within the Countryside Renewal Scheme. It should be noted that the schemes budget was recently cut by 50% despite Policy C1 in the existing Island Plan.		Noted	This proposal is consistent with the Countryside Renewal Scheme and will provide support to scheme emerging from it. Comments about the level of funding for the CRS are noted.	The Minister notes the qualified support for this proposal
DP826		Mrs Susan Kerley		Proposal 15	Stewardship in Agriculture	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
DP939		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Proposal 15	Stewardship in Agriculture	Objecting	Horse livery: Whilst there may be an argument that commercial livery is an economic activity, and a debate as to whether it has reached saturation point, there has been excessive growth in 'private' equestrian facilities. These are often applied for as part of a process of increasing domestic curtilage and therefore these should not be considered a 'legitimate agricultural activity' and must be resisted. There is no information published on the extent of horse ownership or land use which is in stark contrast to the detailed information published about the agricultural sector. This must be addressed by requiring the compilation and publication of equivalent statistical information on equine use. The recent increase in post and rail fencing not only indicates a large scale loss of land from agricultural production but also dramatically changes the character of the countryside.		Noted	The definition of "agriculture" includes horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, the breeding and keeping of livestock, the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, market gardens and nursery grounds; and references to "agricultural land" shall be construed accordingly; accordingly there is no change of use.	The Minister notes the concern
DP925		Mr Daniel Wimberley			Safeguarding Farmland	Supporting		presumption of keeping land in eg - YES	Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP133		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	Supporting			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
DP471		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	Supporting	The Trust fully endorses and very much welcomes the objective of safeguarding the existing agricultural land bank.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP831		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	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
DP894		Mr Iain Norris		Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	Neither	5.142 States that the Minister will generally support diversification where it does not create unwanted impacts. Guidelines are required about how such judgement is to be made and what impacts are to be avoided.		Noted	The very nature of diversification suggests that proposals are likely to be different, therefore it is difficult to provide a general guidance. Accordingly detailed advice will be sought from the relevant consultees on the merits of each proposal.	Noted by the Minister
DP906		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	Neither	2. There should be recognition that productive agricultural land is a precious natural resource that is becoming scarcer and as a result should be afforded the highest level of protection in recognition of global factors over a time span longer than that of the Island Plan.	The RJA&HS is broadly supportive of the key plan policies and is encouraged to note that there is an increased emphasis on resource protection and sustainability. That said the RJA&HS believes that the plan needs to positively state the reasons behind the need for resource protection, particularly in relation to the countryside, and further enhance the powers to protect agricultural land. Protecting the countryside as a resource: It is important that the rural areas of the Island are afforded the highest degree of protection and whilst the reasons for this may be taken as given it is felt important that they are highlighted to reinforce the basis of policy. The following should be iterated as the thesis for protection of the countryside as a valuable resource: The Island's countryside is different to most in Europe in that it has evolved as a highly intimate mix of land uses. This leads residents and visitors to feel 'closeness' to the community through a proximity which is not achieved in most other regions where there are distinct boundaries between different 'zones'. It is important to maintain the mix and balance of land use which people find of interest and leads to their enjoyment of the Island as a place to live and visit. The greatest threat to this currently is development. The beauty of the Island's countryside and natural areas are cited by visitors as the most important factor in their decision to visit and what they enjoyed the most. If the Island is to retain, and grow, a visitor economy in the future then protection of this resource must be core to that objective. The attraction, and retention, of highly mobile and wealthy individuals who contribute disproportionately to the success of the local economy is influenced by the natural	Noted	The plan not only seeks to protect agricultural land, but also the character of the Island's landscape. Agricultural land is protected from development by the Coastal National Park or green zone policies which make a strong presumption against development.	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
								beauty of the Island's environment. It is therefore important to retain, and improve, the character of this resource.			
DP911		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	Objecting	Specific recommendations: 1. A database of agricultural land should be established and monitored to see that agricultural land is being made available for primary production. 2. Any activity which prevents primary agricultural production being undertaken on agricultural land for any period in excess of one year should require permission for 'change of use'. Where 'change of use' is granted, it should only be for time limited periods. 3. Primary agricultural production should not include leisure equine activities, i.e. grazing of horses or constructing sand schools. 4. There should be a strong presumption against the granting of permission for a 'change of use' of agricultural land. 5. The current system of the applicant demonstrating a lack of demand is flawed, abused and should be abolished. It should be replaced by the principle that the demand for agricultural land is cyclical and therefore lack of demand can only be established by long term lack of occupancy.	Protection of agricultural land: The protection of agricultural land is an issue of the highest priority. The objective of protecting the countryside will not be achieved without the specific protection of agricultural land as a resource for primary agricultural production. A viable agricultural sector, which contributes to the diversity of the economy, can only be maintained if there is a 'bank' of agricultural land available at reasonable cost to the people with the necessary skills. There is an absence of detailed information on the bank of agricultural land available for primary production. The only source currently available is the States of Jersey Agricultural Census, and returns from those producers who receive financial support, which does not cover all agricultural land. Data from the census shows that there has been a decline in farmed land from 1970 approaching 30%. Much of the loss has been attributed anecdotally to permanent development, reversion of marginal land or change of use for community projects. In 2004 the Jersey Environment Forum recommended that research be undertaken to establish the status of the land bank and enhance protection of the resource. This has not been done. The primary method of protecting agricultural land must be through the planning process and this is not happening. In addition to the obvious loss of land through development there is a significant loss of land occurring through changes in use. Illustrated below are two examples in which land is being removed from agricultural use Agricultural land loss: The paper is misleading in only examining the area of agricultural land from the year 2000. In fact there has been a loss of agricultural land in the order of 25% since 1970. The table below gives a researched indication as to the current and expected future usage of agricultural land bank: Jersey Royal potatoes 15,500 vv Local vegetable production 4,000 vv Dairying 12,000 vv Flowers 800 vv Protected crops 280 vv Total 32,580 vv This equates well to the agricultural returns figure of 32,554 verges and shows that there is little capacity to lose further land out of agricultural production without comprising the output of the industry. It should be noted that these figures account for double cropping and 'land swaps' that are a common feature of local agriculture. Another	Noted	The suggestions put forward will require a change in the agricultural law. The Island Plan policies could then defend agricultural land from the uses identified	The Minister notes the comments, however this plan does not seek to alter the agricultural laws

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
								common feature of Jersey agriculture is the high proportion of rented land as opposed to owned land that is farmed by the occupier. It is estimated that this is in the region of 75% and leads the industry to being very vulnerable to changes in the land bank. Land classification: It is doubted that a workable system could be devised as an example, small parcels of land may not necessarily be of intrinsic agricultural value but they might be crucial to provide access linking blocks of land together and thus have strategic value. This quality may not always be constant and may lead to inappropriate classifications. Protection of agricultural land: The legal instruments are in place but it is contended that insufficient resources or emphasis has been put into the policing of the existing law and this has led to increasing loss of agricultural land and natural habitat through 'curtilage creep' as people extend their gardens. There are many examples available and greater emphasis must be placed on addressing this issue.			
DP945		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ERE 1	Safeguarding Agricultural Land	Neither	Golf courses : The development of an additional golf course should not be permitted. There has been no evidence published on the benefits of further development, other than anecdotal evidence of ' full waiting lists' , or that it represents anything other than an inefficient form of land use only enjoyed on an exclusive basis. Studies show golf courses in themselves are often not economically viable without the secondary activities of retail, restaurants and accommodation and thus this is an example of a planning 'Trojan horse' to obtain otherwise unacceptable planning consents. It is understood that a scheme to create a new course in St Martin, using up some 370 verges of prime agricultural land, is being promoted and it should be noted that the industry can not afford to loose land on this scale in that area.		Noted	Policy ERE1 safeguards agricultural land first and foremost. Any proposal for a new golf course would need to be considered against Policy ERE1 and other countryside policies. The proposal for a new golf course would be an exception to the plan, for which the Minister would need to undertake a public enquiry.	Noted by the Minister
DP134		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 2	Diversification of Agriculture and the Rural Economy	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP345		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy ERE 2	Diversification of Agriculture and the Rural Economy	Supporting			Noted	Noted	Support is noted by the Minister
DP430		John Le	Jersey	Policy	Diversification	Supporting	We regard this Policy positively.		Noted	Noted	Support is noted

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Maistre	Farmers Union	ERE 2	tion of Agriculture and the Rural Economy						by the Minister
DP927		mr daniel wimberley			Enabling Development	Objecting	Enabling development: Should be scrapped or severely constrained.	Wide open to abuse. This has been a disaster, and creates extremely negative perceptions of the planning process	Noted	The policy for linked and enabling development was supported by the States when it was introduced in the Rural Economy Strategy. Any enabling development proposal will need to satisfy the relevant policies of the plan and the Minister will be required to hold a public enquiry prior to determining any application.	The Minister notes the comment, however there are policies and processes in place which will ensure that any application considered for enabling development is properly scrutinised.
DP135		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 3	Enabling or Linked Development	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP472		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Policy ERE 3	Enabling or Linked Development	Objecting	The Trust is unable to support the principle of this policy if it results in permitted development which is contrary to established planning policy in the Island Plan.	If the States of Jersey wishes to further support the agricultural industry for its custodianship of the countryside, which is a laudable aim in itself, then this should be done in a transparent and publicly accountable manner (such as through the grant system available under the Rural Initiative Scheme) and not at the expense of our rural environment. It is also unclear in the proposed policy as to what equates to a countryside asset. Surely the role of planning must be to protect the agricultural land bank from unsuitable development as opposed to making decisions regarding whether certain agricultural businesses should be subsidised via planning gain to undertake that role. This is particularly pertinent given that the greater part of Jersey's agricultural land ie the asset, lies outside the direct ownership of the working agricultural sector. The Trust is also of the view that the scenarios listed under 5.145 would potentially be permissible under Policy NE7 and therefore it is unclear as to what this policy is seeking to achieve. Finally very little hard evidence has been provided as to whether the flexibility afforded the agricultural sector in previous Island plans has secured the benefits it was intended to achieve, especially given the rapid and continuing consolidation that underlies the industry. Surely this needs to be adequately demonstrated before the sector is granted further planning advantages	Noted	Policy ERE3 contains appropriate checks and balances to ensure that the concern raised can be adequately addressed in a publicly accountable manner	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
								and concessions.			
DP830		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy ERE 3	Enabling or Linked Development	Objecting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted		The Minister notes the objection to this policy
DP941		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ERE 3	Enabling or Linked Development	Neither	Enabling development: There is a case for this, however, it must be well thought through in terms of what is permitted, how much value is realised and how it is re-invested & controlled. If this is implemented incorrectly it could be a 'Pandora' s box' that develops into a method of bypassing normal planning controls.		Noted	The comment is noted and there are sufficient policies and processes in place to ensure proper scrutiny of any proposal for enabling development.	The Minister notes the comment. There are sufficient policies and processes in place to ensure proper scrutiny of any proposal for enabling development.
DP136		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 4	Change of Use and/or Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP473		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Policy ERE 4	Change of Use and/or Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings	Objecting	The Trust would request that this policy accords with Policy HE1		Reject	Policy ERE4 requires accordance with Policy GD1, which in turn requires Policy HE1 to be taken into account.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the issues raised are already adequately addressed
DP604		Mr Paul Le Claire		Policy ERE 4	Change of Use and/or Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings	Supporting		I believe that a Policy should be created to allow for wise use of Countryside or Buildings in Agricultural use historically where a benefit can be demonstrated for amenity, recreation, leisure or culture	Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP827		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy ERE 4	Change of Use and/or Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings	Objecting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		noted		Noted by the Minister
DP877		Mr Stephen D Smith	Health Protection Services	Policy ERE 4	Change of Use and/or Conversion	Neither	The conversion of former farm complexes to mixed use for example noisy commercial activity next to new or existing living accommodation should be resisted. Those in tied accommodation can be		This is covered by GD1 and		Noted by Minister but minded not to amend 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
					n of Traditional Farm Buildings		subjected to noise nuisance but unwilling to complain for fear of losing their job and home.		Public Health Department noise policies and guidelines.		
DP573		Deputy John Le Fondre			Change of Use and Conversion of Modern Farm Buildings	Neither	Alternative Uses for Farm Buildings - This paragraph recommends a period of 5 years of agricultural use after which an alternative use might be considered. I would suggest this is increased to 10 years. The key issue is about deterring new construction in anticipation of future conversion.	The key issue is about deterring new construction in anticipation of future conversion.	Noted and minded to give further consideration in light of the Rural Economy Strategy review	The draft Rural Economy Strategy is currently being consulted on and it would be prudent to ensure that the 5 year period ties in with that Strategy	The Minister notes the comment and is minded to give further consideration in light of the Rural Economy Strategy review
DP137		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 5	Change of Use And/or Conversion of Modern Farm Buildings	Supporting	I feel that the policy should be amended to make it explicit that change of use/conversion to residential accommodation will not be permitted.		Noted but Reject	The policy is designed to protect Modern Farm buildings from being converted to other non related development types (including residential) and this is already explicitly stated: "If the Minister is satisfied that the building is redundant to the needs of the agricultural industry, then consideration may be given to an alternative use provided that the proposed use is appropriate to the Island's economic needs, such as light industry, warehousing or distribution uses." In addition this policy is further supported by Strategic policy SP5 (economic growth and diversification) and policy E1 (Protection of Employment Land). There is a case, however to amend the wording of the supporting text to directly reference these other policies. There will always be unforeseen exceptions and residential development in exceptional circumstances may be acceptable.	Minister minded to reject proposed change but accept amendment to supporting text to include references to strategic policy SP5 (economic growth and diversification) and policy E1 (Protection of Employment Land).
DP474		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for	Policy ERE 5	Change of Use And/or	Objecting	The Trust does not feel this policy is sufficiently comprehensive and in some ways fails to address the argument for removal as per 5.152.	If the Minister is going to grant permission for some of these buildings to be used for alternative uses, then it seems appropriate that this should be	Reject	There are sufficient controls within Policy GD1 to ensure that the impact of any new use is	The Minister rejects the comment on 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
			Jersey		Conversion of Modern Farm Buildings			subject to substantial environmental/landscape gains including reduction in density, massing and scale as would apply to any other commercial undertaking within the Green Zone.		managed appropriately	basis that there are sufficient controls within Policy GD1
DP832		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy ERE 5	Change of Use And/or Conversion of Modern Farm Buildings	Objecting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted		The Minister notes the objection to this policy
DP928		Mr Daniel Wimberley		Policy ERE 5	Change of Use And/or Conversion of Modern Farm Buildings	Neither	5.152 and ERE 5 removal of no longer needed sheds should be possible for the Minister to call for this.		Reject	It is recognised that diversification will support the rural economy and redundant agricultural sheds provide a resource for alternative uses such as light industrial or storage use. There are sufficient controls in Policy GD1 to ensure any alternative use is properly managed.	The Minister rejects the comment on the basis that there are sufficient controls in Policy GD1 to ensure any alternative use is properly managed.
DP138		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 6	New Agricultural Buildings, Extensions, And Horticultural Structures	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP427		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union	Policy ERE 6	New Agricultural Buildings, Extensions, And Horticultural Structures	Objecting	See attached letter	It is vital that agricultural businesses are allowed to develop premises that are adequate for today's needs.	Reject	The proposed policy regime does not preclude the development of new agricultural buildings but rather sets out a series of tests that need to be satisfied to ensure that a sound case can be made for allowing their development	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP475		Mr Charles Alluto	The National Trust for Jersey	Policy ERE 6	New Agricultural Buildings, Extensions, And Horticultural Structures	Objecting	The Trust is of the view that the Minister should extend the condition for removal to all new modern agricultural sheds and not just temporary horticultural structures. This will ensure that sheds are only erected by those who have a long term commitment to the agricultural industry and not an agenda for alternative uses beyond the 5 year period. This policy also begs the question as to why the horticultural sector should be treated any differently		Noted	Redundant agricultural buildings are regarded as an important resource for future industrial space. It is accepted that there may be circumstance where change of use is unacceptable, however this is likely to be the exception rather than the rule.	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
					.		from the rest of the agricultural industry.				
DP833		Mrs Susan Kerley		Policy ERE 6	New Agricultural Buildings, Extensions , And Horticultural Structures .	Objecting	I endorse the suggestions and comments made by the National Trust for Jersey on these policies and proposals		Noted		The Minister notes the objection to this policy
DP943		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ERE 6	New Agricultural Buildings, Extensions , And Horticultural Structures .	Objecting	Agricultural buildings: There is a need for the industry to be able to replace buildings as they become out dated. There is also a case to allow a temporary change of use for industry, although this must not be allowed to then lead to further applications relying on the 'need' for more facilities for agriculture on the grounds of insufficient space. The process by which change of use is granted is not working and a more effective method of advertising availability of both land and buildings needs to be devised. There is evidence of land owners deliberately attempting to obscure availability or unrealistically pricing facilities to ensure that 'no interest is expressed' enabling them to secure a change of permitted use.		Noted and further consideration required	Policy ERE6 provides conditional support for the replacement of agricultural buildings. Temporary change of use is also provided for under Policy ERE5. There comment that land owners are deliberately attempting to obscure availability or unrealistically pricing facilities to ensure that 'no interest is expressed' enabling them to secure a change of permitted use is a concern which needs to be given further consideration. It is perhaps worth considering on new development a planning obligation which requires the owner to remove and restore the land if the shed becomes redundant to agriculture.	The Minister notes the comments and with regard to the last point, it is worthy of further consideration
DP139		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 7	Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP428		John Le Maistre	Jersey Farmers Union	Policy ERE 7	Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses	Neither	It is felt that these sites should be used for housing development prior to any green field sites being used. We also believe that where possible some development on a redundant site should be allowed to provide funds and encouragement for the remainder of the site to be returned to 'green field'.		Rejected	Those glasshouse sites that are considered suitable for use as housing sites to contribute towards the island's needs for homes have been identified in the draft Plan at Policy H1. It is considered that the policy regime provided by draft Policy ERE7 enables consideration for the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouse sites to secure demonstrable environmental gains in exceptional circumstances.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP895		Mr Iain		Policy	Derelict	Objecting	The following could also apply to agricultural		Noted	The comment is noted and would	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
		Norris		ERE 7	and Redundant Glasshouses		buildings 5.156 Highlights the fact that owners have expectations that they can get planning permission for non agricultural development. Whilst this hope value exists we can get the following scenario. Farmer A wants change of use/housing permission (Hope value). Planning permission refused Farmer B wants to lease/buy from farmer A for agriculture/horticulture use Farmer A refuses and/or demands unrealistic rent/price Result = Impasse and unused glasshouse/agricultural building. Farmer B then applies for planning permission for new building when existing one already exists. Planning permission refused as existing glasshouse/agricultural building is already available . Question : To avoid this scenario should some form of compulsion (controversial) be introduced to force Farmer A to rent/sell to farmer B at realistic agricultural rate? If he refuses should there be a requirement to return the glasshouse/agricultural buildings to a green field as they are now redundant (applied for change of use/planning permission)? This policy would remove the hope value if consistently applied or is there scope within the policy?			clearly be controversial. It is not though that the current planning law allows the Minister to intervene in this way and would therefore require a change in the law which is outside of the Island Plan process.	notes the comment
DP912		mr daniel wimberley		Policy ERE 7	Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses	Supporting		Tough policies on redundant glasshouses as set out on page 223	Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP942		Mr James Godfrey	Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society	Policy ERE 7	Derelict and Redundant Glasshouses	Supporting	Glasshouse sites: There is a case for some of the current redundant sites to be permitted for development although any change to 'brown field' should be accompanied by a block against future development of additional glass, the same principle should apply to modern farm buildings in general.		Noted	Those glasshouse sites that are considered suitable for use as housing sites to contribute towards the island's needs for homes have been identified in the draft Plan at Policy H1. It is considered that the policy regime provided by draft Policy ERE7 enables consideration for the redevelopment of redundant and derelict glasshouse sites to secure demonstrable environmental gains in exceptional circumstances.	The Minister notes the qualified support for this policy
DP140		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy ERE 8	Fishing & Fish Farming	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP998		Captain Howard Le Cornu	States of Jersey Harbours	Policy ERE 8	Fishing & Fish Farming	Supporting		Should also be included and defined within Port Operational Area. This industry is important to the port and Island community and should be given the appropriate space and facilities it requires to develop	Noted	Policy ERE8 seeks to protect both the marine and land resources that form the basis of the fishing and fish farming industry, the nature and extent of which would	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
										be too extensive to list. Therefore the policy is written to catch all circumstances.	
DP1024		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce		Visitor Economy	Supporting	There are some excellent comments in the Draft Island Plan with regard to the tourism industry(paragraph 5.159 et seq). It is a shame that these attributes are not documented or promoted elsewhere within the States. Paragraph 5.163 reflects a misuse of statistics in that arrival figures are not a reliable measure of tourism performance, and particularly noting that it was the States that offered financial "incentives" to certain airlines to fly here. In any event, the 2009 tourism statistics reflect a continued and relentless decline. The Draft Island Plan does not reflect or demonstrate any joined up thinking as regards any strategic plans of EDD, if there are any, for the development and growth of Jersey's tourism industry. Whilst generally supportive of the tourism industry, the Draft Island Plan generally says that "we will stick to what we have", and seems scared to think out of the box. It seems especially scared to explain what could be tackled in St. Ouen or in the north of the Island from a tourism viewpoint, or indeed from a view of residents.		Comments noted	EDD have been very close to the draft plan and have endorsed the Visitor Economy section. The areas of St. Ouen and the North coast are sensitive areas and tourism development, or indeed any form of development, needs to be carefully considered within this context.	Noted by the Minister
DP257		mr mike graham			Visitor Economy	Supporting	5.159 1. We must not be fooled that 90,000 people will keep local attractions (heritage, durrell) open. We need visitors. 5.160 1. Without tourism visitors it is inevitable that more major attractions will close. Living legend and Jersey pottery are next closely followed by Durrell and to a significant extend Heritage. Doesn't leave much. We need to bed numbers to firstly stop decling and then increase to keep what we love so dear. About half of staying visitors go to Durrell; so for every 2 we lose that's one less person making a visit. The numbers quickly add up. 2.Fewer air services and no fast ferries means the harbour and airport with significant high fixed costs will then need government support. Generally this section is spot on it that it recognises the link between tourism and the rest of the Island though more should be mentioned of the multiplier effect of tourism throughout our economy. If anything its how far government can go in protecting the tourism product or encouraging it. Bed numbers were down a further 3.3% in 2009. Whilst many hotel owners would be against protection of tourism accommodation from alternative use if this is not considered it may be inevitable that more hotels will move to residential so further reducing bed numbers and its linked effect on other aspects of our way of life.		Comments noted		Noted by the Minister
DP150		Mr		Objectiv	Tourism	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the

Ref	Agent	Name	Org/bus.	No.	Title	Response	Suggested changes to the document:	Why you consider this to be necessary:	General Response	Detailed Officer Response	Minister's Recommendation
		Stephen de Gruchy		e EVE 1	Objectives						Minister
DP776		Seamus Morvan	Morvan Hotels	Objective EVE 1	Tourism Objectives	Objecting	<p>Our following submission seeks to ensure that policy is put in place that is effective in allowing tourism businesses to flourish in line with market demands in the future. We are committed hoteliers of long standing but we do have serious concerns with regard to the actual effect of proposed policy in the following areas: Our following submission seeks to ensure that policy is put in place that is effective in allowing tourism businesses to flourish in line with market demands in the future. We are committed hoteliers of long standing but we do have serious concerns with regard to the actual effect of proposed policy in the following areas:</p> <p>2. Policy H3 - Affordable Homes - We understand that the aim is to provide lower cost homes and believe that this is expected to be achieved (as build costs are a constant), through the lowering of site values. Many hoteliers, naturally in the course of their business, rely on the underlying housing value of their site/s to raise funds to further invest in their businesses. If the effect of policy H3 is to reduce potential tourism site values, this will act as an impediment to raising investment into tourism businesses within the sector.</p> <p>The Past - The failed 'Prime Hotel Site Policy' clearly demonstrated the dangers of restricting or denying fluidity of change of use as the policy impacted the desirability to invest into the sector and thus impacted upon hotel freehold values. The industry largely stagnated. I understand that Planning Officers found the policy was highly problematic to manage and it led to a significant morale issue within the industry. Many hotel proprietors found themselves in the sad position that they could not plan for retirement as they had hoped and the desirability of their trade to the next generation was impacted. In effect, they were trapped into the occupation. Indeed, history clearly demonstrates that hotel investment only flourished when these controls were removed in c. 2001, when we witnessed unprecedented investment into new tourism product following the ending of the policy of Planning intervention. Industry performance issues - Of significant importance to the arguments above is the matter that Jersey currently only enjoys low hotel bed space occupancy. In effect, there is currently an excess of supply, with official figures showing only a 57% bed space occupancy January to November 2009. This low occupancy, together with resultant poor yield per bed sold, is having a detrimental effect</p>		The comments of Morvan Hotels in respect of policy H3 are 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
							upon the value of the industry to the Island whilst consuming the current land footprint. Occupancy and financial yield should be the measure of performance of the sector and not crude bed numbers. Artificially inflating bed numbers in the hope of generation of economic diversification would again be counterproductive to the motivation and flexibility of those involved within the industry and would not serve the island well. To succeed, there will be a need to promote both migration into the tourism sector and exit from the sector with regard to land use - these above highlighted proposals, in practice, do neither. To conclude- We believe that, particularly in the Jersey high cost based context, the above proposed policies of market intervention, whilst well intentioned and seemingly in keeping with States strategy policy, will not benefit the creation of enhanced tourism product or value, nor will it yield the homes to meet the objectives of the plan. We believe that both or either of the above policies, if applied to tourism sites, would generate serious structural issues for our industry for the future, and that this would not be to the benefit of the people of the Island or for the tourism industry generally. In addition, given there is significant history of past detrimental government intervention in this area, we would ask whether these highlighted policies have been drawn-up in consultation with Economic Development, as this department has been market driven in recent times and has so witnessed considerable investment into the sector, including by my own family hotel company. I would be grateful if you would give us the opportunity to meet with the Inspector in order that we may ensure that these arguments, which we genuinely believe are to the betterment of the industry generally, may be explored further. I look forward to hearing from you.				
DP102 6		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce		EVE: Policies	Objecting	Paragraph 5.169 recognises that the quantity, range and quality of accommodation need to be addressed, but there is little, if anything, in the Draft Island Plan to indicate how this concern might be actually tackled.		Comment not fully relevant to Plan	The loss of accommodation has generally been in the lower quality sites and the remaining stock that is left is generally of a higher standard with significant investment being put into some of the best sites. Previous planning policies were adopted to resist the loss of tourist accommodation but this was strongly resisted by the industry and subsequently dropped. The marketing of the industry falls outside the auspices of the Plan.	Noted by Minister but minded not to amend Plan.
DP413		Mr Robin			EVE:	Objecting	In the 2002 Island Plan, policy TR6 designated specific	The 2009 Draft Island Plan should recognise that,	Do not	Policies TR6 & TR5 have been	Minister notes

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
		Troy			Policies		areas for recreational purposes and the development of recreational resources. Policy TR5 sets out criteria for the development of recreational resources and policies TR2 and TR3 were included and are intended to encourage the development of new or extensions to existing tourism and cultural attractions within the built up area or the countryside zone and green zone. These policies have been omitted from the 2009 Draft Island Plan and although replaced by other policies, the concept of designated areas for recreational development is too important to be ignored and must be reinstated. Objecting to removal of 2002 policies TR2, TR3, TR5 & TR6 See attached letter	in connection with sport, tourism, leisure and recreational facilities, these are often unsuitable for development in the urban area or are found in the coastal national park or green zone. The 2002 Island Plan included policies TR2, TR3, TR5 and TR6 which provided for the designation of tourism and recreational areas and policies for the development, improvement and enhancement of such facilities, which have been omitted from the 2009 Draft Island Plan and require immediate reinstatement both as concepts and policies, whether they relate to the green zone or coastal national park. In addition the Minister should have the power from time to time to create additional sites for recreational development. See attached letter	agree with comments as these policies still exist in Plan	replaced in the Social, Community and Open Space section of the plan under policy numbers SCO4 (Protection of Open Space) & SCO5 (Provision and Enhancement of Open Space) and Proposal 17 (Open Space Strategy). Policies TR2 & TR3 are replaced by policies EVE1 (visitor Accommodation, tourism and cultural attractions), EVE2 (Tourist Destination Areas) & EVE3 (Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside).	comment but omissions covered by replacement policies in different part of Plan
DP151		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EVE 1	Visitor Accommodation, Tourism and Cultural Attractions	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP574		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy EVE 1	Visitor Accommodation, Tourism and Cultural Attractions	Objecting	Tourism Accommodation etc - in the Green Zone tourism related construction is permitted for existing tourism facilities. In the Coastal Park there is a presumption against the extension of existing tourism accommodation. Therefore the only area in which one can attempt any new tourism facility is in the built up area. Although not always the case, it is likely that an attractive tourism offering is desirable outside of the urban area. This policy seems to severely restrict such activity, and therefore in my mind, does not support any diversification of the economy.		Comments noted - minded not to support	The Coastal National park is the Island's most sensitive landscape and it is right that new development should be resisted in this zone. However, although there is a presumption against the development and extension of tourism and cultural attractions, exceptions can be made where deemed acceptable by the Minister. The diversification of the economy can be ably supported by other policies in the Plan and in more suitable areas of the island where appropriate.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP861		Gerald Fletcher	Jersey Hospitality Association	Policy EVE 1	Visitor Accommodation, Tourism and Cultural Attractions	Objecting	amended policy wording replace- permitted with supported	In the Policy NE 7 'Green Zone', extensions to existing tourist accommodation, the conversion of existing buildings or development of new tourism and cultural attractions will be strongly supported (permitted- deleted ), where the proposal is directly related to an existing tourism, leisure or recreation facility and satisfies Policy GD1 General Development Considerations. There is a presumption against new tourism development and the extension of existing tourism accommodation, attractions and cultural attractions in the Policy NE 6 'Coastal National	Noted but disagree with comment	It is for other departments such as EDD (Tourism) to support such facilities, where appropriate, the purpose of the Plan is to have policies that give clear guidance to applicants - it is not an enabling policy but rather a criteria based policy.	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
								Park'.			
DP1025		Ray Shead	The Jersey Chamber of Commerce	Policy EVE 2	Tourist Destination Areas	Supporting	The town of St. Helier is increasingly becoming an unattractive place to visit and seems to be a continual building site. It is in this context that the Tourism Committee welcomes the recognition in the Draft Island Plan that other tourist destination areas in the Island need to be looked after.		Support Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP152		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EVE 2	Tourist Destination Areas	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister
DP575		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy EVE 2	Tourist Destination Areas	Neither	Tourism Destination Areas - as noted above certain sites such as Le Braye, El Tico, Watersplash have previously been designated as sites warranting investment. I believe there are some other locations around the island which could also warrant investment but which will now be located in the Coastal Park. Would it be possible to give consideration to specifically identifying such locations (for example the 3 sites above, perhaps St Catheline's café), etc, as sites (tourism related sites ?) which may be given some greater flexibility in the interpretation of policy NE 6. For example, provided there is support from EDD, the proposals are of good design, etc. Otherwise such facilities will over time just stagnate.		Reject	The policy is flexible enough to allow for sympathetic re-development of such sites, provided that they meet with other policies in the plan, including GD1 and NE6. It is important that a balance is achieved between supporting tourism facilities whilst protecting Jersey's, and ultimately the tourism industry's, most precious asset	Comments noted but minded not to support amended policy suggestion.
DP862		Gerald Fletcher	Jersey Hospitality Association	Policy EVE 2	Tourist Destination Areas	Neither	amended policy wording replace- permitted with supported	In relation to Policy EVE 2, which relates to Tourist Destination Areas, it is recommended that the text is amended, as shown below in red, to provide overt support to appropriate development, in order to better reflect the overall aims of the Plan: 'Within the Tourist Destination Areas designated on the Proposals Map, the Minister will strongly support: environmental enhancements to the public realm; proposals for al fresco activities associated with restaurants, bars, cafes and outdoor performances; and improvements in accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users Proposals for new tourist accommodation and support facilities will be strongly supported (permitted) in the Tourist Destination Areas provided that the development accords with Policy Policy GO 1'General Development Considerations'	Noted but disagree with comment	It is for other departments such as EDD (Tourism) to support such facilities, where appropriate, the purpose of the Plan is to have policies that give clear guidance to applicants - it is not an enabling policy but rather a criteria based policy.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP153		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EVE 3	Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside	Supporting			Noted		Support is noted by the Minister
DP346		Mrs Penelope Lee		Policy EVE 3	Tourism Support Facilities	Supporting			Support 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
					in the Countryside						
DP576		Deputy John Le Fondre		Policy EVE 3	Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside	Neither	Tourism Support Facilities - general presumption against provision of tourism and recreational support facilities in the Coastal Park Zone. This is extremely proscriptive, and did not, to my recollection, form part of the consultation sessions. However, if this is to prevent new facilities on green field sites then is probably acceptable. If it is to slowly whittle down existing facilities - e.g. St Catherine's café, this does not seem equitable and could severely damage our tourism offering. For example, if St Catherine's café, which is (rightly) included in the zone, were to want to redevelop its present building, would this policy permit it? Strictly speaking this does not seem to be the case, and I would urge there to be some degree of flexibility built in to this policy.		Noted	The purpose of this policy is not to 'whittle down' existing facilities in the most sensitive areas of the Island and is flexible to allow for the re-development of existing facilities provided that this is done in a sensitive way that does not cause harm or indeed enhances what is already there. There would however be a presumption against the development of brand new facilities in the coastal national park.	Noted by Minister but policy is flexible to allow for the re-development of exiting facilities and not too prescriptive.
DP601		Mr Paul Le Claire		Policy EVE 3	Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside	Objecting	Picnic parks should be developed wherever possible to allow for use of countryside by islanders		Noted	Policy EVE3 already enables the provision of support facilities in the countryside, which would include picnic parks, appropriate to the character of the area. Dependent upon their nature and scale, the provision of limited facilities may also be permitted in the Coastal National Park under the auspices of Policies NE6 and NE8.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan as the matter is already enabled by proposed policies
DP863		Gerald Fletcher	Jersey Hospitality Association	Policy EVE 3	Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside	Neither	amended policy wording replace- permitted with supported	In relation to Policy EVE 3, which relates to Tourism Support Facilities in the Countryside, it is recommended that the text is amended, as shown in red, to provide overt support to appropriate development, in order to better reflect the overall aims of the Plan: 'Proposals for tourism or support facilities including public conveniences, cafes and kiosks will be strongly supported (permitted) where the proposal promotes informal recreational activities appropriate to the sensitivity of the countryside and accords with Policy GO 1'General Development Considerations' There will be a general presumption against the provision of tourism and recreation support facilities in the Policy NE 6 'Coastal National Park' except for minor improvements to enhance public enjoyment of the coast and countryside', which will be supported.	Noted but disagree with comment	It is for other departments such as EDD (Tourism) to support such facilities, where appropriate, the purpose of the Plan is to have policies that give clear guidance to applicants - it is not an enabling policy but rather a criteria based policy.	The Minister is not minded to amend the draft Plan
DP154		Mr Stephen de Gruchy		Policy EVE 4	Beach Kiosks	Supporting			Noted		Noted by the Minister