

# STATES OF JERSEY



## ISLAND PLAN 2022-25: APPROVAL (P.36/2021) – FORTY-THIRD AMENDMENT LES QUENNEVAIS

---

Lodged au Greffe on 12th July 2021  
by Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade

---

STATES GREFFE

**PAGE 2 –**

After the words “the draft Island Plan 2022-25” insert the words “except that –

- (a) on page 38, the words “at higher densities” should be deleted;
- (b) the existing ‘Strategic Proposal 4 – A west of island planning framework’ should be deleted, and there should be inserted the following new Strategic Proposal –  
“Strategic Proposal 4 – A west of island masterplan  
The Minister for the Environment will bring forward a masterplan for Les Quennevais and adjacent areas, including Jersey Airport, in consultation with key stakeholders, no later than May 2023.”;
- (c) within Proposal (Sustainable Communities Fund), after the words “future development of Town” should be inserted the words “and other parts of the island’s built-up area.”; and
- (d) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c).”

DEPUTY M. TADIER OF ST. BRELADE

**Note:** After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

to approve, in accordance with Article 3(1) of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002, as amended by the Covid-19 (Island Plan) (Jersey) Regulations 2021, the draft Island Plan 2022-25, **except that –**

- (a) on page 38, the words “at higher densities” should be deleted;**
- (b) the existing ‘Strategic Proposal 4 – A west of island planning framework’ should be deleted, and there should be inserted the following new Strategic Proposal –  
“Strategic Proposal 4 – A west of island masterplan  
The Minister for the Environment will bring forward a masterplan for Les Quennevais and adjacent areas, including Jersey Airport, in consultation with key stakeholders, no later than May 2023.”;**
- (c) within Proposal (Sustainable Communities Fund), after the words “future development of Town” should be inserted the words “and other parts of the island’s built-up area.”; and**

(d) the draft Island Plan 2022-25 should be further amended in such respects as may be necessary consequent upon the adoption of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c).”

## REPORT



-Banksy

### West is Best

Anyone who was around in Jersey in the early 1960s or before might well remember that much Les Quennevais and the surrounding areas were sand dunes. The name of *Clos des Sables* gives an indication of what was there previously, and what still can be enjoyed by continuing over the sports fields towards St Ouen's Bay, where *Les Blanches Banques* are one of the jewels in the ecological crown of, not just St Brelade, but the island.

Les Quennevais, La Moye and St Brelade more generally, have become a sought after places to live – and one can see why: it has the most beautiful beaches and coastline in the channel islands on its three coasts, West, South and East-facing; it is rich in history and culture; it has excellent States Schools; an excellent sustainable transport network; it has great amenities and Quennevais residents will often tell you, only half-jokingly, *we don't go to town very often. We don't need to.*

The Bridging Island Plan seeks to 'establish' Les Quennevais as '*the island's secondary urban centre.*' **Strategic Proposal 4, A West of island planning framework** (p.30), goes on to say '*The Places section of the plan introduces a policy regime to support this designation that seeks to **protect and enhance** the range of local services currently provided in the area.*'

The commitment to *protect and enhance* the range of local services provided in the area is certainly -on the face of it- a welcome one. However, it is not 100% clear what services will be protected and enhanced, nor indeed how that will be achieved, given that much of the provision is not within the direct gift of government, either central or local. I will explore some of this further below when addressing para. (b) and (c).

Whilst most St Breladais are very proud and protective of their community, there is a general feeling that Les Quennevais and its suburbs have already taken the brunt of over-development at a pace that has not always been matched by investment in infrastructure, either in the private or public domain.

My proposition seeks to highlight some of the tensions that arise from Les Quennevais designation effectively as Jersey's *second town* and seek reasonable safeguards to guarantee proportionality in the planning assumptions, decisions and also funding that will be available, not only to Les Quennevais, but also parts of the island's villages and settlements.

**Paragraph (a)**

With the best will in the world, planning remains subjective. We can all think of examples of buildings where we think *How on earth did that get planning permission?! It is also a fact of the planning process that developers often seek to cram because in so doing they can maximize their profits.*

I was alarmed, then, when I read the following words on p.38 of the plan, under the heading **Spatial strategy – Main centres**

*As one of the island's main urban centres, Les Quennevais can continue to provide a focus for new development enabling investment and regeneration, and being supported as a sustainable alternative place for new development to happen, which might otherwise be located in St Helier by **encouraging** the redevelopment of already developed land and buildings **at higher densities**, and by accommodating a broader range of employment uses, such as the development of office accommodation (up to 200sqm).*

In my mind there is a vast difference between planning policy *allowing* high densities and actively *encouraging* it. As I have suggested above, there is no shortage of examples of developers trying to *squeeze* the figurative *quart into a pint pot*. Sometimes such developments will go to the Planning Application's Panel and sometimes they will be passed or rejected on a single vote.

As things stand, one tends to hope that an *overly audacious* application would get rejected, with the architect going back to the drawing board and submitting a more modest plan. Are we going to see, in the near future, plans rejected because the proposed development is *not* dense enough?

There is no need to *encourage* applications for higher density development. These will be submitted anyway, and they should be judged on their merit. My concern is that this will give the green light for inappropriate developments; for more garden grabs; for extra bedrooms, which might not have been approved previously and which, might be rented out to lodgers, meaning an extra car parked in an already busy housing estate, for example.

As one constituent explained to me recently, if we delete 'at higher densities', then we remove the planning imperative to increase density. It is still **possible**, but it isn't **compulsory**.

**Paragraph (b)**

Parts b and c are very much intertwined, and they are not just about Les Quennevais, but about what kind of planning we want to see in the coming years in other *local centres*, perhaps in St Peter, St Ouen, Maufant, Les Squez and St John, to name but some of the island's villages and conurbations.

My concern is that it is one thing to say, *Let's make Les Quennevais our second town* – which sounds very grandiose, without pausing to ask, *what does that really mean? And what will we (Les Quennevais) get out of it?*

I have been of the opinion for a while now that Les Quennevais needs a *Masterplan*. A vision for the area, based primarily on the ideas and input of the residents and users of the immediate area.

My personal background is as a linguist, not a planner, and as such I perhaps pay more attention to words and phrase rather than maps and drawings; It is significant that the plan states '*Les Quennevais has developed as a secondary urban centre.*' There was no conscious plan to develop it as such. It has been a mostly organic and passive achievement. I suppose, for want of a better expression, it has happened gradually or *by stealth*. In many ways it has happened, as much of the development in Jersey's urban areas, in a piecemeal and uncoordinated way. As it is, Les Quennevais *works*, and this is largely down to the great community spirit and sense of place that it has. But there is certainly potential, with an appropriate amount of proper investment and support, that it could be even better.

I have lost track of the number of times I have done interviews about *empty shops* in Les Quennevais Precinct, for example. And it is difficult, in the free market to effectively influence commercial outcomes; this said, when shops stand vacant for long periods, it does affect not only the viability of the commercial offering, but also the self-esteem of the area. The shopping precinct has not enjoyed the investment of funds or TLC that St Helier or even St Aubin have. This is most apparent at Christmas time. There is the will both on the part of residents and the commercial owners of precinct to have proper regeneration in the area, but these have not been straightforward to achieve until now. And it is certain that government and perhaps the parish have a more active role to play in facilitating sustainable, acceptable and desirable regeneration of the shopping area and its precincts.

The concept of a *Masterplan* is one that is well known for the various *quartiers* of St Helier, whether it be the *North of Town*, *East of Albert*, *the Esplanade Quarter* or the current *Waterfront Masterplan*. I am not convinced that a planning framework will be sufficiently robust in securing the kind of regeneration I and many would like to see for the area.

I do accept that a certain amount of priority has already been given to this area by the inclusion of Strategic Proposal 4 – A West of island planning framework. However, a *planning framework* and a *Masterplan* are two different things.

I think that if Government is serious about effectively making St Brelade into a *second Town*, then it certainly needs to be doing that on the back of a masterplan, and not just a planning framework.

**Paragraph (c)**

The same section of the Spatial strategy (p. 38) talks about 'enabling investment and regeneration' but it does not commit to providing any investment or regeneration directly.

In describing the need for a *Sustainable Communities Fund* the BIP states (p.77/78),

‘the Island Plan proposes a new Sustainable Communities Fund. This fund will be designed to capture a small proportion of the private value uplift arising from the development process and invest it back into the community. **This investment will be aimed specifically towards Town, where the investment is needed most**’ (*my emphasis*)

It is clear from this that no matter where in the island the development takes place, the money accrued to the government arising from the taxation/charge on that capital gain, will and can only be invested in St Helier. This seems unnecessary inflexible and inherently unfair. Whilst I am a big supporter of investment in Town, it should be to the absolute exclusion of other projects throughout the island, especially if other communities are negatively impacted by particular developments.

However, the first mention of the *Sustainable Communities Fund* is on p. 10 of the Draft BIP and here the wording and underlying ethos is somewhat different. It states:

‘To support the Plan for Town, the Island Plan proposes the introduction of a Sustainable Communities Fund to invest in improvements over the long-term by capturing a small proportion of the value created when planning consent is given and recognising that it is legitimate to use this to make wider improvements **to benefit the local communities in which development occurs.**

Note, *communities* – plural. This amendment would clarify that the SCF could be used more widely across the island, not only in St Helier.

#### **Paragraph (d)**

This paragraph would simply allow for consequential changes to be made, where appropriate. For example, were part (c) to be adopted, references to the Sustainable Communities Fund could be amended in line with the amendment.

#### **Financial and manpower implications**

There are no Financial and manpower implications arising from these amendments.

#### **C.R.I.A. Statement**

This amendment has been assessed in relation to the [Bridging Island Plan CRIA](#).

Whilst it is unlikely that these amendments would have any direct or provable impact on Children’s Rights, it is my aspiration that by seeking to oppose an over development of residential areas in terms of high densities, that negative impacts on residents, including families and young people by crowded living conditions should be avoided.

Similarly, it is also my hope that a timely masterplan for Les Quennevais would with a proper consultation process would also enable children to have their say on the development of their community and its future amenities, and to have their voices heard.