

STATES OF JERSEY



ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): THIRTY-FIRST AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 26th April 2011
by Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour

STATES GREFFE

PAGE 2 –

After the words “the revised draft Island Plan 2011” insert the words “except that –

- (a) in paragraph 8.136 (page 327), after the words ‘be excluded from using it’ insert the following words –

‘The Minister, thus, acknowledges that for some sections of the Island community the private vehicle remains the only practical transport option and that parking for commercial vehicles is also of significance to business.’;
- (b) in paragraph 8.137 (page 327), after the words ‘for broad classes of development’ insert the following words –

‘, including residential and commercial land uses and buildings, as well as for urban and rural parts of the Island.’ ”

and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

DEPUTY J.M. MAÇON OF ST. SAVIOUR

REPORT

The first part of this amendment is a slight modification to the amendment made by the Connétable of St. Mary to the Sustainable Transport Policy, which was unanimously adopted by the States Assembly.

The second part is meant to illustrate that for many professions a private vehicle is essential, and that whilst the current Island Plan puts great emphasis on reducing the dependence on the private car – by planning out private residential parking spaces particularly in urban areas, it appears to ignore that for many professions a private vehicle is essential in order to carry out that occupation. The Department cannot predict the current or future occupation of Islanders. This raises the question (for example) – where is “White Van Man” supposed to park his vehicle when his is on a job or at home? I feel that by relaxing the parking provisions especially in urban areas, the Department will create more problems than those it is trying to solve. Also, I feel that the Draft Island Plan as proposed is flawed. It would give the impression that if vehicle parking spaces are planned out and a development has plenty of bicycle racks and is near a bus-stop, that Islanders will not use a private vehicle. It is my opinion that if the Planning Department plans out parking spaces when determining applications, the consequence will not be that more people will use the bus or bicycle. What happens now in a situation whereby adequate parking provision has not been planned in, one may ask? In my own constituency, in those older properties which were built before people owned their own vehicle, residents have bought cars due to the change in technology, and park on the side of the road and on top of pavements. In these areas the residents are calling out for resident parking schemes. In other words, Islanders will not go without their vehicles if they do not have adequate parking spaces at home, they simply park their vehicles on the road, leading to various problems that States members will be aware of.

Financial and manpower implications

I am of the opinion that there are no financial or manpower implications for the States arising from this amendment.