STATES OF JERSEY



ISLAND PLAN 2011: REVISED DRAFT REVISION – APPROVAL (P.37/2014) – TENTH AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 6th May 2014 by Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade

STATES GREFFE

ISLAND PLAN 2011: REVISED DRAFT REVISION – APPROVAL (P.37/2014) – TENTH AMENDMENT

PAGE 2 -

After the words "the revised draft revision to the Island Plan 2011" insert the words –

"except that the following additional revisions shall be made to the Island Plan 2011 in addition to the Minister's draft Revision –

(a) after the preamble for "Other Built-up areas" on page 17 of the Island Plan 2011 insert the following paragraph –

'The Built-up areas outside the main Built-up Area comprise various urban, suburban and isolated rural settlements. They differ widely in their age and architectural style, in individual character and general density of development. This variation greatly contributes to making the Island a unique place and is a quality which has to be conserved for the future. The Minister will review the Island's Built-up areas, as defined on the Proposals Map, for individual areas within it which are particularly sensitive locations in consultation with stakeholders, to determine their individual character and propose limits on the type of development and their densities within each of those areas.';

(b) after Policy SP1 on page 19 of the Island Plan 2011 insert the following new Proposal –

'The Minister for Planning and Environment will, in partnership with key stakeholders, develop supplementary planning guidance for the Island's Built-up area in order to better identify and define the characteristics of its urban, suburban and rural settlements and their character and to use any such guidance to assess and guide development proposals.';

(c) for Proposal 8 on page 96 of the Island Plan 2011 substitute the following revised Proposal –

'Proposal 8

Conservation Area designation

The Minister will complete the identification and designation of Conservation Areas throughout the Island during the Plan period relative to their assessment against published criteria and will adopt these through the publication of supplementary planning guidance, following consultation with stakeholders.'"

DEPUTY J.H. YOUNG OF ST. BRELADE

REPORT

(a) & (b) Policy SP1 Spatial Strategy, for settlements outside the main Built-up area

The Island Plan's spatial strategy (pages 13–18) sets a hierarchy of development which may be summarized –

- the main Built-up area of St. Helier
- the Built-up area in the settlements outside St. Helier
- Brownfield land outside the Built-up area
- to support the rural economies or parish communities.

In a change from the 2002 Plan, the spatial policy adopted in 2011 does not differentiate between urban, suburban and isolated rural settlements. The Plan zones all residential settlements as the Built-up area. Outside the main Built-up area, these settlements, many which pre-date the Planning Law, widely vary in age, their individual character and density. Their variation is one of Jersey's very special qualities which I believe is worthy of conservation. Settlements may be on the edge of the Coastal National Park, have an open aspect over coasts or headlands, in isolated rural pockets or alongside popular tourist beaches such as St. Brelade, along our southern coast or be on the edge of town. Because of their lower density and greater amenity of open space which encourages community life, they are very pleasant places to live. Most of these communities have become settled and their residents have lived there in peace and harmony throughout much of their lives.

The effect of the "one size fits all" Built-up zone policy adopted in 2011 has opened all these areas to high-density redevelopment which is proving to be a very socially divisive. This runs entirely counter to the Minister's own commitment to community planning. The policy protection from over-development which is presently enjoyed by residents living in the Coastal National Park and Green Zone areas should be extended to those living in all urban, suburban and isolated Built-up rural settlements.

The blanket policy of SP1 to treat these Built-up areas equally was well intentioned to generate more homes, but I submit it is misguided. The social cost of opening up these areas to indiscriminate high-density development has not justified this policy.

I tabled a written question on 17th April 2012 seeking information on the density of development and number of residential units approved in all zoned Built-up areas since the Plan was approved, but this information was not available. As at May 2014, this information is still not available The Planning Department therefore has no means of monitoring their policy and is unable to produce a reasoned justification as the Planning Law requires.

My amendment proposes a modification to the policy without radically changing the Spatial Strategy. Settlements types outside the main Built-up area which are zoned as Built-up areas will be considered separately to ensure the density of development permitted is appropriate for each settlement type, especially in particularly sensitive locations. My proposal is that the Minister will review the Island's Built-up areas as defined on the proposal map in consultation with stakeholders, to determine their character and propose limits on the type of development and their densities.

The Minister for Planning and Environment will, in partnership with key stakeholders, develop supplementary planning guidance for the Island's Built-up area in order to better identify and define the characteristics and character of its urban, suburban and rural settlement type character, and to use any such guidance to assess and guide development proposals.

(c) Historic Environment – Conservation Area

Our most special locations, including Gorey Harbour and St. Aubin's Village, have many historic buildings which are already subject to listing and their development is individually controlled. The assemblage of buildings and public realm together create a unique special character which also requires conservation. For many years, the Planning Department have identified the need to establish Conservation Areas which permit the adoption of a wider set of policies. The Island Plan fully recognizes this need. However, Proposal 8 of the Island Plan, which commits the designation of Conservation areas and the publication of supplementary Planning guidance, has still not been implemented.

My amendment is intended to strengthen this policy proposal and enable policies – Historic Buildings Policy HE3 "Preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas" and HE4 Demolition in Conservation Areas to be implemented.

Financial and manpower implications

(a), (b), SP1: The resource implications of my amendment are as stated in my amendment to Policy GD3 – Density of Development, namely: "The development of detailed Supplementary Planning Guidance for the entire Built-up area would have significant resource implications for the Department if this is required. However, my amendment recognises that the Planning Department would need to set priorities so that, following the initial classification of Built-up area into urban, suburban and isolated rural settlements and identification of the more sensitive Built-up locations within it, priority will be given to producing supplementary planning guidance for these areas. I am advised that the Department has limited resources, but the capacity of the Department to carry out this work in addition to other commitments is unknown. If it becomes necessary to engage consultancy support for this task, I would estimate a cost of potentially up to £100,000, but expect this would probably be spread over 2 to 3 years.

(c): Conservation Area Designation: My amendment has no resource implications provided it is implemented from within the Planning Department's existing resources, after the completion of the current historic buildings review as the Minister intends. If this review is delayed for any reason and it becomes necessary to obtain consultancy support to speed up the designation work, an additional cost will arise. Such cost, in my opinion, would be unlikely to amount to more than £50,000.