

STATES OF JERSEY



ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): FORTY-SEVENTH AMENDMENT

Lodged au Greffe on 17th June 2011
by the Minister for Planning and Environment

STATES GREFFE

ISLAND PLAN 2011: APPROVAL (P.48/2011): FORTY-SEVENTH
AMENDMENT

PAGE 2 –

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

- “(a) except that in the section relating to Regeneration Zones, at the end of paragraph 4.71 (page 145), add the following words –
‘Where these are key determinants to the delivery of the masterplan the Minister may refer masterplans to the States for consideration.’;
- (b) except that at the end of Proposal 11 – St. Helier Regeneration Zones (page 149) insert the following words –
‘Where there are significant States-owned assets that are key determinants to the delivery of the masterplan the Minister may refer masterplans to the States for consideration.’;
- (c) except that at the end of Proposal 12 – Jersey Airport Regeneration Zone (page 151) insert the following words –
‘Where there are significant States-owned assets that are key determinants to the delivery of the masterplan the Minister may refer masterplans to the States for consideration.’ ”.

MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

NOTE:

This amendment has been lodged by the Minister for Planning and Environment for less than 8 weeks before the start of the debate in accordance with the provisions of Article 4A of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002. Paragraphs 4A(2), (3) and (4) are in the following terms –

4A Procedure for and following lodging of draft Island Plan

- “(2) An amendment to a draft Island Plan cannot be debated by the States unless it has been lodged for a minimum period of 8 weeks.
- (3) An amendment to an amendment to a draft Island Plan cannot be debated by the States unless it has been lodged for a minimum period of 6 weeks.
- (4) Paragraph (2) or (3) does not apply to an amendment lodged by the Minister if the States agree that the amendment may be debated forthwith or on a day or at a time approved by the States.”

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph (4) the Minister for Planning and Environment will seek the agreement of the States to debate this amendment during the debate on the 'Island Plan 2011: approval' (P.48/2011).

REPORT

This amendment relates to Part 3 of the 37th amendment brought by Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence.

The Minister accepts the principles behind parts of the Deputy's proposed amendment, but believes that as drafted, they are flawed on the basis that they attempt to conflate the consideration of the detailed economics of the development of States-owned land with the development of a planning framework for specific areas of the town.

Whilst the Assembly may wish to involve itself in the financial details of the use and development of States-owned land, the Minister considers that the approval of area-based masterplans is not necessarily the appropriate mechanism to do this. The independent planning inspectors agree with this.

The purpose of these proposals is to enable the Minister to develop, through liaison with key stakeholders as well as through public consultation, a framework for the development of an area, to provide overarching direction and guidance, as well as site-specific guidance, about the development and use of land. The Minister would expect States members to be involved in this process and opportunity is afforded for them to be so.

The development of such frameworks is not just of relevance to States land – and may not even affect States-owned assets – but most significantly, provides a context against which landowners, businesses and developers can make informed investment decisions which will assist, in particular, in the regeneration of St. Helier.

The Minister considers, therefore, that any such obligation to refer the approval of masterplans to the States is only of relevance where the development of States-owned land is the key determinant and driver for the delivery of a masterplan: his amendment reflects this view.

This approach, and the Minister's own amendment, is supported by the independent planning inspectors as '*efficient and sensible*' whilst reflecting the Deputy's concerns as well.

Financial and manpower implications

There are no additional financial or manpower implications arising from this amendment.