

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
BY DEPUTY J. RENOUF OF ST. BRELADE
QUESTION SUBMITTED ON MONDAY 24th MARCH 2025
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON MONDAY 31st MARCH 2025**

Question

“Further to his answer to [Oral Question 64/2025](#), in relation to [Residential Space Standards](#) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), will the Minister –

- (a) state what views, if any, were expressed by other Ministers in relation to his review of the SPG in relation to very large homes;
- (b) advise whether the Government was approached by any stakeholders to express opposition to the SPG, and, if so, how he was made aware of any such approaches; and
- (c) explain, following his assertion in his answer that he wants “more economic value to be put into decisions when it comes to planning applications”, why he considers that there is greater economic value in the construction of a single very large property than in a number of smaller homes?”

Answer

- (a) Under Article 6 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 the Minister is empowered to publish guidelines, and in so doing, is required to consult other Ministers who have an interest in the form of development the subject of the guidance. In the context of a review of guidance related to the development of larger homes in the island, the Minister invited comment from both the Minister for Housing and the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development.

As set out in the ministerial decision ([MD-ENV-2025-94](#)) it is evident that the Minister for Housing provided comment in relation to the review of the 3,000sqft parameter, set out in supplementary planning guidance.

The Minister’s comments were as follows:

“Agree with officer recommendation, with the exception of part b.i.

The HVR team (Locate Jersey) should have the resources and wherewithal to inform themselves of the policy and relay that to prospective applicants for 2(1)(e) status.

The head of LJ admits that there is a “fairly plentiful stock of homes for 2(1)(e)s”, and only cites three clients who claim it is an issue. It would be disproportional to devote attention to this when there are much more pressing matters that affect a much greater number of people.

The suggestion that this restriction serves as a deterrence for people applying for 2(1)(e) status should not concern us. The comments from LJ state that they are on tract (sic) to exceed their target this year.”

The Minister had regard to these comments as part of his consideration of the matter, together with other factors.

The Minister did not formally seek the views of any other ministers and none other were provided as part of the review.

- (b) As set out in the ministerial decision ([MD-ENV-2025-94](#)) the provenance of this review was a request from the High Value Residency Engagement team in the Economy Department, the details of which are set out in appendix 3 of the associated report.
- (c) To infer that ‘there is greater economic value in the construction of a single very large property than in a number of smaller homes’ from the answer given to [Oral Question 64/2025](#) is a misrepresentation.

The answer simply sought to acknowledge and recognise that the economic value and impact of development proposals ought to be given the same consideration to that already given to the social and environmental aspects of planning applications.

