

STATES OF JERSEY



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

Lodged au Greffe on 16th June 2011
by the Minister for Planning and Environment

STATES GREFFE

PAGE 2 –

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

“except that in Policy TT10 – Off-street public parking provision in St. Helier (page 322), in the paragraph beginning ‘All development proposals’ –

- (a) for the words ‘bi-annual’ substitute the words ‘biennial (once every two years)’; and
- (b) after the words ‘bi-annual basis’ insert the words ‘in order that long-stay off-street public parking can be limited or reduced and/or the proportion of short-stay off-street parking increased, in accord with the objectives and performance of the Sustainable Transport Policy (2010)’.”

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

The Minister for Planning and Environment is sympathetic to the intent behind the Deputy of St. Mary's amendment (P.48/2011 Amd.(22)), relating to the need to evaluate the provision of car parking relative to an assessment of overall travel and transport issues affecting St. Helier, but cannot accept the proposed amendment in its current form. On this basis, and having regard to the recommendations of the independent planning inspectors, the Minister proposes his own amendment to address the matter; to provide clarification; and to better reflect the Deputy's intent in the Plan.

The Minister supports the need to evaluate the provision of car parking relative to an assessment of overall travel and transport issues affecting St. Helier. The specific provision intended to be allowed for in Policy TT10 – a biennial (once every two years) review of parking demand – will allow just that, relative to the objectives and performance of the Sustainable Transport Policy.

In other words, as the policies and proposals of the STP are delivered – which should encourage and deliver modal switch away from the private car – it is right that the overall level of demand for and supply of car parking, and for the proportionate split of car parking provision between long- and short-stay parking, is reviewed. The Island Plan allows for this, as set out in paragraph 8.98 (page 318) and in Policy TT10.

The Minister's further amendment seeks to promote clarity and to remove doubt about the intention of this proviso.

The independent planning inspectors support this further amendment. They state that: *Policy TT10 as it stands implies that parking standards for the North St. Helier Masterplan might be driven by motorists' and pressure groups' desire for more spaces – something that is likely to be open ended and upwards. This would be contrary to the Plan strategy and that in the JSTP, both of which look to check and reduce the peak of flow of vehicles in and out of St. Helier. The Minister's further amendment clarifies that the intention is review standards in the light of the Plan and JSTP strategic aims.*

Financial and manpower implications

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