
STATES OF JERSEY



BRIDGING ISLAND PLAN 2022-24: AN ANALYSIS OF THE REVISED ISLAND PLAN REVIEW PROCESS (S.R.3/2021) – RESPONSE OF THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

**Presented to the States on 29th March 2021
by the Minister for the Environment**

STATES GREFFE

**BRIDGING ISLAND PLAN 2022-24: AN ANALYSIS OF THE REVISED
ISLAND PLAN REVIEW PROCESS (S.R.3/2021) – RESPONSE OF THE
MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Ministerial Response to:	S.R.3/2021
Ministerial Response required by:	19th March 2021
Review title:	Bridging Island Plan 2022-24: An Analysis of the Revised Island Plan Review Process
Scrutiny Panel:	Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel

INTRODUCTION

The Environment, Housing and Infrastructure analysed the revised Island Plan Review process which is being referred to as the Bridging Island Plan.

FINDINGS

	Findings	Comments
1	The high-level strategic aim of the bridging Island Plan is to allow significant progress to be made to address key community planning challenges where there is relative certainty and for targeted short-term policy to be developed and applied in areas where there is less certainty for the medium to long-term future.	Noted and accepted.
2	There is a possible disconnect between the high-level strategic aims of a bridging Island Plan and how precisely this will be delivered by a shorter plan.	While this might appear possible in theory, in practice the long-term strategic objectives of the Island Plan must remain consistent with the requirements of the Planning and Building Law (2002) to provide for the sustainable development of the Island. This requires that approaches to key strategic issues such as climate change, biodiversity loss, increasing social inequality and a changing economy, need to be addressed by the policy framework of a new Island Plan, even if the duration of the Plan is for a fixed, shorter period.

	Findings	Comments
		The sustainability appraisal of the Plan will provide an independent assessment of the extent to which the policies of the bridging plan deliver sustainable development.
3	The vision for a bridging Island Plan is informed by a range of sources including: the Common Strategic Policy and other key strategic plans; the findings of key public and stakeholder consultations including Future Jersey; and the emergent work of the Island Identity Policy Development Board.	Noted and accepted.
4	The bridging Plan will set out a number of policy development proposals, resourced through the Government Plan process and written into departmental business plans, to create the best foundations for the next long-term 10-year plan.	Noted and accepted. The integration of the outcomes of the new Island Plan into government planning and resourcing processes should help ensure that better and more effective progress is made in relation to the delivery of key government objectives.
5	The Council of Ministers requested and approved that a condensed bridging Island Plan should be progressed and developed in the current parliamentary term. However, it is unclear what degree of analysis of all the options was undertaken in order to determine that this was the most suitable option presented to them.	<p>A series of options were developed in the period following the onset of the coronavirus pandemic. Each option was presented to ministers with a summary of positive attributes and associated challenges.</p> <p>Initially, options were presented that accorded with the legally prescribed process for the preparation and adoption of a new Island Plan, as set out in the Planning and Building Law (2002) as drafted. Subsequently, options were considered, under a revised Island Plan Review process, that would require an amendment to this Law in order to accommodate a Plan.</p> <p>A summary of these discussions and associated options is set out at Appendix 1 to this response.</p>
6	A recurring theme in submissions was that the current Island Plan should be extended until a 10-year plan was feasible. However, reissuing of the	Noted and accepted.

	Findings	Comments
	current Island Plan until this time was not considered a workable option by the Council of Ministers given that it was considered that there were too many issues and areas which required reviewing in the current plan.	
7	The Minister for the Environment had originally intended that the best way forward was to finish the Island Plan in 2022 after the election, however subsequently chose to implement the advice of the Department's Strategic Partner 'Arup' whose analysis had determined that a 3-year bridging plan was a workable solution. Although it is unclear as to whether it represented the <i>most suitable</i> solution.	<p>This finding suggests the proposal for a Bridging Plan originated as advice from ARUP.</p> <p>The option to develop a bridging Island Plan was developed by officers in response to a request from COM to consider how an Island Plan might be brought forward before the election. The Minister for the Environment asked that advice be sought from ARUP on the viability of this model (which concluded it was a workable solution).</p>
8	No stakeholder consultation was carried out during the process undertaken to evaluate options of how to proceed with the Island Plan Review process and, ultimately, the decision to proceed with a bridging Island Plan. Following the decision, briefing sessions were held online to communicate this to stakeholders.	<p>This is accepted. It is notable however that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the decision was taken between April and early June 2020, at a point when both the Island Plan team and key stakeholders across the Island were heavily diverted by the response to the coronavirus pandemic, and the effect of the change upon stakeholders is considered negligible relative to the original programme such that a review of the current plan is still delivered, and the process for stakeholder engagement with the plan process remains unchanged. The essential change for the users of the plan is the shortening of the plan period. - the effect of the bridging island plan approach that was chosen is primarily to remove certain policy issues from scope by virtue of the length of the Plan. The policy matters that remain in scope have not been materially altered by the decision to reduce the length of the Plan.
9	In order for a short-term bridging Island Plan to be considered and approved by	Noted and accepted.

	Findings	Comments
	the States Assembly before the 2022 election, changes to the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 are required. These changes are proposed under the Draft COVID-19 (Island Plan) Regulations 202- [P.168/2020] and are due for the States to debate on 9 th February 2021. If approved by the States Assembly, this will enable the Minister for the Environment to temporarily change the process by which the draft Island Plan would ordinarily be lodged and debated.	
10	The draft Regulations [P.168/2020], if approved, would change the consultation and lodging process from that of a linear process, to a twin-tracked process, whereby the public consultation would run at the same time as lodging the draft Island Plan.	Noted and accepted.
11	The draft Regulations [P.168/2020], if approved, will not change the process by which members of the public can comment in the public consultation and for their representation to be heard by the planning inspector.	Noted and accepted.
12	It is acknowledged in R.66/2020 that changes to the overall process will result in more amendments, potentially leading to a complex debate which will need to be well-structured and appropriately managed.	Noted and accepted. Consideration of an Island Plan which is, by necessity, a complex and multi-faceted policy document, a process which places unusual demands on the States Greffe and the Assembly. To ensure that this can be managed as efficiently and effectively as possible, the Greffier of the States has been closely involved in the revisions to the Island Plan Review process. In addition, the Minister for the Environment will continue to engage with States Members throughout the Island Plan Review process in order to deal with issues, where possible,

	Findings	Comments
		beforehand; to minimise, as far as possible, the complexity of the States debate.
13	Should the draft Regulations [P.168/2020] be adopted as amended, it will enable States Members to bring forward amendments related to issues raised in the planning inspector's report. However, there would only be scope for the Minister for the Environment to lodge amendments during the States debate itself if the States agree.	Noted and accepted.
14	The draft Regulations, if adopted, would outline a requirement for the development of a longer-term Island Plan to be prepared and brought forward within a reasonable timeframe of the bridging Island Plan coming to an end. The existing plan would remain in effect until a new plan is approved.	Noted and accepted.
15	Should the draft Regulations [P.168.2020] be approved by the States, new Order-making powers would be extended to enable a new Order to be drafted which would enable detailed provision for the procedures by which representations made by the public and States' Members proposed amendments would be heard by the planning inspector.	Noted and accepted.
16	Fears were raised in stakeholder submissions as to the uncertainty of a shorter Island Plan and that the process might be used as a means to exploit land use and create detrimental development opportunities. The Minister for the Environment dismissed these concerns, although further explanation on how a shorter bridging Island Plan would	<p>It is recognised that some stakeholders have raised these concerns, although their basis is unclear.</p> <p>The Preferred Strategy is explicit, in Section 3, that the new Island Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will look forward to the strategic long-term requirements of the Island and set a vision of a sustainable future • will be prepared to exacting standards, and

	Findings	Comments
	ensure sustainable outcomes was not provided.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is an Island Plan in the full sense – prepared in accordance with the law and best professional practice.
17	There is a perceived risk amongst some States Members and stakeholders that unless there is a meaningful public consultation and adequate time to consider the views of those who contribute to the consultation, this could lead to a disenfranchisement of the key individuals and organisations who are considered vital to delivering the outcomes of any approved bridging Island Plan and thereby significantly inhibit the success of the plan.	<p>The perception of this risk is recognised and fully accepted, but the Minister for the Environment is committed to ensure that the Island Plan Review process is open, transparent, and engaging for those who have an interest in it.</p> <p>In this respect, it is relevant to note that the preparation of the draft plan has already been informed by the output of the Strategic Issues and Options consultation; and the preparation of technical evidence base, both of which stakeholders have been able to engage with and contribute to.</p> <p>The IPR in-committee debate, together with the ongoing informal dialogue through rounds of ‘parish-briefings’, have also afforded States Members opportunity to engage with the process.</p> <p>Formal engagement with the Island Plan Review programme is provided by a full 12-week statutory public consultation, together with a detailed Examination in Public conducted by a team of independent professional planning inspectors.</p>
18	The prioritisation process for assessing what should be included or excluded from a shorter 3-year bridging Island Plan was based on need, particularly any identified development pressures facing the Island. The prioritisation process also involved looking at what assessments, studies or policies are currently available to utilise as an evidence base which will help inform a new bridging plan.	<p>The new Island Plan will be comprehensive in its scope and will provide a new comprehensive planning policy framework for the island.</p> <p>The preparation of the Island Plan involves the development of an appropriate evidence base to address key issues, challenges, and policy responses. The scope of the evidence base for the bridging Island Plan was determined to be those issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that would substantially develop over the Plan period and hence required an updated policy response, and <p>that might develop beyond the Plan period but that would not be substantially impacted by matters</p>

	Findings	Comments
		that could not be properly assessed because of uncertainty brought about by Covid-19.
19	The Objective Assessment of Housing Need Report forms part of the core evidence base on which Jersey's housing requirement has been prioritised and is therefore included in the proposed bridging Island Plan.	Noted. The OAHN forms part of the evidence base for the bridging Island Plan, though does not itself form part of that Plan.
20	Affordable Housing Providers are not able to meet the current demand for housing and face obstacles in being able to secure properties or land for development.	The need for the Island Plan to be reviewed, to address issues related to the need for affordable homes, is noted and accepted.
21	The current Island Plan is outdated and the extent of housing provision has become more limited which poses a challenge to responding to the current housing shortage and consequently has been another factor in prioritising housing as a key component of the proposed bridging Island Plan.	Noted and accepted.
22	The public estate has the potential to provide suitable sites for the development of affordable housing, however there is a lack of coordination and long delays in being able to make decisions on the use of these sites, driven in part by delays in the office accommodation project and the site decision for the future hospital.	<p>It is recognised that the public estate has the potential to provide suitable sites for the development of a range of housing types and tenures.</p> <p>An Island Public Estate Strategy has been prepared that provides the strategic framing and governance processes to properly coordinate the use of public land and buildings to support the development of housing.</p>
23	A bridging Island Plan, if approved, will play a vital role in the planning application process for a new hospital. However, should the Plan not be approved, a contingency option to enable the hospital's planning application to be considered via	<p>Any planning application will be considered and determined having regard to the Island Plan that is extant at that time.</p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Our Hospital was published in early 2020 and is material to any consideration of an application</p>

	Findings	Comments
	Supplementary Planning Guidance has been provided for and so that no undue further delay is caused to the delivery of a new hospital.	under the current Island Plan; however, that consideration is not as a stand-alone planning framework but in addition to Island Plan policies.
24	Uncertainties created by Brexit and the continuing global pandemic make it difficult to model potential future population and demand figures for inward migration.	Noted and accepted.
25	Whilst it is proposed that the 3-year bridging Island Plan will be 'decoupled' from a migration and population policy, the plan will still be based on the best available data and will have regard to any emergent migration policy.	Noted and accepted.
26	Issues surrounding land use are expected to be addressed in the next bridging Island Plan, although it is unclear at this stage precisely how they will be prioritised and addressed in the plan. Although it is acknowledged that this will likely be deliberated and decided upon as part of the public consultation provided for in the Island Plan Review process.	<p>The Island Plan is defined in law as a Plan for the comprehensive and sustainable development of land.</p> <p>The process and methodology for making land use choices in the Plan will be set out in the published evidence base and is informed both by strategic consideration and detailed site assessments.</p>
27	A broad planning assumption of average annual population growth of +1,000 has been used to inform relevant infrastructure studies.	Noted and accepted.
28	A bridging Island Plan will take into consideration infrastructure requirements over a 15-year period but will focus on prioritising schemes that are most likely to come forward for a planning decision with the 3-year lifespan of the bridging Island Plan.	The Island Plan seeks to provide a policy framework to enable consideration of infrastructure requirements in the short-term and it may make provision for the development of infrastructure over the longer-term where the available evidence justifies this.

	Findings	Comments
29	A bridging Island Plan will recognise that the States Assembly has declared a climate emergency. The plan will facilitate new programmes and policies in line with the intended aims of the Carbon Neutral Strategy and Sustainable Transport Plan as both these workstreams continue to be developed and so as to ensure long-term environmental sustainability.	Noted and accepted. The Island Plan will, as matter of course, have regard to the challenges of climate change and will seek to ensure that the impact of new development minimises greenhouse gas emissions whilst seeking to ensure that the island is more resilient to the effects of climate change. Given that the development of the Carbon Neutral Strategy has been delayed as a result of Covid-19, it may be necessary to supplement the draft Island Plan, after publication, with relevant matters informed by the planned Citizens' Assembly, and the subsequent Carbon Neutral Roadmap.
30	The urban development of St. Helier will be a key focus for the bridging Island Plan, as will other urban parts of the island. An urban character study is being undertaken to inform this element of the bridging plan.	Noted and accepted.
31	The Shoreline Management Plan will seek to identify, as a starting point, where sea defences need improving or extending, and this assessment will be realised within the lifespan of the bridging plan. This will be used as a foundation for any longer-term investment which may be required in the next 10-year Island Plan.	Noted. Work on the Shoreline Management Plan concluded in 2019 and is already in place. The new Island Plan will seek to provide a new planning framework which enables the delivery of the Shoreline Management Plan policy objectives.
32	The bridging Island Plan will adopt a new Integrated Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment (ILSCA) to establish a new long-term policy regime which will seek to protect the island's most sensitive coast and countryside, as well as sympathetic development of greenfield land where appropriate. The plan will also incorporate the St Brelade Character Study and its focus on considering options to conserve the bay's character.	The ILSCA and St Brelade's Bay Character Assessment are both studies of landscape character commissioned to inform the Island Plan. They will not be directly incorporated into the Plan itself but will inform the policies of the Plan.

	Findings	Comments
33	<p>There are numerous policy areas and identified development needs which will seek to be incorporated into the 3-year bridging plan. However, with so many competing priorities, it is unclear what will need to be scaled back or excluded from the plan in order to have realistic and achievable outcomes within the lifespan of the plan.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged and accepted that, given the time taken to effect the delivery of development ‘on the ground’ – from securing planning permission to being built – the outcomes of all of the new plan’s policy objectives are unlikely to be realised within a shorter plan period. The new plan will, however, set a new planning policy framework against which decisions can be made to effect progress on a range of pressing issues, such as the meeting the need for affordable homes.</p> <p>The scope of the bridging Island Plan was determined to be those issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that would substantially develop over the Plan period and hence required an updated policy response, and <p>that might develop beyond the Plan period but that would not be substantially impacted by matters that could not be properly assessed because of uncertainty brought about by Covid-19.</p>
34	<p>Concerns were expressed by stakeholders, and shared by the Panel, that a bridging Island Plan might be over ambitious in what can realistically be achieved in the limited timescale, as well as how the bridging plan will join up with the next 10-year plan to provide certainty and longevity to those in the building and construction industry.</p>	<p>Proposals made in the bridging Island Plan will be accommodated in subsequent Government Plans and Departmental Operational Business Plans to ensure they are properly resourced and progressed over the Island Plan period.</p> <p>Development during the period of the bridging Island Plan will be facilitated by the planning regime it establishes but is not ‘achieved’ by the Plan as such.</p> <p>Given the proximity between a Plan adopted in 2022 and one expected to be adopted in 2025, it is likely that there will be a high degree of consistency in key policy matters and the core evidence that informs them. However, any future Island Plan will be fully reviewed on its own merits and in response to the community’s needs at that time.</p>
35	<p>There are some fears that a shorter-term plan could create further uncertainty about the long-term focus for the Island. The Minister for the Environment</p>	<p>Noted and accepted.</p>

	Findings	Comments
	believes these fears are unwarranted as the bridging plan will aim to have a long-term focus but with targets and numbers based on a shorter period.	
36	The Minister for the Environment has given his assurances that the risk of key Island Plan policy staff being diverted to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic is very low and that staff will continue to be available to lead on Island Plan review process and see it through to its completion.	Noted and accepted.
37	The costs allocated to fund the initially anticipated 10-year plan are anticipated to be required in full for the shortened 3-year bridging plan. Whilst the Minister anticipates that some of this work will not need to be repeated in the subsequent 10-year plan (therefore incurring further cost) it is uncertain at this stage what the updated cost of a subsequent 10-year plan will be.	Noted and accepted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
1	The Minister for the Environment should publish, prior to the lodging of the bridging Island Plan, the options that were deliberated by the Council of Ministers with a clear rationale provided as to why the bridging Island Plan was deemed the favoured option and why	ME NV	Accept	<p>A series of options were developed in the period following the onset of the coronavirus pandemic. Each option was presented to ministers with a summary of positive attributes and associated challenges.</p> <p>Initially, options were presented that accorded with the Planning and Building Law (2002) as drafted. Subsequently, options were considered that would</p>	

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	alternative options were considered unworkable and consequently rejected.			require an amendment to this Law in order to accommodate a Plan. A summary of these discussion and associated options in set out at Appendix 1 to this response.	
2	The Minister for the Environment should ensure that detail of how a shorter bridging Island Plan will ensure sustainability in regard to land use and development is a key component of the bridging Island Plan when it is lodged in the States, so as to reassure States Members and the public about how this will be realised. For added clarity, the bridging Plan should seek to address the definition of sustainability under the plan.	ME NV	Accept	This will be addressed throughout the Plan, and particularly in key strategic policies. The definition of sustainability, and the application of that definition to the policies and sites identified in the bridging Island Plan, will be set out in an independent Sustainability Appraisal that will be published at the same time as the draft Island Plan.	
3	The Minister for the Environment and the Department for Strategic, Policy, Planning and Performance should ensure that the public consultation period is as thorough and wide-ranging as possible. With proactive steps taken to invite key stakeholders and the general public to submit their views through a variety of	ME NV	Accept	These recommendations reflect the intentions of the Minister and are being actively planned for.	

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	forums that COVID-19 restrictions permit. Furthermore, that requests for views are actively targeted where appropriate and widely advertised, in order to stimulate as large a response as possible.				
4	The Minister for the Environment and the Department for Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance should proactively seek the views of Affordable Housing Providers during the public consultation on the bridging Island Plan, to ensure that the issues they face in being able to secure land for development, and thus expand provision for affordable housing, are adequately addressed by the policies contained within a bridging Island Plan.	ME NV	Accept	These recommendations reflect the intentions of the Minister and are being actively planned for.	
5	The Council of Ministers should prioritise the identification and provision of affordable housing sites within the public estate and appropriate sites should be released for development within the lifespan of the bridging Island Plan.	ME NV /Co M	Accept	The Minister strongly agrees and supports work to achieve this outcome, which is led by the Infrastructure Minister.	

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
6	The Estates Strategy should feed into and inform the bridging Island Plan and, therefore, the Council of Ministers should seek to finalise and publish its long-awaited Estates Strategy prior to the adoption of a bridging Island Plan.	ME NV	Accept	At time of writing, the Estates Strategy is due to be published and will be shared with the Panel.	
7	The Minister for the Environment should ensure that, prior to the public consultation, a further communication drive takes place to get the right messaging across as to what it means to ‘decouple’ the migration policy from a 3-year plan and how a shorter plan will still be as robustly informed as possible by various planning assumptions.	ME NV	Accept	<p>The Preferred Strategy report makes clear that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential future population levels are of central importance to the Island Plan Review - while the shorter scale bridging Island Plan is intended to mitigate the risks of making long-term plans in a volatile context, it will still be based on the best available data, and the planning assumption will still directly inform policy development and site selection - however, the bridging Island Plan can be de-coupled from the <i>sequential development</i> of a population policy by the current Council of Ministers. <p>Communications work will continue to ensure that these messages can be properly understood throughout the consultation.</p>	
8	The Minister for the Environment should provide a clear ‘SMART’ ¹ analysis of	ME NV	Accept	<p>The draft Island Plan will contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a section that explains how it is anticipated to interlink with a 	

¹ S – Specific, M – Measurable, A – Achievable, R – Realistic, T – Timely

	Recommendations	To	Accept/ Reject	Comments	Target date of action/ completion
	<p>how each key component of a shorter plan will be deliverable in the shorter timescale, so as to help to instil confidence in the States Assembly and the public that a shorter plan will be able to deliver its intended outcomes. This should also encompass how the bridging plan will interlink with the next full 10-year plan to ensure longevity and certainty for building developments through the lifespan of a project. This should be provided when the bridging plan is lodged to enable this analysis to be considered during the 12-week consultation period.</p>			<p>future long-term plan (recognising that any future Island Plan will be developed by a future Environment Minister and debated by a future States Assembly), and</p> <p>a section that establishes the performance and delivery framework for the Island Plan, including the indicators and metrics used to assess the effectiveness of the Plan as part of the wider Jersey Performance Framework.</p>	
9	<p>A communications strategy should be put in place to advise and assure islanders about how a bridging plan will still ensure a long-term focus. This should take place before and during the public consultation, to ensure that the public are fully informed and given greater assurance about how a shorter plan will still have a long-term strategic focus.</p>	ME NV	Accept	<p>These messages will be reflected in the communications campaign that supports the public consultation. It is noted though that such a campaign can only start with the lodging and publication of the draft Island Plan.</p>	

CONCLUSION

I thank the Panel for their detailed review of the Bridging Island Plan process, and I accept all their recommendations. I look forward to bringing this important work to the Assembly in 2022 to assist the Island with:

- i. addressing the affordability of housing
- ii. addressing inappropriate development
- iii. Climate change and sustainable transport, and
- iv. Making improvements in town for the benefit of residents.

Appendix 1

Recommendation 1 of the Scrutiny Panel's report is that:

The Minister for the Environment should publish, prior to the lodging of the bridging Island Plan, the options that were deliberated by the Council of Ministers with a clear rationale provided as to why the bridging Island Plan was deemed the favoured option and why alternative options were considered unworkable and consequently rejected.

The timeline below details the development and COM endorsement of the bridging Island Plan option. This was one of three options considered at COM on 6 May. The rationale of Council to support Option 2 was in order to bring forward a Plan on the earliest timescale in order to update the planning policy framework to respond to key public policy and development challenges, particularly to respond to recent increases in the cost of housing. Option 1 would not have proceeded quickly enough to achieve this, and option 3 would not have provided a sufficient update to planning policy as changes could only be made under Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Timeline

- **19 March 2020: report to the Minister for the Environment**
Following the reallocation of key members of the Island Plan Review team to work on the Covid-19 Public Health response, a report was provided by the Island Plan Review team to the Minister for the Environment. The report considered what options were available to progress the Island Plan Review within the current legal framework. The report recommended that it would not be possible, in light of the impact of Covid-19, to bring forward an Island Plan before the 2022 election, and hence the Review would need to be split two govt terms.
- **23 April 2020: report to CoM**
A report was taken to Council of Ministers, based on initial discussions with the Minister for the Environment, which outlined the impact of the Covid-19 response on the Island Plan Review, reported a delay to the programme and considered associated risks and mitigation. The report presented three options:

 1. the (then) current programme, which was noted to have become unviable
 2. a new condensed programme, that would require a new legal mechanism to allow public consultation to happen at the same time as the Plan is lodged *au Greffe*
 3. a revised programme that split the IPR process over two government terms.

The report recommended that Council endorse the principle of a deferral of the IPR programme, beyond May 2022; and endorse the undertaking of further work to develop interim mitigation responses to known or emergent challenges and a detailed revised IPR programme.
Council asked the Minister for the Environment to further explore Option 2.
- **27 April 2020:** The Island Plan Review team sought advice from their strategic partner, ARUP, on the various options.

- **06 May 2020: report to CoM**

A second report was taken to CoM, following discussions with, amongst others, LOD and the States Greffe. The report asked ministers to consider three available options available, and the issues associated with them, and to determine a way forward. The options were:

1. a revised programme that split the IPR process over two government terms
2. a new condensed programme, that would require a new legal mechanism to allow public consultation to happen at the same time as the Plan is lodged *au Greffe*
3. the development of targeted updates to planning policy, using Supplementary Planning Guidance, throughout 2021/22, with a revised Island Plan being lodged later in the next term of government

The report recommended that the Council of Ministers note and consider the range of options available, and the issues associated with them, and determine a way forward.

COM favoured option 2, on the basis that: option 1 would not have proceeded quickly enough to update the planning policy framework to respond to key public policy and development challenges, particularly to respond to recent increases in the cost of housing; and option 3 would not have provided a sufficient update to planning policy as changes could only be made under Supplementary Planning Guidance.

- **11 May 2020: Arup advice sought on option 2**

ARUP were asked to look at what option 2 might mean for the Island Plan Review in terms of scope, process, and content. An advice note was provided, which was shared with the Scrutiny Panel as part of their Review, and which concluded, *“The condensed programme is ambitious, but deliverable subject to a substantial and concerted effort to meet the timescales set out”*.

- **10 June 2020: report to CoM**

The Minister for the Environment took a report to COM setting out: the necessary changes to the IPR process; the requirement for a shortened Island Plan period; the relationship of a shorter-term Island Plan to a subsequent longer-term Island Plan. The purpose of the report was to ensure that CoM were clear about, and comfortable with, the basis on which Option 2 would be progressed. This report was accepted and was endorsed.

COM also endorsed the Minister or the Environment’s proposal that an In-Committee Debate should be held, to include the procedural changes and implications of the Minister's intention to bring bridging plan.

- **17 July 2020: In Committee Debate**

On the 17 July the States Assembly held an In-Committee Debate on the Island Plan Review. A paper was provided in advance to frame key issues Section 1 of which specifically asked the question: *Is the proposed adoption of a three-year bridging Island Plan an appropriate response to the need to progress key*

*community planning matters in a period of some uncertainty caused by the pandemic?*²

- **19 October 2020: In Committee Debate Summary**

A summary of issues raised in the In-Committee Debate was published³, which noted that States Members comments in response to this question were generally supportive. The Minister in this summary responded to specific questions raised in the debate.

² See: <https://statesassembly.gov.je/assemblyreports/2020/r.66-2020.pdf> - p.6

³ R116/2020 – see: <https://statesassembly.gov.je/assemblyreports/2020/r.116-2020.pdf>
