

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

22nd April, 2020

Proposition P.2020/23

AMENDMENT

Proposed by: Deputy D A Tindall

Seconded by: Deputy V S Oliver

DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING AUTHORITY

THE ISLAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN –
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF THE ISLAND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

To delete the original Propositions and to replace them with the following:

- “1. To note:
 - (a) the Annual Monitoring Report 2018, which is Appendix 1 of the Policy Letter attached to these propositions; and
 - (b) that the Development & Planning Authority (“D&PA”) has an obligation under the statutory Island Development Plan (“IDP”) to review Housing land supply and Employment land supply within five years of the adoption of the IDP by the States in November 2016 (“the Five Year Review”) and additionally has committed to review Areas of Biodiversity Importance (ABIs).
2. To note that, notwithstanding Proposition 1, the D&PA intends to pause the Five Year Review of the IDP, which cannot in any event now be delivered in the timescale previously proposed, in order to ensure that review of the IDP (“the Review”) focusses on matters which are critical to strategic recovery and will support future States’ priorities to ensure that land use policies do not stand in the way of the States’ recovery strategy (“the Revised States’ Strategies”). This may require the D&PA to adjust the scope and priority of the Review once the Revised States’ Strategies are known, following which the D&PA will return to the States with its proposals for the Review should they differ from those set out in Proposition 3.
3. To direct the D&PA, in consultation with all relevant Committees and stakeholders, to include, as a minimum, within the scope of the Review if the specific reviews align with the Revised States’ Strategies, such specific reviews being:
 - (a) Housing land supply and Employment land supply;
 - (b) Areas of Biodiversity Importance (ABIs);
 - (c) Development Frameworks thresholds and process;

- (d) development of greenfield land and prioritisation of brownfield land for residential purposes in Centres;
 - (e) Important Open Land;
 - (f) Agriculture Priority Areas giving particular consideration as to:
 - (i) the extent to which existing policies relating to Agriculture Priority Areas are effective in encouraging small-scale, sustainable farming projects, and/or whether any revisions may be needed, in order to foster a community in which local growing initiatives (including non-commercial initiatives) are positively supported; and
 - (ii) Whether a separate policy should be drawn up under the IDP, consistent with the principles of any States of Guernsey Climate Change Action Plan, which has the purpose of providing a clear policy gateway to support the development of small-scale, sustainable farming projects both within, and beyond, Agriculture Priority Areas;
 - (g) visitor accommodation,
 - (h) the protection given to the biodiversity interest of such areas as part of the review of the policies affecting ABIs, including policy GP3, giving particular consideration to strengthening the policies so that development on ABIs, in particular building operations, is only allowed where:
 - (i) the biodiversity interest of the area is maintained or enhanced;
 - or
 - (ii) any negative impacts of the development are appropriately and proportionately mitigated.
- as further detailed in Appendix 3 to the Policy Letter.”

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The D&PA has reviewed its work on the Five Year Review of the IDP in the light of the COVID-19 pandemic and its implications and believes that the right course of action at this time is to pause the Review. The exact strategy for recovery is not yet known. What is clear, however, is that this is likely to require review and refocusing of priorities and policies across Government to ensure that they are aligned with the recovery strategy and do not stand in the way of what needs to be done.

Land use planning is likely to play a key role in the economic and social recovery, and we need to ensure in particular that our land use policies are aligned to the new strategic priorities of the States and do not act to block what the States decides is necessary to achieve.

The Five Year Review cannot in any event proceed within the timetable previously proposed, for a host of reasons including inability to carry out fieldwork and surveys and to obtain necessary data and feedback from other Committees and bodies. More importantly, however, this is an opportunity by pausing the Review to make sure that it focusses on what is really needed now and delivers the most that it possibly can to support the States’ recovery strategy. This will also ensure that we avoid abortive work and wasted costs through pursuing

previous priorities which are no longer valid when objectively assessed in the light of the new Revised States' Strategies.

The D&PA is also mindful that the COVID-19 pandemic has brought about enormous social and economic changes which will impact significantly on matters integral to any Review of the IDP. Pausing the Review, as proposed, will enable such changes and their impacts to be properly understood and relevant evidence to be available, resulting in more robust and effective future planning policies.

The D&PA feels that the concerns raised over the past two years should not be ignored and intends to retain the specific reviews listed in Proposition 3 in any Review when it takes place if they align with the Revised States' Strategies. Also, as the Five Year Review is not a statutory requirement, pausing the Review as proposed would not leave a policy void. For the reasons given above, the D&PA believes that it would be wrong to continue with the Five Year Review but instead that it should re-prioritise its work when the strategic direction of the States is clear.