

The Fourteenth Day of March Two Thousand and Nineteen

Parish Assembly

Please note pre-registration for those wishing to vote will be available from 7.15pm

An Assembly of Principals and Electors of the Parish of St Peter will be held in St Peters Youth & Community Centre on Thursday 14 March 2019 at 7.30pm to:

- 1 Receive, and if deemed advisable, approve the Act of the Parish Assembly held on Tuesday 26 February 2019.
 - 2 To discuss matters that has recently been raised in respect of the First Time Buyer Homes in Perpetuity Scheme.
 - 3 To seek parishioners agreement to continue to progress the scheme, in accordance with decisions of the previous Parish Assemblies held on 26th April 2016 and 13th September 2017 by voting in a ballot.
 - 4 Subject to approval of item 3, to consider the two options facing us by way of voting in a ballot:
 - A Continue to support the proposition lodged by the Constable asking the Planning Minister to produce a revised version of the existing Island Plan which would include the rezoning of the land for the Ville De Manoir Development of 65 units.
 - B To work with the Planning Department to include the Ville De Manoir development, with revisions if required, in the new 2020 Island Plan.
-
- 1 On the proposition of **Rowland Huelin**, seconded by **John Refault**, the minutes of the previous parish assembly held on Tuesday 26 February 2019, which had been previously handed out, were approved
 - 2 The Constable addressed the assembly with an update as he is aware there are elements of the Parish that do not believe that the scheme is required or that the location is not suitable and objections to the use of the field in a green zone. When he became Constable, applicants had been advised that the Housing Minister had rejected the scheme following an Independent Inspectors review.

There is no doubt that the site elected in Route du Manoir was the most suitable, its central location of the parish and position relating to services are sufficiently close to enable developers to be connected at a cost which was manageable. Traffic management is something that needs further work however as all householders are likely to already own a car and already live within the parish, the impact is not necessarily as great as some suggest.

Other sites have been looked at, we have to consider with advice from Planning that these have to be contiguous with the existing centre of the parish, so from a planning view the further we move away from the centre of our existing development the less attractive the scheme becomes.

Talk has been made regarding smaller developments, infilling housing areas. Small developments cannot produce an affordable house for a first time buyer, the economies of scale simply do not exist and each site requires its own architects plans, applications and connection to services. Smaller sites could however deliver housing that would allow some parishioners to downsize, releasing their property into the housing market. The main criticism of the Independent Inspector was that we had not proved the demand for the first time buyer needs despite of over 240 applicants for the 65 homes. The rationale was heavily influenced by information in the current Island Plan which is based on inward immigration of 350 people per year, the recent housing review has confirmed that immigration was vastly under estimated and was more likely to be 1050 per year. The demand for affordable homes has now been proved and it is estimated that a further 7000 homes will be required over the next 10 years, even without immigration a further 2000 homes are required.

The second objection was the use of Green zone land, St Peters has not traditionally had the sort of industries that would give rise to brown field sites and the few we have are in locations some distance away from the centre of the village making them less likely to have planning approval and too far from the service connections. Sites that are suitable are almost always in the hands of developers removing them from the pool of land for the Parish development.

The constable advised that we have a representative from Planning and that also Deputy Huelin is in attendance along with ex Constable John Refault, we understand that there may be a significant amount of questions asked and opened the floor for these:

Deputy Rowland Huelin stood and addressed the assembly:

The most important thing about how people vote at this assembly is choosing the option that is most likely to succeed, in a reasonable timescale, with the least risk and deliver affordable housing to those in the parish. The whole evening will not bear fruit if planning permission is not ultimately approved.

There are two options, option A or option B as per item 4 on this agenda.

If agenda item 3 is accepted then he advised to choose option B and work with the Constable to take to the next Island Plan.

Timing, the Island Plan review (late spring 2019) will undergo consultations and a draft lodged at the end of 2020. This will be debated and adopted by the Assembly in first quarter of 2021, the timing for St Peter to work on and influence the Island Plan now could not be better.

If option A is approved and adopted by the assembly, the Island Plan process could be delayed as obviously there will be reduced amount of resources who will then have to focus on St Peters rezoning, this task should not be underestimated as it includes another planning inspectors hearing and report then return to an assembly for final approval. Another detrimental effect of option A is that it is most likely be used by other parishes to seize the opportunity to lodge their own proposals to promote their own sites, this would overload planning, pushing back the Island Plan even further.

There is a planning risk, please note that asking the Constable to seek to have the land rezoned does not guarantee that planning permission will be given.

The then planning minister cited 10 reasons to refuse the application, only 2 of these will be removed by this proposition namely green zone and affordable housing in rural centres.

Quotes from him are “The proposal would be premature ahead of the completion of work to establish a clear and detailed understanding of the island’s affordable housing needs” Deputy Huelin has checked with planning and it’s their view that nothing has materially changed, so this is as valid today as it was last year.

Second quote “Sufficient justification to warrant substantial and significant departure from the island plan has not been demonstrated”

If amendment is not supported by members, we could fail, risk purpose is high

The point is we can reduce risk by working closely with and attempting to influence the Island Plan.

Conclusions are option A is highly unlikely to succeed, this will have detrimental effect on achieving evidence based planning decision for affordable homes across the whole island with unknown delays, working with the island plan will be far less risky option. Working in conjunction with the island plan is best for St Peter, best for the Island and most importantly best for those in need of affordable housing.

Richard Vibert, Constable clarified that item 3 is the current item being discussed and to decide if we wish to continue with the scheme Yes or No.

Various questions from the audience were raised:

Clarification that the scheme is still for First Time buyers and that no one can benefit as being the first purchaser, every time the house is sold 75% of the market value is used and 25% stays in the trust, the scheme is in perpetuity.

Thoughts that there was nothing wrong with the first plan, why should we have to decide Yes or No again, this scheme allows parishioners to decide who lives in the parish, creates a village to be proud of, we need to look after our future parishioners.

Concerns were raised regarding the infrastructure, when we allow new homes into the parish, any consideration as to where pupils will go to school, services providers, water, power supplies etc.

The Constable confirmed that currently the education department take an Island wide view already and therefore cannot guarantee now that a child will get into the local school just because they live in the parish. There is capacity in the West of the Island to incorporate new pupils in the area.

Question was asked by a parishioner who has lived in the parish all his life (46yrs), cannot afford to buy on the open market, Parish have been in favour in previous assemblies, why did the Deputy not show his angst against the scheme before? Deputy Huelin replied that he is not against affordable housing, just that he feels that option B is the best way forward; a single plan will not work for planning reasons alone. The site is too big for a green space, we need to find appropriate sites, or if we half the size of the current scheme this maybe more favourable, build smaller homes and be more creative and imaginative.

A parishioner thought that the initial request was for 40 homes and not 65, how did we increase to this number?

It was confirmed that at previous assemblies it was agreed to proceed with 65 homes, planning approved 65 homes as the independent inspector would not consider a lower figure.

Ex- Constable, John Refault went over the previous plans and applications, back in 2015 he always wanted the project to be affordable in perpetuity, other schemes allowed people to purchase a First time buyer home but then sell it again in 6months to a non- first time buyer, he didn't want this style, he wanted people without the back up of Mum and Dad to be hardworking and afford homes in perpetuity.

The Housing Minister agreed to commit to a legislation to help the homes be affordable. On the back of this Andium wanted to test this scheme and use the model to see it work and be available. The bond of 25% will be recycled and 75% of market value sale price. Site appraisals were done and when looking at the site in question it was agreed that rather than 40 homes, it was more affordable to build 65 and this was agreed by the assemblies.

Planning said to use 65, due to density, the higher number must be used or the scheme would not be achievable.

Do we really need to object to an extra 25 homes?

Traffic congestion was mentioned, infrastructure needed to be considered, we need cheaper homes however traffic is already a big problem in the parish, against 65 homes, we should reduce the number of homes to be able to consider going further.

Support was given to the Deputy, should stop now and relook at the Island plan to decide if this space and numbers are the right options for the parish. This is the last green site in the parish, once it's gone it's gone, St Brelade's is as an example of an overly populated area but this shows how St Peter could become if we continue with the current plan.

The Constable confirmed that other smaller sites had been looked at however these will not provide affordable services, actually more land would need to be used, wastage of land therefore impossible to do. He does understand that young people are being priced out of the housing market and they need affordable homes.

It was mentioned that there are young Islanders being forced to move out of the Island because they cannot afford to buy.

An elderly parishioner understands that his own children/grandchildren cannot afford a home under the current prices but feels that the land in question should not be used and kept for agricultural purposes, the farming community are custodians of the land. The parish should look after their children however this is valuable agricultural land, most importantly in the middle of green zone, if approval is given then this will result in over 150+ cars in traffic- we must stop now.

Ex-Deputy Kristina Moore addressed the assembly, she wanted to point out that in July 2008 (3 years before the current Island Plan) 8 different sites around the Island were considered (to include homes for over 55;s) There is a precedent to rezone outside of an Island plan, therefore it's important this plan goes forward, there are different housing needs, 7000 homes are needed to fulfil current needs, we need to press forward and ask to reconsider to rezone as need for housing, this project represents 1% of need, only 0.0003% land total area is farmed in the Island, we can allow needs of islanders in front of needs of land

Comment that farming is important, we need the Island's agriculture, land area must be sufficient as need for the production of food.

Agricultural land needs to be kept, vast areas quietly being taken away, cannot be restored when gone.

- 3 A vote by way of voting slips which had been handed out at pre-registration was taken

Yes to proceed with the scheme	85 votes
No, not to proceed with the scheme	74 votes
	2 spoilt papers

- 4 The Constable is 100% committed to delivering affordable homes for first time buyers during his terms as Constable and will do his utmost to do this, there is a lot of work to do and even though he cannot be 100% sure it will be successful, he will try his best. We must now consider the best way to achieve this and be successful in re-zoning the land and obtaining planning approval.

Option A- a proposal has been lodged in the States to request the planning minister to consider a revised Island Plan to include rezoning of field and part of another on Route du Manoir to accommodate the development of these homes, normally this would be the fastest method of achieving states approval however the rezoning and development of land is complex with many variables. It would probably trigger a complete revision of the old Island plan so that our development could be reviewed in relation to development of Jersey; it would be a lengthy process which would introduce delays in delivering the new Island plan to be lodged in 2020. We also need a majority states member's agreement of which my soundings so far result in an unlikely outcome. This rejection would kill the scheme.

Option B-Work on the new Island Plan will soon commence, we can work with planners and revise the plan for Ville du Manoir into something that has an increased success when the Island plan is discussed, most likely 2021. It may seem a long way off but in reality raising the matter by proposition in option A would at best save 9 months and more likely to take the same amount of time and would divert planning staff from the new Island plan delaying that by up to a year.

Questions from the floor:

If we go to the Island plan, will the parish still have their say on who can apply? Yes, the Island plan is to rezone not to decide who gets the choice of a home, the parish will still allocate these. The housing gateway will manage this also.

Kristina Moore said there is nothing wrong with option A- the states could discuss this within the next 2 weeks, delay causes delay, the people who will miss out are those young people living in inadequate homes, children have a right to housing and shelter, the States assembly need to make a positive decision quickly and put the children first.

Q: Voting A doesn't have a downside, the Island Plan needs to consider homes and the community, the site is good, there would be no more traffic as utilities are within walking distance, need a family community, let families be together, there is a concern if we wait, this could take another 5 years for a new Island plan.

A- The first State debate decides if the planning minister is to consider to go ahead, they consider the Island wide impact, they return the plan to the States for members to reconsider by way of planning enquiry, if they say no this will delay the new Island plan with enormous risks

We need to ensure the Island Plan considers: Economy, Location is sustainable, is the Parish community viable.

We can build on this land if we can improve the need, in April 2018 the Independent Inspector said no need however we can more than demonstrate the need but planning did not agree so that is why the independent inspector refused and made his decision

We have the opportunity for the Constable to work with planning and have a working party for the parish to plan together.

A vote was taken by way of voting slips that were handed out earlier at pre-registration:

Option A	35 votes
Option B	92 votes

3 spoilt papers

As there was no further business the Constable thanked everyone for attending.

This concluded the business of the Assembly

14 March 2019

**R P Vibert
Connetable**