

**QUESTIONS ASKED OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING
AUTHORITY
PURSUANT TO RULE 14 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE BY DEPUTY LESTER QUERIPEL**

I would like to respond to the following questions submitted by Deputy Lester Queripel pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure about Island Development Plan Policy GP11.

Question 1

In a recent article in the media you are reported to have said: 'We have policy GP11 in the IDP that states a site with more than 20 units has to include affordable housing. However, you can kind of get around GP11, but generally the IDP will have to be followed'. So with that in mind, can you please explain what you meant when you said 'you can kind of get around GP11?'

Answer

Sir,

It is recognised that this could have been explained better, but the comment was made when put on the spot at the end of an interview, and it was not pre-planned.

Within the IDP and particularly GP11 there are exceptions. The percentage requirement of Policy GP11 may be reduced where it can be demonstrated that the application of this policy, including all provisions for options such as those relating to the mix of unit types and tenure and the provision of land or units on or off site to the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security or a housing association, the level of affordable housing required and/or the particular site constraints, would make the development otherwise unviable. In such circumstances, we will assess economic viability by using recognised financial viability models and may consult independent viability assessors as part of the assessment process, particularly where there is dispute over viability issues. As the costs of consulting an independent viability assessor will be expected to be borne by the applicant, these costs can be included in the viability appraisal of their proposal.

As stated in the relevant published Supplementary Planning Guidance, the D&PA will take a pragmatic and flexible approach when calculating the required level of affordable housing provision where the continued viability of the proposal is threatened. This could be because parts of a site could not be reasonably or cost effectively developed (for example, due to constraints such as topography, irregular shape, water bodies, infrastructure, contamination or features of natural or heritage interest) or because of legitimate economic and financial factors affecting development viability. We will also take into account where parts of a proposal would be for the provision of main roads, strategic infrastructure, structural and other significant landscaping areas and public open space. This will typically be relevant to larger sites only.

If you require further information on the exceptions with Policy GP11 please do read the supplementary planning guidance - [CHttpHandler.ashx \(gov.gg\)](#).

Question 2

You informed the States Assembly towards the end of last year that D+PA member Deputy Dyke, had been tasked with reviewing all aspects of policy GP11, so with that in mind can you please tell me what progress he has made to date?

Answer

Sir,

Deputy John Dyke has been tasked with looking at the process that would need to be undertaken when seeking to change the IDP. The D&PA are looking to see if this process can be shortened. We currently have a draft document suggesting some changes, but this needs to be reviewed by St James Chambers, to make sure that any amended process would still be transparent and fair, and brought before the Committee. In turn, when finalised, this might help as part of any evidence-based proposals to amend Policy GP11 if this Policy is found to require changing and could potentially help in other policy areas.

Date of Receipt of the Questions: 17 January 2022

Date of Reply: 28 January 2022