

## **Questions raised by Jason Lees-Baker to the Inquiry**

### **Field 622**

Dear Mr Bushby

Please find below a series of questions that I should be grateful if you would consider posing to the appropriate parties listed. Thank you in advance for your consideration of the queries made.

#### **Question to Advocate Renouf**

The Advocate has devoted more than fifty percent of his submission detailing his knowledge of the title to the Chemin du Passage, is this not putting the cart before the horse to a certain extent given the purpose of the enquiry is to determine whether a green zone field should fall to development?

Would the establishment of title to and boundaries with this Chemin du Passage be a secondary issue to be addressed once a decision on the main field has been made?

#### **Question to Mr Thorne**

The Minister and previous Minister have had a number of occasions to consider, and if thought fit, approve this application. I also note that these opportunities were during your employment by the Planning and Environment Department. I also note that at the previous Examination in Public the Examiners recommended that this application was rejected.

Why have two ministers and the EiP been reticent to approve the application?

#### **Question to Advocate Renouf**

In relation to your submission and in particular your research into the legal title, you state that the field is divided into two being under separate ownership. You state there is no physical separation. There are various maps of varying age showing that division to be in differing locations. It is very unlikely that the division of the field between the two owners as shown on drawing 4591/28 of Mr Thorne's main submission is/was in the place shown. We understand from the former Rector of St Ouen that the demarcation is likely to run at an obtuse angle from the North West to South East.

Furthermore, I understand that such demarcation issues have been subsequently agreed upon by the Rectorat and the Dean and Rector of St Ouen. I understand that the Western half of the field is under the Trusteeship of the Dean of Jersey, the Governor of the Island of Jersey and the Bishop of Winchester. Should a rezoning of the field take place potentially the value of the land will become significant. Is the Procureur satisfied that due process was followed in relation to seeking, and documentation thereof, the permission of all three trustees of the Western half of field 622 in connection with any land swap that may have occurred?

**Question to Mr Thorne**

In Paragraph 22 page 7 you state that the estate of the benefactor .... will provide funds to meet part of the development costs of this project' Have Parishioners been clearly advised how the remainder of the project will be funded? If so please identify the notices, assemblies and minutes where this is identified? If they have not been so informed, how do you reconcile this statement with that made in your paragraph 25, given such decisions were made over four years ago with no update to the Parishioners since?

Yours sincerely

**Jason Lees-Baker**