

PUBLIC INQUIRY RE: FIELD 622

APPLICATION P/2010/1717

Dear Sir,

I would be grateful if you would consider the inclusion of the following questions in your forthcoming Public Inquiry relating to Planning Application P/2010/1717, following my earlier submissions to the inquiry.

Question 1:

To Mr Richard Renouf, as Senior Procureur du Bien Public of the Parish of St. Ouen:

- a) What is the sum of the legacy that has been left to the Parish by Mrs Beryl Coulter?
- b) A Planning application has been submitted. Please clarify how the legacy has, is and will fund the project?
- c) Why have Parishioners not been kept advised of the accurate amount received to date from Mrs Coulter's legacy?
- d) Does the legacy fully cover the costs of the proposed development submitted under Application P/2010/1717?
- e) If not can the development, as submitted under Application P/2010/1717, be completed without any additional financial costs to the Parishioners?
- f) Why have these details been withheld from Parishioners to date?
- g) What is the exact amount that has to date been expended by the Parish in relation to Planning Application P/2010/1717?

Question 2:

To Mr Thorne:

Mr Thorne states in his main submission to the Public Inquiry, dated 2nd June 2013, in Para 34 in relation to Fields 630 and 654 that.....'the sites are small and could not be developed economically. The combined area is inadequate to meet the wishes of the Parish'

Question: Would you agree that as these two sites are not green zone and are situated extremely close to the parish amenities, they represent potential alternative sites?

Question: Would you agree that the Parish's intentions are driven by a legacy and not a defined demand? Accordingly, can you please clarify exactly what the Parish is able to afford?

Question: Might Fields 630 and 654 represent a more realistic sized area for development in relation to the legacy/funds available?

Question: Would non green zone sites not be more preferable than sub-dividing a long standing green field zone?

Question 3.

To Mr Richard Renouf, as Senior Procureur du Bien Public of the Parish of St. Ouen:

Mrs Coulter died on 9th October 2007. Her will was proved in the Probate Division of the Royal Court on the 25th day of October 2007. Morris Architects in their drawing, Drawing Number 4591/01, dated 'Nov 07', clearly illustrate that Field 622 had been earmarked by the Parish. This is an amazingly speedy decision following the death of Mrs Coulter and the fact that the Parish were advised of the legacy after her death. (Please see K. Vibert submission 10th May 2013)

Question: Please explain to the inquiry why it took the Parish a year (3rd October 2008) to incorporate an Association/Corporate Body as per the requirements of the Will?

Question: Please further explain to the inquiry why it took a further 6 months to achieve a Deed of Variation (28th April 2009) to the legacy? Why if the Parish could identify their preferred site within 2 months of Mrs Coulter's death, they were unable to move as speedily in adhering to the terms of the initial bequest?

Question: Following the track record and events following the death of Mrs Coulter, why was it that the Parish did not adhere to due process, as encouraged by Policy H5, in submitting a Village Plan in support of their application?

Yours faithfully,

Madeleine Poole