

PUBLIC INQUIRY RE: FIELD 622

APPLICATION P/2010/1717

Dear Mr Inspector,

Please find below two series of questions that I would be very grateful if you would consider, if appropriate, raising with those persons identified against each question at your forthcoming Public Inquiry.

1. Question to Mr Renouf, (as Senior Procureur of the Parish of St. Ouen):

Mr Renouf, the Senior Procureur du Bien Public advises in his statement of the 10th June 2013, that ‘the Procureur du Bien Public is “..... a procurator or proxy of the Parish and that his principle duty is to represent the Parish in looking after the property of the Parish”.

Mr Coates in his ‘Statement of Case’, dated 7th June 2013, paragraph 9.2, states“the planning application (P/2010/1717) did not form part of a village plan as encouraged by Policy H5. It may well be the case that if due process had been followed by the Parish and a village plan submitted to the Department for formal review, it may have been approved and adopted by the Minister as forming part of the Island’s planning framework’.

Question: Why did the Parish fail to follow due process and as encouraged by Policy H5, not prepare and submit a village plan?

Question: Is there a village plan? If not why not? If there is a village plan exactly when was Field 622 included in this?

2. Questions for Mr Thorne: (regarding Parish Assemblies & Minutes)

In Paragraph 27, of his ‘Main Submission to the Public Inquiry’, dated 2nd June 2013, Mr. Thorne states.....‘the consultation has proved that the Parish and Parishioners support the development and have voted in favour of it (see relevant extracts of Parish Assembly minutes at Appendices 4&5)’.

a) Question: Are you aware that in relation to the Parish Assembly of 17th November 2009, the processes adopted at the meeting and minutes appertaining to that Assembly, have been the subject of controversy and written complaints to the Constable, Mr. Ken Vibert?

b) Question: Are you aware that the accuracy of the minutes appertaining to the Parish Assembly of 23rd February 2010, have been called into question and are currently subject to a formal complaint to the Constable of St. Ouen?

c) Question: If you have not been advised of these complaints, could the Senior Procurer please inform the inquiry why not, as these minutes form a material part of your submission?

d) Question: Does your submission not suggest substantial support for the Parish's proposal? Would you not agree that, putting aside the controversy surrounding the vote taken on the 17th November 2010, the result was extremely close given that no count of abstentions was taken. Might your submission therefore suggest greater support for the project from Parishioners than is actually the case?

3. Question to Mr Thorne: (regarding the EiP held on 5th October 2010)

Question: Would you please confirm to the Inspector, that at the Examination in Public held on 5th October 2010, you confirmed to Messer's Shepley and Langton, that should the eastern half of Field 622 be re-zoned, the western part of the field and the adjoining field 623 would almost certainly fall and subsequently be rezoned / developed?

Question: Would you therefore agree that should Planning Application P/2010/1717 succeed, this will almost inevitably lead to development in the western part of Field 622 and Field 623?

Question: Are you aware that Parishioners of St. Ouen have been led to believe that this would not be the case? Please therefore clarify your comment(s).

I thank you in advance for considering the above questions.

Yours sincerely,

NICHOLAS POOLE